

Supervisors' in-session behaviors and cognitions

By: [L. DiAnne Borders](#)

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Borders, L. D. (1991). Supervisors' in-session behaviors and cognitions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 31(1), 32-47.

which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1991.tb00369.x>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#).

*****© Reprinted with permission. No further reproduction is authorized without written permission from Wiley. This version of the document is not the version of record. Figures and/or pictures may be missing from this format of the document. *****

Abstract:

A multiple case study of four supervisors indicated that numerous factors shape supervisors' in-session performance and revealed a complex interplay between thoughts and behaviors.

Keywords: counselor supervision | counseling | cognition | behavior

Article:

In 1983, Holloway and Hosford outlined a systematic approach to empirical investigations of counseling supervision. They suggested that exploratory descriptive studies designed to identify relevant variables were prerequisite to second-stage experimental studies. In line with these suggestions, a relatively small but growing body of research has characterized various components of the supervision process (e.g., Friedlander, Siegel, & Brenock, 1989; Holloway, 1982; Holloway, Freund, Gardner, Nelson, & Walker, 1989; Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Holloway & Wolleat, 1981; Kruger, Cherniss, Maher, & Leichtman, 1988; Marikis, Russell, & Dell, 1985; Martin, Goodyear, & Newton, 1987; Nelson & Holloway, 1990; Rickards, 1984; Strozier, Thoreson, & Kivlighan, 1989; Ward, 1987/1988). The purpose of this study was to investigate additional variables that might further our understanding of supervision events and suggest fruitful avenues for future research.

In most studies to date, supervisors' in-session verbal behaviors have been analyzed. Results consistently characterize supervision as a task-oriented enterprise and supervisors as informational teachers. Studies of both novice and experienced supervisors have yielded similar results, although a few distinctions between the two groups have been reported (e.g., Kruger et al., 1988; Marikis et al., 1985; Ward, 1987/ 1988). In general, experienced supervisors were more active and used more teaching and sharing behaviors, while novices tended to be more supportive but less evaluative and confrontive.

Although a fairly consistent picture of in-session behaviors has emerged from these studies, there also are indications that supervisors exhibit highly idiosyncratic verbal patterns (e.g., Holloway et al., 1989; Holloway & Wolleat, 1981). The influence of supervisors' counseling orientations has been investigated, but results have been contradictory (see Holloway et al., 1989; Ward, 1987/1988). Thus, no clear explanation of supervisors' individual patterns has emerged.

One possible avenue for gaining insight into supervisors' differential behaviors is to investigate their thought processes while supervising. It is possible that supervisors' in-session thoughts may direct or explain their behaviors with supervisees (cf. Borders, 1989a; Fuqua, Johnson, Anderson, & Newman, 1984; Hill et al., 1988; Kurpius, Benjamin, & Morran, 1985). To date, however, scarce attention has been given to supervisors' cognitive processes.

Three studies have investigated some aspects of supervisors' cognitions. In two studies, supervisors were asked to "think aloud" their plans prior to a supervision session, Stone (1980) reported experienced supervisors generated more planning statements and more supervisee-focused statements than did novices. In contrast, Marikis et al. (1985) found no differences in the planning statements of supervisors at three levels of experience. They also found no relationship between supervisors' planning statements and their verbal behaviors in subsequent supervision sessions. Supervisors' thoughts while supervising were not assessed in either study.

More recently, Strozier et al. (1989) employed a structured measure of supervisor intentions (an edited version of Hill & O'Grady's, 1985, Therapist Intentions List) in a single case study of an advanced intern-experienced supervisor pair. Sequential analysis indicated some predictable relationships between supervisor's intentions and supervisee's self-reported reactions (e.g., "explore" intention led to "felt challenged" reaction). Possible connections between supervisors' intentions and their in-session behaviors, however, were not explored.

Although these three studies provide initial glimpses of supervisors' thought processes, further studies are needed to identify how supervisors actually think during sessions and how their thoughts and behaviors may be related. Such investigations could shed light on supervisors' response patterns during sessions and could suggest relevant variables for second-stage experimental studies (cf. Holloway & Hosford, 1983).

