Dropout from Supervision:
An Intensive Analysis of One Supervisory Dyad[*]

Shao-Ling Hsu

Institute of Education
and Counseling Center
National Chiao Tung University

Shiou-Ling Tsai

The Center of
General Education
Chung Yuan Christian University

The purpose of this study was to investigate what was happening in a prematurely terminated supervision case with the focus of observation on the interactions between the supervisor and the supervisee. We analyzed four sessions of one supervisory dyad in order to draw a comprehensive picture of the supervisory process. Our analysis showed that the dropout of this supervisee was caused by a series of mild and severe conflict events. Similar conflicts occurred repeatedly. We found that with the accumulation of unsolved supervision relationship problems, negative emotions of the supervisee grew. Seven poor supervisory behaviors persistently appeared in the supervision. Of these, three were most prevalent: the supervisor confronted and evaluated negatively the supervisee; the supervisor misunderstood the supervisee's intentions and behaviors, and the supervisor did not focus on the supervisee's problems or difficulties throughout the supervisory process. We speculated that dropout could have been avoided had the supervisor recognized the factors sabotaging the supervisory relationship and adjusted her interaction styles in relating with the supervisee.

KEY WORDS: dropout, supervisee, supervisor, supervisory process

Underlying most theoretical statements about supervision is the tacit assumption that supervision is a positive process (Hutt, Scott, & King, 1983). Yet in the practice of supervision, good and bad supervisory experience has existed simultaneously (Wulf & Nelson, 2000). Earlier studies about the qualities of supervision investigated good supervision events and good, ideal, or excellent supervisors, while overlooking the negative side of supervision (Carifio & Hess, 1987; Shanfield, Mohl, Matthews, & Hetherly, 1992; Shanfield, Matthews, & Hetherly, 1993; Shanfield, Hetherly, & Matthews, 2001; Worthen & McNeill, 1996). However, bad or harmful supervision does exist and our understanding of it is still preliminary.

Although much of the existing supervision research identifies supervisor behaviors and supervision components that contribute to trainees' experience of negative supervision (Allen, Szollos, & Williams, 1986; Gray, Ladany, Ancis, & Walker, 2001; Hutt et al., 1983; Kennard, Stewart, & Gluck, 1987; Magnuson,

Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000; Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983; Nelson & Friedlander, 2001; Ramos-Sánchez et al., 2002; Watkins, 1997), but there are few studies that illuminate the supervisory process in itself (Burke, Goodyear, & Guzzard, 1998; Nigam, Cameron, & Leverette, 1997). A comprehensive picture of the supervisory interaction in negative supervision remains undeveloped.

According to Ellis (2001), future research should account for more data that (1) concern the harming supervisor and the context in which the harmful supervision occurs and (2) have greater descriptive power. If we can determine the circumstances contributing to negative supervision, we may better avoid destructive supervision practices or successfully resolve harmful situations.

Watkins (1997) stated that it is inevitable that every supervisor exhibits some bad supervisory behavior at some point in time. He suggested that the main focus should rest on supervisors' persisting manners of behaving and relating to supervisees. In order to understand what really happens in negative supervision, we need to investigate the supervisory process and to examine actual conflicted interactions or persisting poor supervisory behaviors.

We could not find persisting poor supervisory behaviors in all the supervisory dyads. Hence, we targeted a dropout supervision case. Only after we analyzed the discourse between the supervisor and the supervisee could we look closely at the types of enduring supervisor behaviors or patterns that caused the supervision case to end in a dropout.

According to our objectives described above, we investigated the following questions in the present study: What was the dropout process like in the supervision? What did the supervisor do or fail to do that caused the supervisee to choose to end the supervision prematurely? Were there any persisting supervisory behaviors in the entire supervisory process?

Method

The supervisee was a 26-year-old female graduate student in guidance and counseling graduate programs. She didn't have any individual supervision experience and only had been in group supervision for eight sessions. Because she was a counselor in training, she didn't have any theoretical orientation yet. The supervisor was 42 years old. She had had 15 years of counseling experience and 8 years of supervisory experience. She was a counseling psychologist with a PhD. Her theoretical orientation was cognitive-behavioral. Before the supervision began, they were strangers to each other.

