

Development of the Psychotherapy Supervisor: Review of and Reflections on 30 Years of Theory and Research

C. EDWARD WATKINS, Jr., Ph.D.

The psychotherapy supervisor's development (i.e., the unfolding process of growth in being and becoming a supervisor) has long been considered a substantive issue in clinical supervision. Theory and clinical wisdom suggest that supervisors' level of development can have a significant and far-reaching impact on the supervision experience, potentially affecting supervisory alliance formation, in-session conceptualization and strategy utilization, and even the outcomes experienced by both supervisees and patients. Consensus seems to be that there is a critical need for empirical study of psychotherapy supervisor development. But with a generation of theory and research on psychotherapy supervisor development behind us, what do we know (or not know); where does this area of inquiry stand today, and what do we need to know about supervisor development going forward?

In this paper, I attempt to address those questions. I examine the last 30-year period (approximately) of supervisor development theory, measurement, and quantitative and qualitative study; provide a contemporary status report of sorts on this subject; and identify some important matters for research and practical consideration. Despite a generation of inquiry, the psychotherapy supervisor still remains the largely unknown party in the supervision experience. But that long-standing reality can be changed, some possibilities for doing so are presented, and the promise of supervisor development study is seen to be an ever-inviting hope that awaits realization.

KEYWORDS: Psychotherapy supervisor development, supervisor development, psychotherapy supervision, clinical supervision, clinical supervisor development

Department of Psychology, University of North Texas **Mailing Address:** 1155 Union Circle #311280, Denton, TX 76203-5017. e-mail: watkinsc@unt.edu

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PSYCHOTHERAPY, Vol. 66, No. 1, 2012

INTRODUCTION

"I feel like a fraud, a female resident in supervision said.

"You are," answered the male supervisor. . . . "We all begin as frauds," he continued . . . "That is the nature of the learning of psychotherapy [and psychotherapy supervision]. As we read, apply theories and techniques, and learn the vicissitudes of the patient-therapist-supervisor interaction, we grow to be less and less fraudulent, and eventually mature into the real thing"

(Chagoya & Chagoya, 1994, pp. 189-190).

What do we know about the interior experience of the developing psychotherapy supervisor? Does it sometimes involve the fraudulence of feeling referred to in the preceding quote? Do fear, anxiety, and conflict routinely besiege beginning supervisors as they practice their craft? How might supervisors' internal life (e.g., cognitions, affect, self-efficacy), skill level, and supervisory identity formation change as they acquire supervision knowledge, training, supervision, and practical experience? Those questions, which have long been matters of concern in the area of psychotherapy supervisor development (Alonso, 1985; Blair & Peake, 1995; Hess, 1987; Cohen & Lim, 2008; Heid, 1997; Pelling & Agostinelli, 2009; Rau, 2002; Watkins, 1995c), continue to be highly pertinent today because: (1) our understanding of the interior experience of the developing psychotherapy supervisor remains quite limited (Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Pelling, 2008), and (2) if we are to have a more informed, wholistic perspective on supervision, then a more complete understanding of both supervisee *and* supervisor as participants in the psychotherapy supervision process would seem requisite (Watkins, 1995d).

As a recognized area of theory, research, and practice, psychotherapy supervisor development can be defined as the examination and explication of:

- (1) the process of growth involved in being and becoming a psychotherapy supervisor, its unfolding and evolution over time;
- (2) the factors (e.g., openness, defensiveness) that facilitate or fracture that growth process;
- (3) the developmental issues (e.g., independence versus dependence) that potentially affect and permeate that process; and
- (4) the tailoring of supervisory interventions to match supervision of supervision needs (Alonso, 1983, 1985; Hess, 1986, 1987; Rodenhauer, 1994, 1997; Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2009; Watkins, 1993, 1994).

Psychotherapy supervisor development is of considerable importance to better understand because the supervisor plays a central, substantive, and pivotal role in the whole of the supervisory process, affecting all aspects of supervisee learning and growth and, in turn, affecting patient learning and growth.

Squarely within the supervision context is the person of the supervisor—his or her development as, and process of “becoming,” a supervisor. Of the many issues and concerns within the supervision context, none seems more important than psychotherapy supervisor development and its ramifications” (Watkins, 1995c, p. 157).

That appears to be a view that finds some resonance within the field. As Majcher and Daniluk (2009) have recently stated, “The consensus in the literature is that there is a critical need to study supervisor development . . .” (pp. 63-64).

At this juncture, the matter of psychotherapy supervisor development has been with us now for approximately a generation—with Alonso’s (1983) developmental life-span theory perhaps serving to mark its beginning point. As we look back over that past generation of activity, punctuated by theoretical construction, empirical research, and qualitative inquiry, what can be said about psychotherapy supervisor development now? What do we know? What do we need to know? What needs to happen for this area of study and inquiry to blossom and grow?

In this paper, I would like to consider those questions. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) recently speculated that there is a “lack of any new interest” (p. 297) in supervisor development and declared that research “is virtually nonexistent” (p. 296). But what do the data actually say? I believe a current review about psychotherapy supervisor development could be useful because:

- (1) it has now been 15 to 20 years or more since our last supervisor development reviews (Russell & Petrie, 1994; Watkins, 1995b; Worthington, 1987);
- (2) supervisor development and its enhancement continues to be an important topic area of concern within the supervision literature (Borders, 2010; Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Granello, Kindsvatter, Granello, Underfer-Babalis, & Moorhead, 2008);
- (3) systematic study and empirical explication of supervisor development continues to be identified and accentuated as a pressing supervision need (Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Ybrandt & Armeilius, 2009); and

- (4) having had an approximate generation of work in the area of supervisor development theory and research (early 1980s up to now), a look back over that 30 year period could prove instructive in our taking a look forward as well.

In what follows, I hope to: (1) briefly describe the primary models of psychotherapy supervisor development that have been proposed; (2) provide a summary review of supervisor development theory/research reviews that have been conducted up through 1995; (3) provide a current critique of supervisor development research studies, surveying and scrutinizing all investigations—quantitative and qualitative—that have appeared from 1/1996 up through mid 2011; and (4) provide a contemporary status report about supervisor development and offer some possible directions for its future.

PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT MODELS: 1983-1995

Psychotherapy supervisor development models were products of the 1980s and 1990s. During that time period, five primary models were proposed: Alonso (1983, 1985), Hess (1986, 1987), Rodenhauser (1994, 1997), Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987), and Watkins (1990, 1993, 1994). No new supervisor models have been proposed since then (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Although Stoltenberg has continued to include a chapter on supervisor development in each new edition of his book (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2009; Stoltenberg, McNeil, & Delworth, 1997), no real changes to his original model have been made over the past twenty-five years. Table 1 provides a summary of the primary features of each of the five models.

In surveying those models, the essential orienting points to bear in mind are: (1) all models are generally cast as either a three or four stage linear progression; (2) with Alonso's life-span model excepted, the models track supervisors from when they begin to supervise through the process of their becoming seasoned, master practitioners; and (3) as supervisors successfully progress through the stages, supervisory identity and skills are theorized to become increasingly enhanced, and supervisory self-doubt, insecurity, and negative affect about oneself as supervisor are theorized to become decreasingly in evidence. Cohen and Lim (2008) nicely capture this process of supervisor developmental unfolding across models:

There is one commonality cutting across. . . the developmental models that is particularly relevant There is anxiety, self-doubt, and feelings of being overwhelmed when initially assuming the role of supervisor. Whether called *role shock*, *imposter syndrome*, or another label, the

experience of angst and struggle are common when a supervisee transitions to becoming a supervisor. The new supervisor should find comfort in the awareness that these feelings are not unique and that they will gradually subside over time. In fact, developmental theories suggest that supervisors will transition through phases and eventually feel confident, comfortable, and integrated . . . (p. 86).

It is that very process—stage-by-stage progression through and increased mastery of developmental struggles, issues, and crises—that seemingly defines the essence of supervisor developmental models (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Cohen & Lim, 2008; Falender & Schafranske, 2004). Supervisor growth is theorized to occur cognitively (e.g., conceptual clarity), affectively (e.g., anxiety giving way to joy in supervising), behaviorally (e.g., expanding one's arsenal of supervision strategies), and in identity formation and consolidation. Heat becomes light; maturing into the supervisor role increasingly evolves; supervisor development comes to be seen as a welcome, ongoing, lifelong process (Falender & Shafranske, 2004; cf. Grant & Schofield, 2007). As Table 1 shows, all the models are far more similar than dissimilar in their content, structure, and progression.

CONSIDERING FINDINGS FROM THE MOST RECENT REVIEWS, 1980-1995

As we attempt to look across the last 30 years of supervisor development, I would like to begin by summarizing the primary findings of the three earlier reviews: Worthington (1987), Russell and Petrie (1994), and Watkins (1995b). Over the course of the time period covered in those three reviews, approximately 1980 through 1995, the five previously-mentioned psychotherapy supervisor development models were proposed, and the status of those models—their theoretic specifics and empirical support (or lack thereof)—was addressed by the reviewers.

