The Supervisory Relationship When Women Supervise Women: An Exploratory Study of Power, Reflexivity, Collaboration, and Authenticity

LORRAINE MANGIONE

Antioch University New England, Keene, New Hampshire, United States

GAIL MEARS

Plymouth State University, Plymouth, New Hampshire, United States

WENDY VINCENT

Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial VA Medical Center, Bedford, Massachusetts, United States

SUSAN HAWES

Antioch University New England, Keene, New Hampshire, United States

What does it mean to have a collaborative, authentic supervisory relationship? Can power and hierarchy in supervision be acknowledged, talked about, and incorporated as part of the learning? What does a supervisory relationship look like that incorporates intentional reflexivity about the relationship into the relationship? Discussions about the importance of the supervisory relationship, including the above topics, have emerged within different psychological communities, such as feminists, contemporary psychoanalytic thinkers, the competency framework in psychology training, and counseling psychologists. The supervisory relationship was investigated through a small-N, exploratory, qualitative study of women psychologists supervising women psychology trainees. Data were gathered for eight "outstanding women supervisors" and supervisees through sessions and interviews. These exploratory, descriptive data of real-life supervision sessions and relationships add to the conversation about relational supervision. Benefits of

Address correspondence to Lorraine Mangione, PhD, Department of Clinical Psychology, Antioch University New England, 40 Avon Street, Keene, NH 03431. E-mail: Lmangione@antioch.edu

a reflexive, collaborative, and authentic framework to supervision are presented.

KEYWORDS collaboration, power, relationship, supervision, women

INTRODUCTION

The relational aspects of supervision have been explored by multiple psychological communities. Feminists, contemporary psychoanalytic thinkers, the competency framework in psychology training, counseling psychologists, and writers from the Relational-Cultural Model have considered the importance of relational dimensions such as collaboration, authenticity, power, hierarchy, and reflexivity to the quality of the supervision experience. Questions have emerged regarding what it means to have a collaborative, authentic supervisory relationship, and whether power and hierarchy in supervision can be acknowledged, talked about, and incorporated as part of the learning.

SUPERVISION PERSPECTIVES

Supervision from a feminist perspective has been described by Porter and colleagues (l998) as a set of "principles guiding feminist supervision" that includes the following relational issues:

1. attention to issues of power,
2. collaborative relationships,
3. reflexivity on the part of the supervisor and between supervisor and supervisee, and
4. authenticity and openness on the part of the supervisor.

Such supervision involves an ongoing analysis of power, and this process, based on the supervisor's ability to be authentic and open, is crucial to the establishment of a truly collaborative supervisory relationship (Hawes, l998; Porter et al., l998). Feminist supervisors "illuminate the process of self-examination by remaining open and nondefensive during reflexive dialogue and by self-disclosing in ways that benefit the supervisees" (Porter et al., l998, p. 164). It is important to actually look at and talk about ways in which power and authority are used, the feelings attached to differences in power, and constraints embodied by the institutionalized, hierarchical, evaluative structure of supervision (Porter et al., 1998). A supervisor and supervisee willing to engage in a dialogic reflexivity (Hawes, 1998) about these questions form the foundation for supervision. Szymanski (2003),

working off many of the constructs from Porter and colleagues' article, has developed a scale to measure feminist supervision that highlights, among other dimensions, collaboration and the analysis of power. Nelson and colleagues (2008) added to the conversation on supervision and feminism with a thoughtful model on a feminist, multicultural perspective that spoke to issues of power, self-reflection, and the capacity to tolerate ambiguity. Likewise, from a feminist family therapy perspective on supervision, Prouty, Thomas, Johnson, and Long (2001) spoke to issues of collaboration and hierarchy and ways to balance those approaches. Adding the trainee's voice to this issue, Martinez & Davis (1999) discussed ethical issues that can arise within the context of the power differential in supervision.

Certainly from the psychodynamic world we see an interest in the supervisory relationship, and Frawley-O'Dea and Sarnat (2001) have described a relationally oriented supervision from a psychodynamic lens. They speak about introducing the relational model to the supervisee in terms such as the following:

> Similarly, the work we do will occur in the context of the relationship we build in our time together. I hope that, as the year progresses, we can talk about our own relationship and how we perceive ourselves and each other in it, so that we can try to understand what is happening between us and how it is affecting your development as a therapist. (pp. 64–65)

Frawley-O'Dea and Sarnat also "emphasize mutuality, negotiation, and distributed power and authority" (2001, pp. 59–61), while at the same time recognizing an asymmetry in the relationship regarding power and authority. The use of the parallel process between the therapy and the supervisory relationships is key here also, and starts to connect what happens in supervision to what happens in therapy. Reflecting on relational dynamics in supervision that are apparent reenactments of relational dynamics in the supervisee's clinical work can provide a rich opportunity for learning and supervisee growth (Morrissey & Tribe, 2001). Buirski and Haglund (2001) illuminate the complexities of relational supervision within an intersubjective model of psychotherapy, and add to our thinking about the appropriate roles and relationships between the supervisor and supervisee, and the interpersonal learning that can occur within this relationship.

In a more general way, the movement in education of psychologists toward a competency framework has helped the field to articulate the competencies needed for both relationship and supervision. Relationship is seen as the underlying or fundamental competency in the model presented by the training council for professional psychologists (Mangione & Nadkarni, 2010), such that all other competencies rest upon sound knowledge, skills, and attitudes around relationship. Supervision as a competency embraces many levels and areas of expertise, including knowledge about

and capacity to form a supervisory relationship (Malloy, Dobbins, Ducheny, & Winfrey, 2010).

From their competency framework and more research-oriented perspective, Falender and Shafranske (2004) also speak to the importance of the relationship and the supervisory alliance, particularly with regard to repairing ruptures that occur within it. They offer the concept of "metacommunication," taken from the psychotherapy literature, as helpful in repairing ruptures within supervision. "*Metacommunication* consists of an attempt to step outside of the relational cycle that is currently being enacted by treating it as the focus of collaborative exploration: that is, communicating *about* the transaction or implicit communication that is taking place" (Safran & Muran, 2003, p. 108, emphasis in original). Falender and Shafranske (2004) elucidate this practice for use in supervision to enhance the working alliance.

Within counseling psychology much of the research attention has been paid to explicating the supervisory relationship, including the fundamental value of the working alliance (see Bernard & Goodyear, 2008, for a review of relationship issues, including how diversity and individual differences influence them). Bordin (1983) applied his working alliance model for the therapeutic relationship to that of the supervision relationship, which he viewed as the foundation from which supervisor-supervisee conflicts can be managed. His model addresses the importance of collaboratively establishing common goals, tasks, and emotional bonds based on trust, respect, mutual caring, and liking. The degree to which change and growth can occur within the supervisory relationship depends upon the success of building and subsequently being able to repair strong working alliances. In general in discussions of the working alliance, the supervisory relationship is viewed as the basis of supervision, even if not all models emphasize the working through of the supervisory relationship just discussed.