This study was designed to obtain a more complete picture of supervision events by investigating supervisors' in-session behaviors and cognitions. Because research in this area is rudimentary, it seemed appropriate to first conduct an intensive descriptive study of these variables (cf. Holloway & Hosford, 1983). Accordingly, a multiple case study approach was used to study four supervisors' behaviors and cognitions during actual supervision sessions. For this exploratory study, some deliberate diversity in supervisors was sought. A review of the existing conceptual and empirical supervision literature suggested three factors that could influence supervision events: theoretical counseling orientation, experience as a supervisor, and preferred approach to supervision. These factors of interest were used to guide the choice of supervisors. As a result, two novice and two experienced supervisors who varied in their theoretical counseling orientations and supervision approaches were asked to participate.

In line with a case study design, multiple measures of supervisors' behaviors and cognitions were employed. In-session behaviors were assessed by (a) verbal response categories and (b) proportion of talk time. As measures of in-session cognitions, supervisors reported their (a) internal dialogue and (b) intentions while supervising.

A secondary research question of this study was whether participants' perceptions would match actual supervision events. Some discrepancies between the two have been found (Borders, 1989b; Martin et al., 1987; Ward, 1987/1988). By comparing self-ratings of supervisors' styles with their actual behaviors and cognitions, I hoped to gather additional data that might guide future research in this area.

METHOD

Participants

Four supervisors in a counselor education program at a medium-size, southeastern university volunteered to participate in the study. Each asked a current, regularly assigned supervisee of his or her choice to participate. The supervisees were second-year students in the 48-hour master's level counseling program; at the time of the study, all four were enrolled in their first semester of internship and all were placed in community agency settings. Internship requirements dictated that certain procedures were similar across supervisors (e.g., supervisors met weekly with their interns and reviewed a minimum of seven audiotapes of counseling sessions).

Experienced-1 (E-1). E-1 (male, age 35) was in his first year as a counselor educator. He had graduate degrees in clinical (MA) and counseling (PhD) psychology and 7 years of counseling experience in several mental health settings. E-1 reported that he had completed a doctoral-level seminar and practicum in supervision and had 4 years of supervision experience, primarily overseeing social work interns in clinical settings. E-1 indicated his counseling orientation was a combination of cognitive-behavioral and systemic approaches. He said that he used a case management approach in supervision and that his primary goal was to help supervisees develop competence in treatment planning.

E-1's intern (female, age 37) reported 10 years of experience in alcohol and drug treatment centers.

Experienced-2 (E-2). E-2 (female, age 38) was in her fourth year as a counselor educator. She had completed graduate degrees in counseling (MA) and counselor education (PhD) and had worked in a college counseling center for 2 years. She also had 7 additional years of experience teaching at the high school and college levels. E-2 reported academic and experiential training in supervision, and over 4 years experience supervising practicum students, interns, and supervisors-in-training. E-2 described her counseling orientation as relationship-based and integrative, and indicated developmental models (e.g., Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981) were her primary framework for conducting supervision.

E-2's intern (female, age 27) reported little prior counseling experience.

Novice-1 (N-1). N-1 (male, age 40) was an advanced doctoral student in the counselor education program. He had completed a master's degree in counseling and had 12 years of post-master's experience as a behavioral specialist in public schools. He described his counseling philosophy as client-centered and Gestalt but said he used a Reality Therapy approach with his school clients because this approach seemed more appropriate for their classroom behavior problems. N-1 had no formal course work in supervision but was enrolled in a supervision practicum at the time of the study. He reported that he used a person-centered approach in supervision.

N-1's intern (female, age 33) reported no prior counseling experience.

Novice-2 (N-2). N-2 (male, age 30) also was an advanced doctoral student in the counselor education program and was enrolled in a supervision practicum. He reported no formal course work in supervision. N-2 had completed a master's degree in sociology and had 2 years of work experience in business (personnel) and 4 years in coaching. He had completed counseling internships in several settings, providing career, personal, and family counseling. He described his approach to both counseling and supervision as cognitive behavioral.

N-2's intern (female, age 52) had extensive work experience but reported little formal counseling experience.

Measures

Supervisors' Behaviors. First, the revised Counselor Verbal Response Modes Category System (CVRMCS; Hill, 1985, 1986) was used to code supervisors' verbal behaviors during their supervision sessions. Previous researchers have employed category systems that were based in other fields (e.g., teaching) or that focused on process variables (e.g., complementarity-anticomplementarity, power-involvement) rather than types of responses. The CVRMCS was chosen for this study because the category types seemed relevant to the types of responses supervisors use in sessions.