WORTHINGTON (1987)

His theory/research review, appearing at the beginning point of psychotherapy supervisor development theory, identified the then recently proposed models of Alonso (1983) and Hess (1986). Because this area was just emerging, there was very limited material upon which to draw. Worthington indicated that “the field [theoretically] is at a rudimentary level” (p. 191); “theories are still general and imprecise” (p. 206), and are lacking much crucial explanatory material (e.g., identifying the variables that effect change in supervision).

Table 1 STAGE SUMMARY FOR FIVE PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT MODELS

Stage Names and Descriptions Across Models				
Model	1	2	3	4
Alonso (1983, 1985)	Novice: Anxious, confused, conflicted; feels fraudulent; quest for identity; draws on experiences as supervisee to inform efforts	Midcareer: Internally settled; ideal mentor; generative, secure; stable sense of self; supervisory altruism in evidence	Late Career: Adjusting to getting older personally/professionally; "The choice is between hope, wisdom, and integrity, and clinical despair and boredom" (Alonso, 1985, p. 75).	
Hess (1986, 1987)	Beginning: Often lack formal training; self-conscious, unaware, anxious; draws on experiences as supervisee for guidance	Exploration: Increasingly aware of importance of supervision and its impact on supervisees; needs of supervisees given priority; fluctuating though much improved performance; informal power base	Identity Confirmation: Solidified supervisor identity; heightened sense of confidence and professionalism; high level of skillfulness	
Rodenhauser (1994, 1997)	Emulation: Draws on previous experiences as supervisee to provide direction; uses memories of past supervisor to guide work	Conceptualization: Conceptual foundation for supervision takes form; rough practice guidelines established; search for a "system" predominates	Incorporation: Increasingly aware of self as supervisor and impact on supervisees; increasingly sensitive to/respectful of differences and diversity; attention to parallel process phenomena emerges	Consolidation: Solidified identity; theoretically grounded; able to effectively address parallel process and supervisee countertransference phenomena

Stoltenberg & McNeill (2009; cf. Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987)	<p>Level 1: Highly anxious, uncomfortable, confused; concerned about doing the “right thing”; can resort to “flight into structure”; draw on past supervisee experiences for direction</p>	<p>Level 2: Conflicted, confused, frustrated; fluctuating motivation and affectivity; assertion of autonomy mingled with lapses into dependency</p>	<p>Level 3: Consistent motivation; autonomous, comfortable, committed; able to engage in realistic self-appraisals; consults with colleagues on “as needed” basis</p>	<p>Level 3 Integrated: “Master supervisor”; highly skilled and integrated; able to effectively work with wide variety of supervisees</p>
Watkins (1990, 1993)	<p>Role Shock: Anxiety, confusion, turmoil; feels fraudulent (impostor phenomenon); limited to no supervisory confidence, identity, or self-awareness; great need for support from others</p>	<p>Role Recovery/Transition: Some recognition of supervisory strengths and abilities; nascent identity core begins to take form; tension, anxiety, confusion, and turmoil abate; vacillating cognitive and affective experience</p>	<p>Role Consolidation: Increasingly realistic sense of self and supervisory impact; general sense of confidence, solidified identity core; stable, consistent, secure; theoretically grounded; able to recognize and address supervisory transference, countertransference, and parallel process</p>	<p>Role Mastery: “Master supervisor”; highest levels of awareness, skill, and identity achieved; consistency, stability, and consolidation predominate; highly committed to supervision as life-long learning experience; highly adept at working with supervisory transference, countertransference, and parallel process</p>

Eight studies were identified that in some way addressed an aspect of supervisor development, such variables as planning statements, supervision emphases, and licensure status were examined for their supervisory impact. Only one study, however, was informed by a (supervisee, not supervisor) developmental model (Miars, Tracey, Ray, Cornfeld, O'Farrell, & Gelso, 1983). Based on Worthington's analysis, he concluded that the research suggested:

- (1) "There are differences in skillfulness in supervision across supervisors" (p. 203);
- (2) "Supervisors do not become more competent as they gain experience" (p. 203); and
- (3) "Supervisors change little in other ways as they gain experience" (p. 205).

With such a limited body of studies, however, there was little else left to say: "[T]he empirical investigation of how supervisors change with experience is at a rudimentary level" (p. 206). Perhaps the one word that Worthington repeated a few times in his review, which seemed to best capture the state and status of psychotherapy supervisor development at that time, was "rudimentary."

RUSSELL AND PETRIE (1994)

In addition to the Alonso and Hess models, Russell and Petrie identified two other proposed models of supervisor development—those of Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) and Watkins (1990, 1993). Based on their review, they concluded that "there is considerable similarity among the [four] theories of supervisor development" (p. 34). "The models . . . [1] provide preliminary guidelines for creating effective supervisory dyads in training environments . . . and [2] provide guidelines for developing training environments for supervisors" (p. 35). Due to the similarity across models, they also indicated that no further model building was needed.

Russell and Petrie made clear that the supervisor development models lacked any empirical support, but they suggested that that possibility could be remedied: "These models provide directions and hypotheses for research on supervisor development" (pp. 35). They further added that "... these models allow for specific hypotheses concerning supervisors' behaviors, thinking styles, emotions, and perceptions to be proposed and tested" (p. 35). In their view, the models were eminently testable and ready for study. Model testing, not further model building, was sorely needed.

WATKINS (1995b)

In this review, the newly proposed supervisor development model of Rodenhauer (1994) was also recognized. Watkins' conclusions were highly consistent with the earlier reviews and largely echoed their findings. With regard to theory, he concluded that (1) "supervisor development across stages shows far more similarity than dissimilarity". . . (p. 673), (2) "important [model] elements are still missing, for example, the identification of specific impediments to supervisor growth, identification of critical incidents". . . (p. 674), (3) "these models are lacking in . . . a transition theory to guide them". . . (674), and (4) "the role of key personality, moderator variables needs to be delineated better . . ." (p. 675). From Watkins' perspective, theory needs in 1995 were no different from theory needs identified by Worthington almost a decade earlier.

Not surprisingly, that "sameness" applied for research as well: "[A]ll of what Worthington identified as research needs then remain as research needs now" (p. 677). Watkins identified only three studies of supervisor development that had appeared since Worthington's review; that limited body of work left little new to say. He called for attention to such neglected variables as supervisor behaviors, cognitions, intentions, and personality traits in the study of supervisor development. Like Russell and Petrie (1994), Watkins also saw empirical possibility here: "[S]ome researchable hypotheses . . . present themselves for study . . . [and] await . . . systematic, rigorous empirical attention . . ." (p. 675). Again, these models were seen as eminently testable and ready for study. In this review, the need for attention to supervision of supervision was also accentuated.

SUMMARY

As of the mid-1990s, psychotherapy supervisor development had been declared "the richest yet most untapped facet of the clinical supervision endeavor" (Watkins, 1995a, p. 34). Five supervisor development models had been proposed: Alonso (1983, 1985), Hess (1986, 1987), Rodenhauer (1994, 1997), Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987), and Watkins (1990, 1993, 1994). All the models were judged to be quite similar in structure, seemed clinically valid (see Russell & Petrie, 1994), yet remained incomplete in some respects (e.g., lacking a transition theory) because of their newness; research was limited but the models were deemed to be research ready and to hold empirical promise. Attention to and interest in psychotherapy supervisor development appeared to be high, and all indications suggested that this area was poised and primed to be taken to its next level of conceptual, experimental, and practical scrutiny and sophistication.

CONSIDERING RESEARCH ON PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT, 1996 to 2011

I would like to complement that 1980 to 1995 summary review with an examination of supervisor development research that has appeared during the last approximate 15 years. What has happened since that beginning, formative period? I thought it best—for a possible body of more recent supervisor development research to be identified—that I cast my review net wide. I defined “psychotherapy supervisor” as a mental health professional who provides psychological treatment supervision. I hoped to include supervision studies across the various disciplines (psychology, psychiatry, social work, psychiatric nursing, and counseling) where psychological treatment supervision has long been considered important. I defined psychotherapy or psychological treatment supervision as: “[A] distinct professional activity” (Falender & Shafranske, 2004, p. 3) or “intervention” (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009, p. 7) in which a senior professional (supervisor) serves as mentor or guide to a junior professional (supervisee) who is in the process of learning and practicing psychological treatment; its primary objective is enhancement of the supervisee’s professional functioning, it involves evaluation of that professional functioning by the supervisor, and it is a hierarchical monitoring process (supervisor to supervisee) that serves a protective function for both patients and profession (Milne, 2007; Thomas, 2010). I defined a “psychotherapy supervisor development study” as one in which supervisor development theory was specifically investigated in some respect, and research findings were then related back to and explained within the context of that body of theory.