The Relational-Cultural Model is grounded in understanding the relational context in which healthy psychological development takes place. The qualities of growth-fostering relationships were identified by Miller (1986b) as including an increased self-worth, a greater capacity to act, an increased interest in relational connections, increased empowerment, and increased sense of self and the other. Growth-fostering relationships are predicated on mutual empathy, authenticity, and a recognition of the implications of hierarchical power (Jordan, 1997; Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991; West, 2005). Sanford (1998), in her study specifically extending these concepts to supervision, poses a "learning paradox" and asks "how can one provide help and knowledge to someone else without in the process making the other feel diminished or ashamed?" (p. 70). Attention to power and its potential for promoting disconnection is an important aspect of supervision through this lens. Noting the need to be reflective regarding power within the supervisor relationship, Downs (2006) suggests that "a relational approach does require a shift in the attribution of power in the

supervisoryrelationship. From this perspective, the supervisor can see herself not as a source of "objective truth," but as one whose power is used to create a space for a mutual, reflective process" (p. 8).

Although the writers within the Relational-Cultural Model attempt to make their concepts clear, Sanford's (l998) commentary on these concepts is important to keep in mind.

> It is so difficult to find language that can convey the subtle nuances of interpersonal connection. Authenticity, empathy, empowerment, etc.— defining these terms or finding other language that adequately expresses the affective experience that these words try to describe is an extremely difficult task. It is in some ways akin to attempting to write about love: Even if you can do it, it may not be worth it because of how much the experience is lost in the translation into words. (p. 70)

FRAMEWORK FOR THE PROJECT

Clearly, an interest in relational aspects of supervision spans several theoretical frameworks, and it is the purpose of this study to explore specific aspects of that relationship in live, ongoing supervisory relationships. In this article, we report on questions of power, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity in supervision that were investigated through talking with and recording actual sessions of women psychologists supervising women psychology trainees.

Philosophically, this study borrows from a phenomenological approach to research in which the goal is discovery rather than confirming a hypothesis (Giorgi & Giorgi, 2004). This form of qualitative analysis seeks to understand "how participants make sense of their personal and social world" (Smith & Osborn 2004, p. 3), and in doing so, bears some resemblance to interpretative phenomenological analysis. It differs, however, in that the themes of power, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity were predetermined and sought after, rather than emerging from the data. The use of such qualitative research carries with it the ontological assumption that there is no one reality (Mertens, 2004). Therefore, while themes were pre-selected, the goal of this study is to gain a better and more comprehensive understanding of the participants' experiences of power, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity within the relational context of women supervising women. In this way, this study seeks knowledge related to how it is that women construct an understanding of their experiences within the supervisory relationship. It is their perception of the four constructs that is under investigation.

This was a small-scale, intensive study of eight dyads, in the exploratory and descriptive tradition, and as such cannot be presumed to represent all women supervising women. Rather, it emerges from the "attitude" (Stricker & Trierweiler, 1995, p. 996) of science within a smaller local setting, and can

yield new ideas and hypotheses. This is in the best tradition of the local clinical scientist (Stricker, 2002; Trierweiler & Stricker, 1998) who looks at local phenomenon with an eye to understanding it systematically, or the representative case method (Shontz, 1978), in which one looks intently and purposefully at a small sample to see a particular process or phenomenon enlarged.

Such small, homogeneous samples, common to qualitative studies (Smith & Osborn, 2004), bring relevance and significance to the findings of a particular population (i.e., women supervising women supervisees), as well as ensure the manageability of data for analysis. The value in this study, therefore, lies in its exploration of good practicing supervisors and supervisees in real supervisory relationships. In this sense it can easily be used as a basis to extend and deepen the conversation about relational supervision, women as supervisors, and all the important issues described herein. It provides speculations and possible implications rather than a final defining word.

Researcher Biases

The original researchers and any subsequent researchers involved with this project clearly held the bias that the relationship was an important defining aspect of supervision, and that by examining women supervising women we would be able to understand some critical aspects of the supervisory relationship. It was also felt that there was a value in talking about certain topics, such as the relationship itself and power within that relationship. Another bias, given that the idea for this research originally sprang from literature on feminist practice and scholarship, was that in soliciting outstanding women supervisors we would also be looking at some women who considered themselves "feminist supervisors." However, we did not assume to be studying "feminist supervision."

The original research group consisted of two women faculty members of a doctoral program in clinical psychology and two advanced students in the program. Both faculty members had done supervision and been supervised, but one was more versed in supervision from a research and theoretical perspective and the other from a more pragmatic, clinical training perspective. The students had both perspectives, in that they had been in supervision and were also interested in research and theory around supervision. During the data analysis portion of the study, a fifth researcher, an alumna from the same academic graduate program, was added (and eventually the two original student researchers left). She had trained at the Stone Center at Wellesley College and had both clinical and research interests in women's issues and relational work. Since that time, she has moved on to supervising interns in a clinical mental health counseling program, having been heavily influenced by relational supervision and clinical work during

her graduate training. In general, more psychodynamic, relational/feminist, and individually oriented supervision was the guiding framework.

METHODOLOGY

Utilizing the following questions as the framework, we present a brief description of the procedures and results from supervision sessions and interviews.

Exploratory Questions

Exploratory questions included the following:

1. How do both women supervisors and supervisees experience or participate in the effect of power differentials on their supervision work and relationship?
2. What are the ways supervisors and supervisees describe being influenced by feminist values and thinking in their practice of and participation in supervision?
3. How is reflexivity in dialogue used in supervision by women psychologists?
4. How might the supervisory relationship look in terms of collaboration and hierarchy?
5. Does the supervisor engage in some type of self-disclosure or authenticity?

Participants

Our participants consisted of eight supervision dyads. In order to find suitable supervisors, the researchers sent a letter to more than 100 psychologists and students in their training network, describing their research goals and making the following request: "We are contacting you because we would like your recommendations for a participant-pool of esteemed women supervisors. Would you take time now to consider women clinical psychologists in the region whom you know personally and consider to be outstanding in their work as supervisors?" Our hope and our bias was that supervisors considered "outstanding" by someone else in the field might demonstrate some of the qualities of relationship that we wished to study. We believed that this approach to theoretical sampling (Mertens, 2004) would also provide some assurance that these could be viewed as sound supervisors, which would add a level of consistency to our sample. Once we received suggestions from our letter requests, we contacted the supervisors, informed them of the purposes of the study and the parameters of their participation, and obtained their willingness to participate. We then asked them to choose a female

supervisee who was a student in a doctoral-level psychology program (at the practicum, internship, or post-doctorate level) who would be willing to participate in the project. The supervisors worked in a variety of settings, such as the Veterans Administration hospitals, colleges and schools, hospitals, and clinics, with a broad range of populations, theoretical perspectives, and practice modalities. Inclusion criteria were as follow: The supervisors had to

- be supervising at the time,
- be interested in the study and open to the idea of taping supervisory sessions,
- have a student willing to be involved,
- have the time to participate.

Twelve supervisors had originally agreed to the study, but three dropped out for a variety of reasons, and the tapes from one dyad were not technically usable.

Procedures

There were two phases for collecting information: a semi-structured, confidential, individual interview with each member of the supervisory dyad, and three of their supervision sessions. Interviews and supervision sessions were audio-taped. The latter were collected over the course of a year's supervision; one at the beginning of the supervisory relationship, one toward the middle, and one at the end. In order to audio-tape the supervision sessions, we sent tapes and envelopes to the participants when it was time to tape the sessions and participants returned the material when they were finished. For the interviews, one of the researchers traveled to a supervision site and conducted separate semi-structured interviews with the supervisor and supervisee (see Appendix for interview protocol). The audiotapes of both the individual interviews and supervision sessions were transcribed by a professional transcriber.