The CVRMCS consists of 12 nominal, pantheoretical, mutually exclusive categories: approval, information, and direct guidance (directives); closed and open questions (information seeking); paraphrase (including restatement, reflection, nonverbal referent, and summary), interpretation, confrontation, and self-disclosure (complex responses); minimal encourages and silence (minimal responses); and other. Acceptable validity and high agreement levels among judges were demonstrated in a series of studies (Elliott et al., 1987; Hill, 1986).

Second, activity level of supervisors was determined by the ratio of number of words spoken by the supervisor to the total number of words spoken by both supervisor and counselor. This approach was similar to that used by Martin et al. (1987).

Supervisors' Cognitions. The measure employed by Strozier et al. (1989) was used to assess intentions of supervisors' responses. This measure is a slightly edited version of the Therapist Intentions List (Hill & O'Grady, 1985). To make the measure appropriate for supervisors, the words counselor and client were changed to supervisor and supervisee. The list includes 19 nominal, pantheoretical, nonmutually exclusive categories: set limits, get information, give

information, support, focus, clarify, hope, cathart, cognitions, behaviors, self-control, feelings, insight, change, reinforce change, resistance, challenge, relationship, and supervisor needs. Validity for the list was established in a series of empirical investigations (Fuller & Hill, 1985; Hill & O'Grady, 1985).

Because structured measures of cognitions may restrict or bias results (Borders, Fong, & Cron, 1988; Fuqua et al., 1984), an open-ended "think aloud" procedure (Dole et al., 1982) designed to assess ongoing internal dialogue also was employed. Dole et al.'s (1982) standardized recall procedure and coding system is an adaptation of Interpersonal Process Recall (Kagan, 1980) and the think-aloud approach (Genest & Turk, 1981). Originally devised to assess counselors' in-session cognitions, the Dole coding system was later expanded to include supervisors' thoughts while supervising (Dole et al., 1984). Each scoring unit (discrete thought) is classified into one category for each of six dimensions: time (past, present, or future); place (in-session or out-of-session); focus (client, counselor, client-counselor interaction or relationship, supervisor, supervisor-counselor interaction or relationship, or other); locus (external, observable characteristic or behavior, or internal, inferred trait, opinion, or value); orientation (professional or personal); and mode (neutral, planning, positive, or negative). Dole and associates (1982, 1984) demonstrated acceptable interrater reliability and provided evidence for internal stability.

Supervisors' Style. The Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) was used to assess participants' perceptions of supervisors' behaviors. The SSI is a measure of three dimensions of a supervisor's style: attractive (collegial), interpersonally sensitive (relationship- and process-oriented), and task-oriented (practical, didactic). Using a scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very), respondents indicate to what extent 33 Likert-type items (adjectives) describe a supervisor's style. Supervisors and supervisees use parallel versions of the instrument. In a series of studies, Friedlander and Ward (1984) demonstrated high reliability and validity for the instrument.

Procedure

Data Collection. Each supervisor was asked to audiotape and videotape a midsemester supervision session (of their choice) in the university video laboratory. A midsemester session was preferred so that the "working stage" (vs. initial or termination stages) of supervision could be studied.

In the hour immediately after the supervision session, each supervisor reviewed his or her session following the standardized recall procedure (Dole et al., 1982). Supervisors were asked to relive the session as they watched the videotape and "think aloud" using the present tense to describe what they were thinking and feeling as they supervised. They were encouraged to report all in-session thoughts and feelings, including those they considered trivial or irrelevant. They stopped the videotape whenever they wished and recorded their retrospections via an audiorecorder that ran throughout the recall procedure.

Because of the intensity of the recall procedure, supervisors were allowed to complete the additional measures on the following day. Within 24 hours, each supervisor reviewed the videotape a second time and completed the intentions list. Supervisors were asked to stop the

tape after each supervisor speaking turn and indicate as many intentions as applied for that particular response.

The SSI also was completed within 24 hours of the supervision session. Supervisors described their style of working with the videotaped intern; each intern reported perceptions of the supervisor's approach.

Data Preparation and Preliminary Ratings. Audiotapes of the supervision sessions were transcribed, and following specified procedures (see Hill, 1985), each supervisors' responses were divided into response units. Three trained raters (a doctoral level counselor educator and two counselor education doctoral students) independently categorized all supervisor response units. Final ratings were determined by consensus: the category selected by at least two raters or (for three-way disagreements) the category identified through discussion. Kappas (agreement corrected for chance) between all pairs of the three raters were .61, .68, and .69.

