University of New Orleans

ScholarWorks@UNO

University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses

5-22-2006

The Relationship of Supervisors' Attachment Styles to their Perceptions of Self-Efficacy in Providing Corrective Feedback and to the Working Alliance in Counselor Education

Matthew Day
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td

Recommended Citation

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SUPERVISORS' ATTACHMENT STYLES
TO THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF SELF-EFFICACY IN
PROVIDING CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK AND TO THE
WORKING ALLIANCE IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
The Counselor Education Program

by

Matthew S. Day

B.A., Furman University, 1991
M.Div., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994

May 2006

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was an amalgamation enhanced by the help and guidance of many people. I would like to acknowledge their support and assistance with this dissertation and more than anything else express my utmost gratitude.

To my committee, I want to thank you for your guidance, feedback, openness to my thoughts and for the time that each of you spent in helping me achieve this study. Dr. Christensen, as the chair of my committee, you were a source of encouragement that allowed me to experience, and more importantly express, an entire spectrum of emotions associated with completing a dissertation. It was with your help that I finished this task as you read and reread the study, provided invaluable feedback, and to your credit, kept me on track. Any doctoral candidate would benefit from your assistance, but I will speak for myself as I hope to convey my gratitude for the commitment you made to me and to seeing me complete this research. Dr. Hulse-Killacky, it was my experience in your courses that helped me decide on my topic. You constantly expressed, and modeled, the benefit of giving corrective feedback and you enabled me to appreciate and understand the supervision experience. Your attention to the details of this project truly enhanced my research. Dr. Watson, your strongest contribution to this study was experienced more in our relationship. You allowed me to simultaneously look forward in my career, while paying attention to the completion of the study. We still have a game of racquetball to complete! Dr. Herlihy, you were a voice practicality. I truly appreciate how you were able to communicate one of the most important messages in this research project – explain what I intend to convey. I learned more about this project once I stopped looking at results and considered implications. Dr. Miller, as the methodologist, you frustrated me so much with your questions

that I believe I learned more in the completion of this study than I did in numerous research classes throughout my academic career. I cannot express my gratitude enough to you for the numerous last minute revisions, answers to my plentiful questions and your willingness to listen. You came onto this project once I had already begun and your assistance allowed me to complete my study, thank you.

To my parents, Bill and Martha Day, I cannot imagine writing these words or those that follow in this project if it were not for both of you. Both of you have always supported you me throughout my life from attempting to learn musical instruments to decisions I made regarding my moves, my education and my career. Thank you is not enough for both of you. I derived my ability to complete this research from the tremendous character that both of you displayed and continue to display in my life.

In conclusion I want to thank a few friends who were a part of this process. Thanks Mark for reading various components of this study and providing feedback, especially regarding the on-line survey administration and collection of data. More importantly in my life however, thank you for your friendship. You have shown me that it does take friends to complete significant life events, which extend beyond this study and beyond the boundaries of Louisiana. Roy, of all the things I could thank you for; I appreciate you most for providing a voice of difference on occasion. You allowed me to realize that varied viewpoints are vital as I continually develop as a professor, counselor and friend. Thanks Roy, and always remember that living in East Jefferson is not the same as living in Orleans Parish.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Supervisors are largely responsible for the structuring of supervision in counseling, which is influenced by various factors pertaining to a supervisor, all of which greatly affect the development of the counselor trainee. This study was designed to explore the factors of attachment styles, self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback and the dimensions of the working alliance. The results will ultimately inform counselor educators and supervisors about the practice of supervision and the implications of supervisors' attachment styles in counselor supervision.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes a detailed discussion regarding the conceptual framework and

rationale for conducting this study. Background information, an overview of the study including

variables of interest, and the purpose of the study will provide a foundation for this chapter.

Research questions, limitations, delimitations, key concepts and terms inherent to this study will

also be explored.

Overview of Study

A vast amount of research has been devoted to supervision, corrective feedback,

self-efficacy, and attachment issues, but not as they relate to each other in counseling supervision

(Kim, 1997; Pistole & Watkins, 1995). Bernard and Goodyear (1998) contended that corrective

feedback is an integral component of the supervisory relationship as evidenced by their

definition of supervision. Supervision is:

> An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior
> member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over
> time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the
> more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the
> client(s) she, he, or they see(s), and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the
> particular profession. (p. 6)

Others have supported this definition as they have indicated that the development of novice

counselors is often enhanced by the process of corrective feedback because it enables junior

members of a profession to become aware of unknown aspects about themselves, as well as learn

1

how to determine motives behind their behaviors (Crouch, Bloch, & Wanlass, 1994; Gladding, 1995; Morran & Stockton, 1980; Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999; Trotzer, 1989).

One factor that may influence the implementation of corrective feedback in the supervisory process is the attachment style of the supervisor. Watkins (1995) indicated that attachment styles have an impact on the character and nature of the supervisory process because attachment styles may influence a supervisor's self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback in the supervisory relationship. Likewise, attachment styles may also influence supervisors' perceptions of the working alliance in the supervisory relationship (Pistole & Watkins, 1995; Efstation, Patton & Kardash, 1990).

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore supervisor attachment styles as they pertain to supervisors' perceptions of their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback. This study also explored the relationship between supervisors' attachment styles and their perceptions of the working alliance. Existing literature presents two general classification systems of a person's attachment style: secure and insecure. Individuals with secure or confident attachment styles are characterized as having their interpersonal needs consistently met through their relationships with others. Insecure attachment is characteristic of individuals who exhibit behaviors that indicate that they get some to none of their interpersonal needs met through relationships with others. Insecure attachment styles have been categorized in numerous ways (Ainsworth, et al., 1978; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan, 1994; Main & Goldwin, 1984). Two classification systems (Bartholomew & Horowitz; Feeney et al.) have been empirically correlated and provide a wider range of classification than the initial three-category adult attachment style models (Main & Goldwin, 1984). Bartholomew (1990) described a person's attachment style or dimension as follows: (a) secure, (b) preoccupied, (c) dismissing,

2

and (d) fearful, which illuminated subtle differences and clarified differences among different attachment styles.

Feeney et al., (1994) introduced yet another classification system of attachment styles which was shown to be statistically similar to Bartholomew's classification system, but with an additional insecure classification that provided a clearer differentiation of the insecure dimensions. Feeney, et al., classified a person's attachment style or dimension as follows: (a) confidence, (b) discomfort with closeness, (c) need for approval, (d) preoccupation with relationships, and (e) relationships as secondary. For the sake of this investigation, the researcher utilized the classification system constructed by Feeney et al. This study explored relationships among all of the aforementioned constructs in order to determine potential relationships among supervisors' attachment styles, their perceptions of self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback, and their perceptions of the working alliance in counselor supervision.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study was based on theoretical explanations of supervision in counselor education and adult attachment. Literature consistently supports the notion that supervision is essential to the development of novice counselors as it is one of the most effective ways to foster skill development and relationship building skills in counselor education (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Borders & Leddick, 1987), while attachment theory offers a useful framework for studying human behavior in relationships (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). By intertwining constructs related to attachment theory and counselor supervision, there is a consistent focus on the significance of interpersonal relationships within the context of counselor education. The following discussion will illuminate various details

related to attachment theory and counselor supervision to provide a theoretical foundation

regarding the importance of a study that addresses how adult attachment styles relate to

supervisors' perceptions of their ability to offer corrective feedback and how such attachment

styles may influence supervisors' perceptions of the working alliance in counselor supervision.

Adult Attachment and Counselor Supervision

To date, there has been limited empirical attention to attachment theory as it pertains to

counselor supervision. There are various adult models of attachment (Bartholomew, 1990;

Feeney et al., 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main, Kaplan & Cassidy, 1985; Sperling & Berman,

1991) that all illuminate the impact that a person's attachment style has on the thoughts,

behaviors, and emotions they experience in interpersonal relationships.

This study used the classification of attachment styles by Feeney et al. (1994) as follows:

(a) confidence, (b) discomfort with closeness, (c) need for approval, (d) preoccupation with

relationships, and (e) relationships as secondary. Individuals with a confident attachment style

would be comfortable with close relationships while maintaining boundaries, and they would be

confident in themselves and in their relationships with others. Individuals with an attachment

style of discomfort with closeness would avoid developing close relationships except when

necessary to achieve a goal; these individuals are confident in themselves, but worry about the

opinions of others. Individuals with an attachment style of need for approval are not confident in

their abilities, and focus more on developing relationships, but mainly to avoid criticism.

Individuals with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships also exhibit little self-

confidence in their abilities, worry about the opinions of others, and are uncomfortable being

close to others. Finally, individuals with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will

have self-confidence in their abilities, but place importance on achievement over relationship, and therefore feel uncomfortable in social situations.

Counselor supervision involves an interpersonal relationship within a process that allows for an individual (supervisor) to oversee another's (supervisee's) work within another relationship (counseling). Dynamics related to both the supervisor and the supervisee and who they are within the context of supervision are indicators of each person's view of the effectiveness of their work together (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). "Supervision provides an opportunity for a student to capture the essence of the psychotherapeutic process as articulated and modeled by the supervisor and, subsequently, to recreate this process in an actual counseling relationship" (Holloway, 1995, p.1). The supervisor, therefore, has an extremely important role and a responsibility to ensure that the supervisee receives the aforementioned information via experience, modeling of the counseling process, and although not directly inferred, through the supervisory relationship. The relationship, and ultimately the supervision that occurs within the relationship, may be greatly influenced by the attachment style of the supervisor. For example, a person with a dismissing attachment style (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991) would be characterized as possessing a positive view of self, and a negative view of others. A supervisor with a dismissing style may have a heightened sense of self-efficacy and may overtax the supervisee with corrective feedback. The dismissing supervisor may be hesitant to disclose personal vulnerabilities, and the developmental growth of the supervisee may be influenced by the misperception of a supervisor being "perfect" (an unattainable goal which the supervisee may be constantly attempting to attain with this particular supervisor).

Overview of the Variables of Interest

The primary variables of interest in this study included self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback, supervisor perception of the working alliance, and supervisors' attachment styles. Each variable is discussed in relation to the supervision process, and in regard to how the influence of these variables may impact supervisors' perceptions of the supervisory relationship. Therefore, this study attempted to determine the potential influence of the variables on the supervisory relationship.

Supervision

Supervision has been widely researched and addressed by various authors in regard to numerous tenets such as: (a) theories and approaches to supervision, (b) components of effective supervision, and (c) supervisor and supervisee characteristics that promote effective supervision (Holloway, 1984, 1992; Russell, Crimmings, & Lent 1984; Worthington, 1987). Existing studies have indicated that numerous characteristics influence the supervisory relationship and supervision-related expectations. Anxiety, supervisor and supervisee behaviors, and developmental factors have all been cited as influential aspects in counselor supervision. The study focused on supervision in terms of supervisors' perceived self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback and their perceptions of the working alliance.

Corrective Feedback

"Corrective feedback is intended to encourage thoughtful examination and/or express the feedback provider's perception of the need for change on the part of the receiver" (Morran, Stockton, & Bond, 1991, p. 410). Giving corrective feedback may present many challenges to supervisors based upon numerous factors. These factors may include supervisor anxiety; supervisor experience; gender, racial, and cultural issues; and the supervisor's self-

efficacy in providing corrective feedback. The evaluative process is a core component of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Claiborn & Lichentberg, 1989; Holloway, 1995; Kadushin, 1985), and the supervisor is faced with the task of evaluating the supervisee through the use of feedback, both positive and corrective. Based on the assumption that corrective feedback is essential in effective supervision and that it often poses interpersonal relationship challenges for supervisors, this study specifically addressed how supervisors' attachment styles may hinder or aid supervisors in giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to the congruence between knowledge and skills in a specific field and the belief that one has the ability to perform the skills successfully (Bandura, 1986). Ideally, supervisors have a significantly greater amount of training and experience in general than the trainees they are supervising. Supervisors are essentially expected to possess self-efficacy in a variety of circumstances throughout the supervisory relationship (Bradley & Olsen, 1980; Kadushin, 1985). For example, there are times when the supervisor must give corrective feedback, which may or may not be received positively by the supervisee. The supervisor needs to be prepared to handle a variety of reactions that corrective feedback can elicit in supervisees. The process of giving and receiving corrective feedback may be hindered if supervisors doubt their ability to guide the process (Steward, 1998). Based on attachment theory, people possess varying degrees of self-efficacy in any type of interpersonal relationship, simply because of their attachment style. Therefore, attachment styles may influence supervisors' self-efficacy, specifically in regard to giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Working Alliance

Efstation, et al., (1990) indicated that the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee in counselor supervision is a working alliance. The working alliance in counselor supervision is designed to facilitate the learning of the supervisee. The perception of the working alliance of both the supervisee and supervisor is an important perception (Bordin, 1981; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001), as this alliance will influence the growth and skill development of the trainee. For the purposes of this investigation, the supervisor's perception of the working alliance was addressed. The primary constructs of the working alliance are rapport, client focus, and identification (Efstation et al.). The supervisor's perception of the three constructs will influence the working alliance and either hinder or aid the collaboration for change which is a necessary component of supervision (Bordin, 1981).

Attachment Styles

Numerous models of adult attachment styles exist (Bartholomew, 1990; Collins & Read, 1990; Feeney et al., 1994; Main et al., 1985; Sperling & Berman, 1991), but the commonality among the models are that they emphasize a person's style as being either securely attached or insecurely attached. In general, a person with a secure attachment style will be more comfortable in close interpersonal relationships. A person with a secure attachment style will be more flexible, trustworthy, and open in interpersonal relationships (Bartholomew, 1990). Numerous variations exist among the attachment style models in respect to insecurely attached individuals, but a general characterization of these individuals is that they are more uncomfortable in interpersonal relationships. When supervisors' attachment styles are insecure, their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback may be influenced, but it is fairly certain that the

8

working alliance between the supervisor and supervisee will be affected (Pistole & Watkins, 1995).

Attachment Styles and Counselor Supervision

Attachment theory has been applied to significant adult relationships such as intimate relationships, co-workers, and the counseling relationship (Bartholomew, 1990; Feeney et al., 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main, et al., 1985; Sperling & Berman, 1991). Researchers have proposed that attachment theory constructs (e.g., secure base, internal working model) and phenomena are relevant to the counseling process as the client is able to view the counselor as a secure base from which the client can explore and develop (Osofsky, 1988; Pistole, 1989). The relationship that exists in supervision has a different function than the counseling relationship, but various aspects are shared, including the working alliance (Efstation et al., 1990; Pistole & Watkins, 1995). Even though research concerning the application of attachment theory to the supervisory relationship is limited (Kim, 1997), it seems logical that attachment theory could be applied to supervision. The supervisor does serve as a secure base from which the supervisee can explore, make mistakes, and develop as a counselor. The supervisor must be capable of providing the secure base for the supervisee, and this study examined how attachment styles may influence the ability of the supervisor to be a secure base, specifically in the areas of giving corrective feedback and accurately perceiving the working alliance.

Purpose of the Study

Counselor supervision is a vital element in the development of the counselor trainee and the relationship that will occur during counselor supervision influences the supervisee in various meaningful ways. Supervisors are largely responsible for the structuring of supervision, which is

influenced by various factors pertaining to supervisors' personal beliefs about content and process, all of which greatly affect the development of the counselor trainee. While attention has been given to numerous factors that may influence the supervisory process (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998), little empirical data exist on how supervisors' attachment styles may influence how supervisors facilitate the interpersonal relationship within supervision (Kim, 1997).