METHOD

To identify articles for review, four steps were taken: (1) PsycInfo, MedLine, Education Research Complete, Digital Dissertations, and Google Scholar database searches were conducted using “supervisor development” as the key search words; (2) reference sections of identified studies were examined to further identify other appropriate articles for inclusion that might have been missed (“ancestry approach”; Cooper, 1989); (3) supervision journals or journals that publish some supervision material were examined for any recent articles that might have appeared; and (4) various supervision texts (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Falender & Shafranske, 2004; Hess, Hess, & Hess, 2008; Watkins, 1997a) were also examined to further find any other possible missed work. Because dissertations have proven to be a valuable source of supervisor development study (e.g., Majcher, 2001; Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Pelling, 2001,

2008; Stevens, 1994; Stevens, Goodyear, & Robertson, 1997), I chose to include that database as a part of this review. Based on those steps, a total of 18 studies were identified—13 quantitative and mixed method investigations, 3 qualitative investigations, and 2 measurement studies. The review time period spanned from January, 1996 through mid-2011. Each article was reviewed to determine: setting/sample characteristics, measures used, analyses, procedure, findings/conclusions, and limitations/strengths. Tables 2, 3, and 4, respectively, provide a summary of the features of those quantitative/mixed method, qualitative, and measurement studies.

RESULTS

Results are presented that address general study characteristics, quantitative and mixed method studies, qualitative studies, and measurement studies.

General Study Characteristics

A wide range of helping professionals was involved in this body of research: Psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, and counselors or students being trained for one or more of those professions. The predominant groups to receive research attention, however, were from the disciplines of psychology and counseling. Some primary features of the samples were: (1) approximately two-thirds of the participants were female (1,918 women versus 1, 139 men); (2) 83% of the participants were Caucasian; and (3) ages ranged from twenty-eight to fifty-two years. Some primary features of the studies were:

- (1) approximately two-thirds of these studies resulted from doctoral student research, with six of the dissertations remaining unpublished and five leading to journal publication;
- (2) sample sizes ranged from a low of four to a high of 1,639;
- (3) two-thirds of the quantitative/mixed method and measurement studies were cross sectional or *ex post facto* in nature, being one-time surveys of supervisor perceptions;
- (4) supervisor development over time was only evaluated in six studies, with the period examined ranging from one semester to one and a half years; and
- (5) practicing professionals' (post-doctoral) supervisor development over time was evaluated in only one study.

Quantitative/mixed Method Studies

Data from these 13 studies suggested that:

- (1) supervisor development models appear to provide a rough ap-

Table 2 QUANTITATIVE AND MIXED-METHOD STUDIES OF PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT

Authors	Setting/Sample	Measures	Analyses	Procedure	Findings/Conclusions	Limitations/ Strengths
Baker, Exum, & Tyler (2002)	12 doctoral students (6 f, 6 m; 5 African- American, 7 European-American; mean age=34 years) enrolled in clinical supervision practicum (experimental group); 7 doctoral students (6 f, 1 m; 2 African-American, 5 European-American; mean age=40 years) not yet enrolled in supervision practicum (comparison group)	Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS); Retrospective interview questions	Independent and dependent \pm tests; Qualitative analysis of interview questions	All students tracked across one semester, administered PSDS at beginning, mid- point, and end of semester, and administered retrospective interview at midpoint and end of semester	Supervisor development of practicum students increased significantly across semester and was significantly greater compared to non- practicum students; qualitative results were mixed	Small sample size; development studied only over single semester in single program
Barnes (2002)	287 clinical supervisors (58% f; 83 % European- American; mean age=43 years; average years of supervision experience=8.06)	Demographic questionnaire; Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale	Correlations Analyses of variance Factor analysis	Three-phase study: Expert evaluations, pilot study, and main study; 1,462 questionnaire sets mailed out to liaison for distribution; 287 clinical supervisors served as final sample; they completed survey packet materials and mailed it back to researchers	"... results provide some evidence of ... validity of the Supervisor Complexity Model" (p. 81) and "... indirect validation for other related supervisor development models" (p. 81)	Self-report survey data; instrument development/ validation study

Bencivenne (1999)	136 American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) Approved supervisors (70 f, 66 m; 129 European- American; mean age=52.17 years); 116 of supervisors' supervisees (64 f, 52 m; 104 European- American; mean age=35.8 years)	Supervisors: AAMFT- Approved Supervisor Demographic Questionnaire; Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Supervisor Emphasis Rating Form-Revised; Personal Preference Scale Supervisees: Supervisee Demographic Questionnaire; Supervisee Levels Questionnaire Revised; Personal Preference Scale	Pearson product- moment correlations; factorial analysis of variance; multivariate analysis of variance	Initial mailing to 500 AAMFT- Approved supervisors; additional mailing to 200 more supervisors; each participating supervisor asked to randomly select a supervisee to fill out supervisee questionnaire packet; each supervisor asked to complete supervisor questionnaire packet; follow-up PSDS sent to supervisors to assess its test- retest reliability	Supervisor development related to hours of training in supervision with AAMFT- Approved supervisors (increased training associated with higher development); experience not related to supervisor development; four- week temporal stability of PSDS was .863	Correlational, cross- sectional, quasi- experimental survey study
----------------------	--	---	---	---	---	---

Table 2 (Continued)

Culbreth & Cooper (2008)	232 substance abuse counseling clinical supervisors (57.5% f; 86.5% white; mean age=51.1 years; mean years experience as supervisor=8.6)	Demographic information questions; Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Role Questionnaire (RQ); Counselor Supervisor Self-Efficacy Scale	Pearson product-moment correlations; multiple regression analyses run for entire group (N=232), recovering supervisors (48%), and non-recovering supervisors (52%)	Survey packet including questions/measures mailed to 491 registered or certified substance abuse counseling clinical supervisors in Midwestern state; reminder postcard and second survey packet mailed out as follow-up	Perceived self-efficacy in supervision theory/ techniques most significant predictor of supervisor development across groups (entire sample, recovering supervisors); some variations in supervisor development found between recovering and non-recovering groups; results seen as being supportive of need for training in clinical supervision for substance abuse counseling supervisors	48.43% return rate; self-report measures used only; one-state survey
Kurdth (2001)	16 clinical supervisors (6 f, 10 m; 15 European-American; mean age= 45 years), 16 supervisors (12 f, 4 m; 15 European-American; mean age=30 years), and 12 clients (9 f, 3 m; all European-American, mean age=30 years; 6 supervisors (2 f, 4 m) from group of 16 served as interview participants for qualitative portion of study	Supervisory Styles Inventory; Working Alliance Inventory; Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory; Supervisory Development Interview	Pearson product-moment correlations Content analysis procedure	Survey packets mailed to 49 potential participants, all actively practicing clinical supervisors affiliated with master's degree counseling program (33% response rate); supervisors then provided supervisee and client packets to supervisee for distribution/completion	Four areas emerged as crucial in supervisor development process: Context within which supervisor learning occurs; making sense of the supervisor role; acquiring an approach to teaching supervisees; and developing a method or style of evaluating	Small sample size; all supervisors affiliated with single institution

Development of the Psychotherapy Supervisor

Lyon, Heppler, Leavitt, & Fisher (2008)	233 psychology pre-doctoral interns (160 f, 71 m; 177 European-American; mean age=32.45 years) from clinical (N=151), counseling (67), school/ counseling (10), and other (N=5) psychology graduate programs; internship sites widely varied	Demographic questions; Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Supervision questions about selected variables (e.g., supervision training, experience, interest in being a supervisor)	Frequencies, percentages, point-biserial correlations, multiple regression analysis	Survey packets mailed to training directors of American Psychological Association accredited internship sites; follow-up email sent as reminder; participating directors then gave survey packets to interns to complete	Total number of supervision training activities and number of hours of supervised supervision predicted interns' level of supervisor development (more training plus more supervised supervision = higher development); most interns had provided supervision to a trainee during or prior to internship, but most had not had a graduate course in supervision; interns expressed interest in becoming supervisors and receiving supervision training	33 % return rate; self-report measures used only
Pelling (2008)	175 clinical supervisors (76 f, 98 m; 85% European-American; 85% doctoral degree holders; mean age=52.5 years; all members of Association for Counselor Education and Supervision	Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Three predictor variable questions (# of years supervising others, # of years treating others, and # of years of supervision training experience)	Frequencies, percentages, forward stepwise multiple regression analyses	Introductory postcard, survey package, reminder postcard, and follow-up survey package mailed out over five week period	Experience providing supervision and training in supervision were the best predictors of supervisor development (8.3% and 4.4%, respectively)	58.3 % return rate; self-report measures used only; highly experienced supervision group

Table 2 (Continued)