Activity level was determined by dividing the total number of whole words spoken during each session with the number of words spoken by the supervisor.

Audiotapes of the recall sessions were transcribed and collated with the transcripts of the supervision sessions; each retrospection was paired with the concurrent supervisor-intern dialogue. Supervisors' retrospections were then divided into scoring units, defined by a shift in the target of the retrospection (e.g., (1) He's breathing hard; (2) We're not communicating) (Dole et al., 1982). Two experienced raters, a counselor educator and a counseling psychology doctoral student, independently classified each scoring unit into one category under each of the six dimensions. Kappas for their ratings in each dimension were .67 (time), .82 (place), .77 (focus), .88 (locus), .75 (orientation), and .80 (mode).

For each supervisor, proportions of intentions in each category were computed and then divided by the total number of intentions reported for the entire session. Perceptions of supervisory style were determined by computing average ratings for the items on each of the three SSI scales (see Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics were compiled for each measure and supervisor. In the following sections, results are reported from two perspectives: (a) overall results for each measure and (b) distinctive results for each supervisor on that measure.

Supervisors' Behaviors

Proportions of response modes and activity levels for each supervisor are reported in Table 1. For all four supervisors, at least half of their responses were directives. Their most frequent response type was providing information (40.5%); all other individual response modes were used relatively infrequently (10% or less). Silence and confrontation were the least frequent responses. In terms of activity level, supervisors generally talked a smaller percentage of the session time than did their interns.

Within these general response patterns, however, the four supervisors demonstrated somewhat idiosyncratic patterns. For example, E-1 was the most verbally active and gave the most specific suggestions (direct guidance). He also used the most complex responses, especially interpretations. In contrast, N-2 talked the least and was the least directive of the four supervisors. He used the most minimal responses, paraphrases, and open questions and was the least likely to give information. N-1 offered his intern the most information and support (approval). E-2 demonstrated no singularly distinct differences from the other participants.

Table 1. Frequencies and Proportions of Supervisors' Verbal Responses in Each Category and Their Activity Level

Response Categories	Supervisors								M%
	Experienced-1		Experienced-2		Novice-1		Novice-2		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Minimal responses	19	3.9	50	15.3	1	0.4	61	19.4	9.7
Minimal encourager	17	3.5	47	14.4	1	0.4	61	19.4	9.4
Silence	2	0.4	3	0.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.3
Directives	296	60.4	164	50.3	185	80.8	125	39.9	57.8
Approval	12	2.4	13	4.0	28	12.2	31	9.9	7.1
Information	194	39.6	118	36.2	135	59.0	85	27.1	40.5
Direct guidance	90	18.4	33	10.1	22	9.6	9	2.9	10.2
Information seeking	46	9.3	74	22.8	8	3.5	66	21.0	14.2
Closed question	13	2.6	37	11.4	6	2.6	23	7.3	6.0
Open question	33	6.7	37	11.4	2	0.9	43	13.7	8.2
Complex responses	127	26.0	38	11.6	35	15.3	62	19.7	18.2
Paraphrase	38	7.8	20	6.1	13	5.7	56	17.8	9.4
Interpretation	49	10.0	9	2.8	6	2.6	2	0.6	4.0
Confrontation	1	0.2	1	0.3	0	0.0	4	1.3	0.4
Self-disclosure	39	8.0	8	2.4	16	7.0	0	0.0	4.4
Other	2	0.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.1
Total responses	490	100.0	326	100.0	229	100.0	314	100.0	100.0
Activity of supervisor	62.3%		44.1%		40.2%		34.3%		45.2%

Note. Response categories are based on the revised Counselor Verbal Response Modes Category System (CVRMCS; Hill, 1985, 1986). Activity level refers to the ratio of number of words spoken by the supervisor to total number of words spoken by both supervisor and counselor.

Supervisors' Cognitions

Internal Dialogue. Individual supervisors' proportions of thoughts in each category of the six dimensions are reported in Table 2. In general, supervisors reported in-session cognitions that were on-task (professional), stated in the present tense, concerned out-of-session events (e.g., counseling session), and considered internal, psychological dynamics. They typically focused on the counselor or supervisor (themselves) individually rather than on the interactive unit (i.e., supervisory relationship or interaction). Their thoughts also tended to be more cognitive (neutral, planning) than affective (positive, negative). Again, however, there were some marked differences between the four in number and content of thoughts reported (see Table 2).

