Eurasian Journal of Educational Research
www.ejer.com.tr

Turkish Undergraduate Supervisees' Views Regarding Supervisory Relationship

Betul MEYDAN[1], Serkan DENIZLI[2]

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Purpose: The supervisory relationship plays a pivotal role in clinical supervision. It is important for supervisors and researchers to identify factors regarding a strong supervisory relationship. In the international literature, research found that various factors influence the supervisory relationship. However, research is limited regarding supervisory relationship in undergraduate counselor education in Turkey. Therefore, the aim of this study was to examine Turkish undergraduate supervisees' views regarding supervisory relationship.

Research Methods: Case study design was used in this study. Participants were selected with maximum variation and extreme case sampling methods. Twelve undergraduate supervisees participated in individual semi-structured interviews. The data were analyzed by content analysis.

Findings: The content analysis indicated three main categories: the quality of the relationship, supervisee and supervisor characteristics that likely influence the relationship, and the outcomes of the relationship.

Implications for Research and Practice: Based on the findings of this study, the most obvious implication is that the supervisory relationship is one of the key components of supervision, and in order to improve the quality of this relationship, developmental needs and expectations of supervisees, as well as supervisors' own variables affecting the relationship, should be carefully taken into consideration by supervisors. We also hope that this attempt to explore the supervisory relationship in Turkey enterprises will encourage researchers for further studies, which will be intended to use different research designs that include collecting data at different sessions of supervision from different universities, thus indicating a way for supervisors to develop strong supervisory relationship with supervisees.

---

[1] Corresponding author: Ege University, TURKEY, betul.meydan@ege.edu.tr, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-9978-6255

[2] Ege University, TURKEY, serkan.denizli@ege.edu.tr, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-8623-841X

Introduction

The supervisory relationship plays a pivotal role in clinical supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Borders & Brown, 2005; Bordin, 1983). Research on clinical supervision has indicated that the supervisory relationship is one of the most important variables related to the effectiveness of supervision (Beinart, 2014; Nelson & Friedlander, 2001; Worthen & McNeill, 1996). Many researchers have claimed that a strong relationship, in which supervisees feel supported and safe, is essential for the personal and professional development of supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Campbell, 2000). In contrast, when supervisees feel unsupported and unsafe in weak relationships, they can lose self-confidence; be reluctant to engage in self-disclosure; and be unwilling to try new skills, techniques, and strategies (Ellis, 2010; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996; Nelson & Friedlander, 2001). Therefore, identifying components of a strong supervisory relationship, along with factors related to such a relationship, is important for supervisors and researchers.

The supervisory relationship has become an important variable in the supervision literature since the studies of Bordin (e.g., 1979; 1983) in the beginning of the 1980s. Bordin (1983) conceptualized the supervisory relationship as a supervisory working alliance and highlighted the components of this alliance as goals, tasks, and emotional bond. Based on these components, a caring emotional bond between supervisee and supervisor is an inseparable part of a strong supervisory relationship. According to Bordin, establishing and strengthening the supervisory relationship is related to: a strong emotional bond, deciding and revising (if necessary) mutual supervisory goals during the supervisory relationship, and implementing the necessary tasks to achieve these supervisory goals. In pursuit of Bordin's studies regarding the components of the supervisory working alliance, later research has found that various factors affect the supervisory relationship. Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) reported that the frequency of supervisor's self-disclosure was positively related to the supervision working alliance. Magnuson, Wilcoxon, and Norem (2000) pointed out that supervisor's sensitivity to the supervisee's developmental level had a positive impact on the supervisory relationship. Similarly, Ramos-Sanchez et al. (2002) found a positive correlation between developmental levels of supervisees and the supervision working alliance. Ladany et al. (2012) defined effective supervisors as ones who support the autonomy of supervisees, develop the supervisory relationship, and facilitate discussion in supervision.

Researchers have also focused on the effects of the supervisory relationship. For example, Hutt, Scott, and King (1983) found that supervisees who defined their supervisory relationship as negative reported higher levels of intense negative emotions, such as anxiety, frustration, and anger. These emotions resulted in mistrust and disrespect in the supervisory relationship, reluctance to engage in honest self-disclosure in supervision, and less satisfaction in meeting developmental needs. Additionally, Horrocks and Smaby (2006) found that the supervision working alliance also predicted the personal and skill development of supervisees. In conclusion, research showed that the supervisory relationship explains much in defining supervision outcomes.

In Turkey, counselors are predominantly trained in four-year undergraduate programs, culminating in a bachelor's degree. Turkish universities also offer graduate programs at the master's and doctoral levels. Presently, there are 60 bachelor's programs (Atlas of Undergraduate Programs, 2017), 21 master's programs, and 15 doctoral programs (Yesilyaprak, 2012) in Turkey. It can be stated that Turkey is one of the few countries that trains counselors through both undergraduate and graduate counselor-education programs. Undergraduate counselor education is especially important in Turkey, since a bachelor's degree is enough to be employed in public and private institutions; the number of the counselors awarded a bachelor's degree each year is larger than those at other levels. In other words, practitioner counselors are mainly trained at the undergraduate level. For this reason, the supervision process during undergraduate education and practicum experiences is crucial.

Most counselor trainees receive supervision for the first time at the undergraduate level in Turkey before they practice or are employed. Since there is no obligatory internship for Turkish counselors, the supervision they receive during their undergraduate education could be the only formal supervision they receive before or during their practice, unless they enroll in a graduate program or some kind of further in-service training. Hence, many researchers have focused on clinical supervision in Turkey, since the role of supervision with undergraduate trainees is critical to training counselors in Turkey. Research related to supervision in Turkey includes such topics as supervision models (Koc, 2013; Meydan, 2015), supervision methods (Aladag & Bektas, 2009; Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011; Denizli, Aladag, Bektas, Cihangir-Cankaya, & Ozeke-Kocabas, 2009), the effects of supervision (Aladag & Bektas, 2009; Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011; Denizli et al., 2009; Koc, 2013; Meydan, 2015), and experiences of undergraduate counselor trainees (Aladag, 2014; Aladag & Kemer, 2016; Ilhan, Rahat, & Yontem, 2015; Ulker-Tumlu, Balkaya-Cetin, & Kurtyilmaz, 2015).

In our review, we found that some studies focusing on different aspects of supervision included findings related to the supervisory relationship in Turkey. For example, Aladag (2014) reported that first-time supervisees needed more positive and supportive supervisory relationships than advanced supervisees, and negative supervisor behaviors hindered the supervisory relationship at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Ilhan et al. (2015) pointed out that positive and sincere supervisor behaviors facilitated the supervisory relationship according to undergraduate supervisees. Aladag and Kemer (2016) indicated that undergraduate supervisees defined the supervisory relationship as intimate, warm, sincere, and trustworthy. Briefly, these findings indicated that the supervisory relationship has an important role for Turkish undergraduate supervisees, particularly those who receive supervision for the first time.