Likewise limited empirical attention has been directed toward the exploration of doctoral students who supervise master's students in counseling education. Therefore, this study was intended to provide information regarding the effect of doctoral student supervisor attachment styles, and how these styles specifically influence supervisors' perceptions about their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback and their perceptions of the working alliance in supervision with master's students in counseling. The results of this research may enable counselor education programs to explore the manner in which they provide supervision to counselors in training, train their supervisors, and supervise their supervisors. Such information will ultimately inform counselor educators about the practice of supervision and the implications of supervisors' attachment styles in counselor supervision.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

Research Question 1

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision?

Research Question 2

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' perceptions of any the working alliance factors of client focus, rapport, and identification in counselor supervision?

Limitations and Delimitations

Creswell (1994) identified limitations as potential weaknesses of a study and delimitations as ways that a study is narrowed in scope. The following discussion will address potential weaknesses of this investigation, as well as ways in which the researcher has narrowed the scope of this investigation. The first limitation involved the limited amount of research conducted on adult attachment styles as they pertain to the supervisor and the supervisory relationship. This dearth of existing research provided little direction regarding future exploration of issues related to adult attachment, in general. Furthermore, the reliance on participants' self-reports also contributed to the limitation of this investigation, as Likert Scale questions may not fully reflect research participants' opinions on certain items. Finally, attachment is a continuous variable and not easily measured on an interval or ratio scale of measurement.

The main delimitation of this investigation pertained to the use of doctoral student supervisors. The researcher realized that this is a use of a convenience sample and that doctoral students in CACREP accredited counselor education programs limited the external validity of the study.

Definition of Terms

Terms relevant to this research project and their definitions are listed below. Definitions were constructed for the sake of this investigation and are based on existing literature and the researcher's experiences in counselor supervision.

Attachment   A motivational control system that has the goal of
                                 promoting safety and felt security in a person through the
                                 relationship with an attachment figure or caregiver.

Adult Attachment   A behavior that results in a person attaining or retaining
                                 proximity to some other differentiated and preferred individual
                                 who is usually conceived as stronger and/or wiser.

Attachment theory   A theory based upon the premise that individuals have an
                                 innate tendency to seek proximity to others. The basic premise of
                                 the theory is that people's attachments play a significant role in
                                 their development, their beliefs about themselves, and their
                                 expectations of others.

Attachment Styles   Dimensions of a person that characterize that person's
                                 patterns of relating in interpersonal relationships.

Corrective Feedback   A statement with an explicit or implicit evaluation

component that refers to attitudes, ideas, emotions, or behaviors of

the counselor trainee or to aspects of the trainee-client relationship

or the trainee-supervisor relationship.

Supervision   The process in which a senior member (a doctoral level counseling

supervisor), oversees the work of a junior member (a master's

level counseling student).

Internal Working Model   Cognitive and affective constructs that develop in the course of

behavioral interactions between two or more people. The model is

a schema that allows the individual to place concerns into

perspective based upon self and others. Based upon a person's

attachment experiences as an infant, the person will organize

cognitive representations of self, others, and relationships, and

these representations are termed working models.

Self   An internalized set of beliefs that integrate perceptions of

one's own competence and love worthiness.

Other   The expectations of the availability and likely

responsiveness of another person to whom one is attached.

Secure Base   A foundation that offers solid, emotional bonds for being in

the world. The base allows for a starting point from which one can

explore the world and develop a sense of identity in regard to self

and others. The base will allow for exploratory behaviors while

simultaneously providing anxiety-reducing functions.

Self-Efficacy   A person's judgments of their capabilities to organize and

execute courses of action required to attain designated

types of performances.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter begins with an overview of supervision, including theoretical and philosophical constructs pertinent to supervision. Because the developmental model has been considered to be one of the most widely researched and accepted frameworks of supervision, it will be used as the foundation for a discussion regarding the process of supervision in counselor education (Holloway, 1992). Other concepts associated with supervision including (a) corrective feedback; (b) self-efficacy as it pertains to providing corrective feedback; (c) the working alliance in terms of client focus, rapport, and identification; and (d) the supervisory relationship will be discussed as they pertain to the proposed research. This literature review also includes a brief overview of attachment theory. In particular, constructs related to the origins of attachment theory with primary attention to adult attachment styles or dimensions and how such styles may influence the supervisory relationship will be explored.

Supervision

The supervisory relationship is characterized by numerous factors such as interpersonal relationship dynamics, the process of giving and receiving feedback, developmental concerns related to case conceptualization and skill attainment, and evaluation. "Supervision is a formal relationship in which the supervisor's task includes imparting expert knowledge, making judgments of trainees' performance, and acting as a gatekeeper to the profession" (Holloway,

1995, pg. 43). Because supervision involves the imparting of knowledge and case conceptualization, supervisors must also continue to develop and enhance their own skills as counselors. Supervisors ultimately must be able to evaluate supervisees and in turn provide feedback about effective and ineffective work by counselors. Supervisors, therefore, have a challenge to enable supervisees to develop as counselors as well as evaluate their competence and growth. While supervision is a formal relationship, it also includes various dynamics related to interpersonal relationships, which must be developed and fostered. Given the multitude of responsibilities faced by supervisors, various issues arise regarding the supervisor's role in the supervisory relationship.

The Developmental Model of Supervision

Developmental models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987) have been prominent in research associated with supervision in counselor supervision. A major construct of developmental theories is that trainees vary in their development as counselors, and it is the supervisor's responsibility to evaluate supervisees' developmental status and competency in counseling. Therefore, supervisors have the awesome task of not only assessing supervisees' counseling skills, but also assisting in the development of supervisees. Numerous supervisee and supervisor factors influence this development, but a vast amount of research has focused primarily on factors related to supervisees (Holloway, 1987, 1992; Winter & Holloway, 1992). Such factors vary from cognitive functioning and conceptual level (Birk & Mahalik, 1996) to counseling experience and expectations by the trainee of the supervisor (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Worthington, 1987). Apart from developmental approaches to supervision and supervision research, few researchers have addressed factors

16

related to supervisors' personal characteristics, which influence the supervisory relationship (Mallinckrodt, et al., 1995; Pistole & Watkins, 1995).

Many have attested to the importance of the relationship between supervisors and supervisees in counselor education (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Holloway, 1995). Numerous instruments have been developed to assess the supervisory relationship (Efstation et al., 1990; Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Holloway & Wampold, 1986), but these instruments measure perceptions of the relationship and do not emphasize how supervisor characteristics may influence the relationship. Furthermore, few researchers have explored supervisors' perceptions of the relationship. Therefore, this study attempted to examine supervisors' perceptions of the relationship in regard to how their personal characteristics, specifically attachment styles, influence supervisors' perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

Corrective Feedback

The evaluative process is a core component of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Claiborn & Lichentberg, 1989; Holloway, 1995; Kadushin, 1985). Supervisors are faced with the task of evaluating the supervisee and the general form of evaluation is through the use of feedback, both positive and corrective. Friedlander, Siegel, and Brenock (1989) defined feedback as follows:

> A statement, with an explicit or implicit evaluation component that refers to attitudes, ideas, emotions, or behaviors of the trainee or to aspects of the trainee- client relationship or the trainee-supervisor relationship. Feedback does not include questions or observations that lack an explicit or implied evaluation of the trainee on the part of the supervisor. (p.151)

Some supervisors may find that giving feedback about the positive aspects of the supervisees (positive feedback) is a more approachable task than offering corrective feedback regarding areas for improvement. Regardless, both types of feedback are critical components in the supervisory

17

process. Research has indicated various considerations when providing feedback: (a)

examination of individual differences,

(b) supervisees' and supervisors' developmental levels, (c) a supervisees' defensiveness toward

supervision or the supervisor, and (d) evaluation as a mutual and continuous component of

supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Fried, Tiegs, & Bellamy, 1992; Kadushin 1985).

However, limited research exists on how attachment styles may influence the provision, or lack

of provision, of corrective feedback in supervision by the supervisor (Mallinckrodt, 1995; Pistole

& Watkins, 1995). Accordingly, this study examined how attachment styles may influence the

provision of corrective feedback and supervisors' self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback.

Self-Efficacy in Giving Corrective Feedback

Self-efficacy is generally conceptualized as a process by which individuals judge their

competence in specific areas. In this study, the focus was on supervisor perceptions of their self-

efficacy in providing corrective feedback in supervision. Research indicates that high levels of

counselor self-efficacy directly relate to supervisor self-efficacy (Bradley & Olsen, 1980; Larson

& Daniels, 1998; Steward, 1998). The supervisors' perception of competency is a vital

component in the provision of corrective feedback, as it requires supervisors to battle with a

dissonance regarding the entitlement to judge, a need to evaluate performance, and a desire to

foster a collaborative and accepting relationship (Kadushin, 1985). While Carifio and Hess

(1987) contended that supervisors with higher levels of self-efficacy are more equipped to battle

possible dissonance and are more equipped to provide feedback that is corrective, empirical

support for such contentions does not exist. Page and Hulse-Killacky (1999) indicated that

research on self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback is limited. They addressed this lack of

research by developing an instrument to help measure supervisors' self-efficacy for giving

corrective feedback, known as The Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument (CFSI), (Page & Hulse-Killacky). The CFSI incorporates two factors that measure the total self-efficacy of the supervisor including: therapeutic efficacy and fear efficacy. While it seems logical that supervisors' personal characteristics, such as attachment styles, may also influence their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback, researchers have yet to give empirical attention to this factor. Therefore, this study explored how supervisors' attachment styles influence their perceptions of their self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback and their perceptions of the working alliance.

Attachment Theory

Bowlby (1977, p.203) defined attachment behavior as "behavior that results in a person attaining or retaining proximity to some other differentiated individual, who is usually conceived of as stronger and/or wiser." Bowlby (1980) indicated that attachment is developed and maintained from close relationships and affectionate bonds with others. Bowlby's emphasis on the infant and mother bond was paramount to attachment theory as theoretical constructs related to attachment initially focused on the infancy and toddlerhood stage of human development. However, researchers noticed that similarities existed between attachment in infants and attachment in adulthood (Ainsworth, 1982, Bowlby, 1980; Bretherton, 1992; Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Adult Attachment Theory

Bowlby (1980) referred to attachment in adulthood as the development of warm, intimate and continuous relationships with significant others. Attachment in adult relationships has been examined in numerous areas such as adult romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver, 1987),

relationships between adult friends (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991), relationships between co-workers (Hazan & Shaver, 1990), relationships between counselors and clients (Bowlby, 1978; Pistole, 1989), and to a lesser degree relationships between supervisors and supervisees (Watkins, 1995).

<p style="text-align:center">Adult Attachment Styles</p>

Bowlby's basic premise was that human beings are innately programmed to seek and form attachments with others (1988). These attachments may be secure or insecure. A parent who consistently meets the needs of a child will likely foster a secure attachment style with the child. Likewise, an adult romantic relationship in which both people's needs are consistently met will be a relationship characterized by secure or confident attachment. Insecure attachment can be categorized in numerous ways (Ainsworth, et al., 1978; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Feeney et al., 1994; Main & Goldwin, 1984). For example, two classification systems (Bartholomew & Horowitz; Feeney et al.) are empirically correlated and provide divergent views about how to classify attachment. They differ from the initial three-category adult attachment style model developed by Main and Goldwin. Bartholomew (1990) developed a four-category classification system of attachment styles. She developed her taxonomy in terms of self and other. She indicated that individuals possess a way of viewing themselves (positive or negative) and a way of viewing others (positive or negative). She used a 2x2 matrix to classify a person's attachment style or dimension as follows: (a) secure (positive self, positive other) individuals are comfortable in relationships, they value relationships, and they can be both intimate and autonomous; (b) preoccupied (negative self, positive other) individuals are characterized by anxiety and emotionality, they are over-involved, and dependent in relationships; (c) dismissing (positive self, negative other) individuals value independence and deny desires for intimacy; (d)

fearful (negative self, negative other) individuals are anxious, distrustful, and fearful of rejection. For instance, first year surgical residents with secure attachment pattern are able to evaluate corrective or negative feedback, and maintain that they are still capable doctors. First year residents with a preoccupied pattern, working model, will allow the negative evaluation to override any amount of positive comments, and in turn devaluate themselves as doctors. Working models however are not rigid, and can be altered when exposed to situations that consistently repudiate an individual's current attachment style (Hazan & Hutt, 1993; Kobak & Hazan, 1991; Rothbard & Shaver, 1994).

A second classifications system was introduced by Feeney et al. (1994) and was shown to be statistically similar to Bartholomew's classification system, but with an additional insecure classification that provided a clearer differentiation of the insecure dimensions. These researchers classified a person's attachment style or dimension as follows: (a) confidence, (b) discomfort with closeness, (c) need for approval, (d) preoccupation with relationships, and (e) relationships as secondary. Individuals with a confident attachment style would be comfortable with close relationships while maintaining boundaries, and they would be confident in themselves and in their relationships with others. Individuals with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness would avoid developing close relationships except when necessary to achieve a goal; these individuals are confident in themselves, but worry about the opinions of others. Individuals with an attachment style of need for approval are not confident in their abilities, and focus more on developing relationships, but mainly to avoid criticism. Individuals with an attachment style of preoccupation of relationships also exhibit little self-confidence in their abilities, worry about the opinions of others, and are uncomfortable being close to others. Finally, individuals with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will have self-

confidence in their abilities, but place importance on achievement over relationship, and therefore feel uncomfortable in social situations (Feeney et al., 1994).

Adult Attachment Theory and Supervision in Counselor Education

The application of adult attachment theory to supervisor/supervisee relationships has been primarily theoretical, with limited empirical attention (Pistole & Watkins, 1995). The literature is comprised of theoretical pieces that support the use of attachment theory in examining aspects of the supervisory relationship (Pistole & Watkins, 1995; Watkins, 1995). The implications set forth by these writers illuminated how key constructs of attachment theory, such as internal working models and a secure base, could be directly applied to the supervisory relationship. The examination of the constructs within the confines of the supervisory relationship would allow for a different perspective to examine components that influence counselor supervision. Given the limited research devoted to adult attachment theory as it relates to the supervision process, this study examined the influence of supervisor attachment on supervisors' perception of their self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback and the working alliance.

Summary

Research on adult attachment has been conducted in regard to many significant relationships. Various researchers have indicated that attachment theory is useful in increasing the understanding of interpersonal behaviors between adults in significant relationships. Despite such empirical support regarding the influence of attachment theory on adult relationships, research specific to adult attachment styles and counselor supervision has been limited. Due to the fact that supervision has been considered to be a highly significant relationship for both

supervisors and supervisees, it is plausible to consider that supervisors' attachment styles may very well influence the outcome of supervision. After all, the goal of supervision is for the supervisee to develop as a counselor and part of attaining that goal involves the supervisee being supported and challenged by receiving corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is evaluative in nature and while supervisee characteristics may influence their receptivity to such feedback, the manner with which supervisors provide such corrective feedback can most certainly influence the relationship and working alliance between supervisees and supervisors. It is the contention of this researcher that supervisors' attachment styles will influence the manner in which they provide corrective feedback and will ultimately influence the working alliance and supervisory relationship. Therefore, this study focused on how attachment styles influenced supervisors' perceptions of their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback. This study also examined the association between attachment styles and supervisors' perceptions of the working alliance. Findings from this investigation provided new information regarding supervision in counselor education, thus establishing a framework from which future researchers can explore other avenues related to the supervisory relationship.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes a detailed discussion of the research questions, hypotheses, variables, and methodological design for this study. Descriptions of the sample and the sample selection process are also presented. Finally, specifics regarding instrumentation, data collection procedures and a data analysis plan provide an account of how this study was conducted.