The dyad was one of six dyads in a parent study about supervisees' nondisclosure in supervision. Six trainees and six supervisors volunteered to participate in the parent study. On the basis of the trainees' practicum, each dyad received six sessions of individual supervision. They were matched according to the compatibility of supervisors' and supervisees' schedules. However, one dyad terminated the supervision in the fourth session. In the interview about nondisclosure in supervision, the supervisee expressed frustration and unhappiness with the supervision. Because of these emotions, she decided to dropout from the supervision. In order to understand which of the supervisor's behaviors or which of the supervisory interactions caused the supervisee to prematurely terminate the supervision, we asked the supervisor and the supervisee to grant us permission to transcribe and analyze their dialogue from the four supervisory sessions. When making the request, we gave the two subjects a general description of the nature of this study.

The "we" in this paper refers to the researchers for this study: two assistant professors at counseling.

Both researchers were counseling psychologists and qualified supervisors. The first author had seven years of postdoctoral experience as a therapist, supervisor, and researcher investigating the area of supervision. The second author had been a counselor for ten years and a supervisor for five years.

Data Analysis

The four supervision sessions were transcribed by one graduate assistant who had been trained in the principles of transcribing and confidentiality. When transcribing, we used three numbers to code the dialogue. The first number(S or C) means Supervisor or Counselor. The second means the session (1-4). The last one refers to the sentence in its sequential order. For example, C-4-248 means the counselor's 248 sentences in the fourth session. The first researcher reviewed the transcripts for accuracy. We used open inductive coding, one coding method of grounded theory, to analyze the transcriptions because this coding does not constrain the judges to a preconceived set of categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

We sought to understand specifically the common patterns or structures of the supervisory process that led to the dropout. First, as we independently read the transcribed supervisory process, we noted themes, patterns, and impressions in the margins; we then read the transcriptions together to analyze the data. Next, we abstracted and coded meaning units from each transcript, and then discussed and categorized similar codes until we reached a consensus. Finally, we identified seven categories of poor supervisory behaviors and described the dropout process together. All the analyzing process was done by two researchers.

Results

Dropout Process in the Supervision

From the transcript of the supervisory process, we found that the dropout was not caused by any single event or any single supervisory behavior. Instead, it was caused by a recurrent interaction pattern. As the supervision went on, the emotional discomfort of the trainee grew. In fact, there were some opportunities for the supervisor to process such conflict-based issues in the supervision. Unfortunately, the supervisor missed both the chance and the timing. What happened during the supervisory process is described below.

Session One

The supervisor and the trainee were strangers to each other. The supervisor said nothing about how the supervision would proceed, nor did she explain her supervisory style. At the beginning of the first session, the trainee mentioned that she found it difficult to deepen conversations with a client. The supervisor asked the trainee many questions about the latter's assumptions about the client. The trainee sometimes hestitated before giving a response. Meanwhile, the supervisor left for a short time so that the trainee might think over and answer the questions. The supervisor seldom gave positive feedback, but directly pointed out what was lacking in the trainee's actions.

Session Two

The trainee mentioned that she found it difficult whenever a client would keep talking and would change topics. The supervisor clarified the issue and concluded that a client's comments and questions are all important and that clients were not changing topics; indeed, the supervisor concluded that the difficulties here-to-for had resulted from the trainee, who had ignored some important information. In this session, the trainee not only expressed that she had been misunderstood by the supervisor but tried hard to clarify this expression, as well. However, the supervisor insisted on the accuracy of her own assumptions and attributed both the client problems and the alleged misunderstanding to the trainee's own problems. The supervisory relationship became intense.

Session Three

The trainee mentioned that she had no idea about the future counseling direction for a particular client. The supervisor did not begin by clarifying the trainee's difficulties. Instead, the supervisor questioned why each client troubled the trainee and why the trainee always had no idea about how to intervene. Along the way, the supervisor tried hard to clarify the trainee's counseling goal. In the middle of the session, the trainee clearly admitted that she really had no idea about how to intervene and that she expected the supervisor to provide concrete suggestions regarding helpful related techniques. The supervisor pointed out the trainee's inability to follow a client's core issues. The trainee admitted that this inability, being her own shortcoming, underscored her need to be supervised. The trainee then expressed her frustration with the supervision. The supervisor ignored the trainee's frustration and kept discussing the counseling goal.