Because research is limited regarding supervisory relationships in undergraduate counselor education in Turkey, and the supervision relationship is one of the most important factors contributing to the outcome of supervision, the purpose of the present study was to examine Turkish undergraduate supervisees' views regarding the supervisory relationship. In this context, the research question was: What are undergraduate supervisees' views regarding the supervisory relationship?

Investigating the supervisory relationship with Turkish undergraduate supervisees would give clues to supervisors about the nature of their supervision relationship, especially with first-time supervisees at similar ages and experience levels. It is also believed that findings of the present study about the factors related to supervisory relationships for first-time supervisees in Turkey will encourage researchers to further study the supervisory relationship, which is one of the most important variables for supervision outcome.

Method

Research Design

A case study design was used in this study. Case study design is used to investigate a new phenomenon within its real-life context (Yin, 2003). The case investigated in this study was the views of undergraduate supervisees concerning the supervisory relationship in the Individual Counseling Practice course. Within the Individual Counseling Practice course, supervision was provided in groups. Supervisees were assigned to 6 supervisors and consequently to 6 supervision groups (13-15 supervisees per group) during the fall semester of the 2015-2016 academic year. Each supervisor divided their group of supervisees into two subgroups, which included 6-8 supervisees, and then carried out supervision sessions with these two small groups. Supervisees were expected to provide counseling for at least 10 sessions with clients throughout the semester and to present one counseling session in each supervision session. Supervisees audio- or video-recorded all counseling sessions and (prior to the supervision session) completed a session-report form. They were also required to transcribe 5 of the 10 sessions. Prior to the supervision, supervisors read the forms and transcripts and (if necessary) listened to or watched the recordings. The semester lasted for 14 weeks; supervisees met with their supervisors once per week, and every supervision session lasted for 5 academic hours. During the group supervision meetings, each supervisee received 15-20 minutes on average of individual attention, but all supervisees stayed in the supervision group during the supervision session, and supervisees were encouraged to discuss cases or give feedback to other supervisees.

Participants

Maximum variation sampling method and extreme case sampling method were preferred for participant selection (Patton, 1990). The pool of participants from which interviewees were selected included 84 undergraduate supervisees (71 female, 13 male) enrolled in the Individual Counseling Practice course in the guidance and counseling undergraduate program of a state university located in western Turkey, during the fall semester of the 2015-2016 academic year. First, maximum variation sampling method was used to gather data from undergraduate supervisees who were in supervisory relationships with separate supervisors, who have separate supervisory-relationship characteristics. This method increases the reliability of the results obtained from various cases (Yildirim & Simsek, 2013). Thus, researchers

ensured the variety of undergraduate supervisees' opinions in terms of the supervisory relationship. Nevertheless, extreme cases sampling method, which provides an opportunity to learn from intense examples of phenomena (Yildirim & Simsek, 2013), was also used to obtain data from undergraduate supervisees. Extreme cases sampling was utilized by researchers, since it can be claimed that a strong supervisory relationship is highly desired by supervisors and that supervisors naturally avoid establishing weak relationships with supervisees. Therefore, supervisees with strong relationships with their supervisors were expected to reveal more information about the nature of a desired supervisory relationship, whereas supervisees with weak supervisory relationships may reveal information about undesired elements of a supervisory relationship. Hence, supervisees evaluated the effectiveness of their supervision with the Turkish form of the Supervision Questionnaire-Short Form (SQ-SF; Denizli, 2010) at the end of the semester, so that researchers could identify extreme cases based on their evaluations.

Briefly, the SQ-SF is a 14-item scale consisting of three subscales, named *Technical Help, Support*, and *Usage of the Supervision Process*. The *Support* subscale of the SQ-SF focuses partly on the supervisory relationship. Hence, SQ-SF scores provided both evaluations of supervision outcome based on the supervisee's perception as well as some aspects of the quality of the supervisory relationship based on the supervisee's perception. Researchers chose to use SQ-SF since no other instruments could evaluate good or poor supervisory relationships for the time that the study was in action. Thus, SQ-SF scores were used to identify extreme cases of both effective and ineffective supervisee evaluations about supervision, also including a supportive supervisory relationship. Two supervisees were selected from each supervision group; the supervisee with the highest score and the supervisee with the lowest score within their groups. As a result, a total of 10 female and 2 male undergraduate supervisees participated in the study. Their consent to participate in the study was obtained with a written informed-consent form. In addition, supervisors were informed about the study, and their consent was obtained before the interviews. Age of supervisees ranged from 22 to 24, and the mean age was 23.08 (*SD*=.51). Their counseling experience ranged from 9 to 14 counseling sessions under supervision, and none of them had prior counseling or supervision experience. Demographic characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

Participants	Gender	Age	Number of Clients	Counseling Experience (Number of Sessions)	Supervision Experience (Number of Sessions)
S1	Male	23	1	9	9
S2	Female	23	2	10	9
S3	Female	23	1	10	10
S4	Female	22	1	11	11
S5	Male	23	1	12	12
S6	Female	24	1	14	14
S7	Female	23	1	11	10
S8	Female	23	1	12	12
S9	Female	23	2	11	11
S10	Female	24	2	14	14
S11	Female	23	1	11	11
S12	Female	23	1	11	11

Research Instruments and Procedures

The data were collected through semi-structured interviews. Following Patton's (1990) recommendations, we reviewed the existing supervision literature to create a question pool. The questions were evaluated by three experts who had doctoral degrees in counseling and were experienced in qualitative research methods. The researchers revised the questions on the basis of the experts' feedback. The interview form included questions such as "What do you think about the quality of the supervisory relationship with your supervisor?", "Could you mention the factors that contributed to or hindered your supervisory relationship? Could you give me some specific examples?", "In your opinion, what was the most effective/ineffective part of your supervision, and how did this affect your supervisory relationship?", "If you could define your supervisory relationship with only one word, which word would you choose? Why?", "What recommendations would you make for your supervisor for his/her future supervisees?"

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by using content analysis. Following Schreier's (2014) recommendations, the specific steps used in this study are presented below.

Data preparation. All interviews were conducted by one of the authors, who had prior experience in qualitative research. Each interview was video recorded and lasted approximately 30-40 minutes. Subsequently, all interviews were transcribed with the interview questions asked by the researcher, and transcripts were identified with codes (e.g., "S1, S2…S12").

Building a coding frame. A concept-driven way was combined with a data-driven way for building a coding frame. First, in accordance with the concept-driven way, the researcher created categories based on supervision literature and developmental supervision models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Second, transcripts were continuously read and themes were added by using the data-driven way. Third, categories were named, such as "quality of the relationship", "supervisee and supervisor characteristics that likely influence the relationship", and "the outcomes of the relationship"; themes and codes were also named, and specific examples regarding these themes and codes were found by the researchers for the sake of definition. Finally, all categories, themes, and codes were revised, and the coding frame was finalized by the researchers.