In summary, there were two sets of information in this study— semi-structured interview audio-tapes and transcriptions from each member of the supervisory dyad and tapes and transcriptions of tape-recorded supervisory sessions.

Interviews

Our interpretations of the interviews were theoretically framed by our research questions: Do women supervisors and supervisees acknowledge the effect of power differentials, and how do they describe its impact? Do supervisors and supervisees describe being influenced by feminist values and thinking in supervision, and do they discuss power? Is reflexivity used, is it reflexivity about the supervision or the relationship, and is there a desire

for more of this? Is there a sense of collaboration and what does the supervisory relationship look like in terms of collaboration and hierarchy? Does the supervisor engage in self-disclosure or authenticity? We each individually applied these questions to participants' responses to each of the interview questions, first reading through each interview carefully, then rereading and identifying relevant domains, and inserting notations next to the relevant interview response in the transcript.

Each set of interviews was read by two co-researchers. These individual interview readings and notations were followed by a conversation between each pair of researchers responsible for every supervision dyad. We used a consensual process to develop shared understandings of the interviews that included clarifications of the meaning of interpretive domains, such as reflexivity and manifestations of power. To achieve consensus, differences between individuals' points of view were openly discussed and resolved (Hill et al., 2005). After all interviews had been analyzed, we performed and drafted the cross-analysis (by roles) of the results from the individual interviews.

Supervision Sessions

As with the interviews, we interpreted each of the supervision sessions with the following questions in mind: What are some of the ways that reflexivity in dialogue is used in the practice of supervision by women psychologists? What would the supervisory relationship look like in terms of collaboration and hierarchy? Does the supervisor engage in some type of self-disclosure, and what seems to be the supervisee's response? Prior to beginning our analysis, we defined the core ideas that served as our conceptual framework (Miles & Huberman, 1994):

1. Reflexivity: The supervisor or supervisee initiates discussion about the supervision or the supervisory relationship. There is an overt effort to look at and discuss the supervision or supervisory relationship. A special instance of this would be reflexivity around issues of power.
2. Collaboration: The supervisor and supervisee engage in non-hierarchical, mutual dialogue about some issue or question. There is openness to a solution being found or worked out between the two rather than the supervisor imposing one. Both supervisor and supervisee choose topics to be discussed.
3. Authenticity: The supervisor engages in some type of self-disclosure that may involve her own professional or personal life, or feelings she has about the supervision, the work, or people involved.

We began with the assumption that it would be possible that we would not identify any of our core concepts in one or all of the supervisor–supervisee dialogues.

Two of the researchers independently read each transcript, seeking instances of the concepts, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity. Following independent analyses of the sessions, we came together and began the consensual process we had used with the interviews. Using a constant comparison method (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), we went through each session for each dyad. This process led us to reconsider and modify our definitions of authenticity and collaboration. The latter core concept turned out to be the most complex to identify, and resulted in our resolving to apply a more inclusive and less refined definition.

RESULTS

For all of our results, we do not offer a breakdown of responses by particular participants or dyads, given the necessity to protect privacy. Speaking about a specific supervisory experience with a specific supervisor or supervisee involves much more potential for privacy violations than, say, studies that ask about supervision in general.

Talking about the Supervision: Results From the Interviews

Interview results are presented through a tabulation of answers and illuminating quotations and paraphrases. Quotations chosen are ones considered interesting, thought-provoking, and illustrative, to offer a flavor of the work, without an attempt to be "representative." "Se" indicates Supervisee, and "Sr" indicates Supervisor.

QUESTION 1: POWER

Do women supervisors and supervisees acknowledge the effect of power differentials, and how do they describe its impact?
Three of the supervisors and five of the supervisees acknowledged the effect of power differential on supervision, while the rest did not. Four supervisors described its impact, four did not, and all supervisees described the impact of power.

> Sr: I am interested in the constructive use of power, so the supervisee won't feel diminished . . . . Careful how I present things.

> Sr: I have such a hard time with the word power. Choice and options are what we always talk about.

> Se: The power differential is always there and always going to be there.

> Se: I wanted to speak first [about the therapy] because I knew her words
> would carry more weight.

While half of the supervisors spoke of and acknowledged power, all of the supervisees did. For many of the supervisees, this was an affectively charged issue, and clearly one they had considered. When supervisors considered power, it was often in the spirit of minimizing its significance or noting their discomfort with its existence.

QUESTION 2: FEMINISM

Do supervisors and supervisees describe being influenced by feminist values and thinking in supervision, and do they discuss power?

Six supervisors and six supervisees described being influenced by feminism. None of the supervisors discussed power as part of feminism, and one supervisee did.

There was a wide variety of responses, with some participants being "absolutely" influenced, others speaking as though it is "in the air" but not a strong influence, and those who felt no influence. Only a supervisee spoke of power as an aspect of feminism, and she was quite emphatic and articulate.

> Se: I think that I draw more from feminism in a way as a frame of reference of always considering . . . it as part of the picture . . . if there's a power differential or power struggle . . . . The power relationship . . . . Who are in between the poles of the power . . . . What is the dynamic that they perceive as power or lack of power?

QUESTION 3: REFLEXIVITY

Is reflexivity used, is it reflexivity about the supervision or the relationship, and is there a desire for more of this?

Six supervisors utilized reflexivity about supervision, none engaged in reflexivity about relationship, and two desired more. Five supervisees utilized reflexivity about supervision, one engaged in reflexivity about relationship, and five desired more.

> Se: Yes, she always asked how the supervision was going and what I needed.

> Se: It was impossible to give feedback. The tone wasn't set for that to be allowed.

> Sr: I give her an enormous amount of credit for helping this relationship to work well by her willingness to speak up.

> Sr: I think I choose not to talk about it [power] because I think the way I
> work is one that doesn't use or abuse power and it's one that says, even
> from the beginning, "I'm very curious, I have lots of questions, I offer
> hypotheses, these are just tentative working tools, things change—you
> don't have to do anything that I say, just have them in the back of your
> mind"...and I will say, "What do you think about this?"

While there was reflexivity about the supervision, there was almost
none about the relationship, and many supervisees clearly yearned for more
of that.

QUESTION 4: COLLABORATION

*How might the supervisory relationship look in terms of collaboration and
hierarchy?*

Three supervisors and three supervisees saw the supervision as
collaborative.

> Se: It was collaborative, very professional, but sometimes light. We
> laughed a lot. Um, sometimes it was more personal.... It was very close
> and became more collaborative over time.... In the beginning it was, I
> brought her a tape, she listened to it with me and she told me it was great
> or it was good and this is what I could do.... But I think over time, she
> learned that I had something to offer her. So it would be more of a dis-
> cussion rather than a didactic kind of lecture. Although...it was never
> like a lecture. Never. I would always respond to her.... And I'll like dis-
> cuss it, you know keep going with it and we would both learn I think....
> How collaborative it was. I feel much more confident now, like I can
> contribute as well. I don't need to just sit and listen.

> Se: [with regard to not collaborating] I'm trying to remember how
> we resolved that...I think I just described what I did and I think she
> tolerated what choices I made around interventions, but didn't really
> fully support that and so she was kind of living with that difference, just
> as I was.