Purpose of the Study

Counselor supervision is a vital element in the development of the counselor trainee and the supervisory relationship that evolves throughout the process of supervision, which influences the supervisee in various meaningful ways. Supervisors are largely responsible for the structuring of supervision, which is influenced by various factors pertaining to supervisors' personal beliefs about content and process, all of which greatly affect the development of the counselor trainee. While attention has been given to numerous factors that may influence the supervisory process, scant empirical data exist on how supervisors' attachment styles may influence how supervisors facilitate the interpersonal relationship within supervision (Pistole & Watkins, 1995). While many have alluded to the importance of such research (Kim, 1997; Pistole, 1989; Schlosse & Gelso, 2001), few have conducted studies specific to these constructs. This study intended to provide information regarding the effect of supervisor attachment styles, and how these styles specifically influence supervisors' perceptions about their self-efficacy in

giving corrective feedback and their perceptions of the working alliance in counselor supervision.

The conceptual framework for this investigation was based on the premise that by understanding attachment styles, supervisors will be better prepared to provide corrective feedback in a manner that facilitates supervisees' receptivity and willingness to implement the feedback. Once supervisees reap the benefits of incorporating feedback, they begin to develop positive self-perceptions about the efficacy of their counseling skills (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999). Furthermore, it is the belief of the researcher that knowledge of attachment styles may also allow supervisors to examine factors that contribute to their perceptions of the working alliance and the supervisory relationship. The results will enable counselor education programs to evaluate how the practice of supervision by doctoral students may be more beneficial to the development of both the supervisor and supervisee.

Research Questions

The research questions considered in this study include the following:

Research Question 1

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision?

Research Question 2

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' perceptions with any of the working alliance factors of client focus, rapport, and identification in counselor supervision?

Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses for each research question in this study include the following:

Research Question 1

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision?

Null Research Hypothesis 1-1

Supervisors with a confident attachment style will not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-2

Supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-3

Supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness will not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-4

Supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval will not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-5

Supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships will not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-6

Supervisors' attachment styles will not be an indicator of a supervisor's self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Research Question 2

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' perceptions with any of the working alliance factors of client focus, rapport, and identification in counselor supervision?

Null Research Hypothesis 2-1

Supervisors with a confident attachment style will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-2

Supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-3

Supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-4

Supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-5

Supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Participants

Doctoral students enrolled in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs that supervise master's level counseling students who are in practicum and internship were solicited to participate. The list of CACREP-accredited counselor education programs was obtained from the counseling website (www.counseling.org) under the CACREP directory. Participants were identified through a letter addressed to the director of the Practicum/Internship program (Appendix E) at 44 CACREP-accredited doctoral programs in counselor education. Faculty members in charge of the doctoral supervision groups were asked to provide a list of e-mail addresses of doctoral students or to disseminate the survey packet link to the students if they did not want to disclose the e-mail addresses of the students.

After receiving the instruction regarding how the faculty members wanted to disseminate the information, an e-mail was sent either to the faculty member or to individual student's e-mail address, which included a cover letter and a link to the surveys and demographic information (Appendix E). The cover letter illustrated the intent of the research, the benefits of participating in the research, how confidentiality was ensured, and the minimal risk of harm and the potential results of the proposed study (Appendix E). The same process was repeated two weeks later with a follow-up cover letter reminding faculty and students about the study and thanking those students who had already participated (Appendix E).

Sample size was determined after computing a power analysis. Four factors were considered in determining an appropriate sample size: (a) level of significance, or the alpha level, (b) power of the test, (c) the population error variance, and (d) effect size (Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). Power is defined as the probability of correctly rejecting the null hypothesis when it is false. To reduce a Type II error, which is not rejecting a false hypothesis, the alpha level was increased leading to a more powerful test. The alpha level for this study was set at .05 and was satisfactory in examining the aforementioned variables. The power level was approximately .80, derived from $1 - \beta(\alpha)$. A small effect size with a conservative estimate is sufficient because this was an exploratory study (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). To detect an effect size of .10 with a 90% probability, a sample size needed to range from 170 to 200. A sample size 176 was obtained, meeting the aforementioned requirements.

Research Design

Survey Research

Based on the purpose of this study, to explore supervisors' attachment styles and perceptions regarding the supervisory relationship, it was appropriate to utilize survey research as the methodological approach. While survey research is known for measuring characteristics of a sample of people and then making inferences about the larger population, survey methodology can also be employed to collect data from well-defined, smaller populations (Kerlinger, 1986). Furthermore, survey research is commonly utilized to explore various aspects of psychological and sociological factors related to attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors that enable researchers to understand relationships among such variables and people (Creswell, 1994; Kerlinger, 1986).

Therefore, a self-report instrument was utilized in an ex post facto questionnaire survey design to answer research questions in this investigation and address specific variables. The self-

report instrument consisted of the following (a) the Attachment Style Questionnaire - ASQ (Feeney, et al., 1994) (Appendix B), (b) the Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument - CFSI (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999) (Appendix A), (c) the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – SWAI (Efstation, et al., 1990) (Appendix C), and (d) the Personal Information Questionnaire (Appendix D). A discussion regarding how each instrument pertains to specific variables follows.

Variables

The variables of interest in this study included attachment styles, levels of self-efficacy in regard to providing corrective feedback, and perception of the working alliance. The predictor variables associated with this study pertained to attachment styles which are qualitative in nature and include the following: (a) confidence, (b) discomfort with closeness, (c) need for approval, (d) preoccupation with relationships, and (e) relationships as secondary. The criterion variables, self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback and perception of the working alliance, are quantitative. Accordingly, attachment styles were measured by using the Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Appendix B) designed by Feeney, et al., (1994). Self-efficacy was measured through the use of the Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument (CFSI) (Appendix A) constructed by Page (Page and Hulse-Killacky, 1999). Supervisors' perception of the working relationship was measured with the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) (Appendix C) developed by Efstation, et al., (1990). A detailed discussion of each of these instruments and how they were utilized in this investigation follows.

Instrumentation

Attachment Style Questionnaire

The Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Feeney et al., 1994) is a 40-item self-report measure of adult attachment dimensions (Appendix B). Participants were asked to respond to the items, which are worded as statements, using a six-point Likert scale. The Likert scale for this instrument varies from a 6, indicating, "totally agree," to a 1, indicating "totally disagree." Each statement, or item, provided a measure for a specific factor or dimension of attachment. Specific dimensions or styles of attachment included: (a) confidence, (b) discomfort with closeness, (c) need for approval, (d) preoccupation with relationships, and (e) relationships as secondary. Each dimension (attachment style) was measured by a specific set of items: confidence was measured by 8 items (questions numbered 1, 2, 3, 19, 33, 37 and 38); discomfort with closeness was measured by 10 items (questions numbered 4, 5, 16, 17, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26 and 34); need for approval was measured by 7 items (questions numbered 11, 12, 13, 15, 24, 27, and 35); preoccupation with relationships was measured by 8 items (questions numbered 18, 22, 28, 29, 30, 32, 39, and 40); and relationships as secondary was measured by 7 items (questions numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 and 36). On each of the dimensions, participant's scores may range as follows: confidence (8 to 48), discomfort with closeness (10 to 60), need for approval (7 to 42), preoccupation with relationships (8 to 48), and relationships as secondary (7 to 42). Higher scores on a specific dimension indicated that the participant's attachment style is characteristic of that dimension. Lower scores on a specific dimension indicate that the participant's attachment style is not characteristic of that dimension. For the purpose of this study, a person's attachment

style was determined by the highest score, based upon a percentage value, on a specific dimension.

Feeney et al. (1994) tested the ASQ in two samples, college students and eighth grade students, to establish levels of reliability and validity. The scale was initially composed of 65 items, but was reduced to 40 after the authors conducted a principal-components analysis using the 470 responses of the college students. Coefficient alphas were calculated for each of the dimensions to evaluate internal consistency using data from the entire sample. The coefficient alphas were as follows: 0.80 for confidence, 0.84 for discomfort with closeness, 0.79 for need for approval, 0.76 for preoccupation with relationships, and 0.76 for relationships as secondary. Reliability was established by a retest of 295 of the students after 10 weeks and the reliability coefficients were as follows: 0.74 for confidence, 0.74 for discomfort with closeness, 0.78 for need for approval, 0.72 for preoccupation with relationships, and 0.67 for relationships as secondary. This indicated that the dimensions, the attachment styles, differ from each other in regard to what they measured and therefore enabled the use of a five factor classification. The test-retest reliability measure was to ensure that the test measures were consistent.

Convergent validity was established by examining the correlation between the five dimensions of the scale with dimensions from other measures of adult attachment styles. Feeney et al. (1994) used a cluster analysis with Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) dimensions of attachment (secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful) to examine how participants described by one of Bartholomew and Horowitz's four dimensions differed from the five dimensions of the ASQ. Participants with a secure dimension (characterized by a positive view of self and a positive view of others) also scored high on the confidence dimension and low on the other four ASQ dimensions. Participants with a fearful dimension (negative view of self and negative view

of others) scored low on the confidence subscale of the ASQ, and high on the other four subscales of the ASQ. Participants with a dismissing dimension (positive view of self, but negative view of others) scored high on discomfort with closeness and mid-range on the other subscales, indicating that achievement precedes relationship in a working alliance. Such individuals might also be described as being self-confident (positive view of self), while simultaneously worrying about other's approval, which would be represented by a mid-range score on the need for approval subscale. Finally, participants with a preoccupied dimension (negative view of self, but positive view of others) scored high on need for approval and preoccupation with relationships and low on the subscales of confidence and relationships as secondary. These individuals would probably lack self-confidence and would be preoccupied with worrying about the approval of others, which would explain the tendency to be characterized as being moderately uncomfortable around others. Overall, analysis of the ASQ provided support for at least a four-dimension model of attachment styles, rather than the three factor models proposed by other authors (Hazan & Shaver, 1987).

Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument

The Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument (CFSI) (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999) is a 16-item self-report measure to assess supervisors' perceptions of their self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback (Appendix A). The survey includes items worded as statements such as "I feel confident that I can give corrective feedback without the receiver becoming angry with me," and used a six-point Likert scale ranging from 6 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). Each item provided a measure for one of three specific constructs that were identified as evidence of providing corrective feedback effectively. The three constructs are (a) composing feedback messages with effective message content, (b) overcoming fears, and (c) giving

corrective feedback in ways that are considered to be therapeutic. A total composite score indicated a measure of self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback, with higher scores indicating high self-efficacy and lower scores indicating low self-efficacy. Each of the constructs was based upon characteristics or factors associated with the effective implementation of the specific construct. The Message Efficacy Scale was based upon seven characteristics associated with giving effective feedback messages such as directive/nondirective or positive/corrective. Both the Fears Efficacy Scale and the Therapeutic Efficacy Scale were established by a similar method.

The original scale consisted of 40 items, but was initially reduced to 34 based upon expert feedback. A three-phase data collection and analysis plan was conducted to establish validity and reliability using graduate students as the sample group. Data were collected from 152 students from 14 universities in 12 states in phase one. The total composite CFSI score indicates the participant's self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback. Kaiser-Guttman tests were conducted to determine the statistical characteristics of the items associated with each factor on the scale. Any item that loaded at 0.40 or higher on a specific factor was retained for the next phase. Scale reliability was calculated using Cronbach's alpha and intercorrelations among the scales also provided a measure of reliability. The criterion set for the inclusion of factors and items in the final instrument was that items would load at 0.40 or higher and after 2 phases, only 16 items remained and only on two factors, therapeutic efficacy and fears efficacy.

Reliability and validity studies were conducted on the final instrument in phase 3 and the participants completed the CFSI (Appendix A) as well as the Counselor Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE, Larson et al., 1992) and the NEO Five-Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The COSE consists of five factors that measure counselor self-efficacy for specific counseling skills:

(a) microskills, (b) process, (c) dealing with difficult client behaviors, (d) cultural competence, and (e) awareness of values. Validity measures of the COSE factors had already been established. The NEO Five-Factor Inventory measures five dimensions of adult personality: (a) neuroticism, (b) extroversion, (c) openness to experience, (d) agreeableness, and (e) conscientiousness. Internal consistencies and validity measures of the NEO Five-Factor Inventory also had already been established. Convergent validity of the CFSI would be established by positive and significant correlations between total scores on the CFSI and scores on the COSE. Lack of correlation on total scores of the CFSI and total scores on the NEO Five-Factor Inventory would support the discriminant validity of the CFSI. Reliability would be established by test-retest reliability and measuring internal consistencies, which would be measured by Cronbach's alpha.

The correlations among the factor composite of the CFSI (Appendix A) and the microskills of the COSE supported the convergent validity of the CFSI: $r = 0.42$, $p < .01$ between therapeutic efficacy and microskills; $r = 0.36$, $p < .05$ between fears efficacy and microskills; $r = 0.44$, $p < .01$ between CFSI total and microskills; $r = 0.26$, $p < .05$ between therapeutic efficacy and process; $r = 0.30$, $p < .05$ between fears efficacy and process; and $r = 0.30$, $p < .05$ between CFSI total and process.

The correlations supported the discriminant validity of the CFSI (Appendix A) factors and the factors of neuroticism, extroversion, and openness: neuroticism and CFSI scores were therapeutic efficacy ($r = -0.09$, $p > .01$), fears efficacy ($r = -0.19$, $p > .01$), and CFSI total ($r = -0.15$, $p > .01$); extroversion and CFSI scores were therapeutic efficacy ($r = -0.04$, $p > .01$), fears efficacy ($r = -0.04$, $p > .01$), and CFSI total ($r = -0.04$, $p > .01$); and openness and CFSI scores

were therapeutic efficacy (r = 0.06, p> .01), fears efficacy (r = - 0.07, p> .01), and CFSI total (r = 0.00, p> .01).

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory

The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory, Supervisor's Version, (SWAI-S; Efstation et al., 1990) is a 23-item self-report measure of the relationship in counselor supervision (Appendix C). Participants responded to items, which were worded as statements such as "I make an effort to understand my trainee," using a seven-point Likert scale. The Likert scale for this instrument varies from a 7, which indicates "almost always," to a 1, which indicates "almost never." Each statement, or item, provided a measure of a supervisor's perception of a specific factor that was deemed to be important to the supervisory relationship.