Segmentation. In this step, the data set was divided into meaningful data units by thematic criteria (Rustemeyer, 1992, as cited in Schreier, 2014). In other words, the researcher read the transcripts twice without interruption, paid attention to topic changes within the transcripts, and tried to provide the best fit between the data units and the coding frame.

Trial coding. The researchers, and an auditor with a doctoral degree in counseling and experience with supervision and qualitative research, independently coded the transcripts. They entered all codings into a coding sheet.

Evaluating and modifying the coding frame. The researchers and the auditor discussed their own codings via the coding sheet. Next, the coding frame was finalized for the main analysis.

Main analysis. According to the coding frame, the researchers coded all interviews without making any changes on the coding frame. Subsequently, the authors checked and discussed the results of coding (via data matrix) as to whether the coding was suitable for answering the research question of the study. They made revisions (if necessary) before finalizing the analysis.

Presenting the findings. After the categories, themes, and codes were decided as suitable for answering the research question of the study, representative quotations were selected from the transcripts. To ensure variance in the representative quotations, contradictory statements of supervisees were also included. Representative quotations were translated from Turkish to English. To prevent minor errors in representing the participants' views, a native speaker was asked to provide his/her views on the translated quotations.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was ensured in this study with certain precautions, based on the interpretivist paradigm (Merriam, 1998). For credibility (internal validity), the researchers: a) used open-ended interview questions and semi-structured interviews for *in-depth data collection and prolonged engagement in each interview*; b) revised the interview form and coding frame after consulting with several researchers, who were experts in clinical supervision and qualitative research, as *expert opinion* precaution; c) conducted *peer review* in conceptual discussions; d) audio-recorded all interviews and

made detailed transcriptions, which were checked by undergraduate supervisees for *member checking* process; and e) used *researcher triangulation* to confirm the persuasiveness and consistency of the results. For transferability (external validity), the researchers used: a) *purposive sampling methods*, such as maximum variation sampling method and extreme cases sampling method, to determine both the typical events and the different characteristics among these events; b) detailed descriptions of supervisees' characteristics and the theoretical framework of the study, as *thick description* precaution; and c) *direct quotations* without making any comments. For dependability (internal reliability), researchers spent sufficient time in *in-depth data coding*, and expert feedback was sought out to ensure the consistency of the data coding. Lastly, for confirmability (external reliability), the researchers described the theoretical framework of the study, supervisees' characteristics, data collection process, data analysis, and results in detail.

Results

The content analysis of the study indicated three main categories: (a) the quality of the relationship, (b) supervisee and supervisor characteristics that likely influence the relationship, and (c) the outcomes of the relationship. The summary of categories, themes, codes, and frequencies of the study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Categories, Themes, Codes, and Frequencies

Categories, Themes, and Codes	Respondents
Quality of the relationship	
Strong	7
Weak	5
Supervisee and supervisor characteristics that likely influence the relationship	
Supervisee's characteristics	
Basic developmental needs	10
Intermediate developmental needs	3
Supervisor's characteristics	
Roles	2
Attitudes	3
Personal characteristics	11
Interventions	12
Feedback	11
Time management	8
The outcomes of the relationship	
Attitudes	6
Feelings	5

Note. N=12. Respondents indicate the number of cases.

The Quality of the Relationship

Two themes emerged that described the quality of the relationship. The supervisees who stated that they had developed a *strong* (*n*=7) supervisory relationship described their supervisor as warm, friendly, sincere, relaxed, supportive, secure, confrontational (when necessary), and instructive. One supervisee expressed his/her opinions this way: "What does my supervisor mean to me? For instance, while I was riding my bicycle, my father used to hold me… my supervisor might be him. I mean, my supervisor supported me while I was learning to ride a two-wheel bicycle."

Those who reported a *weak* (*n*=5) supervisory relationship described their supervisors as formal, distant, ineffective, insincere, disruptive, extremely instructive, hard, unstable, disappointing, and irritating. One of these supervisees pointed out that: "I define my supervision as a course… To me, it didn't mean anything to me except a course. Our relationship was irritating. I would never feel relaxed and peaceful in that relationship".

Supervisee and Supervisor Characteristics that Likely İnfluence the Relationship

Supervisee characteristics. Supervisee's developmental needs were readily classified as *basic* (*n*=10) and *intermediate* (*n*=3). *Basic developmental needs* were observed as: needing active listening and minimal encouragers from the supervisor, connecting the case to theoretical orientation, applying skills learned in counseling skills class, and presenting alternatives for the next counseling session. One supervisee expressed his/her needs with these statements:

> We used to have some problems, like what could I do at that point; I mean they were all related to guidance. ... In such situations, there was some distress. And there were also times in which we really looked for raw information in supervision for our next counseling session. I needed my supervisor's direct guidance when we were expected to do long readings and to internalize what we read.

Another supervisee expressed his/her opinions this way:

> During initial supervision sessions, s/he found our faulty sides and explained them to us so explicitly that s/he guided us substantially. I mean s/he always smoothed us over. Image it like a tree… I mean we grew by becoming greener and greener… s/he also provided us with academic knowledge in many issues. Here, I saw which theory was better than another, or which theory we could do better.

Some supervisees mentioned their *intermediate developmental needs*, such as determining professional orientation, providing personal development, examining professional proficiency, not being able to get guidance, and increasing self-awareness. One supervisee mentioned his/her needs like this:

> I expected to draw a professional pathway for myself in our relationship. I was a bit indecisive in that matter. Through our supervision sessions and supervisory relationship, I realized which path I should take, I could determine a clearer way for myself. It is a pleasing thing for me. Since it cleared the ambiguity, I could say it met my supervisory relationship expectations.

Supervisor characteristics. Under the supervisor characteristics, six codes emerged: (a) *roles* (*n*=2), (b) *attitudes* (*n*=3), (c) *personal characteristics* (*n*=11), (d) *interventions* (*n* =12), (e) *feedback* (*n*=11), and (f) *time management* (*n*=8). On the basis of supervisor's *roles* code, some supervisees had asked supervisors to take the consultant role. One supervisee said that: "Well, the things affecting our relationship were basically the respect s/he showed to us and that s/he saw us as his/her colleagues. S/he behaved like a consultant towards me. I felt good in this relationship."

The supervisees indicated that supervisors' *attitudes* towards supervision affected the relationship. In this sense, one supervisee mentioned that:

To begin with, s/he attended class vivaciously. S/he used to reflect his/her positive energy on us. S/he would behave more like a friend rather than just a supervisor…upon seeing these behaviors, I liked the supervision sessions more, and I liked this kind of relationship, since it was a different relationship. It was more sincere than a teacher-student relationship.