> Sr: Some interns will come in and say, "Well, here's the patient. What do
> we do?" She [supervisee] really was in a very different place. She had
> some real good insights about why he was operating the way he was.
> Had some really good theories about what might be going on...which
> I thought was really very good.... She just kind of took off.... I try to
> be consistent in saying, "How would you handle it? What did you do?
> What is your read on this case?" Always moving it back to her, so that
> she was able to think things through within the supervisory session....
> By about November, my feeling, my sense was that we were two profes-
> sionals solving some clinical problems and puzzles together.

Sr: . . . some of it has to do with having been a parent. I get this sense of being part of a process, but not owning it. It's her process, in a sense, to grow and develop and what I have to do is create an environment and facilitate that growth.

Collaboration characterized less than half of the dyads. Where collaboration did exist, it was felt by both participants, was thought to be helpful and positive, and was easily discerned by the raters. Where it did not exist, it seemed missed by the supervisees.

QUESTION 5: AUTHENTICITY

Does the supervisor engage in self-disclosure or authenticity?
Eight supervisors felt that they had engaged in self-disclosure and been authentic, while five supervisees thought this was so about the supervisors.

Se: [The supervisor shared] about where she had worked in the past, about her internship experience, about her education, but personally, it took her a while to do that . . . . She does have personal things around . . . . Some people don't even do that . . . . She told me about her situation with her marriage and her significant other, but later, it took a while . . . . It was always in the context of helping me understand something.

Se: This one interaction with [supervisor] I found particularly valuable because it was one of the rare times where she took the time to sort of focus on and discuss the parallel process that was going on, because as I was telling her about it, she was becoming more confused. And she said, "Wait a minute. Let's stop. I'm confused. Now let's think why am I getting confused and maybe it will help you understand why you're getting confused because the same thing is happening. When you are sitting with this boy, you're getting confused and now when you're telling me about it we're both getting confused."

Sr: Sometimes that's [self-disclosure] a real tricky line and there's this little voice in my head that says, "You know, supervision is not psychotherapy and do not self-disclose," that I learned in school and then there's the reality of life. When you have an intern in here who's having a life crisis, you do a little therapy. And I am quite comfortable with self-disclosure in terms of similar cases that I worked with. I will say, "Oh well, you blew that one. Let me tell you about one that I blew or the struggle that I had over a similar issue." That's, I think that's appropriate . . . a very nice way for people to learn. That, particularly interns, students, that they don't have to be perfect, that they don't have to do it right . . . . I think that it realigns the power balance, if they can see that I am human, that I have made mistakes.

Sr: It was easy for me to share the experience of when I started in a hospital, and my first case was this kid with cancer who was about the same

age as one of my kids and I walked into the room and here's this beautiful child who was never going to get any better and I thought I was going to faint . . . so to me that was a pertinent thing to bring up because . . . the supervisory question was being a mother, being in this setting where there are traumatic events, how do you function and how do you leave it here.

All of the supervisors described some level of authenticity on their parts, although three of the supervisees did not experience that. Three dyads appeared to be high in authenticity according to supervisors, supervisees, and raters, and the experience was positive and helpful. These were among the most poignant moments in the interviews.

Doing the Supervision: Results from the Sessions

Responses to three questions are presented through a tabulation and illuminating quotations and paraphrases that were altered when needed to protect confidentiality.

QUESTION 1: REFLEXIVITY

Approximately 28 instances of reflexivity, of varying duration, were found, spread throughout 13 of the 24 sessions, with a range of 0 to 6 in any 1 session. One dyad accounted for 11 instances in sessions 1 and 3, and another dyad accounted for 6 instances in session 3. Almost all were brief mentions, ranging from discussing evaluation, supervision in general, setting the frame, pragmatics, and asking for specific feedback. There was no mention of relationship, per se, or power.

> 1. Sr: It's interesting, when you were talking about settling into roles, what I was thinking of, in addition to the, the roles that the two of you were working on, it's the roles that you and I have been working on and then—the work you and I have been doing in terms of our different perspectives on your role. And I wonder whether that's been part of why it's been harder for you to settle into a role?
> Se: I think that's contributed to it, because, because—I immediately sensed, you know, your different approach—to what I was accustomed to, say . . . .
> 2. Sr: So does it—does it help or does it make it harder when I say, "Okay, this was another choice point, this is another option that—"?
> Se: No, that's really helpful. Yeah. I'd like more of that.

QUESTION 2: COLLABORATION AND HIERARCHY

Approximately 43 instances of collaboration, of varying duration, were found, spread throughout 21 of the 24 sessions, with a range of 0 to 6 in any 1 session. There were no instances of full-scale collaboration between

equals. Rather, there were examples of "invitational language" and a colla-borative tone on the part of the supervisor, along with a few instances of truly puzzling through questions together in which the supervisor seemed open to unknown possibilities. In one session a very collaborative role play developed. Special instances of collaboration occurred with dyads who worked closely together with the same clients.

> 1. Sr: Feel free to be as creative as you want with, you know. Anything occurs to you to liven it up. To offer that to E. like you just suggested. Se: Mm-hmm. Hmm. I was just thinking, yeah, it's a great opportunity since her sister's in the school building. Yeah, I never thought of that . . . .
> 2. Se: I could come for the morning part, but, I don't know. Otherwise it's really my last day with the group. Um.
> Sr: Well, I guess this is your decision.
> Se: Mm-hmm. Um, I'm trying to think.
> Sr: And you don't have to make it now, I mean, although we can talk about it now.

QUESTION 3: SELF-DISCLOSURE OR AUTHENTICITY

Approximately 208 instances of authenticity, of varying duration, were found, spread throughout 24 of the 24 sessions, with a range of 0 to 14 in any 1 session. Subcategories included personal self-disclosure (5), pro-fessional self-disclosure (51), personal/professional/sharing of one's process (41), affectively supportive (66), modeling (39), and miscellaneous (6). All supervisors showed some willingness to be "authentic" and open, such as sharing work experiences, offering their internal processes, giving examples of words they would use, or expressing support for the supervisee. The tone of most sessions was warm and inviting.

> 1. Sr: And you're developing a nice beginning relationship with her that you can use as time goes on when you're asking more of her. You know, you're really listening well, you're clarifying. The fact that she's talking to you about being out of control, she sees you as a person who is accept-ing of that . . . . It indicates a good beginning of a therapeutic relationship.
> 2. Sr: And I looked at that [a difficult situation that had developed among the staff and affected the supervisee and her client] and I, I became very, very angry. So yesterday I went to the other staff person and said, "How could this be happening after all that's gone on?"

DISCUSSION: THE STRANDS OF A SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP

In this section we offer ideas to further the conversation about relational supervision and power, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity, based on our understanding of the interviews and sessions.

Reflexivity and Power

From the interviews we learn that most of the dyads did engage in discussion about the supervision, thus a reflexive stance was present. There was a notable lack, though, of deeply engaging in questions of relationship, power, status, and roles, unless there was a conflict. "Talking about" the supervisory relationship in any way was rare. In several cases it was the supervisee who initiated talking, usually when there was a problem, and in general the supervisees seemed more aware of and articulate about the power differential. Several of the supervisees yearned for more of this kind of dialogue, and felt that supervision benefited from its inclusion, although a few supervisees in particularly positive experiences were content without it.