Intentions. A summary of the proportions of intentions in each category for each supervisor is presented in Table 3 (see p. 42). The most frequent intention of all supervisors was give information, followed by clarify, get information, and support. They reported few intentions for dealing with supervisory relationship issues or meeting their own needs. Again, however, patterns and reporting of intentions seemed highly individual.

Table 2. Frequencies and Proportions of Supervisors' Retrospections in Each Dimension and Category.

Retrospective Dimension and Categories	Supervisors								M%
	Experienced-1		Experienced-2		Novice-1		Novice-2		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Time									
Past	17	17.7	49	11.5	66	24.0	72	21.6	18.7
Present	43	44.8	213	50.1	177	64.4	161	48.4	51.9
Future	36	37.5	163	38.4	32	11.6	100	30.0	29.4
Place									
In-session	20	20.8	223	52.5	132	48.0	96	28.8	37.5
Out-of-session	76	79.2	202	47.5	143	52.0	237	71.2	62.5
Focus									
Client	20	20.8	20	4.7	6	2.2	12	3.6	7.8
Counselor	37	38.6	165	38.8	104	37.8	160	48.1	40.8
Client-counselor	12	12.5	48	11.3	8	2.9	29	8.7	8.8
Supervisor	19	19.8	147	34.6	112	40.7	96	28.8	31.0
Supervisor-counselor	8	8.3	40	9.4	43	15.7	32	9.6	10.8
Other	0	0.0	5	1.2	2	0.7	4	1.2	0.8
Locus									
External	25	26.0	40	9.4	36	13.1	33	9.9	14.6
Internal	71	74.0	385	90.6	239	86.9	300	90.1	85.4
Orientation									
Professional	94	97.9	408	96.0	254	92.4	292	87.7	93.5
Personal	2	2.1	17	4.0	21	7.6	41	12.3	6.5
Mode									
Neutral	54	56.3	207	48.7	135	49.1	78	23.4	44.4
Planning	28	29.2	113	26.6	34	12.4	6	1.8	17.5
Positive	8	8.3	38	8.9	52	18.9	4	1.2	9.3
Negative	6	6.2	67	15.8	54	19.6	245	73.6	28.8
Total retrospection	96	100.0	425	100.0	275	100.0	333	100.0	(282.25)

Note. Dimensions and categories are based on a coding system devised by Dole et al. (1982). Each retrospection unit is categorized on each of the six dimensions, so that the total number of retrospections within each dimension equals the total number of retrospections overall (i.e., for Experienced-1, there are 96 retrospections within the Time dimension, the Place dimension, and so forth).

E-1, the most verbally active supervisor, reported substantially fewer intentions and in-session thoughts than did the other participants. His primary intentions (e.g., give information), however, paralleled his predominant response categories (e.g., direct guidance, interpretations). He also reported more client-focused thoughts and more frequently considered observable (external) rather than psychological (internal) events.

In contrast, E-2 was quite deliberate, reporting the most in-session thoughts and intentions. She reported more frequent intentions to educate or instruct the intern (i.e., "change"--develop new skills, frameworks, and perceptions of self as counselor) and tended to give more focus to events within the supervision session.

N-1, the most verbally positive supervisor, also reported having the most positive thoughts during the session. He indicated relatively more intentions of encouraging the intern to expect progress and change (hope), reinforcing change, dealing with her feelings, building her confidence, and helping her gain a sense of mastery (self-control). In addition, his in-session thoughts also suggested he gave the most attention to the supervisory relationship.

Table 3. Frequencies and Promotions of Supervisors' Intentions in Each Category

Intention Categories	Supervisors								M%
	Experienced-1		Experienced-2		Novice-1		Novice-2		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Set limits	0	—	3	1.8	5	5.6	3	2.2	2.4
Get information	4	10.3	16	9.6	6	6.7	28	20.6	11.8
Give information	12	30.8	31	18.5	12	13.7	17	12.5	18.8
Support	5	12.8	19	11.4	9	10.0	15	11.0	11.3
Focus	0	—	8	4.8	4	4.4	18	13.2	5.6
Clarify	8	20.5	34	20.3	2	2.2	22	16.2	14.8
Hope	0	—	3	1.8	8	8.9	2	1.5	3.1
Cathart	0	—	6	3.6	3	3.3	2	1.5	2.1
Cognitions	0	—	1	0.6	0	—	9	6.6	1.8
Behaviors	0	—	4	2.4	2	2.2	0	—	1.2
Self-control	0	—	1	0.6	4	4.4	1	0.7	1.4
Feelings	0	—	2	1.2	6	6.7	6	4.4	3.1
Insight	5	12.8	12	7.2	8	8.9	1	0.7	7.4
Change	0	—	20	12.0	4	4.4	7	5.2	5.4
Reinforce change	0	—	4	2.4	6	6.7	0	—	2.3
Resistance	2	5.1	0	—	1	1.1	2	1.5	1.9
Challenge	3	7.7	3	1.8	7	7.9	3	2.2	4.9
Relationship	0	—	0	—	1	1.1	0	—	0.2
Supervisor needs	0	—	0	—	2	2.2	0	—	0.5
Total intentions	39	100.0	167	100.0	90	100.0	136	100.0	(108)