The first factor on the instrument, measured by 9 items, is client focus (questions numbered 1 – 9). Client focus is a factor that reflects supervisors' emphasis on promoting trainees' understanding of clients on a range of scores from 9 to 63. The second factor on the instrument is rapport, which is measured by 7 items (questions numbered 10 – 16), with a range of scores from 7 to 49. Rapport is a factor that reflects supervisors' efforts to build relationships with trainees through support and encouragement. The third factor on the instrument is identification, which is measured by 7 items (questions numbered 17 – 23), with a range of scores from 7 to 49. Identification is the factor that represents supervisors' perceptions of trainees' identification with supervisors. Higher scores on a specific factor indicate that supervisors perceive themselves as emphasizing that factor in counselor supervision. Supervisors could perceive themselves as emphasizing all three factors, any of the three factors, or none of the factors in counselor supervision.

Efstation et al., (1990) tested the SWAI-S in a sample consisting of 185 graduate level supervisors at various counseling and clinically oriented programs. The instrument initially consisted of 30 items, but was reduced to 23, as 7 items did not load at 0.40 or higher. Another initial analysis included using extraction methods to reduce the initial 8 principal factors of concern to 3 factors (client focus, rapport, and identification). Cronbach's alpha was used to evaluate the internal consistencies of the 3 factor scales. The factors were found to be internally consistent, and therefore reliable, based upon the following scores: Client Focus (0.71); Rapport (0.77); and Identification (0.77). Finally, analysis of the convergent and divergent validity was assessed. Efstation et al. conducted intercorrelations among the (a) SWAI (supervisor and supervisee versions); (b) Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) - supervisor and supervisee versions (Friedlander & Ward, 1984); and (c) Self-Efficacy Inventory (SEI; Friedlander & Synder, 1983). The SSI and SEI had been found to have high internal consistencies and significant convergent and divergent validity in earlier analysis (Friedlander & Ward). The SSI and SEI measured similar constructs related to the working alliance in supervision and were considered to be satisfactory for obtaining intercorrelations to establish validity of the SWAI. The correlations of the SWAI with the other scales were low, ranging from 0.23 to 0.26, but were statistically significant. The SWAI factor structure related to the task-oriented scale of the SSI with moderate correlations (0.50), and the rapport and identification scales showed moderately high correlations with the attractiveness and interpersonally sensitive scales of the SSI. These results indicated that the three-factor scale was statistically significant, internally consistent, and that the three factors differed from each other enough to indicate varying measures within a similar construct, working alliance.

Data Collection

After obtaining approval from the dissertation committee, a letter was submitted to the University of New Orleans (UNO) Human Subjects Review Committee requesting permission to conduct this investigation (Appendix F). Permission was granted to conduct this research (Appendix G) and the researcher contacted counselor educators from 44 CACREP-accredited doctoral programs. The list of CACREP-accredited counselor education programs was obtained from the counseling website www.counseling.org) under the CACREP directory. Participants were identified through a letter addressed to the director of the Practicum/Internship program at 44 CACREP-accredited doctoral programs in counselor education. Faculty members in charge of the doctoral supervision groups were asked to provide a list of e-mail addresses of doctoral students or to disseminate the survey packet link to the students if they did not want to disclose the e-mail addresses of the students.

After receiving the instruction regarding how the faculty members wanted to disseminate the information, an e-mail was sent either to the faculty member or directly to students' e-mail addresses. The email included a cover letter and a web link of a site comprised of the demographic information and the self-report instruments including: (a) the Attachment Style Questionnaire - ASQ (Feeney, et al., 1994) (Appendix B), (b) the Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument - CFSI (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999) (Appendix A), (c) the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – SWAI (Efstation, et al., 1990) (Appendix C), and (d) the Personal Information Questionnaire (Appendix D).

The cover letter illustrated the general purpose of the study, informed participants of the measures that were taken to ensure their confidentiality, provided contact information for the principal investigator, and explained informed consent (Appendix E). In this investigation,

consent to participate was assumed by submitting the completed survey by clicking the "submit" button at the bottom of the survey website. The same process was repeated two weeks later with a follow-up cover letter that reminded faculty and students about the study and encouraged students to participate in the study if they had not already done so. Likewise, the letter thanked those students who had already completed the surveys (Appendix E).

Data Analysis Plan

Once 176 surveys were submitted, it was deduced that enough surveys had been returned to satisfy the established return rate (between 170 to 200). Next, all data were organized and entered into a computer database that was kept secure by the principal investigator of this study. Statistical software utilized in this study was SPSS version 11.0. Demographic information was obtained from a personal information questionnaire (Appendix D) designed to elicit information to assist the researcher in fully describing the characteristics of the sample. A discussion regarding statistical procedures that were utilized to address each of the research questions and the stated hypotheses follows.

Statistical Analyses

Data analysis consisted of reporting descriptive statistics for all research questions, and using multiple regression analysis and Pearson correlation on research questions 1 and Pearson correlation on research question 2:

Research Question 1

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision?

Null Research Hypothesis 1-1

Supervisors with a confident attachment style will not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-2

Supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-3

Supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness will not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-4

Supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval will not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-5

Supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships will not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Null Research Hypothesis 1-6

Supervisors' attachment styles will not be an indicator of a supervisor's self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

<div align="center">*Research Question 2*</div>

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' perceptions of any the working alliance factors of client focus, rapport, and identification in counselor supervision?

Null Research Hypothesis 2-1

Supervisors with a confident attachment style will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-2

Supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-3

Supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-4

Supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Null Research Hypothesis 2-5

Supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship.

Descriptive statistics (i.e. means, standard deviations) were calculated to report demographic information about the sample. Data from the descriptive statistics were also used to determine comparability with participants' responses from previous studies. Finally,

41

demographic information was used to establish correlations between the significant variables and information such as level of experience and age.

Cronbach alphas were calculated to evaluate the internal consistency of the instruments, using Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold's (1992) reliability estimate of 0.70 to indicate satisfactory internal consistency. In order to test the null research hypotheses for research question 1, standard multiple regression and Pearson correlation were the methods of analysis. The analysis determined if specific total composite scores of self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback on the CFSI were associated with specific attachment styles for the null hypotheses in research question 1. Correlation was used to determine if the attachment styles maintained the same association as described by the author's overview of the Attachment Style Questionnaire (Feeney, et al., 1994). The secure attachment style, confidence, and the four insecure styles (relationships as secondary, discomfort with closeness, need for approval, and preoccupation with relationships) were expected to maintain an inverse relationship with each other. Simultaneously, the insecure attachment styles (relationships as secondary, discomfort with closeness, need for approval, and preoccupation with relationships) were expected to maintain a positive relationship with one another. Multiple regression was used to determine if a supervisor's self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback could be predicted from the attachment styles and to determine the variance contributed by the various attachment styles.

In order to test the null hypotheses for research question 2, Pearson correlation was the method of choice. The results of the Pearson correlation determined if scores on the various working alliance factors (client focus, rapport, and identification) were associated with specific attachment styles obtained from the ASQ (Feeney et al., 1994). Correlation analysis was

conducted to determine association with each of the working alliance factors individually and to determine the direction of the relationship if any.

Summary

In this chapter, the researcher focused on the purpose of the study with emphasis on the research questions, the independent and dependent variables, hypotheses, and the methodical design. The development of each of the instruments that were utilized in this study (CFSI, ASQ, and SWAI) was detailed. Specifics regarding the validity and reliability of these three instruments were also provided as a way to establish the rationale for using the selected instruments. The sample was discussed in terms of selection procedures, the predicted response rate, and the actual response rate. Finally, the researcher presented specific data collection procedures and an overview of the data analysis plan for this investigation.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Purpose of the Study

Counselor supervision is a vital element in the development of the counselor trainee and the supervisory relationship evolves throughout the process of supervision to, ideally influence the supervisee in various meaningful ways. Supervisors are largely responsible for the structuring of supervision, which is influenced by various factors pertaining to supervisors' personal and professional beliefs about content and process and the supervisory relationship. All of which greatly affect the development of the counselor trainee. While attention has been focused on numerous factors that may influence the supervisory process, scant empirical data exists on how supervisors' attachment styles may influence how supervisors facilitate the interpersonal relationship within supervision (Pistole & Watkins, 1995). Furthermore, previous literature has addressed the importance of corrective feedback and self-efficacy (Hulse-Killacky & Page, 1994; Page & Hulse-Killakcy, 1999; Komiskey, 2004) and the working alliance (Efstation, et al., 1990) in counselor supervision. While many have alluded to the importance of such research (Kim, 1997; Pistole, M.C. 1989; Schlosse & Gelso, 2001), few have conducted studies specific to these constructs. Accordingly, this study provided information regarding the influence of supervisor attachment styles on supervisors' perceptions about their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback and their perceptions of the working alliance in counselor supervision.

Conceptual Framework

Attachment theory has been applied to significant adult relationships such as intimate relationships, co-workers, and the counseling relationship (Bartholomew, 1990; Feeney et al., 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Main, et al., 1985; Sperling & Berman, 1991). Researchers have proposed that attachment theory constructs (e.g., secure base, internal working model) and phenomena are relevant to the counseling process as the client is able to view the counselor as a secure base from which the client can explore and develop (Osofsky, 1988; Pistole, 1989). The relationship that exists in supervision has a different function than the counseling relationship, but various aspects are shared, including the working alliance (Efstation et al., 1990; Pistole & Watkins, 1995). Even though research concerning the application of attachment theory to the supervisory relationship is limited (Kim, 1997), it seems logical that attachment theory could be applied to supervision.

The conceptual framework for this investigation was based on the premise that by understanding attachment styles, supervisors will be better prepared to provide corrective feedback in a manner that facilitates supervisees' receptivity and willingness to implement the feedback. Once supervisees reap the benefits of incorporating feedback, they begin to develop positive self-perceptions about the efficacy of their counseling skills (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999). Furthermore, it is the belief of the researcher that knowledge of attachment styles may also allow supervisors to examine factors that contribute to their perceptions of the working alliance and the supervisory relationship, in general. The results will enable counselor education programs to evaluate how the practice of supervision by doctoral students may be more beneficial to the development of both the supervisor and supervisee.

Characteristics of the Sample

Personal Information

On the Personal Information Questionnaire (Appendix D), participants were asked to

indicate their gender, age, race, setting in which supervision was practiced, years and months of

experience as a supervisor, number of supervisees, and semesters of doctoral study. Frequency

distributions were generated to illuminate characteristics of those who chose to participate in this

investigation. Such distributions were based on descriptive statistics (i.e. means, standard

deviations, and ranges) that were calculated in order to determine the comparability of

participant's responses to existing data. The frequency distributions and descriptive data for the

participants' responses regarding their characteristics are represented in Tables 1 – 7.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution by Gender

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Female	121	68.8
Male	55	32.2
No Response	0	0
Total	N=176	100.0%

Women comprise about two thirds of all counselors (Bowman et al., 1995). Since women

made up 68 % of the 176 participants who chose to take part in this study, the distribution of

gender was consistent with the general population of counselors.

Table 2

Mean, Standard Deviation and Range of Ages

N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
176	31.6	5.757	22 - 57

The variable of age was assessed for normality and it was determined that a normal distribution was obtained with approximately 50% of the scores falling above the mean and 50% of the scores falling below the mean. The researcher was able to use the standard normal distribution to obtain the proportion of scores between two points in the distribution. The points used were based upon standard deviation. Analysis using one standard deviation unit along with the standard normal curve, determined approximately 68% of the participants were between the ages of 26 and 37 with an average age of approximately 32 years old. According to other researchers, the average age of counselor education students is 29 with a range of 22 – 58 (Lam, 2005); therefore the distribution of age among participants in this investigation was consistent with the population of counselor education students, in general.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution by Race

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Race			
African American	32	18.2	18.2
Asian American	14	8.0	26.2
Caucasian	114	64.8	91.0
Hispanic American	16	9.0	100.0
Total	N=176	100.0%	100.0%

The participants were primarily Caucasian, 64.8 %, while other racial groups comprised the other 35.2 % of the sample. Eighty-three percent of students in nationally accredited counseling graduate programs identify themselves as "White" (Dinsmore & England, 1996), therefore the distribution of race in this study was not consistent with and included a more racially diverse population of students than those typically enrolled in CACREP accredited graduate programs.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution by Supervision Setting

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Setting			
Human Services	66	37.5	37.5
College Counseling	32	18.2	55.7
School Counseling	73	41.5	97.2
Other Sites	5	2.8	100.0
Total	N= 176	100.0%	100.0%

The primary settings in which the doctoral students who participated in this investigation offered supervision for counseling students included: (a) School Counseling, 41.5% and (b) Human Services, 37.5%. College Counseling and other sites accounted for the remaining 20% of locations where doctoral students provided supervision for students enrolled in counselor education programs. Hollis and Dodson (2000) provide information about clinical experience settings, but provide statistical information about settings only within various programs (mental health, rehabilitation, school, etc.) and not about counselor education doctoral students in general. Without such information, it is difficult to compare those who participated in this study with the national average.

Table 5

Supervisory Experience (Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation)

N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Experience in Months			
176	26.5	3.80	1 – 96

The variable of supervision experience in months was assessed for normality and it was determined that a normal distribution was obtained with approximately 50% of the scores falling above the mean and 50% of the scores falling below the mean. The researcher was able to use the standard normal distribution to obtain the proportion of scores between two points in the distribution. The points used were based upon standard deviation. Analysis using one standard deviation unit along with the standard normal curve, determined approximately 68% of the participants had between 22 and 30 months of experience as supervisors, with an average of 26 months of experience. Based upon the use of two standard deviation units along with the standard normal curve, approximately 95% of the participants had between 19 and 34 months of experience. Only 5% of the participants accounted for supervisors with over 35 months of experience. Practicing counselor supervisors report an average of 177 months of supervision experience (Melincoff, 2001). Since the researcher purposefully selected doctoral students who were supervisors in counselor education programs, it was expected that doctoral students be fairly inexperienced as supervisors. Therefore based upon the sample from this study it can be assumed that the participants had less experience than practicing supervisors.

Table 6

Number of Supervisees (Mean, Standard Deviation and Range)

N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
176	2.43	1.12	1 – 7

The variable of number of supervisees was assessed for normality and it was determined that a normal distribution was obtained with approximately 50% of the scores falling above the mean and 50% of the scores falling below the mean. The researcher was able to use the standard normal distribution to obtain the proportion of scores between two points in the distribution. The points used were based upon standard deviation. Analysis using one standard deviation unit along with the standard normal curve, determined approximately 68% of the participants were supervising between 1.3 and 3.5 supervisees. Practicing counselor supervisors report an average of 56 lifetime supervisees (Melincoff, 2001). The researcher expected the doctoral students who were supervisors in counselor education programs to have a limited number of supervisees. Based upon the sample from this study it can be assumed that the participants supervised fewer supervisees than practicing supervisors.

Table 7

Doctoral Study Experience (Mean, Standard Deviation and Range)

N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
Experience per Semester			
176	3.72	1.93	0 – 10

The number of semesters of doctoral study experience in months was assessed for normality and it was determined that a normal distribution was obtained with approximately 50% of the scores falling above the mean and 50% of the scores falling below the mean. The researcher was able to use the standard normal distribution to obtain the proportion of scores between two points in the distribution. The points used were based upon standard deviation. Analysis using one standard deviation unit along with the standard normal curve, determined approximately 68% of the participants had completed between 1.79 and 5.65 semesters of doctoral studies.