Although many of the participants acknowledged the importance of feminism, an articulated analysis of power in their supervisory relationship, which is necessary to reflexivity as described by Hawes (1998), did not seem to be included in it, a finding that was surprising to the researchers. It is noteworthy that the one person who did acknowledge the dimension of power within feminism was a supervisee, and it seemed quite significant to her. With regard to speaking to us of the impact of power issues on the supervision, all of the supervisees and only half of the supervisors saw supervision within this framework. One is reminded that it is usually the person in the lower position of power who notices the power inequity, as was pointed out in Miller's (1976, 1986a) classic work. With regard to reflexivity in the sessions, there was little ongoing or regular discussion about the supervision, with no mention at all of the relationship per se or issues of power or hierarchy. Certainly we may have missed conversations from other sessions, especially the first, last, or formal evaluation sessions. What is clear is that none of these supervisors engaged in reflexivity as a routine part of the supervision.

Collaboration

From the interviews we found evidence of collaboration in three dyads, and we were relieved to see that the supervisor and supervisees agreed as to whether collaboration was present. It is hard to know what collaboration could look like if one felt it and the other did not. The collaborative parties were enthusiastic, seeing it enhance learning and self-confidence. Some yearning existed for collaboration from other dyads.

In the sessions, we saw "shades of collaboration" and are left asking what true collaboration looks like in a "power over" relationship. There were instances of "invitational language," with the supervisor interested in the supervisee's process, thoughts, and feelings, but we wondered whether it felt like an invitation or a quiz to the supervisee. Two areas where a true collaborative spirit seemed to hover were when the dyad joined in "not

knowing," truly puzzling through an issue, and in the absence of any hint of overt shaming criticism. All supervisors seemed affirming of the work, even fairly unsophisticated work, and appeared to use affirmation as encouragement.

We raise the questions of what does constitute collaboration, what are its components, what is the feel of it? From the interviews, a sense of "we're in this together," a collegiality, is part of collaboration. A sense of safety and a supportive attitude seem to be the foundation. We see how collaboration entails something as basic as the tone in which, say, a question is asked: Is it a test or an invitation?

Authenticity

The interviews revealed many instances in which supervisors and, to a somewhat lesser extent, supervisees, felt that supervisors were open and available to the supervisees. Role-playing, sharing of work experiences, sharing mistakes, expressing genuine affect, revealing reactions to issues in the workplace, and at times sharing something personal were all viewed as part of the learning. We noted the positive affect and liveliness used in speaking about these instances; clearly both supervisors and supervisees viewed these times as some of the more important moments in supervision. Similar findings about types of self-disclosure and what self-disclosure means to the supervisory dyad have been noted by Ladany, Walker, and Melincoff (2001), and Ladany and Walker (2003), who offer the following way of categorizing self-disclosure: personal material, therapy experiences, professional experiences, reactions to the trainee's clients, and supervision experiences.

We imagine that in addition to learning, these offered moments of emotional closeness and bonding. Supervisors seemed willing to be emotionally available and to share their work and internal process. We were intrigued by the category we labeled "personal/professional/sharing of one's process," for the supervisor was speaking about professional activities but in an open or personal way, which appears to us to be positive learning and role-modeling. This is consistent with Jordan's (1987, 2001) discussion of mutuality, in which she speaks to the growth-fostering benefits of bidirectional influence in relationships. Mutuality involves noticing another's experience, being moved by that experience, and demonstrating the impact to the other. Similarly, Miller (1986) identifies zest and the ability for each person in the relationship to gain a more accurate understanding of themselves and each other as qualities of growth-fostering relationships.

We noted the lack of inappropriate self-disclosure, such as the supervisor discussing personal concerns. Obviously, that may have been an artifact of the research, but the tone of professionalism and respect we heard would, we think, make a boundary transgression less likely.

Can openness and self-disclosure used in the service of learning really be called authentic? A couple of supervisors articulated their implicit guidelines or rules for disclosing, and most could speak cogently about what they were trying to do in these instances. We suggest viewing these verbalizations as "considered authenticity," which captures their flavor. The literature differentiates between intentional and unintentional self-disclosure, the former type being preferred as more helpful to the supervisory relationship and work (Falender & Shafranske, 2004), and what we saw seemed to fit into the intentional realm.

It also seems as if we saw one or two instances of self-disclosure without a strong relational or collaborative context. We wondered if this could end up feeling more like a monologue about the supervisor rather than a mutually enhancing process of authenticity and openness, reminding us of Ladany and Walker's (2003) concerns about the overuse of self-disclosure for the supervisor's own self-interests. Self-disclosure that is not relational, that is not embedded in the relational flow of the supervisory dyad and the needs of the supervisee, might just fill up the space with itself.

JUDGING THE FINDINGS

In the qualitative tradition, the quality of a study and its findings can be judged in many ways, much like forms of reliability and validity speak to the quality of quantitative data. Briefly, this study included the use of multiple cases and thick description, which allow for the reader a basis for determining the transferability of the findings (Mertens, 2005). Credibility of data was achieved through prolonged, substantial engagement, which included interviews and the taping of three supervisory sessions throughout the course of the study. And the fact that a researcher categorized and tabulated data, which was then verified by a different researcher, suggests that there was a degree of objectivity or confirmability present.

LIMITS TO THE RESEARCH

While the small group of participants intensively studied helped to generate ideas and illuminate processes, a larger-scale survey of relational supervisors would complement the work. Many of our interview questions are amenable to survey methodology.

One can question how the act of looking at these relationships might have changed them. The presence of the tape recorder, and perhaps the novelty or specialness of being singled out for a research project, were most likely quite salient. Yet it is our hope that supervisors and supervisees over time had no choice but to be themselves.

Given our assumption of power issues, it raises the question of what could and could not be said by the participants, particularly supervisees. A student's willingness to risk discussing perceived problems strikes us as very brave.

The elusive nature of some of our constructs, such as collaboration, reflexivity, and authenticity, has only slightly transformed through this project. Whereas authenticity grew in texture and detail, and reflexivity became more straightforward, collaboration, power, and hierarchy remained relatively abstruse and intangible. In our analysis of the interview sessions, it might have been helpful to have started with smaller, more defined categories from the beginning, or to have broken down and detailed our categories more explicitly.

Finally, our supervisee participants were drawn from a range of developmental levels, which certainly may have affected our findings, making them more heterogeneous perhaps. Some of the concepts, such as collaboration, may be more fitting for students at more advanced developmental levels, and development level was not considered here. This study was limited to students in supervision, and cannot necessarily comment on supervisory relationships with supervisees who are employees, where the relational and contextual dynamics are bound to be different and where the supervisees might be further along a developmental trajectory. Our supervisors were also at different levels of development, which may have affected our findings.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SUPERVISORY PRACTICE: OUR VISION OF RELATIONAL SUPERVISION

What do these qualities and processes around power, reflexivity, collaboration, and authenticity add to a supervisory relationship, and how can they be included in supervision? While it is certainly possible to have productive, valuable supervision without this framework, we saw a sense of connectedness, energy, and zest in the more collaborative, authentic, reflexive relationships. There seemed to be an excitement and interest level that was greater than in the other very good relationships, and greater than we hear from some of our student reports of their supervision. We describe herein our vision of a relational supervision, in which the supervisor and supervisee are encouraged to bring all of themselves to the supervision while keeping to boundaries of roles and ethical parameters. This vision stems from what these dyads have taught us, and we invite readers to consider this vision in their work as supervisors or supervisees. However, in this ending section, as we articulate this vision we are in a sense moving beyond the research results that could be easily reported here to an intersection of participant themes and a qualitative feel of the interviews, some additional literature, and researcher thoughts stimulated by this work. We also invite readers to

extrapolate beyond supervision to psychotherapy itself, for the supervisory relationship is a powerful model for the psychotherapy one, and many of these concepts may be helpful for both relationships.