Note. Intention categories are based on the Therapist Intentions List (Hill & O'Grady, 1985). To make the measure appropriate for this study, the words counselor and client were changed to supervisor and supervisee. Mean number of intentions = 108.

N-2's in-session behaviors and cognitions presented somewhat contrasting views of the supervision session. His primarily neutral responses (e.g., minimal responses, paraphrases) were paralleled by intentions of getting information and clarifying. Almost three-fourths of his in-session cognitions, however, were negative thoughts about his intern and himself. In fact, N-2 sometimes verbalized agreement with the intern while he mentally expressed strong disapproval.

Supervisors' Style

Ratings of supervisory style for each supervisor-intern pair were determined by scores on the SSI (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). Three of the four supervisors and their interns described the supervisors' styles as more collegial (attractive) and relationship- and process-oriented (interpersonally sensitive) than didactic and practical (task-oriented). Only one intern-supervisor pair disagreed about predominant style: E-1 described himself as attractive and interpersonally sensitive, while his intern rated him as primarily task-oriented (Ms=6.20 vs. 4.50).

DISCUSSION

This study was an initial investigation of supervisors' in-session cognitions. Results indicate that supervisors' thoughts can provide instructive data toward understanding their in-session behaviors and suggest some specific questions for future research. Quantitative results are summarized as follows with illustrative examples drawn from the content of supervisors' thoughts and behaviors.

The four supervisors' verbal behaviors paralleled those reported in previous studies (e.g., Holloway, 1982; Holloway et al., 1989; Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Kruger et al., 1988; Marikis et al., 1985; Martin et al., 1987): All four were task-oriented and informational but also exhibited wide variations in their verbal responses. Measures of cognitions, unique to this study, revealed similar results. Although there was a general pattern of on-task thoughts, there also were striking differences in deliberateness, planfulness, conscious awareness of actions, and desired outcomes (e.g., instructing vs. avoiding conflict).

The supervisors were selected based on variations along three factors of interest (i.e., counseling orientation, supervision approach, and supervisory experience), and these factors helped to explain some individual patterns of in-session events. The three factors, however, seemed to provide only a partial explanation for the unique results for each supervisor.

E-1's systemic and cognitive-behavioral counseling orientation was evident in his references to specific client behaviors, the counseling interventions he suggested, and the explanations of client behavior he shared. The chronology of the supervision session seemed to illustrate his self-reported case management approach: He asked the intern to present a case, asked questions about the client's history and current status, generated a number of hypotheses or diagnoses about the client's behavior, and then made several specific suggestions for the next session and for long-range treatment planning. Similarly, N-1's humanistic orientation to counseling and supervision was evident in his supportive thoughts and behaviors, focus on feelings, and positive expectations for change.

In contrast, the counseling orientations of E-2 and N-2 were not readily apparent in their supervision sessions. E-2's developmental approach to supervision, however, may have explained her focus on in-session events, her focus on the supervisees and the supervision session rather than the client, and her educational intentions.

Similar to counseling orientation and supervision approach, supervisory experience seemed to provide limited explanations for in-session events. In contrast to their more experienced counterparts, N-1 and N-2 exhibited some previously reported characteristics of novice supervisors (e.g., Kruger et al., 1988; McColley & Baker, 1982; Robyak, Goodyear, & Prange, 1987). Both tended to use more approval statements overall, and both expressed more affectively based thoughts (vs. neutral and planning thoughts). Although the novice-experienced contrasts seemed consistent with previous research, there also were striking differences between the two supervisors at each experience level, as previously noted in the Results section.