Rønnestad, Orlinsky, Parks, & Davis, & Society for Psychotherapy Research Collaborative Research Network (CRN) (1997)	1639 psychotherapists (975 f, 458 m; mean age=40) from around the world (two-thirds from Europe); professions represented included medicine (N=395), psychology (N=867), social work (N=174), and other (N=177); theoretical orientations included analytic/dynamic (50.8%), humanistic (33.8%), cognitive (23.4%), systemic (22.9%), and behavioral (17.7%)	Development of Psychotherapists Common Core Questionnaire	Frequencies, percentages, step-wise multiple regression analyses	Large international survey of psychotherapists, and counselors conducted by CRN	Noticeable increases in supervisor confidence observed after initial supervisory experiences; supervisor confidence not predicted by amount of therapy supervisor received, but was predicted to some extent by amount of therapy supervision experience; becoming a supervisor found to be "part of the normative development of practicing psychotherapists" (Rønnestad et al., 1997, p. 195)	Self-report measure; cross-sectional study; highly experienced sample; supervision training or supervisor supervision received not included as variables
Stevens, Goodyear, & Robertson (1997)	60 practicing mental health professionals (39 f, 21 m; 46 European-American; mean age=41.6 years; 30 eclectic, 12 psychodynamic, 7 cognitive-behavioral, 3 person-centered, 3 family systems, 5 other)	Demographic survey; Supervisory Emphasis Report Form-Revised (SERF-R); Thought listing; Video-tape stimulus questions	Factor analysis, factorial analysis of variance; multivariate analysis of variance	12 sites for clinical, counseling, or professional psychology training used; participants asked to complete demographic survey and SERF-R, watch stimulus videotape, and then do thought listing and stimulus questions	Limited support found for predicted, linear movement of supervisors as they gain experience; experience identified as necessary but not sufficient for supervisor development; need for supervisory training underscored	Self-report measures; cross-sectional study; limited to southern California

Vidlak (2002)	99 clinical or counseling psychologists (53% f; 89% European-American; mean age=45.6 years) working at approved (American Psychological Association) pre-doctoral internship sites; all clinical supervision providers	Demographic questionnaire; Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Supervisory Styles Inventory; Working Alliance Inventory-Form	Correlations ± tests Analysis of variance Regression analyses	Online survey packet completed by 99 participants	Supervision training and supervisor supervision highly related to level of supervisor development, but supervisor experience was not; supervisory style served as mediator in relation between supervisor development and supervisory working alliance	Self-report survey data; non-causal design; limited sample size
Vieceli (2006)	37 supervisors (in academic and clinical settings; no specifics with regard to gender or ethnicity provided)	Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale; Supervisory Emphasis Report Form-Revised; Selected supervision variables (e.g., supervision experience, training)	Pearson product-moment correlations Non-paired ± tests Multivariate analysis of covariance	Survey packets distributed to supervisor group	No significant multivariate effect found for impact of supervisors' years of experience, supervision training, and perceived workplace support on supervisor development; positive correlation found between supervisor development and emphasis on conceptualization	Small sample size; low return rate; self-report survey data

Table 2 (Continued)

White (1997)	4 clinical psychology doctoral students (3 f, 1 m) followed over 1-year period, in which they provided supervision to therapy trainees during the last four months of year; participants' supervision training experiences varied (e.g., didactic/experiential practicum, "learning by doing" or "trial by fire")	Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS); Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI); Working Alliance Inventory (WAI); 2-hour semi-structured interview	Visual inspection of data graphs Correlation of coefficients Atlas ti qualitative data analysis program	In June, participants asked to complete PSDS and SSI every 2 to 3 weeks until September (beginning of supervisor training); participants completed semi-structured interview first week of September; SSI and PSDS completed at each month's end until study finished; participants filled out WAI after first meeting with their supervisees and at each month's end until study finished; supervisor trainees completed semi-structured interview 3 weeks after beginning actual therapy supervision; completed another interview 3 weeks before study's end	Developmental model studied (Supervisor Complexity Model; SCM) "does describe the experience of these supervisees fairly well, with exceptions" (p. 199); issues considered fundamental in SCM "to supervisor development do appear to have been central to those supervisors' experiences" (p. 200); speculated that supervisor development may occur more quickly than theory suggests and that structure and support may diminish or eliminate "impostor phenomenon" and other highly negative experiences associated with early supervisor development; PSDS viewed as being potentially useful in tracking supervisor development longitudinally	Intensive, longitudinal mixed-methods design, small number of participants, supervision of therapist experience only 4 months in duration
--------------	---	---	---	--	---	---

Ybrandt & Arnelius (2009)	9 supervisor trainees (6 f, 3 m; all Caucasian; mean age=48 years; 7 psychologists, 2 social workers) participating in a three-semester postgraduate supervisor and teacher training program at Swedish University; supervisor group consisted of 12 highly experienced supervisors (7 f, 5 m; mean age=49 years), all clinical psychologists	Swedish Structural Analysis of Social Behavior (SSASB)	Three self-image ratings (before, after, and follow-up) compared on two levels of aggregation, clusters, and vectors with paired sample \pm tests	SSASB self-image questionnaire mailed to supervisor trainee group participants at three points: Before training, after training, and at four-month follow-up	Supervisor trainees self-image found to change over the course of supervisor training, reflecting more autonomy and positive self-acceptance; gains also maintained at follow-up	Self-report measure used; small sample size; developmental changes studied over three semesters plus four-month follow-up
---------------------------	---	--	---	--	--	---

Table 3 QUALITATIVE STUDIES OF PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT

Authors	Setting/Sample	Measures	Analyses	Procedure	Findings/ Conclusions	Limitations/ Strengths
Majcher & Daniluk (2009)	6 doctoral students (4f, 2m; all European-American; age range late 20s to mid 40s) participating in 8 month supervision training course (with didactic and experiential components)	Three in-depth, audiotaped interviews, 1 to 2 hours in duration, conducted with each supervisor trainee	Interpretive phenomenological analysis and thematic review	In-depth audiotaped interview conducted with each supervisor trainee at three different points: Beginning of supervision course, midway through, and at course's end. Main interview question was: "How do you experience and make sense of your process of becoming a clinical supervisor? Please describe your experience of becoming a supervisor in as much detail as possible" (Majcher & Daniluk, 2009, pp. 64-65).	Relationship dimension emerged as core common element for all participants across all identified themes across all interviews; interview 1 common themes—role ambiguity/uncertainty, competence/incompetence, excitement, and accomplishment; interview 2 common themes—transformation, developing competence/confidence, supervisory role identification, and role/boundary clarity; interview 3 common themes—supervisory commitment, congruence, and having experienced a significant growth process; findings reflected a process similar to supervisor development models	Small sample, all European-American, drawn from single program; 8 month course

Development of the Psychotherapy Supervisor

Nelson, Oliver, & Capps (2006)	<p>Study 1 sample: 13 doctoral students (10 f, 3 m; 7 European-American, 6 Hispanic; taking 3 semesters of practicum/internship) who were supervisors in training Follow-up sample: 5 doctoral students (4 f, 1 m; 2 European-American, 1 Hispanic, 2 African-American; taking practicum/internship) used to explore and confirm/disconfirm thematic results from Study 1 sample; followed sample 1 by 1 1/2 years</p>	<p>8 primary research questions (e.g., "How did this process help you develop supervisory skills?")</p> <p>asked of each participant</p>	<p>Constant comparative methods used to analyze individual/focus group interview transcripts, student interview notes, and researcher memos/reflections; open coding, selective coding, and theoretical sampling employed</p>	<p>Individual interviews used to gather responses to 7 primary research questions; at each semester's end, identified themes presented to participants' focus group for discussion/clarification purposes; sample 1 thematic data used to stimulate further discussion about supervisor development in follow-up sample's focus group</p>	<p>Six major themes in supervisor development identified: Learning (e.g., through academics, experience), supervisee growth, individual uniqueness, reflection (i.e., pondering on one's experience as supervisor), connections (e.g., to peers, supervisors, professional associations), and putting it all together (i.e., finding integration where once there was none); "voices of doctoral students in this study mirror the [supervisor development] literature" (p. 29); [o]ver the year and a half of study, marked by less need for structure, increased confidence and decreased anxiety about supervision, and a transition from relying on external resources to relying on internal resources" (p. 29).</p>	<p>One doctoral program; limited number of research participants; follow-up sample used as check and balance</p>
--------------------------------	--	--	---	---	---	--

Table 3 (Continued)

Rapisarda, Desmond & Nelson (2011)	7 doctoral students (5 f, 2m of varied ethnicities; mean age=37.7 years) taking supervision practicum course	Two overarching questions guided interview process—(1) How do students describe supervisor transition? and (2) What challenges/surprises did they find in that transition?	Collective case study design, constant comparative method used, QSRN6 qualitative research software used throughout for data analysis	2 45-minute interviews conducted with each participant; first interview took place at mid point of semester, second interview at end of semester	Two main themes identified in supervisee to supervisor transition; (1) establishing a supervisory relationship; and (2) developing a supervisory skill set. Two main themes identified as transition challenges/surprises: (1) the challenge of time; and (2) increased appreciation for and valuing of supervision as professional activity.	One doctoral program; limited number of participants, most of whom were Caucasian females; development followed for only 1 semester
------------------------------------	--	--	---	--	---	---

proximation of the process through which some beginning supervisors proceed on their developmental journey (e.g., Stevens et al. 1997; White, 1997);

- (2) supervision training appears to matter greatly in the supervisor development process, positively and significantly impacting how beginning supervisors feel about being prepared and equipped to supervise therapists (Baker, Exum, & Tyler, 2002; Bencivenne, 1999; Lyon, Heppler, Leavitt, & Fisher, 2008; Pelling, 2008; Stevens et al, 1997; Vidlak, 2002; Ybrandt & Armelius, 2009); and
- (3) supervision experience alone does not generally appear to be sufficient to guarantee any measure of supervisor development (Bencivenne, 1999; Stevens et al., 1997; Viceli, 2006; Vidlak, 2002). Many of these studies were one-time surveys (61%), and often-mentioned limitations included small sample size, self-report instrumentation, and cross-sectional designs.