<div align="center">Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ)</div>

The 176 participants also completed three scales to determine adult attachment style, self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback and perception of the working alliance. The adult attachment style of the sample of participants was defined as the primary style of relating to others and was determined by an analysis of frequency distributions, descriptive statistics and comparative results with other studies involving counselor education students. The Attachment Style Questionnaire (Appendix B) was used to assess attachment style in regard to the subscales of confidence, discomfort with closeness, need for approval, preoccupation with relationships, and relationships as secondary. Descriptive statistics of the participants' attachment styles were analyzed and data specific to the means, standard deviation and range of scores are provided in Table 8.

Table 8

Mean Distribution of Attachment Style Questionnaire (ASQ)

N	Mean	SD	Range	Possible Range of Scores
Attachment Styles				
Confidence	38.13	3.32	23 – 43	8 – 48
Discomfort w/ Closeness	31.83	4.26	23 – 40	10 – 60
Need for Approval	19.44	3.51	12 – 27	7 – 42
Preoccupation w/ Relationships	25.22	3.20	16 – 31	8 – 48
Relationships as Secondary	12.34	2.62	9 –21	7 – 42

Total N = 176

The mean score for the subscale confidence was 38.13, which was slightly higher compared to those in studies conducted by Feeney et al. (1994) and Kim (1997). The mean score for the subscale discomfort with closeness was 31.83, which was comparable to those in studies conducted by Feeney et al. and Kim. The mean score for the subscale preoccupation with relationships was 25.22, which was slightly lower compared to those in studies conducted by Feeney et al. and Kim. The mean score for the subscale need for approval was 19.44, which was slightly lower compared to those in studies conducted by Feeney et al. and Kim. The mean score for the subscale relationships as secondary was 12.43, which was slightly lower compared to those in studies conducted by Feeney et al. and Kim.

Frequency distributions were analyzed and 34.7% of the participants scored 38 on the confidence subscale, approximately the mean, and approximately 40% scored higher than the mean. Approximately 75% of the participants' scores on the confidence subscale were either at the mean, 38.13, or higher. On the subscale of discomfort with closeness, 42% of the participants scored higher than the mean, 31.83, with the majority of participants, 24.4%, scoring a 30, which was slightly lower than the mean. On the subscale of relationships as secondary, 63.6% of

participants scored lower than the mean, 12.34, with the majority of participants, 25.6%, scoring

a 10 on the subscale. On the need for approval subscale, 24.4% of the participants scored a 20,

approximately the mean, 19.44, with approximately 50% of the participants scoring above the

mean and 50% scoring below the mean. On the final subscale, preoccupation with relationships,

the majority of participants, 21.6%, scored a 24, which was slightly lower than the mean, with

approximately 50% of the participants scoring above the mean and 50% scoring below the mean.

Based upon the aforementioned method of defining the results of participants' responses

on the ASQ (Appendix B), doctoral student supervisors who took part in this investigation

indicated comparable scores to previous studies (Feeney et al., 1994; & Kim, 1997) on the

subscales of need for approval, discomfort with closeness and preoccupation with relationships.

On the subscale of confidence, 75% of the participants in this study scored above the mean,

which was already slightly higher than the means of previous studies (Feeney et al.; & Kim).

Therefore the participants in this study potentially considered the attachment style of confidence

as a primary style more often than in the previous studies (Feeney et al.; & Kim). On the

subscale of relationships as secondary, 63.8% of participants scored lower than the mean, which

was already lower than the means reported in previous studies (Feeney et al.; & Kim). Therefore

the participants in this study potentially considered the attachment style of relationships as

secondary as a primary style less often than in the previous studies (Feeney et al.; & Kim).

Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument (CFSI)

The participants' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback was defined by a total

composite score from the Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument (Appendix A). The

participants' total composite score was analyzed using frequency distributions, descriptive

statistics and comparative results with other studies involving counselor education students.

Descriptive statistics of the participants' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback were

analyzed and data on means, standard deviation and range are provided in Table 9.

Table 9

Mean Distribution of Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument (CFSI)

N = 176	Mean	SD	Range	Possible Range of Scores
Total CFSI Scale	76.19	5.88	61 – 94	16 – 96

In previous studies, (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999), participants' mean score on items

was approximately 4.5 (between slightly agree and agree) which provided for an approximate

total composite score of 72. Participants' mean total composite score in this study was 76.19 and

the mean score on items was 4.76, which was consistent with previous studies (Hulse-Killacky &

Page; Page & Hulse-Killacky). The distribution of scores was considered normal and 50% of the

participants scored above the mean and 50% scored below the mean. The majority of

participants, 21.6%, scored a total composite score of 80, indicating a higher self-efficacy. Total

composite scores below 64 on the CFSI indicate lower self-efficacy and based upon the

frequency distribution, only 4% of the participants scored a 64 or below. Accordingly, the

majority of participants' scores indicated that they perceived themselves as possessing a high

self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback.

Finally, participants completed a Supervisory Working Alliance - Supervisor's Version (Appendix C) in order to determine participants' perceptions of the working alliance in their supervisory relationships in terms of three specific dimensions (client focus, rapport and identification). The participants' perception of the working alliance was defined as the primary style of relating to others in a supervisory relationship by an analysis of frequency distributions, descriptive statistics and comparative results with other studies involving counselor education students. Descriptive statistics represent participants' responses regarding the three different dimensions of the working alliance based on means, standard deviation and range of scores, and are listed in Table 10.

Table 10

Mean Distribution of Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI)

	Mean	SD	Range	Possible Range of Scores
Working Alliance Dimensions				
Client Focus	48.80	8.16	31 – 61	9 – 63
Rapport	43.75	3.02	38 – 49	7 – 49
Identification	41.05	2.85	33 – 45	7 – 49
Total N = 176				

Participants' mean score for the subscale client focus was 48.80, which was comparable to those in the studies conducted by Efstation, et al., (1990) and Melincoff, (2001). The majority of participants, 36.9%, scored a 54 on the subscale client focus, which was higher than the mean

and indicated that participants emphasized the dimension of client focus in the working alliance. The participants' mean score for the subscale rapport was 43.75, and was slightly higher than the mean scores in comparable studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff). The majority of participants, 23.9%, scored a 44, approximately the mean (43.75), with approximately 50% of the participants scoring above the mean and 50% scoring below the mean on the subscale rapport. The participants' mean score for the subscale identification was 41.05, which was comparable to mean scores on the subscale of identification in previous studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff). The majority of participants, 26.1%, scored a 42, slightly above the mean (41.05) with approximately 50% of the participants scoring above the mean and 50% scoring below the mean.

Based upon the aforementioned method of defining the results of participants' responses on the SWAI, doctoral student supervisors who took part in this investigation indicated comparable scores to previous studies (Efstation, et al., 1990; Melincoff, 2001) on the working alliance dimensions of rapport and identification. The majority of participants that participated in this investigation scored much higher on the dimension of client focus than the mean of this study and the mean of comparable studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff). Therefore the participants in this study potentially emphasized the dimension of client focus in the working alliance more often than in comparable studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff).

<u>Summary of Participants' Characteristics</u>

Based upon descriptive analysis, doctoral students who chose to participate in this investigation were primarily female, 68%, and had an average of 3.7 semesters of experience as students in counselor education. Doctoral students who responded to this investigation were predominately Caucasian, 65%, with an average of 2.4 supervisees per semester and 26.5 months of supervision experience. School Counseling (41.5%) and Human Services (37.5%) made up

56

the primary settings in which the doctoral students supervised master's students. While doctoral students involved in this study were between the ages of 22 and 57, on average, doctoral students were approximately 32 years of age.

Based on responses, the sample of participants indicated similar scores on the attachment styles of discomfort with closeness, preoccupation with relationships and need for approval compared to previous studies (Feeney et al., 1994; & Kim, 1997). Participants in this study potentially considered the attachments style of confidence as a primary style more often than in the previous studies (Feeney et al.; & Kim) based upon higher scores. Lower scores were obtained on the subscale of relationships as secondary, therefore the participants in this study potentially considered the attachments style of relationships as secondary as a primary style less often than in the previous studies ((Feeney et al.; & Kim). The participants that were investigated in this study had comparable scores on the CFSI to previous studies (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999). The majority of participants, 96%, indicated a high self-efficacy in the provision of corrective feedback. Finally, participants in this investigation had comparable scores on the SWAI on the working dimensions of rapport and identification to previous studies (Efstation, et al., 1990; Melincoff, 2001). The participant's scores on the working dimension of client focus were higher than previous studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff). Therefore the participants in this study potentially emphasized the dimension of client focus in the working alliance more often than in comparable studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff).

Data Analysis

Reliability coefficients were determined to evaluate each scale's internal consistency based upon the responses from participants and in regard to the existing reliability data

previously established by authors of the various scales. Internal consistencies of the measures used in this study were evaluated using Cronbach's alphas. Cronbach's alphas were calculated for the Attachment Style Questionnaire (Appendix B), Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix A) and Working Alliance Inventory (Trainer's Version) (Appendix C). Heppner, Kivlighan, and Wampold's (1992) reliability estimate of 0.70 to indicate satisfactory internal consistency was employed in this study. All scales had strong internal consistencies in the studies conducted by the authors of each scale. In this study, the Attachment Style Questionnaire had a slightly lower coefficient alpha, 0.67, but the reliability estimates were still sufficient for the purposes of this study. The main concern would be that approximately 30% of the variance of the scores on the subscale could be due to error. Both the Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Scale, 0.89, and Working Alliance Inventory (Trainer's Version), 0.93, had alphas that indicated a high level of internal consistency.

Pearson correlation coefficients and the use of multiple regression were the primary methods of analysis to establish how sets of variables were able to infer the outcome of a particular variable, to determine which variables made the greatest contribution to the overall variance of a particular variable and to determine the association and the direction of the association between sets of variables.

Research Question 1

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision?

Test of Hypothesis 1-1

Null hypothesis 1-1 suggested that supervisors with a confident attachment style would not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in

counselor supervision. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between the total composite self-efficacy score and the confident attachment style subscale score. A significant positive correlation was found for high scores on the confidence subscale and high total composite self-efficacy scores (r (176) = .471, $p < .05$), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and supervisors with a confident attachment style did perceive themselves as possessing a high self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision. Supervisors in this study with a confident attachment style indicated an ability to provide corrective feedback to supervisees and believed that their corrective feedback would be helpful to the supervisee.

<u>Test of Hypothesis 1-2</u>

Null Hypothesis 1-2 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary would not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between the total composite self-efficacy score and relationships as secondary attachment style subscale score. A positive correlation was found for high scores on the relationships as secondary subscale and high total composite self-efficacy scores (r (176) = .019, $p < .05$). Despite the fact that a positive correlation was found, the correlation between the composite self-efficacy score and the relationships as secondary was attachment style subscale score was considered statistically insignificant and thereby did not indicate a significant relationship between the variables. Consequently, the researcher failed to reject the null and it is hypothesized that those doctoral students who possessed an attachment style of relationships as secondary do not perceive themselves as possessing a high self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Test of Hypothesis 1-3

Null hypothesis 1-3 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness would not perceive themselves as possessing high self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between the total composite self-efficacy score and discomfort with closeness attachment style subscale score. A significant negative correlation was found for scores on the discomfort with closeness subscale and high total composite self-efficacy scores (r (176) = - .580, $p < .05$). Therefore, analysis indicated that there was a significant relationship between participants who indicated discomfort with closeness as their primary attachment style and their perception of their composite self-efficacy. Despite this result, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis, as the direction of the relationship was established in the hypothesis (participants were anticipated to have high scores on both variables or low scores on both variables, but the direction was inverse). In fact, a significant negative correlation did exist, thus indicating that doctoral students who indicated discomfort with closeness as their primary attachment style perceived themselves with a low self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Test of Hypothesis 1-4

Null hypothesis 1-4 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval would not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback. A significant negative correlation was found for high scores on the need for approval subscale and high total composite self-efficacy scores (r (176) = - .858, $p < .05$), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and doctoral students who indicated that they possessed an attachment style that focused on the need

for approval did perceive themselves as possessing a low self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Test of Hypothesis 1-5

Null hypothesis 1-5 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships would not perceive themselves as possessing low self-efficacy in providing corrective feedback. A significant negative correlation was found for high scores on the preoccupation with relationships subscale and high total composite self-efficacy scores (r (176) = - .561, p < .05), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected and doctoral students who identified with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships did perceive themselves as possessing a low self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

Test of Hypothesis 1-6

Null hypothesis 1-6 suggested that Supervisors' attachment styles would not be an indicator of supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision. The significance of r for null hypotheses 1-1 through 1-5 was greatly influenced by sample size. Small correlations were considered significant due to the large sample (N=100+) and while statistical significance was reported, the report needed to include additional information (Pallant, 2005). The additional analysis was the basis for using multiple regression to determine variance and prediction among the variables that were analyzed.

A multiple linear regression equation was calculated to determine if the 5 attachment styles could infer a supervisor's self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. Summaries of the results are listed in Table 11 - 13.

Table 11

Coefficients Obtained from Multiple Regression

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)	Standardized Coefficient (Beta)	Sig.	Part Correlations
Constant	117.528		.000	
Confidence	-.167	-.092	.164	-.051
Discomfort w/ Closeness	-.527	-.284	.000	-.191
Need for Approval	-1.581	-.954	.000	-.534
Preoccupation w/ Relationships	.475	.250	.001	.126
Relationships as Secondary	.093	.052	.321	.036

Table 12

ANOVA Obtained from Multiple Regression

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8519.455	5	1703.891	116.811	.000
	Residual	2450.574	168	14.587		
	Total	10970.029	173			

Predictors: Confidence, Discomfort w/ Closeness, Need for Approval, Preoccupation w/ Relationships, and Relationships as Secondary
Dependent: Self-Efficacy/Corrective Feedback

Table 13

Model Summary of Variables of Interest

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.881	.777	.770	3.81926

A significant regression equation was found ($F_{(5, 168)} = 116.81$, $p < 0.0005$, with an R^2 of .770. The researcher used the unstandardized coefficients listed as B to determine the following regression equation. The participants' predicted total composite score on the CFSI was equal to -0.167 (Confidence) – 0.527 (Discomfort with Closeness) + 0.093 (Relationships as

Secondary) – 1.581 (Need for Approval) + .475 (Preoccupation with Relationships). Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected; meaning attachment styles were able to infer a supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. Based upon the positive unstandardized coefficients obtained, participants' CFSI scores were predicted to increase as the scores on the styles of relationships as secondary, 0.093, and preoccupation with relationships, 0.475, increased. Based upon the negative unstandardized coefficients obtained, participants' CFSI scores were predicted to decrease or increase as scores on the styles of confidence, -0.167, discomfort with closeness, -0.527, and need for approval, -1.581, increased or decreased respectively.

Variance was analyzed to determine the contribution of all the attachment styles as well as each of the attachment styles individually to total CFSI scores. The regression consisted of one model, which was comprised of the predictors (the five attachment styles) and the dependent variable (total composite score of the CFSI). The model, the predictor variables, explained 77% of the variance in the dependent variable, total composite score for the CFSI. Each attachment style was determined to have a significant relationship with the dependent variable, with the exception of relationships as secondary. The significant amount of variance in the dependent variable explained by the attachment styles cumulatively helped the researcher to decide to reject the null hypothesis that supervisors' attachment styles would not be an indicator of a supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision.