Conditions

There seem to be certain conditions that would allow for the development of this type of relational supervision, conditions that include first and foremost a sense of safety and support for the supervisee. For a supervisee to be able to enter into a more collaborative, self-reflexive relationship, which obviously entails speaking sincerely and taking risks, a sense of safety must be feasible. Supervision is rife with possibilities for shaming, and these must be avoided by the supervisor (Alonso & Rutan, 1988). The supervisor offering affective support may be key to this sense of safety, as well as acknowledging the reality of evaluation. By affective support we mean actively and genuinely supporting the supervisee as a learner and a person. Acknowledging the reality of evaluation does not minimize it, but recognizes the power differential and situates it within the relationship as an ongoing and helpful part of the process. In this type of supervision, a supervisee would never be surprised at the end with a summative (Falender & Shafranske, 2004) evaluation of heretofore never discussed issues! Regular, ongoing, integrated feedback and evaluation, which is considered the more formative type of feedback (Falender & Shafranske, 2004), and checking in together about how the learning is progressing, would be part of this supervision, and evaluation would lose some of its sting and its more punitive connotations.

Another key component of this type of supervision is working out clear expectations from the start. Developing supervision contracts that orient both parties to the responsibilities of each party, the learning objectives, the structure of the supervision, and evaluation criteria is an essential supervision practice (Cobia & Boes, 2000; Thomas, 2007). Clarity of expectations from the beginning enhances the possibility of navigating conflict later on in supervision (Nelson, Barnes, Evans, & Triggiano, 2008). Two of the present researchers, in their practicum/internship directors' roles, are often in the position of coaching their students entering practicum to engage the supervisors in initial discussions that help to set the frame for supervision, as it seems that many supervisors don't embark on this beginning supervisory task on their own.

Collaboration

Our supervisory vision is a collaborative one of two authentic, open people working together to enhance the learning and growth of the supervisee, with the added awareness that the supervisor can also grow and change from the experience. While we question the existence of complete collaboration,

certainly one could approximate a collaborative relationship, depending on the stage of development of the supervisee, the confidence of the supervisor, and the nature of the tasks at hand. This vision of collaboration in supervision is perhaps quite similar to the supervisory role of consultant as defined by the Discrimination Model of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). The Discrimination Model predicts that supervisors will spend increasing time in the consultation role as the supervisee matures clinically. Supervisors could consider adopting a more inviting stance with their supervisees, encouraging supervisees to speak first, not being afraid to puzzle through some conundrum with the supervisee, and asking questions that are truly open rather than miniature examinations. By inviting supervisees to express and explore their own thinking and feeling, and even define what the clinical issues are, the supervisor has moved in the collaborative direction. If the supervisor holds an authentically curious and open attitude, then collaboration can grow and develop. Questions from the supervisor would be seen as more honest and real, looking for the supervisee's viewpoint, rather than questions designed to elicit the answer the supervisor wants. Supervisees would stop searching for "what does my supervisor want from me?" and instead pay attention to "what are my real thoughts and feelings about the client, myself, the therapy, or whatever situation is at hand?"

In the researchers' discussions of what it means to be collaborative, and how and when it is appropriate, the idea of supervisee developmental level seemed most relevant. If a supervisee is not developmentally ready for a collaborative approach, in general, or if the supervisee has an unusually stressful caseload or is trying a new theoretical orientation, the use of a collaborative approach could be potentially harmful or destabilizing for the clinician or the client. Collaboration is a framework and an attitude that needs to be used intentionally, not indiscriminately. Understanding supervisory interventions and approaches that are developmentally appropriate is considered a competency for supervisors (Falender et al., 2004). Collaboration is more likely as supervisees gain a sense of greater autonomy and supervisors gain a greater sense of confidence in their supervisees. Without delving into the complexities of developmental theories of supervision, Stoltenberg's (1993) description of supervision for a Level 3 trainee is appropriate here: "At this point, supervision itself becomes more of a consultation arrangement, with less a need for intensive guidance and advice and more of a collegial sharing of impressions and experiences" (p. 134). We would add that supervisors may need education and practice in moving from a more directive to a more collegial stance.

Authenticity

As with collaboration, we also question the possibility of complete authenticity and openness on the part of the supervisor, but do feel that an attempt

at authenticity within the hierarchy and roles of supervision can exist and is conducive to learning, and may contribute to the supervisee's confidence and competence. Supervisees seem to value it in their learning. Supervisors need to have implicit or explicit rules that keep authenticity useful. Within supervision, the supervisor might experiment with how and when she is open and authentic, noticing in what ways it might be helpful. Supervisor self-disclosure was shown to predict the strength of the supervisory alliance (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999) in a study of supervision with counselor trainees. Looking at what one discloses, such as professional experiences, here-and-now reactions, etc., and reflecting on them, either with or without the supervisee, can help guide a supervisor in terms of the use of the self. Particularly with regard to personal/professional/sharing of one's process, this appears to us to be positive learning and role-modeling, and we encourage supervisors to consider this more open use of self, particularly in terms of self-disclosures that are both intentional and bear on the work at hand. Openness about one's own clinical challenges, for example, can help to foster a healthy supervisory relationship (Nelson et al., 2008) and was shown in Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman's (1999) study to impact the supervisor-supervisee emotional bond, which is one of the key elements of the supervisory working alliance.

Yet it needs to be said that forced "authenticity" is not authenticity at all, and a supervisor ought to be thinking about what it means to attempt to become more authentic in supervision, perhaps even discussing it with peers. It should only be done in a thoughtful, planned way, which may sound like a contradiction in terms. However, if the new way of relating does not come from the most authentic place of the supervisor, it will not work. This also may sound like a contradiction in terms, but we view it as holding the tension between being fully present and open to oneself and one's supervisee, yet always measured in one's overt response, hence our term, "considered authenticity." It is an attitude and a value as much as it is a skill or activity, and if the attitude and value of the meaning and importance of authentic relating is not present, what will occur will not actually be "authenticity."

In order to understand this idea more fully, one might hearken back to Rogers' view of genuineness with clients and extrapolate that to our work with supervisees. In his 1957 ground-breaking work (reprinted in 1992), Rogers describes genuineness of the psychotherapist in this way: "It means that within the relationship he is freely and deeply himself, with his actual experience accurately represented by his awareness of himself. It is the opposite of presenting a façade, either knowingly or unknowingly" (p. 828). Rogers goes on to comment that genuineness does not always lead to communicating about what one is experiencing. We would agree here that authenticity in supervision does not necessarily have to culminate in self-disclosure, but that it is fundamental and beneficial in its own right.

Reflexivity and Power

It may be helpful and certainly in keeping with relational ideals to introduce reflexivity on a more regular basis for at least two reasons. This models for the supervisee the importance of checking in with the other person in the relationship (such as in therapy), helps to build that relationship, and affirms the meaningfulness of both participants' perspectives. It also is a great safeguard to have such a process established in case a more urgent need for discussion of the supervision were to arise. A relationship can work and be productive without the kind of reflexivity described here. However, given the power differential, the vulnerability of the supervisee and the difficulty several of them expressed in being the one to initiate a reflexive conversation, it would be helpful to have a feedback mechanism in place from the beginning. As Nelson et al. (2008) suggest, conflict is an important theme in the supervisory relationship, and the discussion of power and evaluation within supervision may be necessary to the development of a trusting relationship in which conflict can be effectively managed.