Qualitative Studies

Data from these three studies (Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Nelson, Oliver, & Capps, 2006; Rapisarda, Desmond, & Nelson, 2011) suggested that: (1) the process of supervisor development involved movement—from a place of uncertainty, ambiguity, anxiety, and limited confidence—to a place where greater certainty, clarity, emotional comfort, and confidence were preponderant; (2) issues with which supervisors tended to struggle in the development process surrounded matters of competence, confidence, role definition/clarification/identification, boundary clarification, and personal and professional integration; and (3) these qualitatively-identified process and issues show some similarity to the process and issues incorporated into supervisor development models. Limitations included small sample size and participants being drawn from a single doctoral program.

Measurement Studies

Data from these two studies (Barnes & Moon, 2006; Hillman, McPherson, Swank, & Watkins, 1998 [drawn from Hillman, 1996]) suggested that: The Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS; Watkins, Schneider, Haynes, & Neiberding, 1995) appears to possess some reliability and validity as a supervisor development measure. Limitations included self-report survey methodology and possible social desirability effect.

DISCUSSION

In their recent research review, Inman and Ladany (2008) indicated that focus on “the supervisory role is lagging” (p. 501) . . . “supervisory

Table 4 MEASUREMENT STUDIES OF PSYCHOTHERAPY SUPERVISOR DEVELOPMENT

Authors	Setting/Sample	Measures	Analyses	Procedure	Findings/ Conclusions	Limitations/Strengths
Barnes & Moon (2006)	255 clinical supervisors (58% f; 86% European- American; average number of years providing supervision=8.34) drawn from counseling programs across the nation	Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS); Demographic form; Counselor Supervisor Self- Efficacy Scale	Confirmatory factor analyses of second-order factor model and four-factor model	Survey packets distributed to participants and, once materials completed, then returned to researchers via mail	Results offered validation for PSDS, supported a slightly modified four-factor model as best fit, and suggested that supervisor competence/effectiveness, supervisor identity development/commitment, supervisor self- awareness, and supervisor sincerity were each key areas in the supervisor development process; "counseling" supervisors and "psychotherapy" supervisors (Watkins et al., 1995) responded to PSDS in virtually identical developmental fashion	Self-report survey data; possible social desirability effect

Hillman, McPherson, Swank, & Watkins (1998)	43 clinical supervisors (27 f, 16 m; 28 European-American; 36 practitioners, 7 supervisor trainees); all participants involved in providing psychotherapy supervision, supervisor receiving supervisor training	Demographic data sheet; Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS); Theory description	Pearson product-moment correlations; Guttman split-half coefficient estimates	83 survey packets sent to counseling center training directors and supervisors for distribution to interested participants; after completing initial packet, participants were again mailed PSDS four weeks later for completion	Four-week temporal stability coefficient = .85; split-half coefficient = .95; PSDS considered to be highly homogeneous, stable measure of supervisor development	Small sample, self-report survey data; all counseling centers in Southwestern United States; single training program also in Southwest
---	---	---	---	--	--	--

experiences continue to receive little [research] attention” (p. 511). The primary problem with that unfortunate fact, as they noted, is that “the supervisor is integral to counselor [and therapist] development” (p. 511). We empirically know the least about the party who may exert the most substantial impact on supervisees’ therapeutic development and actualization.

Supervisor development models were, perhaps, created in an effort to offset that trend; they were attempts to shine a light on the inner workings of the supervisor “in process” and use that as a fulcrum to consider how supervision was accordingly affected. But as Inman and Ladany’s (2008) conclusions suggest, the promise of supervisor development models has yet to be fulfilled. As we reflect on these 18 studies and the earlier 15-year period of theory/research, what conclusions can we draw about the contemporary status of psychotherapy supervisor development theory, research, and practice? How might we use those conclusions to point us forward in our pursuit to better understand the “integral supervisor”?

THOUGHTS ON THEORY

Perhaps the strongest, safest theoretical statement that can be made about these five supervisor development models (Table 1) is: They provide a somewhat general, global feel for how supervisor development may unfold over time. The models seemingly have their clearest, most identifiable distinctions at the beginning and end points; it is the middle parts that become a bit more fuzzy and difficult to track. Supervisor development theory is still very much stuck in the ’80s and ’90s; the limitations, imperfections, or deficiencies that existed then still exist now, and no efforts have been made to remedy those. Our most meaningful explications of supervisor development thus far may well have come from studying the clarity that supervisors gain and the growth that they experience with regard to crucial supervision issues and themes over time (e.g., role definition and identification, boundary clarification, professional integration; cf. Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Kurd, 2001; Nelson et al., 2006; White, 1997). In my view, that empirical focus on the continuua of supervisor clarity (e.g., expanding self-awareness) and growth (e.g., “growing” skills)—and how those can change across manifold supervisory issues/themes—has yielded some interesting, instructive theoretical insights about supervisor development that we have not had before. While those explanations could be placed within a stage framework, I am not sure what that necessarily adds; they seem quite meaningful without any reference to or even consideration of stages whatsoever.

These five models do appear to provide some useful perspective for thinking about the potential mechanisms by which supervisor development is thought to be actuated. From my reading and reflection, there seem to be at least four particular mechanisms that emerge as critical and pivotal for change and growth across models: (1) sufficient *interest* in being and *desire* to improve as a supervisor; (2) *openness* to one's supervisory self-experiencing; (3) capacity for and willing embrace of supervisory *self-examination* and *self-reflection*; and (4) *action, practice, and experimentation* (e.g., with regard to supervision skills, strategy deployment, and alliance formation). Whatever the model, those elements seem to be both the prerequisites and lubricant for the initiation and maintenance of any sort of supervisor development process. In my clinical experience, those variables remain every bit as significant today in the "making" of psychotherapy supervisors. While it is vitally important that we better understand the psychotherapy supervisor development process, it also seems well worth taking note of those variables that make that very process possible (or not). These models, however imperfect they may be, still give us some useful ideas about what must be *sine qua non* for supervisor growth to occur.

What changes to supervisor development theory might be needed? Because supervisor development theory has not evolved, the answer to that question really seems no different now than it would have been 15 to 20 years ago. For example, we still lack attention to critical incidents in supervisor development, the impact of various personality and other moderator variables upon the growth process, and a transition theory that guides our thinking about supervisor movement (forward and backward). If any sort of developmental theory is to productively be our guide for research, such missing elements will need to be incorporated into future theoretical refinements or revisioning. We need to move beyond the "general," "imprecise," and "rudimentary" that still seem to characterize far too much of our stage-theory conceptualizations. Even if stage theory itself is ultimately abandoned (e.g., for a more continuous conceptual framework), supervisor development theory requires a level of much greater precision, definition, and specificity than has previously been the case for advancement to occur.

Thoughts on Research and Measurement

These most recent 18 studies (1996 through mid 2011) were all driven in some way by supervisor development theory. Study results have tended to give some support to two fundamental developmental propositions: (1)

in the supervisor development experience, supervisors proceed through some type of progressively unfolding supervisor growth process—where they seemingly move from a place characterized by less to more supervisory clarity, definition, identity, and skill; and (2) in the supervisor development experience, supervisors often tend to struggle with some of the same key developmental issues (e.g., gaining a sense of competence) during that growth process. While offering some support for a developmental view, this body of studies, however, remains quite limited in number, and any conclusions drawn from them would perhaps best be considered suggestive. No supervisor development theory has emerged empirically unscathed (e.g., Stevens et al., 1997; White, 1997).

Dissertations have been a ready source of supervisor development study, with some high quality unpublished and publication-bound research being done (e.g., Bencivenne, 1999; Majcher, 2001; Majcher & Daniluk, 2009). Approximately two-thirds of the 18 studies were dissertation projects, with about half of those being published in peer-reviewed journals (e.g., Barnes & Moon, 2006 [drawn from Barnes' database, 2002]; Pelling, 2008). But research on this topic by more senior professionals—to use the words of Bernard and Goodyear (2009)—“is virtually nonexistent.” The supervisor development theory progenitors contributed almost no research on this subject and their efforts were far more conceptual than empirical. Neither Alonso nor Hess, who sadly are no longer with us, ever conducted any research on supervisor development; their first supervisor development theoretical contributions were essentially their last. Much the same could be said for Rodenhauser, who—after the horrific onslaught and aftermath of Hurricane Katrina—left psychiatry at Tulane University to become a full-time artist in Albuquerque. I only conducted one study on supervisor development (Watkins et al., 1995) and last wrote on the topic about 15 years ago (Watkins, 1997b). While Stoltenberg has conducted research on supervisee development (see Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2009), I am not aware that he has ever turned an empirical eye to supervisor development. None of those theory progenitors took up the research mantle, and no one has since stepped in to fill that research void. Psychotherapy supervisor development, as an area of empirical inquiry, has lacked for and has never really had any research leadership.