The idiosyncratic patterns of the four supervisors suggest that there may be an interplay between experience, orientation, and approach on supervisors' behaviors and cognitions. In addition, other factors not included in this study may have influenced in-session events. For example, it may be that differences in the experienced supervisors' previous professional experiences influenced their approach to the supervision sessions. E-1's extensive clinical experience may help explain his focus on the client and his case management approach, while E-2's years in educational roles may have influenced her focus on the counselor and her instructional interventions. Future work is needed to explore these and other factors that may influence supervisors' predispositions concerning their role and conduct of supervision.

A secondary goal of this study was to compare participants' perceptions of supervisory style with actual behaviors. Similar to Ward's (1987/1988) findings, the two were not in full agreement. Supervisors and supervisees (with only one exception) believed that the supervisors were primarily collegial and relationship-oriented. Supervisors observed in-session behaviors, however, were primarily directive and didactic.

The contrast between perceptions and actual events could be explained by the quantitative differences between supervisors' intentions to support and their actual verbalizations of this support. Because the supervisors were working with beginning counselors, their informational interventions may have been perceived as supportive by both participants (cf. Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981). It may be that the perceptions or interpretations of behaviors (via style ratings) reflected subtle dynamics that were not measured by direct observations of those behaviors. While continued study of actual events is needed, additional attention to supervisors' (and supervisees') interpretations of supervision events also seems warranted.

Several limitations of this study must be considered. Although naturalistic case studies provide in-depth perspectives, they also are subject to numerous confounding variables. In this study, four diverse supervisors saw four different interns, each in a different field setting, and only one session per supervisor was analyzed. The study also focused on one participant in the session; it did not investigate ways the interns--or their clients--may have influenced the supervisors' behaviors and cognitions (cf. Ellis & Dell, 1986; Holloway et al., 1989).

The study also relied on counseling-based measures to describe supervisors' behaviors and intentions. Both supervisors and raters indicated they had some difficulty in applying the measures to supervision events. In particular, the response categories and list of intentions seemed to provide limited opportunities to describe educationally oriented behaviors and cognitions. Give information intentions and directive responses (e.g., give information, direct guidance) seemed to be the only categories for educational events, so that a large percentage of diverse responses were placed in these categories. More subtle interventions, such as modeling and the use of metaphors, also were difficult to categorize.

Other supervision researchers (e.g., Friedlander et al., 1989; Holloway, 1982; Holloway et al., 1989; Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Holloway & Wolleat, 1981; Martin et al., 1987; Ward, 1987/1988) have used more generic coding systems to categorize supervisors' verbal responses. While the results of this study revealed similar depictions of supervisors' behaviors (i.e., informational, instructional), the merits of existing coding systems for accurately describing

supervisors' verbal responses have not been evaluated. Measures derived from the analysis of supervisory interactions might better reveal the distinct behaviors, skills, and thought processes of supervisors. (This conclusion was stimulated by a conversation with Elizabeth Holloway.)

In this and other case studies, a summary of categorical results typically are reported. Different approaches, however, are needed to describe the process within supervision sessions. One possible approach is analysis of events by session segments (cf. Hill, Carter, & O'Farrell, 1983; O'Farrell, Hill, & Patton, 1986). To explore this alternative, proportions of response modes during each third of the sessions were examined. In general, all four supervisors became more directive and self-disclosing as their sessions progressed. E-1 had the most distinctive pattern across the session. He decreased his use of open questions, paraphrases, and interpretations, and increasingly relied on direct suggestions for counseling interventions, illustrating them with examples from his clinical experience (self-disclosure). Similar analyses in future studies may provide additional insights into the course of supervision sessions.

In summary, the results of this study suggest that, to obtain a more complete picture of supervision events, researchers need to consider supervisors' thoughts in addition to their behaviors. Supervisors' cognitions seem to be one promising avenue for understanding the complexity, subtlety, and diversity within the supervision enterprise.

REFERENCES

- Borders, L. D. (1989a). Developmental cognitions of first practicum supervisees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 163-169.
- Borders, L. D. (1989b). A pragmatic agenda for developmental supervision research. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 29, 16-24.
- Borders, L. D., Fong, M. L., & Cron, E. A. (1988). In-session cognitions of a counseling student: A case study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 28, 59-70.
- Dole, A. A., et al. (1982). Six dimensions of retrospections by therapists and counselors--A manual for research. *JSAS: Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 12, 23. (Ms. No. 2454)
- Dole, A. A., Nissenfeld, M., Bowers, C., Herzog, M., Levitt, D., McIntyre, P., Wedeman, S., & Woodburn, P. (1984, April). Counselor retrospections and supervisor cognitions: A case study. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Elliott, R., Hill, C. E., Stiles, W. B., Friedlander, M. L., Mahrer, A. R., & Margison, F. R. (1987). Primary therapist response modes: Comparison of six rating systems. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 218-223.
- Ellis, M. V., & Dell, D. M. (1986). Dimensionality of supervisor roles: Supervisors' perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 33, 282-291.