The Standard Error of the Estimate provided a margin of error for the prediction equation. Based upon the estimate, 68% of the data fell within one standard error of the estimate, $\pm$ 3.81926, to the right and left of the mean, 76.9253, and 95% of the data fell within two standard errors of the estimated units, $\pm$ 7.63852, to the right and left of the mean. The incorporation of all attachment styles to predict scores on the CFSI, increased the overall

variance and 95 % of the time, and increased the probability of predicting a score to within +

7.63852 of the mean.

Analysis of part correlations coefficients determined the contribution of each attachment style individually compared to the overall variance determined by R^2, 0.77, in the dependent variable, total CFSI score. When the squared part correlations were totaled, only .392 or 39% of the variance was explained by the contribution of all the attachment styles, compared to the .77 or 77% seen in the total R^2, or variance from the cumulative attachments styles with or without influence of other variables. The cumulative attachment styles helped explain the total CFSI greater than any separate attachment style. The analysis of part correlations however represented the unique contribution of the specific attachment style without any influence or shared variance from the other attachment styles. The attachment styles of confidence and relationships as secondary made less of a contribution to the variance of CFSI composite scores, as the significance scores for each were > 0.0005. The significance scores for the attachment styles need for approval, discomfort with closeness and preoccupation with relationships were all < 0.0005. Therefore each individually made a significant contribution to the variance of CFSI composite scores, with the style of need for approval making the greatest individual contribution of .285 or 28.5%.

<u>Research Question 2</u>

Is there a significant association between supervisors' attachment styles and supervisors' perceptions of any the working alliance factors of client focus, rapport, and identification in counselor supervision?

Test of Hypothesis 2-1

Null hypothesis 2-1 suggested that supervisors with a confident attachment style would not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship. A negative correlation was found for high scores on the confidence subscale and high scores on the subscale of client focus ($r(176) = -.074$, $p < .05$), indicating a weak relationship between the variables. A negative correlation was found for high scores on the confidence subscale and high scores on the subscale of rapport ($r(176) = -.033$, $p < .05$), indicating a weak relationship between the variables. A positive correlation was found for high scores on the confidence subscale and high scores on the subscale of identification ($r(176) = .016$, $p < .05$), but was very small indicating a weak relationship between the variables. There was no significant correlation between any of the working alliance dimensions and a style of confidence; therefore the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. In this study, doctoral student supervisors who indicated a confident attachment style did not perceive any significant associations with any of the three working alliance dimensions.

Test of Hypothesis 2-2

Null hypothesis 2-2 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness would not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship. A significant positive correlation was found for high scores on the discomfort with closeness subscale and high scores on the subscale of client focus ($r(176) = .349$, $p < .05$), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. A significant positive correlation was found for high scores on the discomfort with closeness subscale and high scores on the subscale of rapport ($r(176) = .432$, $p < .05$), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. A positive correlation

was found for high scores on the discomfort with closeness subscale and high scores on the subscale of identification (r (176) = .003, p < .05), indicating a very weak relationship between the variables. A significant positive correlation existed between the attachment style of discomfort with closeness and the working alliance dimension client focus; therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. In this study, doctoral student supervisors who indicated a discomfort with closeness attachment style did perceive a significant association with the working alliance dimensions of rapport and client focus, but not with the dimension of identification.

Test of Hypothesis 2-3

Null hypothesis 2-3 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval would not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship. A significant positive correlation was found for high scores on the need for approval subscale and high scores on the subscale of client focus (r (176) = .423, p < .05), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. A positive correlation was found for high scores on the need for approval subscale and high scores on the subscale of rapport (r (176) = .280, p < .05), indicating a relationship between the variables, but did not meet the test for significance (r ≥ 0.30). A positive correlation was found for high scores on the need for approval subscale and high scores on the subscale of identification (r (176) = .144, p < .05), but was too small indicating no significant relationship between the variables. A significant positive relationship existed between the need for approval style and the dimension of client focus; therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. In this study, doctoral student supervisors who indicated a need for approval attachment style did perceive a significant association with the working alliance dimension of client focus, but not with the dimensions of rapport and identification.

Test of Hypothesis 2-4

Null hypothesis 2-4 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships would not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship. A significant positive correlation was found for high scores on the preoccupation with relationships subscale and high scores on the subscale of client focus (r (176) = .404, p < .05), indicating a significant relationship between the variables. A positive correlation was found for high scores on the preoccupation with relationships subscale and high scores on the subscale of rapport (r (176) = .218, p < .05), indicating a relationship between the variables. A positive correlation was found for high scores on the preoccupation with relationships subscale and high scores on the subscale of identification (r (176) = .163, p < .05), indicating a relationship between the variables. A significant positive relationship existed between the preoccupation with relationships style and the dimension of client focus; therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. In this study, doctoral student supervisors who indicated a preoccupation with relationships attachment style did perceive a significant association with the working alliance dimension of client focus, but not with the dimensions of rapport and identification.

Test of Hypothesis 2-5

Null hypothesis 2-5 suggested that supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary would not perceive an association with any of the three factors of the working alliance (client focus, rapport, and identification) in the supervisory relationship. A positive correlation was found for high scores on the relationships as secondary subscale and high scores on the subscale of client focus (r (176) = .061, p < .05), indicating a weak relationship between the variables. A positive correlation was also found for high scores on the relationships as secondary

67

subscale and high scores on the subscale of rapport (r (176) = .041, p < .05), indicating a weak relationship between the variables. A small positive correlation was also found for high scores on the relationships as secondary subscale and high scores on the subscale of identification (r (176) = .001, p < .05), indicating a very weak relationship between the variables. There was no significant correlation between any of the working alliance dimensions and a style of relationships as secondary; therefore the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. In this study, doctoral student supervisors who indicated relationships as secondary attachment style did not perceive any significant associations with any of the three working alliance dimensions.

Summary

Based upon descriptive analysis, doctoral students who chose to participate in this investigation were primarily female, 68%, and had an average of 3.7 semesters of experience as students in counselor education. Doctoral students who responded to this investigation were predominately Caucasian, 65%, with an average of 2.4 supervisees per semester and 26.5 months of supervision experience. School Counseling (41.5%) and Human Services (37.5%) made up the primary settings in which the doctoral students supervised master's students. While doctoral students involved in this study were between the ages of 22 and 57, on average, doctoral students were approximately 32 years of age.

The inferential data demonstrated significant correlations between four of the five adult attachment styles (confidence, discomfort with closeness, need for approval and preoccupation with relationships) and self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. A significant correlation did not exist between the adult attachment style of relationships as secondary and self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. The significant correlation between the discomfort with closeness attachment style and self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback was not significant for the

purposes of this study, as the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. The researcher anticipated a positive correlation and the association obtained was a negative, or inverse, correlation. The data also demonstrated that supervisors' adult attachment styles were able to infer supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. The only attachment styles that made a significant contribution to the variance in supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback were discomfort with closeness, need for approval and preoccupation with relationships.

The inferential data demonstrated significant correlations between three of the five adult attachment styles (discomfort with closeness, need for approval and preoccupation with relationships) and specific dimensions of the working alliance. A significant correlation did not exist between the two adult attachment styles of confidence and relationships as secondary and any of the three dimensions of the working alliance. Doctoral student supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness indicated an association with the working alliance dimensions of client focus and rapport. Doctoral student supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval indicated an association with the working alliance dimension of client focus. Doctoral student supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships indicated an association with the working alliance dimension of client focus.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Participants in this study were identified through a letter addressed to the director of the Practicum/Internship programs (Appendix E) at 44 CACREP-accredited doctoral programs in counselor education. Faculty members in charge of the doctoral supervision groups were asked to select one of two options: (a) to provide a list of e-mail addresses of doctoral students or (b) to disseminate the survey packet link to the students if they did not want to disclose the e-mail addresses of the students.

After receiving instructions regarding how specific the faculty members wanted to disseminate the information related to this investigation, an e-mail was sent either to the faculty member or directly to the appropriate students' e-mail addresses. The email included a cover letter and a web link of a site comprised of the demographic information and the self-report instruments including: (a) the Attachment Style Questionnaire - ASQ (Feeney, et al., 1994) (Appendix B), (b) the Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument - CFSI (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999) (Appendix A), (c) the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – SWAI (Efstation, et al., 1990) (Appendix C), and (d) the Personal Information Questionnaire (composed by the researcher) (Appendix D).

The conceptual framework for this investigation was based on the premise that by understanding attachment styles, supervisors will be better prepared to provide corrective feedback in a manner that facilitates supervisees' receptivity and willingness to implement feedback. Counselor supervision is a vital element in the development of the counselor trainee and the supervisory relationship evolves throughout the process of supervision, to ideally influence the supervisee in various meaningful ways. Supervisors are largely responsible for the

70

structuring of supervision, which is influenced by various factors pertaining to supervisors'

personal and professional beliefs about content and process and the supervisory relationship. All

of which greatly affect the development of the counselor trainees. Accordingly, this study

intended to provide information regarding the influence of supervisor attachment styles on

supervisors' perceptions about their self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback and their

perceptions of the working alliance in counselor supervision.

Summary of Findings

Based upon descriptive analysis, doctoral students who chose to participate in this

investigation were primarily female, 68%, and in counselor education programs with an average

of 3.7 semesters of experience as students. Respondents were predominately Caucasian, 65%,

with an average of 2.4 supervisees. Respondents averaged 26.5 months of supervision

experience. The primary settings in which the doctoral students supervised the supervisees were

in School Counseling, 41.5% and Human Services, 37.5%. Respondents were between the ages

of 22 and 57, while the average age was approximately 32 years.

Based on responses, the sample of participants indicated similar scores on the attachment

styles of discomfort with closeness, preoccupation with relationships and need for approval

compared to previous studies (Feeney et al., 1994; & Kim, 1997). However, findings from this

investigation differed in that participants in this study scored higher on the "confidence"

subscale, thus indicating that these participants considered confidence as their primary style of

attachment more often than participants involved in previous research (Feeney et al.; & Kim).

Participants in this study indicated that they primarily had a positive view of self in conjunction

with a positive view of others in regard to adult relationships, specifically in the supervisory

relationship. Supervisors with a confident attachment style would be comfortable with close

relationships while maintaining boundaries, and they would be confident in themselves and in their relationships with others. Supervisors with a confident attachment style believed that they could provide corrective feedback without fear and that was therapeutic and useful to the supervisee. Lower scores were obtained on the subscale of relationships as secondary, therefore the participants in this study potentially considered the attachments style of "relationships as secondary" as indicative of their primary style of attachment less often than participants in previous studies (Feeney et al.; & Kim,). Participants in this study indicated that they rarely had a positive view of self in conjunction with a negative view of others in regard to adult relationships, specifically in the supervisory relationship. Supervisors with an attachment style of relationships as secondary will have self-confidence in their abilities, but place importance on achievement over relationship, and therefore feel uncomfortable in social situations (Feeney et al.).

The participants that were investigated in this study had comparable scores on the CFSI to previous studies (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999). The majority of participants, 96%, indicated a high self-efficacy in the provision of corrective feedback. The participants viewed themselves as being competent in giving corrective feedback and competent in facing the challenge of giving corrective feedback, which entails evaluating performance while simultaneously fostering a collaborative relationship (Kadushin, 1985).

Finally, participants in this investigation had comparable scores on the SWAI on the working dimensions of rapport and identification to previous studies (Efstation, et al., 1990; Melincoff, 2001). Rapport is a factor that reflects supervisors' efforts to build relationships with trainees through support and encouragement. Identification is the factor that represents supervisors' perceptions of trainees' identification with supervisors. The participants'

comparable scores on these dimensions indicated that they did emphasize the dimensions in the supervisory relationship, but not as often as the dimension of client focus. The participants' scores on the working dimension of client focus were higher than previous studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff). Therefore the participants in this study appeared to emphasize the dimension of client focus in the working alliance more often than in comparable studies (Efstation, et al.; Melincoff). Meaning, participants in this study indicated that they placed a strong emphasis on promoting trainees' understanding of clients in supervision in counselor education.

The inferential data demonstrated significant correlations between four of the five adult attachment styles (confidence, discomfort with closeness, need for approval and preoccupation with relationships) and self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. A significant correlation did not exist between the adult attachment style of relationships as secondary and self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. A supervisor with an attachment style of relationships as secondary would value achievement over relationship and have a positive view of self perhaps indicating tendency toward higher self-efficacy. Supervisors with an attachment style as relationships as secondary are uncomfortable with close relationships, which might explain the limited association that existed in this study. The significant correlation between the discomfort with closeness attachments style and self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback was not significant for the purposes of this study, as the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis. The researcher anticipated a positive correlation and the association obtained was a negative, or inverse, correlation. Supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness would avoid developing close relationships except when necessary to achieve a goal; these individuals are confident in themselves, but worry about the opinions of others. The participants of this study indicated that they demonstrated an attachment style of discomfort with closeness less often than

comparable studies (Feeney et al., 1994; & Kim, 1997) and simultaneously demonstrated a high self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback.

The data also demonstrated that supervisors' adult attachment styles were directly related to supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. The only attachment styles that made a significant contribution to the variance in supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback were discomfort with closeness, need for approval and preoccupation with relationships. The supervisors' attachment styles, cumulatively, in this study were able to predict the supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. Attachment styles were evaluated individually for the amount of variance, or the portion of individual difference in one attachment style associated with the individual difference in self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. The participants' scores in this study indicated that an attachment style of need for approval made the greatest individual difference in participants' scores in self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback.

The inferential data demonstrated significant correlations between three of the five adult attachment styles (discomfort with closeness, need for approval and preoccupation with relationships) and specific dimensions of the working alliance. A significant correlation did not exist between the two adult attachment styles of confidence and relationships as secondary on any of the three dimensions of the working alliance. Doctoral student supervisors with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness indicated an association with the working alliance dimensions of client focus and rapport. Associations were anticipated by the researcher, but the positive correlation between high scores on the attachment style discomfort with closeness and high scores on the dimension of rapport caused the researcher to examine the definition of the attachment style of discomfort with closeness. Supervisors with an attachment style of

discomfort with closeness would have a positive, or high, view of themselves and a negative, or low, view of other, the supervisee in this study. The dimension of rapport focuses the effort of the supervisor to build and encourage a collaborative relationship, which would appear to contradict the positive association determined in this study. Feeney et al. (1994) indicated that persons with an attachment style of discomfort with closeness would avoid developing close relationships except when necessary to achieve a goal. The scores of the participants in this study indicated a significant relationship between the variables of discomfort with closeness and rapport, but the unexpected direction of the relationship may indicate a need for assessment of additional variables.