While dissertation contributions are helpful and suggest that study of supervisor development is possible, these studies as a group have produced nothing but “one and done” efforts: Not one of these dissertation contributors has ever carried out another investigation of psychotherapy supervisor development. But research beyond dissertations (e.g., Baker et

al, 2002; Nelson et al., 2006; Ronnestad et al., 1997) fares no better: None of these contributors has carried out any supervisor development study beyond their original investigation either (more “one and done” efforts). There has been an absolute absence of any systematic or programmatic inquiry into this subject; unfortunately, when the totality of supervision research is considered, that, perhaps, should not come as a big surprise. Systematic programs of research in supervision have been and tend to be quite few in number (Ellis, 2010; Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Inman & Ladany, 2008). Furthermore, supervisor development—because of its focus on change and growth over time—can be a highly challenging and difficult area to study. While this body of “one and done” efforts (dissertation and non-dissertation) has provided some useful contributions, still movement beyond the one-shot study would seem sorely needed if knowledge and understanding of supervisor development is ever to advance most meaningfully; that at least would be a reasonable, though not necessarily easily achieved, desideratum to pursue as we think about trying to push this line of inquiry forward.

In further considering the challenge and difficulty of researching psychotherapy supervisor development, this body of empirical work seemingly brings into focus yet another crucial reality: That the missing element in supervisor development study thus far has largely been development itself. The majority of investigation has been cross-sectional, *ex post facto*, one-time surveys. Twenty-five years ago, Holloway (1987) stated that “At present, the most obvious problem in supervision research is the absence of longitudinal data to investigate developmental change” (p. 213). Her statement largely appears no less true today. Development, or the examination of change and growth over time, has only been researched in six supervisor development studies—with the time period being but 4 months in 3 studies (Baker et al., 2002; Rapisarda et al., 2011; White, 1997), 8 months in 1 study (Majcher & Daniluk, 2009), and a year and a half in 2 studies (Nelson et al., 2006; Ybrandt & Armelius, 2009). Ybrandt and Armelius (2009) conducted the only developmental study involving seasoned professionals, whereas all other investigations used doctoral students as subjects.

How supervisors might develop and grow beyond that four-month to year-and-a-half time period remains a mystery. Longitudinal study by definition tends to be a time-consuming, often demanding, even daunting process, and psychotherapy supervisors (whether experienced professionals or advanced doctoral students) can be a far less available participant pool for study than beginning supervisees or their psychotherapy patients.

When you combine those two realities, that limited research attention to actual supervisor development over time should come as no great surprise either and, again, only serves to further accentuate the often problematic nature of investigating this subject area.

Nevertheless, each of these studies—qualitative and/or quantitative in design and execution—proves quite instructive and informative in how to approach the project of supervisor development, and all are well worth reading for that reason alone. (White's [1997] dissertation, which weighs in at a staggering 437 pages, is really a hefty book in and of itself—but a most interesting read, nonetheless.) While both quantitative and qualitative investigation seem needed and eminently possible in psychotherapy supervisor development, Majcher and Daniluk (2009) recently indicated that qualitative methodologies might be most useful for inquiry now because supervisor development investigation is at such an early stage of empirical scrutiny. Perhaps, through building a more substantive base of knowledge by means of qualitative study, we would then be placed in a much better position to proceed quantitatively. As we consider how best to approach study of supervisor development, Majcher and Daniluk's (2009) thoughts at least seem well worth weighing in that regard.

From my analysis, the matter of measurement may also provide yet another reason to further consider the potential viability and advisability of taking a qualitative approach first at this early juncture. After all, what valid, reliable measures do we actually have to now study the construct of psychotherapy supervisor development? The Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale (PSDS; Watkins et al., 1995) has been the primary means by which supervisor development has been measured quantitatively. For the 13 quantitative/mixed method studies in Table 2, and 2 measurement studies in Table 4, 11 of the 15 used the PSDS. Yet in many respects, this measure has yet to be proven. What we know about the PSDS is:

- (1) The original exploratory factor analysis supported use of the PSDS as a one-factor, global measure of supervisor development (Watkins et al., 1995), but a later confirmatory factor analysis supported a four-factor structure instead (Barnes & Moon, 2006).
- (2) In other studies, support for the PSDS as a global (as opposed to four-factor) supervisor development measure has been voiced (e.g., Baker et al., 2002; Bencivenne, 1999; Hillman et al., 1997), but none of those studies was factor analytic in nature.
- (3) Some support for the test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities of the PSDS has been reported (Bencivenne, 1999; Hillman et al., 1997; Watkins et al., 1995).

- (4) No study as yet has involved validating the PSDS with any sort of developmentally sensitive measures or markers (e.g., changes in supervisor behaviors, conceptual framework, or intentions over time).
- (5) Criticisms of the PSDS have included its unclear factor structure, tendency toward skewing of scores, restriction of range, and possible social desirability effect (e.g., Bencivenne, 1999; Vieceli, 2006).

Further validation efforts clearly seem needed if this measure is to be confidently used in supervisor development research; the data about the PSDS present a somewhat mixed picture. Furthermore, if this scale is to be used to assess supervisor development, it seems supremely important to keep in mind what it provides: At its best, the PSDS is a measure of *self-perceived supervisor development* and nothing more. While that perceptual variable surely has a place in research study, the extent to which (or even if) perceived supervisor development relates to actual supervisor development is a question without empirical answer at the moment. Until we have a more solid supervisor development research measure to use, that question will unfortunately have to wait quantitatively.

Perhaps if there is one preeminent obstacle to progress to be identified here, it would have to be measurement. Our research is only as good as our research measures, and in psychotherapy supervisor development, we are left with little upon which to draw. While measurement has been and continues to be a serious problem in supervision research generally (Ellis, D'Iuso, & Ladany, 2008; Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Watkins, 1998, 2011), it would seem to be particularly acute in supervisor development. Until some remedy is forthcoming, quantitative study may well be stymied. Until that remedy arrives, and it is something on which we can be now working, the recommendation of Majcher and Daniluk (2009) for qualitative study of supervisor development seems all the more apropos.

As a final limitation to mention about this body of research, the vast majority of the studied supervisors was Caucasian (83%). We know little, then, about supervisors of other ethnicities. If study of supervisor development is to advance, efforts to be more inclusive with regard to diversity would also seem critically important.

Thoughts on Practice and Education

In the learning and practice of psychotherapy supervision, data over the past 15 years have seemed to converge with relative consistency on the following point: Training in supervision matters (Baker et al. 2002; Ben-

civenne, 1999; Lyon et al., 2008; Pelling, 2008; Stevens et al., 1997; Vidlak, 2002; Viecele, 2006; Ybrandt & Armelius, 2009). Not that long ago, supervision training was far more the rarity than reality. Hoffman (1994) even once referred to the lack of supervision training as the mental health profession's "dirty little secret." But considerable change in thinking seems to have occurred about the importance of supervision training since the mid-'90s, and we now see such training being more readily available, required, or at least recommended across the disciplines of psychology, psychiatry, psychiatric nursing, social work, and psychoanalysis (e.g., American Psychological Association, 2009; Cutcliffe, Hyrkas, & Fowler, 2011; Munson, 2001; Pegeron, 2008; Riess & Herman, 2008; Szecsody, 2008; Whitman, Ryan, & Rubenstein, 2001). Data from these supervisor development studies seem to reflect nicely and be supportive of that shift in thinking about supervision.

But why should supervision training really make that much difference? In his now classic review, Worthington (1987) brought to light the possibility that "[s]upervisors do not become more competent as they gain experience" (p. 203). As he stated,

Unwilling as we might be to accept it, most supervisors simply might not improve with experience. One reason for this might be that supervisors have little training in how to supervise effectively and thus may perpetuate the mistakes of their own supervisors. . . . Mere experience might be insufficient to enable one to view one's work objectively or to take different perspectives on one's work (p. 206).

That conclusion, which was based on only four studies at the time, has tended to be confirmed by a number of subsequent research investigations. It indeed seems increasingly likely, as Milne and James (2002) have indicated, that "[c]ompetence in supervision appears to require training" (p. 55), and recent research about the potential benefits of structured supervisor training programs seems to offer some support for their statement as well (see Milne, 2010; Sundin, Ogren, & Boethius, 2008). We seem to have arrived ever more so at the conviction that "... experience, without formal training in supervision, is insufficient as a basis for reliably producing those behaviors and values . . . that . . . will enhance the supervisory relationship" (Stevens et al., 1997, p. 87).