The person in the more powerful position has the responsibility to set the tone and provide the conditions for talking about the supervision and the relationship. This may be as simple as the supervisor stating that she would like to set aside time (each week, each month?) to really talk about how the supervision itself and their relationship is progressing. We are not here asking the oft-repeated question in supervision, "How are things going?" Rather, we are asking, "How is the supervision itself going?" and "How are things going *with us* in here?" Then it is time for the supervisor to be listening for an answer, which may come in many different ways.

Actually naming the issue of power and the unequal power status is essential. A more process-oriented supervisor might be consistently aware of derivatives about the relationship in the supervisory material. We would argue that even when everything appears to be fine, attention to interpersonal process and power differentials would enhance learning, add a dimension to the supervision, and allow for similar awareness and dialogue with clients.

When supervision is problematic, reflexivity may be what can salvage it. To paraphrase questions raised by one supervisor: What is it that makes a pair work well? What do you do to help that when it is not going well? How do you stop it from really deteriorating when there's not a match? These questions take on urgency when one sees what high-stakes supervisions these are, for a student's progress in her program, or her very career, along with present and future clients' welfare, all are resting on the clinical supervision. Further, Nelson and colleagues (2008) see conflict within the context of supervision as "useful, something necessary for achieving clarity of understanding and improving relationships" (p. 180).

We suggest that frank discussion on a regular basis is the starting point for ameliorating problems. A framework of collaboration and authenticity

may be necessary conditions for reflexivity. Practicing reflexivity within a relational tapestry would allow for conflict and difference to be woven into that tapestry.

It also very well may be that a given supervisor/supervisee dyad just does not work, or that a supervisee is not appropriate for that setting or for the field itself. These kinds of potentially more stressful conversations, which can consume enormous amounts of time and energy in a training program, would be greatly ameliorated by ongoing reflexivity in the relationship. Pantesco (2009), referring to difficult confrontations within an academic or clinical training setting, comments on all the reasons one shrinks from engaging in such conversations, including individual concerns and fears as well as lack of institutional support. Perhaps if the discipline of speaking about oneself and the other, within a relationship, were instituted within supervision, those difficult confrontations might seem a bit less extreme or unfamiliar. We agree with the implication from Nelson and colleagues (2008) in their study of conflict in supervision that conflict be viewed as inevitable in at least some of a supervisor's experiences, and that training programs have a role in helping supervisors to understand and develop strategies to effectively work with that inevitability.

Enhancing Learning through the Relationship, and Vice Versa

Overall these were productive, supportive, and rich supervisory encounters. We noted how much we had learned from them about the content and process of clinical work and supervision. We were left with the following questions that frame the supervisory experience. For the supervisor, our questions would be:

- How does one embark on a new teaching enterprise, *and* create a new relationship?
- How might one ask the supervisee to learn tasks *and* to learn about herself?
- How does emotional engagement facilitate learning?

For the supervisee, we would ask similar questions:

- How does one embark on a new learning enterprise, *and* create a new relationship?
- Will you want to learn tasks *and* learn about yourself?
- How does emotional engagement facilitate learning?

When these questions frame the supervision, learning will be contextualized in a relationship that promotes empathic connection and is truly growth fostering (Jordan, 2001; Miller, 1986b; West, 2005). Attention to relationship, and

the enhanced awareness of self and other that can occur in relationships, as well as the task of learning/teaching skills, may be the essence of successful supervision.

REFERENCES

Alonso, A., & Rutan, S. (1988). Shame and guilt in supervision. *Psychotherapy*, *25*, 576–581.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2008). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *11*(1), 35–42.

Buirski, P., & Haglund, P. (2001). *Making sense together: The intersubjective approach to psychotherapy*. New York: Jason Aronson.

Cobia, D. C., & Boes, S. R. (2000). Professional disclosure statements and formal plans for supervision: Two strategies for minimizing the risk in post-master's supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *38*, 293–296.

Downs, M. (2006). *Between us: Growing relational possibilities in supervision* (Work in Progress, No. 105). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Paper Series.

Falender, C. A., Erickson Cornish, J. A., Goodyear, R., Hatcher, R., Kaslow, N. J., Leventhal, G., Shafranske, E., Sigmon, S. T., Stoltenberg, C., & Grus, C. (2004). Defining competencies in psychology supervision: A consensus statement. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *60*(7), 771–785.

Falender, C. A., & Shafranske, E. P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Frawley-O'Dea, M. G., & Sarnat, J. E. (2001). *The supervisory relationship: A contemporary psychodynamic approach*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Giorgi, A., & Giorgi, B. (2004). Phenomenology. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology* (pp. 25–50). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hawes, S. E. (l998). Positioning a dialogic reflexivity in the practice of feminist supervision. In B. Bayer & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Material transactions: Disciplinary practices and the making of subjects*. London: Sage Press.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B., Williams, E. N., Hess, S. A., & Ladany, N. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. Education Faculty Research and Publications, College of Education, Marquette University, 1–25.

Jordan, J. (1987). *The meaning of mutuality* (Work in Progress, No. 23). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Papers Series.

Jordan, J. (2001). A relational-cultural model: Healing through mutual empathy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, *65*(1), 92–104.

Jordan, J. V. (1997). A relational perspective for understanding women's development. In J. V. Jordan (Ed.), *Women's growth in diversity: More writings from the Stone Center* (pp. 6–24). New York: Guilford Press.

Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I., & Surrey, J. (1991). *Women's growth in connection*. New York: Guilford Press.

Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the

supervisor working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *38*(3), 143–160.

Ladany, N., & Walker, J. A. (2003). Supervisor self-disclosure: Balancing the uncontrollable narcissist with the indomitable altruist. *JCLP/In Session*, *59*(5), 611–621.

Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory style: Its relation to the supervisory working-alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *40*, 263–275.

Malloy, K. A., Dobbins, J. E., Ducheny, K., & Winfrey, L. L. (2010). The management and supervision competency: Current and future directions. In M. B. Kenkel & R. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Competency-based education for professional psychology* (pp. 161–178). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Mangione, L., & Nadkarni, L. (2010). Relationship competency: Broadening and deepening. In M. B. Kenkel & R. L. Peterson (Eds.), *Competency-based education for professional psychology* (pp. 69–86). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Martinez, L. C., & Davis, K. C. (1999). Feminist ethical challenges in supervision. *Women and Therapy*, *22*(4), 35–55.

Mertens, D. (2004). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, J. B. (1976). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (1986a). *Toward a new psychology of women* (2nd ed.). Boston: Beacon.

Miller, J. B. (1986b). *What do we mean by relationships?* (Work in Progress, No. 22). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Papers Series.

Morrissey, J., & Tribe, R. (2001). Parallel process in supervision. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *14*(2), 103–110.

Nelson, M. L., Barnes, K. L., Evans, A. L., & Triggiano, P. J. (2008). Working with conflict in clinical supervision: Wise supervisors' perspectives. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *55*(2), 172–184.

Pantesco, V. (2009). *Putting difficult confrontations into practice: A professional and ethical mainstay*. Unpublished manuscript.