In terms of the *personal characteristics* code, a supervisor's dealing with supervisees as polite, relieving, caring, humorous, supportive/encouraging, sincere, understanding, soothing, fair, helpful, and respectful was among the factors that affect the relationship. One supervisee expressed his/her opinions on this code this way: "We had never done a counseling session before; of course, it was going to cause performance anxiety. S/he could have talked about our anxiety more. S/he was not soothing or relaxing enough."

Another supervisee mentioned that:

The things which strengthen the supervisory relationship between us might be his/her style of dealing with fears. For instance, in one week, I felt so bad and went to his/her office after I left the counseling session. S/he hugged me, which was really important for me. S/he was sincere, which strengthen our supervision relationship. I think sincerity might be the most important thing in the supervisory relationship.

Supervisees noted a variety of *interventions* used by supervisors. These included self-disclosure, asking exploratory questions, active listening, using of awareness-raising interventions and confrontations, examining session reports, listening/watching to session records, making use of role-playing techniques during supervision, suggesting books/articles, and structuring the supervision process. For example, one supervisee expressed that: "S/he shared examples with us from his/her own life and even from counseling sessions…also, in every case that we presented, s/he expressed his/her point of view about the case."

Another supervisee stated that:

S/he used supportive confrontations for our lacks. Because all of us had personal problems, and we used to reflect on them in counseling and the supervision relationship. S/he used to emphasize this point… It was kind of weird at the beginning of our relationship, but then I thought that our awareness in this sense

contributed to both the supervision relationship and the counseling process. S/he helped us with his/her confrontations.

Another code related to supervisor characteristics was found to be *feedback*. Following this code, the features of feedback that affected the relationship include adequacy and/or inadequacy, its style, the reinforcing/constructive features, its written and/or verbal form, being personal, or about session features of the feedback. One supervisee mentioned that: "S/he had little but personal observations about everybody; s/he gave feedback to all of us and they were really precious…s/he had a good sense of observation. I liked his/her feedback and reinforcements."

Another supervisee indicated his/her negative opinions regarding his/her supervisor's feedback this way:

> Well, I did not think that my supervisor cared about us that much. I did not even think that s/he listened to audio-recordings of counseling sessions, because s/he never gave feedback in this sense… Well, it left a bad impact on me and our relationship.

Time management was found to be the last code. In examination of this code, it is clear that equal amount of supervision time and more time for supervision were important for supervisees, and accessibility of the supervisor also affected the supervisory relationship. One supervisee suggested that:

> S/he might dedicate equal time to everybody. Some spoke too much. S/he couldn't manage the time well. Time could have been managed better… I had to express myself in less time. There were even times I couldn't express myself at all. It affected our relationship.

The Outcomes of the Relationship

Under this category, two themes emerged: (a) *attitudes* (n=6) and (b) *feelings* (n=5). It was ascertained that supervisors' attitudes affected supervisees' *attitudes* towards supervision. For example, supervisees mentioned that they had different attitudes towards supervision, such as reluctance, commitment, willingness, or regression. One supervisee expressed that:

> We couldn't get in return what we labored for, that probably influenced us negatively. I gradually started to become uninterested. I had started the supervision process with enthusiasm, but throughout the semester, I kind of lost it. It is like the enthusiasm in me cooled.

In terms of the *feelings* theme, supervisees mentioned that they had intense feelings based on the quality of the relationship, such as anger, self-confidence, comfort, (un)happiness, anxiety, satisfaction, injustice, admiration, and irritation. One supervisee indicated that: "In the beginning, s/he was very remote. I did really feel anger against the supervisor for some time."

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The purpose of the present study was to examine Turkish undergraduate supervisees' views regarding the supervisory relationship. The study findings show that supervisees' descriptions of the supervisory relationship generally fit the categories of strong or weak. Additionally, the relationship was impacted by supervisees' developmental needs as well as supervisor's attitudes, interventions, feedback, roles, personal characteristics, and time management. Moreover, the supervisory relationship had an intense effect on supervisees' attitudes and feelings towards supervision.

When the existing literature was reviewed in terms of supervisory relationship quality, most research claimed that a strong relationship strengthened the personal and professional development of supervisees (e.g. Ellis, 2010; Ladany et al., 2005; Nelson & Friedlander, 2001) and made significant contributions to the effectiveness of supervision (e.g. Nelson & Friedlander, 2001; Worthen & McNeill, 1996). In a study by Worthen and McNeill (1996), supervisees defined the satisfaction with supervision experiences according to their experiences within the supervisory relationship. For instance, supervisees reported that the supervision was effective when their supervisors were empathic, nonjudgmental, and encouraging. Similarly, in Ellis's (2010) study, some dos and don'ts related to supervision were identified. Ellis (2010) emphasized that establishing and maintaining a respectful and supportive supervisory relationship was the first step for fostering the professional development of the supervisees and supervision outcomes. Based on the findings of the present study and existing research, it is believed that quality of the supervisory relationship is one of the critical factors in achieving supervision outcomes.

The other key finding of this study was that supervisees' *developmental needs* were crucial factors affecting the supervisory relationship. In terms of developmental supervision models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981), it is known that beginning supervisees have different professional characteristics when compared to experienced supervisees. In other words, these models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981) indicate that supervisees' supervisory needs and expectations differ in accordance with their professional developmental level; beginning supervisees have more basic needs and expectations from supervision, whereas advanced supervisees have more advanced needs and expectations from supervision. In parallel with this information, the findings of this study show that most supervisees' specific *basic developmental needs* included needing active listening and minimal encouragers from the supervisor, connecting the case to theoretical orientation, applying skills learned in counseling skills classes, and presenting alternatives/solutions for the next counseling session. Other supervisees, despite have the same experience and educational level as the others, reported having *intermediate developmental needs*, such as determining the profession orientation, placing importance on personal development, understanding professional competence, and personal awareness; this situation can be attributed to individual differences among supervisees.

To sum up, our study also supported developmental supervision models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981); it indicates that supervisees who are newly exposed to counseling/helping interactions and the supervision process mainly seek direct instruction and structure. Regardless of the level of supervisees' developmental needs, it was found that meeting these needs within the supervisory relationship is a strengthening component for the supervisory relationship. A study by Frost (2004, as cited in Beinart, 2014) supports the findings of this study. Frost (2004, as cited in Beinart, 2014) found that unmet expectations about the supervision process and the supervisory relationship led supervisees to difficulties that were challenging to resolve in their supervisory relationships.

The literature makes it clear that beginning supervisees do not know what exactly to do regarding the counseling/therapy process (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Worthington, 2006). For example, first-time supervisees expected their supervisors to be more instructive and directive (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Worthington, 2006), and perceived direct guidance and support as helpful (Jacobsen & Tanggard, 2009). However, as undergraduate supervisees gained more experience in supervision, the supervisee became a more active participant in the experience and was less reliant on the supervisor for instruction and direction (Aladag, 2014). In a general review of developmental supervision models, it is emphasized that supervisees' developmental levels should be taken into consideration when developing and sustaining the supervisory relationship (Borders & Brown, 2005; Loganbill et al., 1982; Magnuson et al., 2000; Ramos-Sanchez et. al., 2002).