As a part of the supervision training experience, the supervision of supervision process has also been brought into focus in some of these reviewed studies (Baker et al., 2002; Lyons et al., 2008; Majcher & Daniluk, 2009; Nelson et al., 2006; Vidlak, 2002; Ybrandt & Armelius, 2009). The results have appeared to offer some support for the potential

complementary value of supervisor trainees having their work supervised. For decades now, professional opinion has tended to converge on the importance of both didactic and experiential components in the training of psychotherapy supervisors (see Borders, 2010; Falender et al., 2004; Hoffman, 1994; Kaiser & Kuechler, 2008; Russell & Petrie, 1994; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2009; Watkins, 1992; Whitman et al., 2001). But the supervision of supervision process has often seemed to be shortchanged.

Almost 20 years ago, Ellis and Douce (1994) summed up the state of supervisor supervision as follows: “The scarcity of information regarding the practice of supervising supervisor trainees is particularly apparent . . . only a handful of published articles address the topic . . . and none explicitly detail the practices involved” (p. 520). Watkins (1995b) concurred: “. . . the supervision of supervision process . . . is something about which virtually nothing is known . . . (p. 677). Rodenhauer (1997) opined shortly thereafter that “[s]upervision of psychotherapy supervisors is uncommon” (italics in original; p. 539). While those statements still largely ring true today, there at least appears to be increasing recognition of the reality that—just as psychotherapists in training can benefit from and need their psychotherapy supervised—supervisors in training can benefit from and need their supervision supervised as well. Across disciplines, we seem to be increasingly moving toward an expanding professional vision of effective supervision training—characterized by a mixture of organized, systematic coursework and/or seminars and sustained practical supervisor supervision experiences. In my view, that vision is a welcome change in perspective that ultimately can have immensely positive ramifications for supervisor trainees, their supervisees, and the patients that they serve. Perhaps the reality of supervision training opportunities will come to eventually match our rhetoric about need for supervision training and supervisor supervision. That at least seems to be a worthy objective which we can continue to vigorously pursue in the decades that lie ahead.

With the importance of supervisor training/supervision increasingly recognized and embraced, it also seems worth emphasizing that: Supervisor learning, education, growth, and development should not stop after having received some training in the fundamentals of how to supervise (Goin, 2006). Ideally, supervisor development is an active, vital, lifelong educational process and commitment that is joyously and relentlessly pursued with vigor and determination. Ongoing supervisory growth is most apt to happen when ongoing deliberate efforts are made to challenge and cultivate supervision skills and perspectives over time. Supervisory

skills and vision, when not subjected to such deliberate efforts, can indeed become mired in a complacency that is antipathetic to the very spirit of supervisor development.

Discussion Summary

In surveying this first generation of psychotherapy supervisor development theory, research/measurement, and practice/education, some of the primary points to emerge were:

- (1) Supervisor development theory, whether adhering to a stage model perspective or some alternative approach, needs to be rendered more precise, defined, and specific in its content and description.
- (2) Supervisor development research offers some support for the following propositions: (a) supervisors tend to proceed through some type of progressively unfolding supervisor growth process, where some skill and identity enhancement seem to accrue, and (b) supervisors often struggle with some of the same key developmental issues during that growth process.
- (3) Systematic research about supervisor development, though difficult and eminently challenging, has been absent and is sorely needed; so far, all supervisor development research has been of the “one and done” variety.
- (4) Reliable, valid measures of supervisor development are lacking; that lack, perhaps the most significant stumbling block to research advancement in supervisor development, needs to be substantively addressed and remedied; if the PSDS is to be used in supervisor development research, then its validity needs to be much more thoroughly scrutinized.
- (5) Because supervisor development research is still in its infancy, qualitative investigation may provide the most viable avenue by which to productively pursue this area of study at this time.
- (6) In providing competent supervisory practice, supervision training appears to be requisite—experience in and of itself seemingly is not enough; the ideal supervisor training experience, at least as we now think about it, involves a combination of supervision coursework and/or seminars and sustained supervision of supervision practice.

CONCLUSION

The reach of the psychotherapy supervisor is broad, far, and affecting. In the supervision training experience, supervisors strive to enhance the learning and development of their supervisees and, accordingly, their supervisees' patients. It is well recognized that the potential influence of the supervisor on the development of budding psychotherapists can be both considerable and enduring. But what do we really know about the actual development of psychotherapy supervisors themselves? In this paper, I have examined that question by reviewing the last generation of supervisor development theory, research, and practice. In my opinion, if we are to have the most complete and informed understanding of the supervision process, its outcome, and its participants, then we need a vision of supervision that gives voice to and incorporates the intersecting developmental processes, trajectories, and experiences of the supervisee *and* supervisor. Unfortunately, the developmental process, trajectory, and experiences of the supervisor have remained more mystery than manifest for far too long. As I have hoped to show here, that can change, and work done thus far nicely identifies needs that require redress and provides some constructive direction for remediation and advancement. From my perspective, the study of supervisor development—though still in its infancy—is an area punctuated by much promise and empirical possibility. The somewhat “barren scape” of supervisor development need not stand. The developmental interior of the psychotherapy supervisor has the potential to be charted and better understood, and our vision of the supervision experience has the possibility of being accordingly transformed.

REFERENCES

- Alonso, A. (1983). A developmental theory of psychodynamic supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 1 (1), 23-36.
- Alonso, A. (1985). *The quiet profession: Supervisors of psychotherapy*. New York: Macmillan.
- American Psychological Association, and Commission on Accreditation (2009). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation in professional psychology*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Baker, S.B., Exum, H.A., & Tyler, R.E. (2002). The developmental process of clinical supervisors in training: An investigation of the Supervisor Complexity Model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 42, 15-30.
- Barnes, K. L. (2002). *Development and initial validation of a measure of counselor supervisor self-efficacy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.
- Barnes, K.L., & Moon, S.M. (2006). Factor structure of the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 39, 130-140.
- Bencivenne, J.C. (1999). *An investigation of professional supervisor and supervisee development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, New Jersey.
- Bernard, J.M., & Goodyear, R. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Blair, K.L., & Peake, T.H. (1995). Stages of supervisor development. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 13 (2), 119-126. doi: 10.1300/J001v13n02_09
- Borders, L. D. (2010). Principles of best practices for clinical supervision training programs. In J. R. Culbreth & L. L. Brown (Eds.), *State of the art in clinical supervision* (pp. 127-150). New York: Routledge.
- Chagoya, L., & Chagoya, C. (1994). The development of a psychotherapy supervisor. In S.G. Greben & R. Ruskin (Eds.), *Clinical perspectives on psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 189-209). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Cohen, L.L., & Lim, C.S. (2008). The transition from supervisee to supervisor. In A.K. Hess, K.D. Hess, & T.H. Hess (Eds.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.; pp. 82-93). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Cooper, H. M. (1989). *Integrating research: A guide for literature reviews* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Culbreth, J. R., & Cooper, J. B. (2008). Factors impacting the development of substance abuse counseling supervisors. *Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling*, 29, 22-35.
- Cutcliffe, J. R., Hyrkas, K., & Fowler, J. (Eds.). *Routledge handbook of clinical supervision*. New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, M. V. (2010). Bridging the science and practice of clinical supervision: Some discoveries, some misconceptions. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 29, 95-116. doi: 10.1080/07325221003741910
- Ellis, M.V., D'Iuso, N., & Ladany, N. (2008). State of the art in the assessment, measurement, and evaluation of clinical supervision. In A.K. Hess, K.D. Hess, & T.H. Hess (Eds.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., p. 473-499). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Ellis, M.V., & Ladany, N. (1997). Inferences concerning supervisees and clients in clinical supervision: An integrative review. In C.E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 447-507). New York: Wiley.
- Falender, C.A., Cornish, J.A.E., Goodyear, R.K., Hatcher, R., Kaslow, N.J., Leventhal, G., Shafranske, E., Sigmon, S., Stoltzenberg, C., & Grus, C. (2004). Defining competencies in psychology supervision: A consensus statement. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 60, 771-785. doi: 10.1002/jclp.20013
- Falender, C.A., & Shafranske, E.P. (2004). *Clinical supervision: A competency-based approach*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Goin, M.K. (2006). Improving supervisory skills: An exercise in lifelong learning. In J.H. Gold (Ed.), *Psychotherapy supervision and consultation in clinical practice* (pp. 73-81). New York: Aronson.
- Granello, D. H., Kindsvatter, A., Granello, P. F., Underfer-Babalis, J., & Moorhead, H. J. H. (2008). Multiple perspectives in supervision: Using a peer consultation model to enhance supervisor development. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 48, 32-47.
- Grant, J., & Schofield, M. (2007). Career-long supervision: Patterns and perspectives. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 7, 3-11. doi: 10.1080/147331140601140899
- Heid, L. (1997). Supervisor development across the professional lifespan. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 16, 139-152. doi: 10.1300/j001v16n02_09
- Hess, A.K. (1986). Growth in supervision: Stages of supervisee and supervisor development. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 4 (1), 51-67. doi: 10.1300/J001v04n01_04
- Hess, A. K. (1987). Psychotherapy supervision: Stages, Buber, and a theory of relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18, 251-259. doi: 10.1037//0735-7028.18.3.251
- Hess, A.K., Hess, K.D., & Hess, T.H. (Eds.). (2008). *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hillman, S.L. (1996). *Further validation of the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale*. Unpublished candidacy paper, University of Houston.
- Hillman, S.L., McPherson, R.H., Swank, P.R., Watkins, Jr., C.E. (1998). Further validation of the Psychotherapy Supervisor Development Scale. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 17 (1), 17-32. doi: 10.1300/J001v17n01_02
- Hoffman, L. W. (1994). The training of psychotherapy supervisors: A barren scape. *Psychotherapy in Private Practice*, 13, 23-42.
- Holloway, E. L. (1987) Developmental models of supervision: Is it development? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18, 209-216. doi: 10.1037//0735-7028.18.3.209
- Inman, A.G., & Ladany, N. (2008). Research: The state of the field. In A.K. Hess, K.D. Hess, & T.H.