Porter, N., Vasquez, M., Fygetakis, L., Mangione, L., Nickerson, E. T., Pieniadz, J., Plunkett, M., Snyder, M., & Simpson, B. (l998). Co-vision: Feminist supervision, process, and collaboration. In J. Worell & N. Johnson (Eds.), *Feminist visions: New directions in education and practice* (pp. 155–172). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press.

Prouty, A. M., Thomas, V., Johnson, S., & Long, J. K. (2001). Methods of feminist family supervision. *Journal of Family and Marital Therapy*, *27*(1), 85–97.

Rogers, C. R. (1992). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *60*(6), 827–832. (Original work published 1957)

Safran, J. D., & Muran, J. C. (2003). *Negotiating the therapeutic alliance*. New York: Guilford Press.

Sanford, L. A. (1998). Learning psychotherapy through connection: A self-in-relation model of supervision (Doctoral dissertation, Antioch New England Graduate School, 1998). UMI, 9826809.

Shontz, F. C. (1978). Single organism research and the representative case method. In D. J. Lettieri (Ed.), *Drugs and suicide* (pp. 25–44). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2004). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology* (pp. 51–80). London: Sage Publications.

Stoltenberg, C. D. (1993). Supervising consultants in training: An application of a model of supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *72*(2), 131–138.

Strauss, A. C., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stricker, G. (2002). What is a scientist-practitioner anyway? *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *58*(10), 1277–1283.

Stricker, G., & Trierweiler, S. (1995). The local clinical scientist: A bridge between science and practice. *American Psychologist*, *50*(12), 995–1002.

Szymanski, D. M. (2003). The feminist supervision scale: A rational/theoretical approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *27*, 221–232.

Thomas, J. T. (2007). Informed consent through contracting for supervision: Minimizing risks, enhancing benefits. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *38*(3), 221–231.

Trierweiler, S. J., & Stricker, G. (1998). *Toward the scientific practice of professional psychology: Methodology for the local clinical scientist*. New York: Plenum.

West, C. K. (2005). The map of relational-cultural theory. *Women & Therapy*, *28*(3/4), 93–110.

APPENDIX: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

For the Supervisor

What did you anticipate would happen in this supervision?
  What do you think your supervisee expected of this supervision?

What would you say was the main purpose of the supervision?
  What efforts were made to achieve it, and how was it achieved?
  Did you ever ask for feedback about how things were going?

Would you see learning as having taken place during this supervision relationship, and if so, how?

What, in general, do you get out of doing supervision?
  What did you get out of doing this supervision?
  What would you say ___ got out of the supervision?
  Did you and ___ talk about any of this?
  What would it have been like to talk about this?

Can you describe a time/episode over the past year that stands out for you?
  What about it was/is significant?
  Would ___ think it was a significant event?
  What was the impact of the relationship on the event/time?
  What was different in the supervision relationship before and after this
    time?
  Did you and ___ talk about this?
  If not, what would it have been like to talk about this?
Can you describe a point of conflict, challenge, or disagreement that stands
    out for you?
  How did it come about?
  How was the challenge made?
  Who did that when?
  How did it get resolved?
  Did things change after that?
  How?
  How did you experience your unequal power status during this dis-
    agreement/conflict/challenge?
  Have you and ___ talked about this?
  What was the impact of the evaluation component of your relationship on
    this conflict/challenge?
  If a conflict like this had occurred earlier/later in the supervision relation-
    ship, would it have played out any differently?
  How?
  What would you say you learned about yourself and _____ from this
    experience?
  Did you and ___ talk about this?
  If not, what would it have been like for you and _____ to talk about
    this?

Would you say feminism/feminist theory has informed your participation in
    this supervision relationship?
  Tell me some of the ways feminism/feminist theory has been incorporated
    into your practice of supervision.
  Do you introduce specific themes drawn from feminism into your super-
    vision practice? Which themes? Role of advocacy?

What are your thoughts about self-disclosure in this supervision relation-
    ship?
  What was your intent in using self-disclosure?
  How does it work?
  What are the boundaries for you in using self-disclosure?
  What about feelings about the relationship?

Did you and _____ talk about this?
   If not, what would it have been like to talk about it?

How would you describe your supervision relationship?
   What was it like to work together?
   Did you talk about this?

What about this supervision relationship/experience do you think you will
   carry with you to the next supervision?
   Why? (Say more.)
What do you think ___ will carry with her?
   Why? (Say more.)

What about this relationship/experience do you anticipate you will not
   repeat or carry with you next time?
   Why? (Say more.)

What do you think ___ will not repeat or carry with her?
   Why? (Say more.)

What did it feel like being in this relationship?
   Did you ever talk about that?

Is there anything I haven't covered that you'd like to talk about?

Was there anything about this year or this particular site that had an impact
   on your supervision?

What was it like for you to participate in this interview, this project?

For the Supervisee

What did you expect for supervision?
   Did you talk about this with your supervisor?

What would you say was the main purpose of the supervision?
   What efforts were made to achieve this, and was it achieved?
   Were you ever asked for feedback, or did you offer feedback?

Would you see learning as having taken place during this supervision
   relationship, and if so, how?

What did you get out of being in this supervision?
   What would you say ___ got out of the supervision?

Did you and ___ talk about any of this?
  If not, what would it have been like to talk about this?
Can you describe a time/episode over the past year that stands out for you?
  What about it was/is significant?
  Would ___ think it was a significant event?
  What was the impact of the relationship on the event/time?
  What was different in the supervision relationship before and after this
    time?
  Did you and ___ talk about this?
  If not, what would it have meant to talk about it?
Can you describe a point of conflict, challenge, or disagreement that stands
    out for you?
  How did it come about?
  How was the challenge made?
  Who did what when?
  How did it get resolved?
  Did things change after that?
  How?
  How did you experience your unequal power status during this dis-
    agreement/conflict/challenge?
  Have you and ___ talked about this?
  What was the impact of the evaluation component of your relationship on
    this conflict/challenge?
  If a conflict like this had occurred earlier/later in the supervision relation-
    ship, would it have played out any differently?
  How?
  What would you say you learned about yourself and _____ from this
    experience?
  Did you and ___ talk about this?
  If not, what would it have been like for you and _____ to talk about it?

Would you say feminism/feminist theory has informed your participation in
    this supervision relationship?
  Tell me some of the ways feminism/feminist theory has been incorporated
    into your experience of supervision.
  Have specific themes drawn from feminism been a part of your supervision
    experience? Which themes? Role of advocacy?

What are your thoughts about self-disclosure in this supervision relationship?
  How did it work?
  What about feelings about the relationship?
  Was this discussed during supervision?
  If not, what would it have been like to talk about this?

How would you describe your supervision relationship?
  What was it like to work together?
  Did you and your supervisor talk about this?

What about this supervision relationship/experience do you think you will
  carry with you to the next supervision?
  Why? (Say more.)

What do you think ___ will carry with her?
  Why? (Say more.)
What about this relationship/experience do you anticipate you will not
  repeat or carry with you next time?
  Why? (Say more.)

What do you think ___ will not repeat or carry with her?
  Why? (Say more.)

What did it feel like being in this relationship?
  Did you ever talk about that?

Is there anything I haven't covered that you'd like to talk about?

Was there anything about this year or this particular site that had an impact
  on the supervision, or other issues covered here?

What was it like for you to participate in this interview, this project?
  What was it like to speak evaluatively of the supervision and your relation-
    ship with your supervisor?