In the present study, a relatively small group of the supervisees reported intermediate developmental supervision needs. These supervisees seemed to expect their supervisors to adopt a *consultant role.* Similarly, in the related literature, it is clear that supervisees who have intermediate developmental needs prominently want to become independent from their supervisors, and expect less instruction and structured supervision settings (Stoltenberg, 1981). Thus, these expectations are parallel with the consultant roles defined in the discrimination supervision model, where the supervisor guides less, mostly focuses on personal development, and adopts a more explorative supervisory relationship. Findings from our study suggested that the supervisees with intermediate developmental needs developed a stronger and more constructive supervisory relationship, which allowed the supervisors to adopt a consultant role. Our finding is consistent with Ronnestad and Skovholt (2003), who stated that counselors/therapists go through different professional developmental stages, although not necessarily in the same order. Although our findings indicated that many novice counselors had basic developmental needs, we suggest that supervisors should plan to also have supervisees who are ready for more advanced feedback. In brief, the findings of our study support the other research findings conducted on this topic: being aware of the developmental levels and expectations of supervisees plays an important role in empowering the supervisory relationship, which is a critical characteristic of an effective supervisor. Additionally, the findings

indicate that while working with novice supervisees, supervisors should not expect that all supervisees have the same developmental needs and expectations.

Moreover, supervisors' attitudes towards supervision, interventions, feedback, personal characteristics, and roles influenced the supervisory relationship. Among these variables, supervisor's personal characteristics, interventions, and feedback stood out. In the existing literature, developmental supervision models emphasize the significance of supervisors' personal and professional characteristics in developing and sustaining a high-quality supervisory relationship (Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981). For example, supervisors' support, openness, encouragement, acceptance, openness to criticism, respect, trust, empathy, open-mindedness, humor, reliability, ability to soothe, sensitivity, thoughtfulness, optimism, and sincerity all contributed to the strong relationship (Aladag, 2014; Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011; Denizli et al., 2009; Ladany et al., 2013; Loganbill et al., 1982). Additionally, supervisors' support and openness, which were defined as supervisory relationship factors, predicted effectiveness of supervision (Lizzio, Wilson, & Que, 2013). In addition to these findings, it is reasonable to state that a supervisor's personal characteristics, as mentioned by supervisees, are also interpersonal relationship skills that are accepted as prerequisites to developing strong relationship (Campbell, 2000). Thus, it is thought that supervisors who possess effective interpersonal relationship skills would effectively relieve supervisees' anxieties and precipitate the improvement of their self-competencies.

Interventions were another critical variable that influence the supervisory relationship in this study. Supervisees reported that self-disclosure, asking exploratory questions, active listening, using awareness-raising interventions and confrontations, examining session reports, listening to/watching session records, making use of role-playing techniques during supervision, suggesting books/articles, and structuring the supervision process all positively affect the supervisory relationship. In this context, it can be inferred that supervisees expect empathic interventions from their supervisors that consider their developmental needs. Indeed, in the literature, Loganbill et al. (1982) categorized supervisory interventions broadly as facilitative, confrontational, conceptual, prescriptive, and catalytic. The researchers expressed that interventions based on the facilitative conditions—such as being sincere, respectful, and having unconditional acceptance and empathy, as defined by Rogers (1957/2007)—are necessary for the development of the supervisory relationship in the first supervision sessions; however, these conditions alone are not sufficient to sustain and improve the supervisory relationship. Loganbill et al. (1982) indicated that in order to improve the supervisory relationship, not only confrontational interventions but also other interventions should be employed, which in turn develop the supervisory relationship. Similarly, Borders et al. (1991) suggested using supportive interventions during the development of a supervisory relationship, and to integrate these interventions with collaborative skills over time.

Another variable affecting the supervisory relationship in this study was *feedback*. The supervisees reported that sufficient, constructive, supportive, verbal or written feedback influence the supervisory relationship positively, while insufficient and

inappropriate feedback have negative effect on the supervisory relationship. In the literature, parallel findings suggest that sufficient, supportive, and instructive feedback is of vital importance for supervisees (Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011; Denizli et al., 2009; Worthington, 2006); and is generally the most important component of a supportive and trusting supervisory relationship (Hughes, 2012). Moreover, the quality of the supervisory relationship can be fostered or hindered by the accuracy of the supervisors' feedback (Karpenko & Gidycz, 2012). Campbell (2000) emphasized the critical significance of feedback in developing a high-quality supervisory relationship. In one study (Aladag, 2014), it was found that feedback was the most commonly-mentioned factor in a high-quality supervisory process for undergraduate supervisees. Within the developmental supervision models, it is known that supervisees who receive supervision for the first time might be more anxious and have a lower sense of self-competence (Loganbill et al., 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Hence, it is quite understandable that such supervisees need more supportive feedback during the supervision process. In addition, another study finding that can be discussed within the code of feedback is *time management*. Within this code, supervisees indicated that they should receive longer periods of feedback and that each supervisee should receive an equal amount of feedback. This finding is consistent with the literature suggesting that sufficient time of feedback during supervision is crucial for supervisees who receive supervision for the first time (Aladag & Bektas, 2009; Meydan, 2015). In accordance with the findings of both the current study and the research findings in the literature, it can be inferred that feedback is an inseparable part of supervision, and adequate amounts of feedback have a direct effect on both the efficiency and the quality of supervision and the supervisory relationship.

The final category of this study was the *outcomes of supervisory relationship*. This category consisted of two themes: *attitudes* and *feelings* towards supervision. In a general overview of supervisees' attitudes and feelings towards supervision, it was discovered that these variables influence supervisees' motivation and willingness in supervision, based on the quality of the supervisory relationship. However, it was found that the quality of the supervisory relationship might result in experiencing intense feelings in supervisees, such as anger, rage, withdrawal, relief, joy, sadness, indignity, and admiration towards supervision or the supervisor. In the literature, studies were found that suggest that the supervisory relationship affects the supervisee's satisfaction (e.g. Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), feelings (e.g. Hutt et al., 1983), and personal and professional development (e.g. Horrocks & Smaby, 2006). According to Hutt et al. (1983), a negative supervisory relationship resulted in feeling intense negative emotions, such as anxiety, disappointment, and anger, and it prevented supervisees from disclosing themselves fully in supervision, hindering their professional growth. Aladag (2014) asserted that supervisors who were not supportive and unable to raise their awareness of the needs of the supervisory process might lead to their supervisees experiencing a sense of worthlessness, anxiety, and sadness, which in turn negatively effects supervisory satisfaction. In this sense, a weak supervisory relationship may undermine the emotional bond that is one of the key components of the supervisory relationship (Bordin, 1983). In terms of developmental supervision

models (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981), it is emphasized that the supervisees who receive supervision for the first time may experience intense feelings within the supervisory relationship; this intensity is likely correlated with their novice level of development.