Development of the Psychotherapy Supervisor

- Hess (Eds.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 500-517). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Kaiser, T. L., & Kuechler, C. F. (2008). Training supervisors of practitioners: Analysis of efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 27, 76-96. doi: 10.1080/07325220802221538
- Kurdt, K. A. (2001). *Supervisor development, style, and links to the supervision and counseling processes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Lyon, R. C., Heppler, A., Leavitt, L., & Fisher, L. (2008). Supervisory training experiences and overall supervisory development in predoctoral interns. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 27, 268-284. doi: 10.1080/07325220802490877
- Majcher, J. M. (2001). *The experience of becoming a clinical supervisor*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia (Canada).
- Majcher, J., & Daniluk, J.C. (2009). The process of becoming a supervisor for students in a doctoral supervision training course. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 3, 63-71. doi: 10.1037/a0014470
- Miars, R. D., Tracey, T. J., Ray, P. B., Cornfeld, J. L., O'Farrell, M., & Gelso, C. J. (1983). Variation in supervision process across trainee experience levels. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30, 403-412. doi: 10.1037//0022-0167.30.3.403
- Milne, D.L. (2007). An empirical definition of clinical supervision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 46, 437-447. doi: 10.1348/014466507x197415
- Milne, D. L. (2010). Can we enhance the training of clinical supervisors? A national pilot study of an evidence-based approach. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 17, 321-328. doi: 10.1002/cpp.657
- Milne, D. L., & James, I. A. (2002). The observed impact of training on competence in clinical supervision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 41, 55-72.
- Munson, C. (2001). *Handbook of clinical social work supervision* (3rd ed.). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.
- Nelson, K. W., Oliver, M., & Capps, F. (2006). Becoming a supervisor: Doctoral student perceptions of the training experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 46, 17-31.
- Pegeron, J. (2008). A course on the supervisory process for candidates. . . and supervisors: An attempt to address inconsistencies in psychoanalytic education and fundamental paradox of psychoanalytic training. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 28, 344-360. doi: 10.1080/07351690801962406
- Pelling, N.J. (2000). *Supervisory identity development and its relationship to supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision*. Unpublished dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.
- Pelling, N.J. (2008). The relationship of supervisory experience, counseling experience, and training in supervision to supervisory development. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 30, 235-248. doi: 10.1007/s-008-9060-2
- Pelling, N., & Agostinelli, A. (2009). Supervisor development. In N. Pelling, J. Bartlett, & P. Armstrong (Eds.), *The practice of clinical supervision* (pp. 201-211). Bowen Hills, Australia: Australia Academic Press.
- Rapisarda, C. A., Desmond, K. J., & Nelson, J. R. (2011). Student reflections on the journey to being a supervisor. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 30, 109-123. doi: 10.1080/07325223.2011.564958
- Rau, D. R. (2002). Advanced trainees supervising junior trainees. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 21, 115-124. doi: 10.1300/j001v21n01_09
- Riess, H. & Herman, J. B. (2008). Teaching the teachers: A model course for psychodynamic psychotherapy supervisors. *Academic Psychiatry*, 32, 259-264. doi: 10.1176/appi.ap.32.3.259
- Rodenhauser, P. (1994). Toward a multidimensional model for psychotherapy supervision based on developmental stages. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research*, 3, 1-15.
- Rodenhauser, P. (1997). Psychotherapy supervision: Prerequisites and problems in the process. In C.E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 527-548). New York: Wiley.
- Rønnestad, M. H., Orlinsky, D. E., Parks, B. K., Davis, J. D., & Society for Psychotherapy Research Collaborative Research Network (1997). Supervisors of psychotherapy: Mapping experience level and supervisory confidence. *European Psychologist*, 2, 191-201. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.2.3.191
- Russell, R.K., & Petrie, T. (1994). Issues in training effective supervisors. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 3, 27-42. doi: 10.1016/S0962-1849(05)80106-4

- Stevens, D.T. (1994). *Supervisory development: A study of C.E. Watkins' model of development in clinical supervisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Stevens, D. T., Goodyear, R., & Robertson, P. (1997). Supervisory development: An exploratory study in stance and emphasis. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 16 (2), 73-88. doi: 10.1300/J001v16n02_05
- Stoltenberg, C. (2005). Enhancing professional competence through developmental approaches to supervision. *American Psychologist*, 60, 857-864. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.8.85
- Stoltenberg, C.D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stoltenberg, C.D., McNeill, B., & Delworth, U. (1997). *The IDM: The Integrated Development Model of clinical supervision*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stoltenberg, C.D., & McNeill, B. (2009). *The IDM: A developmental approach to supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sundin, E.C., Ogren, M., & Boethius, S. B. (2008). Supervisor trainees' and their supervisors' perceptions of attainment of knowledge and skills: An empirical evaluation of a psychotherapy supervisor training program. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 381-396. doi:10.1348/014466508x304414
- Szecsody, I. (2008). Does anything go in psychoanalytic supervision? *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, 28, 373-386. doi:10.1080/07351690801962455
- Thomas, J. (2010). *Ethical and legal issues in supervision and consultation*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Vidlak, N. W. (2002). *Identifying important factors in supervisor development: An examination of supervisor experience, training, and attributes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Vieceli, V. E. (2006). *A comparison of supervisor development and supervision emphasis of academic and on-site supervisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbon-dale.
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1990). Development of the psychotherapy supervisor. *Psychotherapy*, 27, 553-560. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.27.4.553
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1992). Reflections on the preparation of psychotherapy supervisors. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47, 145-147. doi: 10.1002/1097-4679 (199201)48:1::AID-JCLP22704801213.0.CO;2-5
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1993). Development of the psychotherapy supervisor: Concepts, assumptions, and hypotheses of the Supervisor Complexity Model. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 47, 58-74.
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1994). The supervision of psychotherapy supervisor trainees. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 48, 417-431.
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1995a). Considering psychotherapy supervisor development: A status report. *The Psychotherapy Bulletin*, 29(4), 32-34.
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1995b). Psychotherapy supervisor and supervisee: Developmental models and research nine years later. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 15, 647-680. doi: 10.1016/0272-7358 (95) 00038-Q
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1995c). Psychotherapy supervisor development: On musings, models, and metaphor. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research*, 4, 150-158.
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1995d). Researching psychotherapy supervisor development: Four key considerations. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 13(2), 111-118. doi: 10.1300/J001v13n02_08
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (Ed.). (1997a). *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision*. New York: Wiley.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1997b). The ineffective psychotherapy supervisor: Some reflections about bad behaviors, poor process, and offensive outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 16(1), 163-180.
- Watkins, C.E., Jr. (1998). Psychotherapy supervision in the 21st century: Some pressing needs and impressing possibilities. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research*, 7, 93-101.
- Watkins, C. E. Jr. (2011). Psychotherapy supervision since 1909: Some friendly observations about its first century. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 41, 57-67. doi: 10.1007/s10879-010-9152-2
- Watkins, C.E., Jr., Schneider, L.J., Haynes, J., & Nieberding, R. (1995). Measuring psychotherapy supervisor development: An initial effort at scale development and validation. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 13(1), 77-90. doi: 10.1300/J001v13n01_06
- White, K. E. (1997). *Becoming a supervisor: An intensive study of the early development of clinical supervisors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba (Canada).

Development of the Psychotherapy Supervisor

- Whitman, S.M., Ryan, B., & Rubenstein, D.F. (2001). Psychotherapy supervisor training: Differences between psychiatry and other mental health disciplines. *Academic Psychiatry, 25*, 156-161. doi: 10.1176/appi.ap.25.3.156
- Worthington, E.L., Jr. (1987). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience: A review. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 189-208. doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.18.3.189
- Ybrandt, H. & Armelius, K. (2009). Changes in self-image in a psychotherapy supervisor training program. *The Clinical Supervisor, 28*, 113-123. doi: 10.1080/0732522090334381