Doctoral student supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval indicated an association with the working alliance dimension of client focus. Doctoral student supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships indicated an association with the working alliance dimension of client focus. Participants in this study emphasized the dimension of client focus, placing a strong emphasis on promoting trainees' understanding of clients in supervision in counselor education. Supervisors with an attachment style of need for approval may find it easier to focus on the supervisee and the supervisees' understanding of a client, thereby avoiding criticism that may arise from attempting to establish rapport or from self-perceptions of trainees' identification with supervisors. Supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships display little self-confidence in their abilities, worry about the opinions of others, and are uncomfortable being close to others. Supervisors with an attachment style of preoccupation with relationships may find it easier to focus on client focus for the aforementioned reasons of a supervisor with an attachment style of need for approval. The scores of the participants in this study indicated a significant relationship between the attachment styles

of need for approval and preoccupation with relationships and the working dimension client

focus, but additional variables should be explored for a more thorough understanding.

Limitations of the Study

Creswell (1994) identified limitations as potential weaknesses of a study and

delimitations as ways that a study is narrowed in scope. The first limitation of this study involved

the limited amount of research conducted on adult attachment styles as they pertain to the

supervisor and the supervisory relationship, specifically in regard to the provision of corrective

feedback (Kim, 1997). This dearth of existing research provided little direction regarding future

exploration of issues related to adult attachment, in general. This study was further limited by the

fact that the instrumentation lacked established reliability and validity as a battery of instruments,

despite the fact that each individual instrument possessed established significant reliability and

validity results. While each instrument possessed high reliability and validity individually,

additional use of the instruments in a battery would have to occur to establish internal reliability

and validity. Furthermore, the reliance on participants' self-reports also contributed to the

limitation of this investigation, as Likert Scale questions may not fully reflect research

participants' opinions on certain items and self-report can be subject to individual bias.

An additional limitation of this investigation pertained to the use of doctoral

student supervisors. The researcher realized that this is a use of a convenience sample and that

doctoral students in CACREP accredited counselor education programs limited the external

validity of the study as the results may not be generalized to other samples or populations.

Additional limitations involve the dispersion of the surveys and use of Web-based surveys in general. While Internet use is growing at a rate of about 2 million new users per month (Granello & Wheaton, 2004), it remains the researchers responsibility to ensure that the selected participants have equal access to the necessary technology to complete the surveys. An assumption was made on behalf of the researcher that all of the universities provided access to the participants who were students and many of the participants had personal access to the appropriate technology apart from university access. Likewise, it was impossible to know the response rate, as the researcher was unable to know the exact number of individuals who received the information. Therefore the repetitious nature of the sample was compromised. Most research indicated that lower response rates were common with Web-based surveys and greater concerns about anonymity existed among participants (Medin, Roy, & Ann, 1999; Nichols & Sedivi, 1998).

Final limitations concerned the assumption of participants' computer literacy and potential difficulties with technology. An assumption was made that participants would be able to use a web link to open a survey, complete the survey without the standard pencil and paper format, and be able to submit the survey so it could be included in the data set, in an appropriate time manner. Various concerns such as dial-up speed (i.e. 56k, or less than, or DSL), computing platforms such as Windows 95/98 or higher; and the choice of internet browser such as Netscape or Internet Explorer, were not considered when setting up the Web-based survey and therefore could have attributed to potential concerns regarding participants' ability to access the surveys via the provided link.

Implications for Further Research

Future research could include a more thorough investigation of Web-based surveys designed to address concerns and limitations such as response rate and technology concerns. Researchers have not determined if solicitation via e-mail increases the following: (a) response rate, (b) maintains a rate similar to mail out surveys, or (c) produces a lower response rate (Crawford, et al., 2001; Kittleson, 1997; Solomon, 2001). Additional research could also determine if specific factors controlled by the researcher could increase the response rate such as number of follow-up emails, intervals at which the e-mails would be sent, information to be included in the initial and follow-up e-mails.   Finally, a more thorough investigation of the actual format may prove beneficial as participants may be more likely to complete surveys if the screens are easily navigated, and if the placement of the instructions precedes each individual survey or section, if using various question formats.

A comparative study refined the original CFI instrument (Hulse-Killacky & Page, 1994) and addressed a new construct, the clarifying factor, that accounts for variance in giving and receiving corrective feedback (Hulse-Killacky, Orr, & Paradise; In Press). The clarifying factor contains information regarding the reception of a corrective feedback statement. Attention to this factor by supervisors is beneficial as a supervisee may be unwilling to seek clarification if the feedback message is confusing. Supervisors with attachment styles of need for approval and discomfort with closeness may prevent a supervisee from asking clarification questions and impede the corrective feedback message. Supervisors with an attachment style of confidence would be willing to hear a message from a supervisee indicating a lack of understanding of a corrective feedback message, and would simultaneously clarify the message without feeling

challenged or resentful. Further investigation of the various factors that comprise the CFI (Hulse-Killacky & Page, 1994), which is now the Corrective Feedback Instrument – Revised (Hulse-Killacky, et al; In Press), might provide a more thorough understanding of the associations with specific attachment styles that were determined in this study.

Investigation of additional variables such as the theoretical orientation of the supervisor may also prove beneficial. When examining attachment styles and the working alliance, information about theoretical orientation may help organize hypotheses and allow the researcher to have a more thorough understanding of why various null hypotheses were rejected or why various null hypotheses failed to be rejected. Perhaps supervisors from a behavioral orientation may not view the specific working alliance dimensions of rapport and identification as important even though their primary attachment style is one of confidence. In contrast a supervisor from a client-centered approach may view rapport as important with little attention given to the other working alliance dimensions even though their primary attachment style is also one of confidence. The researcher focused on any association that existed between attachment styles and the dimensions of the working alliance. Further investigation may focus on specific associations that existed among variables and participants and examine additional variables to understand why the association existed, such as age, gender, or level of experience.

Additional research may also seek to determine if and which additional constructs may provide the best information in assessing the self-efficacy of a supervisor in providing corrective feedback in counselor supervision. Future investigations may also determine if an awareness of attachment styles, self-efficacy for providing corrective feedback, and perception of the working alliance can be applied to other supervisors. This study focused on doctoral students providing supervision to masters' level interns at CACREP institutions, but could also determine if the

same constructs could be applied to non-CACREP university doctoral students, to licensed mental health counselor's, and to the general population of people who provide supervision within their profession.

Implications for Counselor Educators

Once supervisees reap the benefits of incorporating feedback, they begin to develop positive self-perceptions about the efficacy of their counseling skills (Page & Hulse-Killacky, 1999). Furthermore, it is the belief of the researcher that knowledge of attachment styles may also allow supervisors to examine factors that contribute to their perceptions of the working alliance, perceptions of their self-efficacy in regard to giving feedback and to the supervisory relationship, in general. The results will enable counselor education programs to evaluate how the practice of supervision by doctoral students may be more beneficial to the development of both the supervisor and supervisee.

Doctoral students who are supervisors may be able to have a better awareness of difficulties that occur in the supervisory relationship if they are directly aware of their attachment styles and how those styles influence their ability to give corrective feedback. Likewise, doctoral students may also be able to perceive why they might emphasize a specific working alliance dimension based upon an awareness of their attachment style. If various difficulties are occurring in the supervisory relationship, supervisors may look toward their style as opposed to the actions of a supervisee to help alleviate some of the difficulties and thereby enhance the supervisory relationship. Supervisors may also be able to better understand that their supervisees may posses a different attachment style, and therefore work with their supervisees to address the differences as positive, but differences that must be addressed to ensure a successful supervisory

relationship. According to this study, supervisors with attachment styles of confidence had a high self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. Supervisees with attachments styles of need for approval may not accept corrective feedback messages as helpful, but more as a message of failure and lack of approval from supervisors. Supervisors with an awareness of their attachment styles and their supervisees' attachment styles may be able to adequately address the purpose and intent of a corrective feedback message.

Counselor educators may be able to include information about attachment styles in curricula, specifically in supervision coursework. Students would be able to complete surveys to develop an awareness of their attachment style, understand which dimensions of the working alliance they emphasize in a supervisory relationship, and ultimately understand how a combination of the constructs may enhance the supervisory relationship. Counselor educators would be able to assess how an awareness of the aforementioned constructs influence the supervisory relationship by having students address critical incidents in supervision in terms of attachment and working alliance terminology in group settings.

Conclusion

This study was descriptive in nature and explored the supervisory relationship in terms of adult attachment styles, perception of the working alliance and self-efficacy in the provision of corrective feedback. The study sought to determine whether doctoral student supervisors in CACREP- accredited programs possessed a high self-efficacy in the provision of corrective feedback within the supervisory relationship. The researcher examined the aforementioned construct in regard to the variables of adult attachment styles and the working alliance.

Doctoral student supervisors' attachment styles did have an association with some of the working alliance dimensions and were able to imply a prediction in supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback in counselor supervision. Likewise, associations existed among certain attachment styles and supervisors' self-efficacy for giving corrective feedback. Primarily however this study provided evidence that knowledge of supervisors' attachment styles may serve as a conceptual framework to better understand the working alliance in supervision, and may enable the enhancement of the feedback exchange, may alter the curricula in counselor education, and thus be vital to the supervisory relationship. The researcher hopes that additional studies may further develop the ideas presented in this study and continue to examine constructs that will refine the relationship know as supervision in counselor supervision.

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M.D.S., Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Personal and Social Relationships, 7,* 147-178.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L.M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61,* 226-244.

Bernard, J.M., & Goodyear, R.K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (2nd Ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Birk, J.M., & Mahalik, J.R. (1996). The influence of trainee conceptual level, trainee anxiety, and supervision evaluation on counselor developmental level. *Clinical Supervisor, 14* (1), 123-137.

Borders. L.D., & Leddick, G. R. (1987). *Handbook of Counseling Supervision.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Bordin, E.S. (1983). A working alliance model of supervision. *Counseling Psychologist, 11,* 35-42.

Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. I. Aetiology and psychopathology in light of attachment theory. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 130,* 201-210.

Bowlby, J. (1978). Attachment theory and its therapeutic implications. In S.C. Feinstein & P.L. Giovacchini (Eds.), *Adolescent psychiatry* (Vol.VI: Development and clinical studies). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 5-33.

Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss. Volume III: Loss*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachments and healthy human development*. New York: Basic Books.

Bowman, V. E., Hatley, L. D., & Bowman, R. L. (1995). Faculty-student relationships: The dual role controversy. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34,* 232-242.

Bradley, J.R., & Olson, J.K. (1980). Training factors influencing felt psychotherapeutic competence of psychology trainees. *Professional Psychology, 11,* 930-934.

Carifio, M.S., & Hess, A.K. (1987). Who is the ideal supervisor? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18,* 244 – 250.

Claiborn, C.D., & Lichtenberg, J.W. (1989). Interactional counseling. *Counseling Psychologist, 17,* 355-453.

Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, N.L., & Read, S.J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(4), 644-663.

Crawford, S.D, Couper, M.P., & Lamias, M.J. (2001) Web Surveys: Perception of Burden. *Social Science Computer Review, 19*, 146-162.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches.* Thousand Oaks: CA: Sage.

Crouch, E.C., Bloch, S., & Wanlass, J. (1994). Therapeutic factors: Interpersonal and intrapersonal mechanisms. In A. Fuhriman & G.M. Burlingame (Eds.), *Handbook of group psychotherapy* (pp.269-318). New York: John Wiley.

Dinsmore, J.A., & England, J.T. (1996). A study of multicultural counseling training at CACREP-accredited counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36(1),* 58-76.

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

Feeney, J.A., Noller, P., & Hanrahan, M. (1994). Assessing adult attachment. In M.B. Sperling & W.H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspective*, 128-152. New York: Guilford.

Fried, Y., Tiegs, R.B., & Bellamy, A.R. (1992). Personal and interpersonal predictors of supervisors' avoidance of evaluating subordinates. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 462-468.

Friedlander, M.L., Siegal, S.M., & Brenock, K. (1989). Parallel process in counseling and supervision: A case study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 149-157.

Friedlander, M.L., & Ward, L.G. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31,* 542-558.

Gladding, S.T. (1995). *Group work: A counseling specialty.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Granello, D.H., & Wheaton, J.E. (2004). Online Data Collection:Strategies for Research. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 387 – 393.

Hazan, C., & Hutt, M. (1993). *Patterns of adaptation: Attachment differences in psychosocial functioning during the first year of college*. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P.R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P.R. (1990). Love and work: An attachment-theoretical perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 270-280.

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

Heppner, P.P., Kivlighan, D.M., Jr., & Wampold, B.E. (1992). *Research design in counseling*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brokks/Cole Publishing.

Holloway, E.L. (1984). Outcome evaluation in supervision research. *Counseling Psychologist, 12,* 167-174.

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

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

Holloway, E.L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. London: Sage publications.

Hulse-Killacky, D., & Page, B.J. (1994). Development of the corrective feedback instrument: A tool for use in counselor training groups. *Journal for Specialist in Group Work, 19*, 197-210.

Hulse-Killacky, D., Orr, J.J., & Paradise, L.V (In Press). The corrective feedback instrument – revised. *Journal for Specialist in Group Work*.

Kadushin, A. (1985). *Supervision in social work* (2nd Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioral research* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Kim, S.H.M. (1997). Influence of trainee attachment on satisfaction with supervision, the supervisory relationship, and perceptions of supervisory style (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*

Kittleson, M. (1997). Determining effective follow-up of e-mail surveys. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 21,* 193-196.

Kobak, R.R., & Hazan, C. (1991). Attachment in marriage: Effects of security and accuracy of working models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60* (6) 861-869.

Komiskey, C.A. (2004). Supervisors' perceptions about giving and receiving corrective feedback: Implications for counselor education and supervision (Doctoral dissertation, university of New Orleans, 2004). *Digital Dissertations*.

Lam, S. (2005). From serving families to community awareness. *American Exchange Quarterly* March 22, 2005. Retrieved on 5/15/05 from http://www.highbeam.com/ library/doc3

Larson, L.M., & Daniels, J.A. (1998). Review of counseling self-efficacy literature. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 179-218.

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

Main, M., & Goldwyn, R. (1984). *Adult attachment classification system*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

Main, M., Kaplan, N., & Cassidy, J. (1985). Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50,* (Nos. 1-2), 66-104.

Mallinckrodt, B. (1995). Attachment theory and counseling psychology: Ready to be a prime time player? *The Counseling Psychologist, 23,* 501-505.

Mallinckrodt, B., Gantt, D.L., & Coble, H.M. (1995). Attachment patterns in the psychotherapy relationship: Development of the Client Attachment to Therapist Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 42,* 307-317.

Medin, C., Roy, S., & Ann, T. (1999). *World Wide Web versus mail surveys: A comparison and report.* Retrieved on 3/23/05 from http://www.anzmac99.unsw.edu.au/anzmacfiles/papers.htm

Mellincoff, D. S. (2001) Supervisory Style: Its Relation to the Supervisory Working Alliance and Supervisor Self-Disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision.* Retrieved from http://www.highbeam.com/library/doc3 asp?DOCID=1 G1:75608337&num=2.

Moran, D.K., & Stockton, R. (1980). Effect of self-concept on group members reception of positive and negative feedback. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27*, 260-267.

Moran, D.K., Stockton, R., & Bond, L. (1991). Delivery of positive and corrective feedback in counseling groups. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 410-414.

Nichols, E., & Sedivi, B. (1998) Economic data collection via the Web: A census bureau case study. Proceedings of Survey Methods Selection, 1998 American Staistical Association Meetings, Dallas, Texas.

Osofsky, J.D., (1988). Attachment theory and research and the psychoanalytic process. *Psychoanalytic Psychology, 5,* 159-177.