Limitations

Although this study is one of the initial studies in supervision literature in Turkey, it has some limitations. Researchers (Beinart, 2014; Holloway, 1995) indicate that the supervisory relationship is a kind of interpersonal relationship, and can be developed in an ongoing supervision process. For example, Holloway (1995) described the supervisory relationship with three phases: the early phase, the mature phase, and the termination phase. This study is limited because the data regarding the quality of the supervisory relationship, the affective variables on the supervisory relationship, and its effects on supervisees were collected after the termination of the supervision process, and do not provide information about different phases of supervision. Moreover, some researchers suggested focusing on both supervisors' and supervisees' perspectives, to comprehend the full supervisory relationship (Beinart, 2014; Nelson, Barnes, Evans, & Triggiano, 2008). However, data in our study regarding the supervisory relationship were solely collected from the supervisees. Another limitation of the study was related to the supervision method that was used in the study. Participants were supervised in a group supervision setting, including peers, and they interacted with each other during supervision sessions. The effect of the inter-supervisee interaction on supervisees' relationship with supervisors is unclear. Moreover, this study was conducted with supervisees who received supervision only at one university. In terms of data analysis and trustworthiness of the study, collecting data from one university limits the transferability (external validity) of the results.

Implications for Research and Practice

When the findings of this study are considered, of the effects of the supervisory relationship on supervisees' personal and professional development, the most obvious implication is that the supervisory relationship is one of the key components of supervision, and in order to improve the quality of this relationship, variables affecting the relationship should be carefully taken into consideration by supervisors. In other words, we believed that supervisors should be pay attention to developing strong supervisory relationships with undergraduate supervisees. Thus, the developmental needs and expectations of supervisees should be taken into consideration for establishing a strong supervisory relationship, as previously proposed by developmental supervision models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). It is also expected that our findings will illuminate a path for supervisors when supervising first-time supervisees with beginning developmental supervision needs, on how to establish a strong supervisory relationship with them.

Furthermore, the findings of the study reveal that supervisor variables, such as attitudes, interventions, feedback, roles, personal characteristics, and time management, have effects on the supervisory relationship, and it is thought that supervisors should pay attention to their own variables affecting the relationship. Keeping in mind undergraduate supervisees' professional developmental characteristics and the effects of supervisor variables on the relationship, supervisors should engage in initiator and facilitator roles to establish a supervisory relationship with undergraduate supervisees. Unfortunately, few research findings exist that investigate supervisory relationships in Turkey. Therefore, further explorations are needed of the variables affecting the supervisory relationship. Finally, we hope that this attempt to explore the supervisory relationship and the variables affecting this relationship in Turkey will encourage other researchers to conduct further studies that will use different research designs, which include collecting data at different sessions of supervision from different universities, and to include supervisors in the study process, showing a clearer way for supervisors to develop strong supervisory relationships with undergraduate supervisees.

References

Aladag, M. (2014). Psikolojik danisman egitiminin farkli duzeylerinde bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulamasi supervizyonunda kritik olaylar [Critical incidents in individual counseling practicum supervision across different levels of counselor education]. *Ege Education Journal, 15*(2), 428–475.

Aladag, M., & Kemer, G. (2016). *Psikolojik danisman egitiminde bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulamasi ve supervizyonunun incelenmesi [The examination of individual counseling practicum and its supervision in counselor education]*. Izmir, Turkey: Ege University, Directorate of Scientific Research Projects.

Atlas of Undergraduate Programs. (2017). *Rehberlik ve psikolojik danismanlik programi bulunan tum universiteler [Universities where have guidance and counseling undergraduate programs]*. Retrieved July 12, 2017, from https://yokatlas.yok.gov.tr/lisans-bolum.php?b=10172

Beinart, H. (2014). Building and sustaining the supervisory relationship. In C. E. Watkins & D. L. Milne (Eds.), *Wiley international handbook of clinical supervision* (p. 257-281), doi: 10.1002/9781118846363.ch11

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. MA: Pearson.

Borders, L. D., Bernard, J. M., Dye, H. A., Fong, M. L., Henderson, P., & Nance, D. W. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: Rationale, development, and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31*(1), 61-78, doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1991.tb00371.x

Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, *16*(3), 252-260, doi: 10.1037/h0085885

Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 35- 4,. doi: 10.1177/0011000083111007

Buyukgoze-Kavas, A. (2011). Bireysel ve grupla psikolojik danisma uygulamalarina yonelik bir degerlendirme [An evaluation regarding individual and group counseling practicums]. *Turkish Educational Sciences Journal, 9*(2), 411-432.

Campbell, J. M. (2000). *Becoming an effective supervisor: A workbook for counselor and psychotherapist*. USA: Routledge.

Denizli, S. (2010). *Danisanlarin algiladiklari terapotik calisma uyumu ve oturum etkisi duzeylerinin bazi degiskenlere gore yordanmasi*: *Ege Universitesi ornegi* [Prediction of client perceived working alliance and session impact levels regarding some variables: The example of Ege University*]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ege University, İzmir, Turkey.

Denizli, S., Aladag, M., Bektas, D. Y., Cihangir-Cankaya, Z., & Ozeke Kocabas, E. (2009, October). *Psikolojik danisman egitiminde bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulamasi ve supervizyonu: Ege Universitesi ornegi* [Individual counseling practicum and supervision in counselor education: The example of Ege University*]*. Paper presented at the annual National Conference of Guidance and Counseling, Adana, Turkey.

Ellis, M. V. (2010). Bridging the science and practice of clinical supervision: Some discoveries, some misconceptions. *The Clinical Supervisor, 29*(1), 95-116, doi: 10.1080/07325221003741910

Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Horrocks, S., & Smaby, M. H. (2006). The supervisory relationship: Its impact on trainee personal and skills development. *Compelling Perspectives on Counselling: VİSTAS*, 173-176.

Hughes, J. (2012). Practical aspects of supervision: All you ever wanted to know but were too afraid to ask. In I. Fleming & L. Steen (Eds.), *Supervision and clinical psychology: Theory, practice and perspectives* (p. 184–206). Hove, UK: Routledge.

Hutt, C. H., Scott, J., & King, M. (1983). A phenomenological study of supervisees' positive and negative experiences in supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 20*(1), 118, doi: 10.1037/h0088471

Ilhan, T., Rahat, E., & Yontem, M. K. (2015, October). *Psikolojik danisman adaylarinin supervizyon surecinde yasadiklari danisma kaygisina ve supervizyon egitimine yonelik deneyimlerinin incelenmesi [*Investigating the experiences of counselor candidates regarding counseling anxiety and supervision training in

supervision *process]*. Paper presented at the annual National Conference of Guidance and Counseling, Mersin, Turkey.