Friedlander, M. L., Siegel, S. M., & Brenock, K. (1989). Parallel processes 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, 541-557.

Fuller, F., & Hill, C. E. (1985). Counselor and helpee perceptions of counselor intentions in relation to outcome in a single counseling session. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 329-338.

Fuqua, D. R., Johnson, A. W., Anderson, M. W., & Newman, J. L. (1984). Cognitive methods in counselor training. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 24, 85-95.

Genest, M., & Turk, D. C. (1981). Think-aloud approaches to cognitive assessment. In T. V. Merluzzi, C. R. Glass, & M. Genest (Eds.), *Cognitive assessment* (pp. 233-269). New York: Guilford.

Hill, C. E. (1985). *Manual for Hill Counselor Verbal Response Category System*. College Park, MD: Author.

Hill, C. E. (1986). An overview of the Hill Counselor and Client Verbal Response Models Category Systems. In L. S. Greenberg & W. M. Pinsof (Eds.), *The psychotherapeutic process: A research handbook* (pp. 131-159). New York: Guilford.

Hill, C. E., Carter, J. A., & O'Farrell, M. K. (1983). A case study of the process and outcome of time-limited counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30, 3-18.

Hill, C. E., Helms, J. E., Tichenor, V., Spiegel, S. B., O'Grady, K. E., & Perry, E. S. (1988). Effects of therapist response modes in brief psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35, 222-233.

Hill, C. E., & O'Grady, K. E. (1985). List of therapist intentions illustrated in a case study and with therapists of varying theoretical orientations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 3-22.

Holloway, E. L. (1982). Interactional structure of the supervision interview. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 29, 309-317.

Holloway, E. L., Freund, R. D., Gardner, S. L., Nelson, M. L., & Walker, B. R. (1989). Relation of power and involvement to theoretical orientation in supervision: An analysis of discourse. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 88-102.

Holloway, E. L., & Hosford, R. E. (1983). Towards developing a prescriptive technology of counselor supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 11(1), 73-77.

Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1983). Patterns of verbal behavior and judgments of satisfaction in the supervision interview. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30, 227-234.

Holloway, E. L., & Wolleat, P. L. (1981). Style differences of beginning supervisors: An interactional analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 373-376.

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

Kruger, L. J., Cherniss, C., Maher, C., & Leichtman, H. (1988). Group supervision of paraprofessional counselors. *Professional Psychology*, 19, 609-616.

Kurpius, D. J., Benjamin, D., & Morran, D. K. (1985). Effects of teaching a cognitive strategy on counselor trainee internal dialogue and clinical hypothesis formulation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 263-271.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 10(1), 3-42.

Marikis, D. A., Russell, R. K., & Dell, D. M. (1985). Effects of supervisor experience level on planning and in-session supervisor verbal behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 410-416.

Martin, J. S., Goodyear, R. K., & Newton, F. B. (1987). Clinical supervision: An intensive case study. *Professional Psychology*, 18, 225-235.

McColley, S. H., & Baker, E. L. (1982). Training activities and styles of beginning supervisors: A survey. *Professional Psychology*, 13, 283-292.

Nelson, M. L., & Holloway, E. L. (1990). Relation of gender to power and involvement in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 37, 473-481.

O'Farrell, M. K., Hill, C. E., & Patton, S. M. (1986). A comparison of two cases of counseling with the same counselor. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 141-145.

Rickards, L. D. (1984). Verbal interaction and supervisor perception in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31, 262-265.

Robyak, J. E., Goodyear, R. K., & Prange, M. (1987). Effects of supervisors' sex, focus, and experience on preferences for interpersonal power bases. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 26, 299-309.

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

Stone, G. L. (1980). Effects of experience on supervisor planning. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 27, 84-88.

Strozier, A. L., Thoreson, R. W., & Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (1989, August). The process of supervision. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.

Ward, L. G. (1988). Behavioral correlates of three dimensions of supervisory style (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Albany, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 2587A.