Page, B.J., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (1999). Development and validation of the corrective feedback self-efficacy instrument. *Journal for Specialist in Group Work, 24* (1), 37-54.

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS Survival Manual* (2nd Ed.). Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.

Pistole, M.C. (1989). Attachment: Implications for counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 68*(2), 190-193.

Pistole, M.C., & Watkins, C.E. (1995). Attachment theory, counseling process, and supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 23* (3), 457-478.

Rothbard, J.C., & Shaver, P.R. (1994). Continuity of attachment across the life span. In M.R. Sperling & W.H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives* (pp.31-71). New York: Guilford.

Russell, R.K., Crimmings, A.M., & Lent, R.W. (1984). Counselor training and supervision: Theory and research. In S.D. Brown & R.W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of Counseling Psychology*. New York: Wiley, 625-681.

Schlosse, L.Z., & Gelso, C.J. (2001). Measuring the working alliance in advisor-advisee relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(2), 157-167.

Sperling, M.B., & Berman, W.H. (1991). An attachment classification of desperate love. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 56*(1), 45-55.

Sprinthall, R.C. (2000). *Basic statistical analysis, 6th Ed.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Solomon, D.J. (2001). Conducting Web-based surveys. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 7*(19). Retrieved from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=19.

Steward, R.J. (1998). Connecting counselor self-efficacy and supervisor self-efficacy: The continued search for counseling competence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 285-294.

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

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

Trotzer, J.P. (1989). *The counselor and the group: Integrating theory, training, and practice* (2nd ed). Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

Watkins, C.E. (1995). Pathological attachment styles in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy, 32,* 333-340.

Winter, M., & Holloway, E.L. (1992). Relation of trainee experience, conceptual level, and supervisor approach to selection of audiotaped counseling passages. *The Clinical Supervisor, 9,* 87-103.

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

APPENDIX A

Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument

Corrective Feedback Self-Efficacy Instrument
Page, B.J., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (1999)

INSTRUCTIONS: Rate the items on the following scale by circling the number that most resembles your own beliefs. The receiver would be considered the supervisee.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback without being rejected by the receiver.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

2. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback without being challenged by the receiver.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

3. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback and the receiver will realize that I am not attacking the receiver.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

4. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback without the receiver attacking me verbally.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

5. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback in a manner that the receiver will like me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

6. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback without the receiver becoming angry with me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

7. I feel confident I can give corrective feedback without hurting the receiver's feelings.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

8. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver improve skills in getting along with people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree

9. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver feel more trustful of other people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

10. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver learn to approach others.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

11. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver learn the receiver's silence sometimes confuses people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

12. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver get things off his or her chest.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

13. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver learn that others have similar issues to the receiver.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

14. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver express negative and/or positive feelings toward others.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

15. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver express concerns rather than holding them in.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

16. I am confident my corrective feedback will help the receiver feel belonging and acceptance.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

APPENDIX B

Attachment Style Questionnaire

Attachment Style Questionnaire
Feeney, J.A., Noller, P., & Hanrahan, M. (1994)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following items by circling the number that represents your rating on this scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Totally Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree	Totally Agree

1. **Overall, I am a worthwhile person.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

2. **I am easier to get to know than most people.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

3. **I feel confident that other people will be there for me when I need them.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

4. **I prefer to depend on myself rather than other people.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

5. **I prefer to keep to myself.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

6. **To ask for help is to admit that you are a failure.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

7. **People's worth should be judged by what they achieve.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

8. **Achieving things is more important than building relationships.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

9. **Doing you best is more important than getting along with others.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6

1	2	3	4	5	6
Totally	Strongly	Slightly	Slightly	Strongly	Totally
Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree

10. If you've got a job to do, you should do it no matter who gets hurt.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

11. It's important to me that others like me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

12. It's important to me to avoid doing things that other's won't like.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

13. I find it hard to make decisions unless I know what other people think.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

14. My relationships with others are generally superficial.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

15. Sometimes I think I am no good at all.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

16. I find it hard to trust other people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

17. I find it difficult to depend upon others.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

18. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like to be.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

19. I find it relatively easy to get close to other people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

1	2	3	4	5	6
Totally Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree	Totally Agree

20. I find it easy to trust others.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

21. I feel comfortable depending upon other people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

22. I worry that others won't care about me as much as I care about them.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

23. I worry about people getting too close.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

24. I worry that I won't measure up to other people.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

25. I have mixed feelings about being close to others.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

26. While I want to get close to others, I feel uneasy about it.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

27. I wonder why people would want to be involved with me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

28. It's very important to me to have a close relationship.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

29. I worry a lot about my relationships.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

1	2	3	4	5	6
Totally Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree	Totally Agree

30. I wonder how I would cope without someone to love me.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

31. I feel confident about relating to others.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

32. I often feel left out or alone.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

33. I often worry that I do not really fit in with other people.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

34. Other people have their own problems, so I don't bother them with mine.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

35. When I talk my problems over with others, I generally feel ashamed or foolish.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

36. I am too busy with other activities to put much time into relationships.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

37. If something is bothering me, others are generally aware and concerned.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

38. I am confident that other people will like and respect me.

   1   2   3   4   5   6

39. I get frustrated when others are not available when I need them

   1   2   3   4   5   6

1	2	3	4	5	6
Totally Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Strongly Agree	Totally Agree

40. Other people often disappoint me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6

APPENDIX C

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory –

Supervisor's Version

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory:
(Supervisor's Version)
Efstation, J.F., Patton, M.J., & Kardash, C.M. (1990)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please respond to the following items by circling the number located below each statement that represents your beliefs about your relationship with your current supervisee(s).

Rating Scale

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Never	Rarely	Occas- ionally	Some- times	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

1. **I help my trainee work within a specific treatment plan with his/her client.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. **I help my trainee stay on track during our meetings.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. **My style is to carefully and systematically consider the material that my trainee brings to supervision.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. **My trainee works with me on specific goals in the supervisory session.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. **In supervision, I expect my trainee to think about or reflect on my comments to him/her.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. **I teach my trainee through direct suggestion.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. **In supervision, I place a high priority on our understanding the client's perspective.**

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Never	Rarely	Occas-ionally	Some-times	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

8. **I encourage my trainee to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing.**

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. **When correcting my trainee's errors with a client, I offer alternative ways of intervening with that client.**

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. **I encourage my trainee to formulate his/her own interventions with his/her clients.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. **I encourage my trainee to talk about the work in the ways that are comfortable for him/her.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. **I welcome my trainee's explanations about his/her client's behavior.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. **During supervision, my trainee talks more than I do.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. **I make an effort to understand my trainee.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. **I am tactful when commenting about my trainee's performance.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. **I facilitate my trainee's talking in our sessions.**

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Never	Rarely	Occas-ionally	Some-times	Often	Very Often	Almost Always

17. In supervision, my trainee is more curious than anxious when discussing his/her difficulties with clients.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

18. My trainee appears to be comfortable working with me.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

19. My trainee understands client behavior and treatment technique similar to the ways that I do.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

20. During supervision, my trainee seems able to stand back and reflect on what I am saying to him/her.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

21. I stay in tune with my trainee during supervision.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

22. My trainee identifies with me in the way he/she thinks and talks about his/her clients.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

23. My trainee consistently implements suggestions made in supervision.

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

APPENDIX D

Personal Information Questionnaire

Supervisor Personal Information Questionnaire
Day, M.S (2003)

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions by placing an "X" next to the response that most closely reflects you and your experiences. Thank You!

1. What is your gender? 1 _____ Female 2 _____ Male

2. What is your age? _____

3. What is your racial/ethnic background?

    1 _____ African-American/Black

    2 _____ Asian-American/Asian Indian/ Pacific Islander

    3 _____ Caucasian-American/White

    4 _____ Hispanic-American/Latino/Latina

    5 _____ Native American/American Indian

    6 _____ Biracial/Multiracial (please indicate: _____)

    7 _____ Other racial/ethnic background (please indicate: _____)

4. Which sites describe settings in which your supervisees counsel clients?
    (Mark all that apply)

    1 _____ Human Services

    2 _____ College Counseling

    3 _____ School Counseling

    4 _____ Other sites (please indicate: _____)

5. To date, how long have you been supervising? Years _____ Months _____

6. How many supervisees are you currently working with? _____

7. How many semesters of doctoral study have you completed? _____

APPENDIX E

Instruction Letters to Participants

INTRODUCTION LETTER

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a study to explore supervisors' adult attachment styles in relation to their perceived self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback within counselor supervision. Data gathered from this study will provide useful information that pertains to the field of counselor education and supervision.

Should you chose to participate in this survey, the information you provide will remain strictly confidential and nothing could be used to identify you. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes and can be completed by clicking on the following URL (http://www.uno.edu/~testserv/midcity/ccr.html) or by cutting and pasting this address in your internet browser. In the event you have any difficulties opening the web page, please contact me via e-mail at (daym@girlsandboystown.org) and I will contact you immediately to determine the best way to proceed.

I greatly appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Matthew S. Day, M.Div., LPC
Doctoral Candidate

Teresa Christensen, Ph.D., NCC, LPC, RPT-S
Assistant Professor of Counselor Education
University of New Orleans

FOLLOW-UP

Dear Colleague:

You recently received a request from me to explore supervisors' adult attachment styles in relation to their perceived self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback within counselor supervision. Data gathered from this study will provide useful information that pertains to the field of counselor education and supervision. If you have already completed this survey, please accept my gratitude and disregard the remainder of this message.

If you have not yet completed this survey, please read the following information. Should you chose to participate in this survey, the information you provide will remain strictly confidential and nothing could be used to identify you. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes and can be completed by clicking on the following URL (http://www.uno.edu/~testserv/midcity/ccr.html) or by cutting and pasting this address in your internet browser. In the event you have any difficulties opening the web page, please contact me via e-mail at (daym@girlsandboystown.org) or phone (718-636-2130) and I will contact you immediately to determine the best way to proceed.

I greatly appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Matthew S. Day, M.Div., LPC
Doctoral Candidate

Teresa Christensen, Ph.D., NCC, LPC, RPT-S
Assistant Professor of Counselor Education
University of New Orleans

LETTERS TO PROFESSORS/CHAIRS

Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Foundations
College of Education and Human Development
University of New Orleans
348 Education Building
New Orleans, LA 70148

Dear Counselor Education Chair or Coordinator:

As the final step in the completion of my Ph.D. from the Department of Counseling at the University of New Orleans, I am in the process of conducting my dissertation research. Directed by Dr. Teresa Christensen, my investigation will explore supervisors' adult attachment styles in relation to their perceived self-efficacy in giving corrective feedback within counselor supervision. Data gathered from this study will provide useful information that pertains to the field of counselor education and supervision.

The prospective participants for this investigation will be doctoral students solicited from all CACREP accredited programs in Counseling and Counselor Education in the United States. Therefore, I am contacting you to request your assistance with this research. If possible, would you please send me the e-mail addresses for each doctoral student who is currently considered a part-time or full-time student in your counseling program? Likewise, will you please send the e-mail addresses for each full-time and part-time professor who is currently teaching within your doctoral program in Counseling or Counselor Education? If you do not feel comfortable sending me this information, would it be possible for you to disseminate this information to the aforementioned people on my behalf? If so, I will send you all of the necessary documents via e-mail. In the event that none of these options are possible and you are interested in assisting me with my dissertation research, please contact me so that we can discuss potential alternatives.

As I know that you are incredibly busy, I truly value your time and attention and hope that you will be able and willing to assist me with this matter. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (718) 636-2130 (office), (718) 623-1175 (home), or ((daym@girlsandboystown.org). You may also contact Dr. Teresa Christensen at (504) 280-7434 (office), or e-mail @ (tchriste@uno.edu).

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Matthew S. Day, M.Div., LPC
Doctoral Candidate

Teresa Christensen, Ph.D., NCC, LPC, RPT-S
Assistant Professor of Counselor Education
University of New Orleans

APPENDIX F

Letter to Human Subjects Committee

March 10, 2003

Dr. Matthew Stanford, Chair
Human Subjects Committee
Department of Psychology
GP 2002
University of New Orleans
New Orleans, LA 70148

Dear Dr. Stanford:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education program at the University of New Orleans. I am writing you to request a waiver of the formal review process by the Human Subjects Review Committee for my study. The chairperson of my dissertation committee is Dr. Teresa Christensen, Assistant Professor of Counselor Education in the Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling, and Foundations.

My dissertation instrument is a survey designed to assess the implications of counselors' attachment styles as they relate to supervision within counselor education and the counseling profession. I intend to survey professors and doctoral students from CACREP accredited counseling programs. The participants will receive a letter and the instrument via e-mail and will be able to reply in the same manner. Two weeks after the initial mailing, participants will receive a follow-up letter reminding them to complete the survey if they have not already done so, another attachment with the instrument, and a note thanking them for their participation. No information will be gathered that could be used to identify the participants.

Please contact me by phone (718-812-8196) or e-mail (daym@girlsandboystown.org) if you have any questions or comments. You may contact Dr. Christensen by phone (280-7434) or e-mail (tchriste@uno.edu) as well regarding this research project. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Matthew S. Day, M.Div., LPC
Doctoral Candidate

APPENDIX G

Approval from Human Subjects Committee

Campus Correspondence

To: Matthew S. Day
        Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations

From: Matthew S. Stanford, Ph.D.
        Associate Professor and Chair
        University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

Date: 3/11/03

RE: Counselors' attachment styles

Because of the anonymous nature of your project it is exempt from committee review as stated in section 46.101 B, paragraph 2 of the OHRP guidelines.

VITA

Matthew S. Day was born and raised in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. He graduated from Furman University in 1991 and left South Carolina in 1992 for the serene nature of New Orleans, Louisiana. Matthew planned to remain in New Orleans for three years until he completed his Masters of Divinity in Counseling Psychology from New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary. He completed his Masters in 1994, but allure of the Big Easy convinced him to stay.

During the next 8 years, Matthew worked as a counselor for various youth care agencies and taught as an adjunct faculty member at William Carey College. Matthew also opened a private counseling practice and worked as a Licensed Professional Counselor and Board Approved Supervisor at Mid-City Counseling Center. It was during this period, around the fall of 2000, that Matthew decided to embark upon a goal that had earlier been pushed aside. The kind words from a variety of professors and the experience of a group class at the University of New Orleans convinced Matthew to pursue his Doctor of Philosophy in Counselor Education at the University of New Orleans.

Matthew was teaching, enrolled at the University of New Orleans, and working at his private practice when a moment at the New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival changed everything, including his place of residence. Matthew moved to Brooklyn, New York and started working as a program director of a juvenile facility and later became the clinical director. He also taught as an adjunct faculty member at John Jay University, Long Island University and Queens College. The latter experience was very special as an opportunity arose to apply for the position of Assistant Professor in the Educational and Community Programs department at Queens College. The opportunity became a reality when Matthew accepted the position, and he

will begin a new journey in the fall of 2005 in Queens, New York. Matthew's personal and professional experiences have been varied, but have always been shaped by his family, close friends, and his desire to teach and counsel. Much has occurred so far in Matthew's personal and profession life, and he eagerly anticipates those experiences which are to come.