Jacobsen, C. H., & Tanggaard, L. (2009). Beginning therapists' experiences of what constitutes good and bad psychotherapy supervision: With a special focus on individual differences. *Nordic Psychology, 61*, 59-84, doi: 10.1027/1901-2276.61.4.59

Karpenko, V., & Gidycz, C. A. (2012). The supervisory relationship and the process of evaluation: Recommendations for supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor, 31*(2), 138-158, doi: 10.1080/07325223.2013.730014

Koc, I. (2013). *Kisiler arasi sureci hatirlama teknigine dayali supervizyonun psikolojik danisman adaylarinin psikolojik danisma becerilerine, ozyeterlik ve kaygi duzeylerine etkisi* [The effect of supervision with interpersonal process recall on the counseling skills, self-efficacy and anxiety levels of counselor trainees*]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ege University, Izmir, Turkey.

Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*(4), 447-455, doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02472.x

Ladany, N., Hill, C. E., Corbett, M. M., & Nutt, E. A. (1996). Nature, extent, and importance of what psychotherapy trainees do not disclose to their supervisors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(1), 10-24, doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.10

Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*(3), 143-160, doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb00567.x

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*(4), 263-27, doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01259.x

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(1), 3-42, doi: 10.1177/0011000082101002

Lizzio, A., Wilson, K., & Que, J. (2009). Relationship dimensions in the professional supervision of psychology graduates: Supervisee perceptions of processes and outcome. *Studies in Continuing Education, 31*(2), 127-140, doi: 10.1080/01580370902927451

Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Norem, K. (2000). A profile of lousy supervision: Experienced counselors' perspectives. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*(3), 189-202, doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2000.tb01231.x

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education. Revised and expanded from "case study research in education"*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Meydan, B. (2015). Bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulamasinda Mikro Beceri Supervizyon Modeli'nin etkililiginin incelenmesi [Examining the effectiveness of Microcounseling Supervision Model in individual counseling practice]. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 5*(43), 55-68.

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, doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.55.2.172

Nelson, M. L., & Friedlander, M. L. (2001). A close look at conflictual supervisory relationships: The trainee's perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(4), 384-395, doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.48.4.384

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage Publictions, Inc.

Ramos-Sanchez, L., Esnil, E., Goodwin, A., Riggs, S., Touster, L. O., Wright, L. K., & Rodolfa, E. (2002). Negative supervisory events: Effects on supervision and supervisory alliance. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*(2), 197-202, doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.33.2.197

Rogers, C. R. (2007). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, and Training, 44*(3), 240-248, doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.44.3.240

Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt. T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development, 30*(1), 5-44, doi: 10.1023/A:1025173508081

Schreier, M. (2014). Qualitative content analysis. In U. Flick (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis* (p. 170-183). Sage Publications. Retrieved November 25, 2017, from

http://www.ewipsy.fuberlin.de/einrichtungen/arbeitsbereiche/qualitative_sozial_bildungsforschung/Medien/58869_Flick__The_SAGE_HB_of_Qualitative_Data_Analysis_Chapter1_mapping-the-field.pdf

Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 59–65, doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.28.1.59

Ulker-Tumlu, G., Balkaya-Cetin, A., & Kurtyilmaz, Y. (2015, October*). Psikolojik danisman adaylarinin bireyle psikolojik danisma oturumlarinin degerlendirilmesi [*Assessing individual counseling sessions of counselor candidates*]. Paper presented at the annual National Conference of Guidance and Counseling, Mersin, Turkey.

Yesilyaprak, B. (2012). The paradigm shift of vocational guidance and career counseling and its implications for Turkey: An evaluation from past to future. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 12*(1), 97–118.

Yildirim, A., & Simsek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel arastirma yontemleri* [Qualitative research methods in the social sciences]. Ankara, Turkey: Seckin Yayincilik.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Worthen, V., & McNeill, B. W. (1996). A phenomenological investigation of good supervision events. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(1), 25-34, doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.25

Worthington, E. L. (2006). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience: A review. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 18*(3), 133-160, doi: 10.1037/0735-7028.18.3.189

Türkiye'de Lisans Düzeyinde Süpervizyon Alan Adayların Süpervizyon İlişkisine Yönelik Görüşleri

Özet

Problem Durumu: Nitelikli süpervizyon ilişkisi etkili bir süpervizyon süreci yürütülmesinde kritik öneme sahiptir. Süpervizyon alanyazını incelendiğinde, süpervizyon ilişkisinin süpervizyonun etkililiği üzerinde önemli bir rolü olduğu görülmektedir. Pek çok araştırmacı nitelikli süpervizyon ilişkisinin süpervizyon alan adayların kişisel ve profesyonel gelişiminde temel bir rolü olduğunu belirtmektedir. Bu nedenlerle, nitelikli süpervizyon ilişkisinin bileşenlerini ve süpervizyon ilişkisinin kurulmasında ve geliştirilmesinde hangi faktörlerin rol oynadığını belirlemek önem taşımaktadır. Yurtdışındaki süpervizyon ilişkisine dair alanyazın incelendiğinde, etkili süpervizyon sürecinde süpervizyon ilişkisinin rolünü ve önemini incelemeye, süpervizyon ilişkisini etkileyen faktörleri belirlemeye ve süpervizyon ilişkisinin etkilediği boyutları ortaya çıkarmaya yönelik pek çok araştırma yapıldığı görülmektedir. Bu araştırmaların sonuçları, etkili süpervizyonun önemli bileşenlerinden birinin süpervizyon ilişkisi olduğunu; süpervizyon alan adayın gelişimsel düzeyinin, bilişsel yapısının, bağlanma stillerinin ve kaygısının ve süpervizörün kaygısının, bağlanma stillerinin, kişisel özelliklerinin ve müdahalelerinin süpervizyon ilişkisinin kurulmasını ve geliştirilmesini etkilediğini göstermektedir. Bununla birlikte, süpervizyon ilişkisinin süpervizyon alan adayların

süpervizyona yönelik duyguları, tutumları, kişisel ve mesleki gelişimleri, beceri kazanımları ve süpervizyon memnuniyetleri üzerinde önemli bir rol oynadığı görülmektedir. Türkiye'de alanyazın incelendiğinde ise süpervizyon modelleri, süpervizyon yöntem ve teknikleri, süpervizor özellikleri ve süpervizor geribildirimi, süpervizyonun psikolojik danışma becerilerine ve özyeterliğine etkisi, lisans düzeyinde süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyon yaşantıları, etkili süpervizyon uygulamaları ve akran süpervizyonu gibi konularda yapılan araştırmaların son yıllarda artış gösterdiği dikkat çekmektedir. Bu araştırmaların sonuçları incelendiğinde ise süpervizyon ilişkisine dair bulguları olan araştırmalar olduğu görülmüş; ancak, süpervizyon ilişkisini doğrudan inceleyen bir araştırmaya rastlanmamıştır.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Alanyazın incelendiğinde, Türkiye'de süpervizyon konusunda yapılan araştırmalar son yıllarda artış gösterse de hala sınırlı sayıda olduğu söylenebilir. Bununla birlikte, etkili süpervizyonun önemli bileşenlerinden biri kabul edilen süpervizyon ilişkisi konusunun henüz keşfedilmeyi bekleyen bir alan olduğu görülmektedir. Bu bağlamda, bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye'de lisans düzeyinde süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyon ilişkisine yönelik görüşlerini incelemektir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu araştırmada nitel araştırma desenlerinden durum çalışması kullanılmıştır. Araştırma, 2015-2016 öğretim yılı güz döneminde Türkiye'nin batısında bulunan bir üniversitenin Eğitim Fakültesi Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık lisans programında Bireyle Psikolojik Danışma Uygulaması dersini alan 84 (71 kadın, 13 erkek) kişi arasından maksimum çeşitlilik örneklemesi ve aykırı aşırı durum örneklemesi yöntemleri kullanılarak seçilen 12 süpervizyon alan aday (10 kadın, 2 erkek) ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Adayların Bireyle Psikolojik Danışma Uygulaması dersinde süpervizörleriyle kurdukları ilişkiye yönelik görüşlerinin elde edilmesi amacıyla, araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan yarı yapılandırılmış bireysel görüşme formu kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın katılımcısı olarak belirlenen 12 aday araştırmanın amacına ve veri toplama sürecine ilişkin araştırmacılar tarafından bilgilendirilmiştir. Görüşmeler başlamadan önce adayların ve süpervizörlerinin yazılı onayları bilgilendirilmiş onay formu kullanılarak alınmıştır. Görüşmeler 30-40 dakika sürmüştür. Görüşmeler sırasında görüntü kayıt aracı kullanılmıştır. Araştırma kapsamında toplanan veriler içerik analizi aşamaları takip edilerek çözümlenmiştir.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Araştırma verilerinin çözümlenmesi amacıyla yapılan içerik analizi sonucunda üç temaya ulaşılmıştır: a) süpervizyon ilişkisinin niteliği, b) süpervizyon ilişkisini etkileyen süpervizyon alan adaya ve süpervizore ilişkin özellikler ve c) süpervizyon ilişkisinin etkileri. Süpervizyon ilişkisinin niteliği teması güçlü ve zayıf olmak üzere iki koddan oluşmuştur. Süpervizyon ilişkisini etkileyen süpervizyon alan adaya ve süpervizöre ilişkin özellikler teması incelendiğinde, süpervizyon alan adayların temel mesleki gelişim ihtiyaçlarının ve ileri mesleki gelişim ihtiyaçlarının süpervizyon ilişkisini etkilediği görülmüştür. Temel mesleki gelişim ihtiyaçlarının süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizörün etkili dinlemesine, asgari düzeyde teşvik kullanmasına, kuramsal bilgiler ile vakalar arasında bag kurmasına, öğrenilen becerilerinin uygulanışını göstermesine ve bir sonraki psikolojik danışma oturumuna yönelik plan yapmasına ilişkin duydukları ihtiyaçlardan; ileri

mesleki gelişim ihtiyaçlarının ise profesyonel yönelimin belirlenmesi, kişisel gelişim sağlaması, kişisel farkındalığın artırılması gibi ihtiyaçlardan meydana geldiği görülmüştür. Bunula birlikte, süpervizörlerin olumlu tutumlarının, ihtiyaç duyulan müdahaleleri kullanmalarının, yeterli ve yapıcı geribildirimler vermelerinin, kibar, esprili, destekleyici, anlayışlı, yardımsever, saygılı olmak gibi kişisel özelliklere sahip olmalarının, gerektiğinde müşavir rolü üstlenmelerinin ve süpervizyon süresini etkili kullanabilmelerinin de süpervizyon ilişkisini etkilediği ortaya çıkmıştır. Son olarak, süpervizyon ilişkisinin süpervizyon alan adayın süpervizyona yönelik tutumunu ve süpervizyonda yasadığı duyguları etkilediği bulunmuştur.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Bu araştırmada Türkiye'de lisans düzeyinde süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyon ilişkisine yönelik görüşleri incelenmiştir. Araştırma sonuçları, süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyon ilişkisinin niteliğini güçlü ve zayıf olarak sınıfladıklarını; süpervizyon alan adayların gelişimsel düzeylerinin, süpervizörün süpervizyona yönelik tutumunun, süpervizyonda kullandığı müdahalelerin, geribildirimlerinin, kişisel özelliklerinin ve süpervizyon süresini etkili kullanıp kullanamamasının süpervizyon ilişkisini etkileyen faktörler olduğu ve süpervizyon ilişkisinin süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyona yönelik tutumları ve duyguları üzerinde etkileri olduğunu göstermiştir. Bu sonuçlar göz önüne alındığında, güçlü süpervizyon ilişkisi kurulabilmesi ve geliştirilebilmesi için süpervizörlerin öncelikle süpervizyon alan adayların gelişimsel düzeylerinin ve süpervizyondan beklentilerinin farkında olmaları ve bu doğrultuda süpervizyon amaçlarını adayların gelişimsel düzeylerine uygun şekilde belirleyerek uygun müdahaleler kullanmaları önemli görülmektedir. Bunula birlikte, güçlü süpervizyon ilişkisi kurulabilmesi için süpervizörlerin süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyondaki kaygılarını ele almalarının, etkili kişilerarası becerileri kullanmalarının ve yeterli geribildirim vermelerinin önemli olduğu görülmüştür. Bu araştırma Türkiye'de lisans düzeyinde süpervizyon alan adayların süpervizyon ilişkisine yönelik görüşlerinin incelendiği ilk araştırmalardan biri olmakla birlikte bazı sınırlılıkları bulunmaktadır. Bu araştırmada veriler süpervizyon süreci tamamlandıktan sonra sadece süpervizyon alan adaylardan toplanmıştır. Gelecek araştırmalarda süpervizyon sürecinin farklı oturumlarında ve süpervizörlerden de veri toplanarak farklı araştırma desenleri kullanılması önerilmektedir. Bunula birlikte, bu araştırma sadece tek bir üniversitede süpervizyon alan adaylarla gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma sonuçlarının genellenebilirliğinin artırılması amacıyla ileride yürütülecek araştırmalarda farklı üniversitelerde süpervizyon alan adayların araştırmaya dâhil edilmesinin yararlı olacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Psikolojik danışman eğitimi, klinik süpervizyon, süpervizyon süreci, psikolojik danışman adayı.