Session Four

The trainee made no mention of any counseling difficulties, and the supervisor asked some questions about the trainee's counseling verbatim. During the discussion, the supervisor tried hard to ascertain the trainee's case conceptualization, but failed. The trainee mentioned that she did not agree with the supervisor's focus on a client's family backfround or on a client's interpersonal relationships. The trainee disclosed her discomfort, anxiety, and sense of rejection insofar as these emotions related to the supervision. She felt frustration and more self-doubt in response to the supervisor-supervisee interactions. However, the supervisor did not focus on the trainee's emotions. The supervisor changed the topic from the trainee's emotions to the trainee's theory preference and pointed out that the trainee's low self-esteem caused her more difficulties. Finally, the trainee said she would like to end the supervision. The supervisor said that maybe the trainee's hurt feelings from the third session had lingered on and had prompted the trainee to request an end to the supervison. The supervisor pointed out the trainee's hurt feelings; however, rather than process them, the supervisor just invited the trainee to continue the supervision. The trainee refused.

Categories of Poor Supervisory Behaviors

In the present study, we uncovered seven categories of recurring poor supervisory behaviors: the supervisor's failure to follow the trainee's concerns, the supervisor's failure to give positive feedback, the supervisor's efforts to confront and to evaluate the trainee, the supervisor's insistence on the accuracy of her own assumptions, the supervisor's distortion of the intentions and the behaviors of the trainee, the

supervisor's insistence on suggestions with which the trainee openly disagreed, and the supervisor's failure to process the relationship issues. The results are specified as follows:

The supervisor's failure to follow the trainee's concerns

In each supervisory session, the trainee mentioned some difficulties that she had been experiencing in her counseling practice. However, the supervisor neither recognized nor traced the trainee's difficulties (concerns). Therefore, the supervision failed to clarify for the trainee how she might effectively address these concerns. The trainee expressed that she needed specific suggestions and disclosed her frustration several times in the supervisory process. From the dialogue, we found that the supervisor supervised the trainee on the basis not of the trainee's needs but of the supervisor's own agenda. For example, the supervisor asked the trainee to talk about her impressions of the client and what she felt about the client in each session. When the trainee answered such questions, the supervisor neither used the information nor asked more questions that might facilitate the formulation of an accurate hypothesis about a client's condition. In the following session, the supervisor ignored the trainee's concerns about concrete client-oriented interventions. As a result, the supervisor's abstract case conceptualization and the supervisor's lectures on theory failed to facilitate the trainee's learning of counseling. Below is an excerpt from the verbatim transcript:

C-4-248: *This time, I really don't know what to do.* (The trainee clearly expressed her difficulty.)

S-4-249: *O.K., in your theory, your preferred theory or skills, what are your reflections on your theory and skills?* (The supervisor didn't follow the trainee's concerns.)

The supervisor's failure to give positive feedback

In the supervisory process, the trainee described what had happened in her counseling practice. She mentioned that she had intervened with the client in ways that seemed proper. Most of the time, the supervisor's responses to the trainee's remarks were neutral, like "ah" or "hmm," and the supervisor gave the trainee no further positive feedback or encouragement. For example, in the second session, the trainee reported a specific topic from her discussion with a client: the client had mentioned that, despite his lengthy study sessions, he had received poor grades. During the supervision, the supervisor asked the trainee about her immediate response to the client's remark. When the trainee replied that she had empathized with the client's frustration, the supervisor said only "O.K." And although in the fourth session, the supervisor invited the trainee to think of any good responses or interventions from the counseling sessions, the supervisor responded to the trainee's related comments by nodding and by saying "uh huh." There was no further positive feedback.

The supervisor's efforts to confront and to evelute the trainee

Most of the time, the supervisor asked the trainee what she had failed to do. For example, the supervisor asked the trainee why she had not collected data about a client's family or interpersonal experiences. Sometimes the supervisor questioned the trainee's competency or evaluated the trainee's intervention. For example, in the third session, the supervisor challenged the trainee's decision merely to follow the client instead of either to steer the direction of the counseling or to deepen the content discussed. Moreover, the

supervisor questioned why the trainee had not formulated a consistent or appropriate goal for counseling. In the first and fourth sessions, the supervisor also pointed out several times that the trainee's low self-confidence had caused the impasse in her counseling process. The following excerpt from the verbatim transcript illustrates this point:

> *S-1-296: Yeah, that's because you have no confidence, so the client became an observer or a supervisor.*

> *S-4-435: That's your trait or something. Think about it, you seem to have no confidence.*

The supervisor's insistence on the accuracy of her own assumptions

From the verbatim transcript, it is easy to see that the supervisor had her own assumptions and opinions. She quickly voiced her own opinions, to which the trainee responded by providing additional information or explanations, but the supervisor insisted on the accuracy of her own opinions and tried to persuade the trainee to accept them. For example, in the second session, the trainee mentioned that the client had jumped from one topic to another and that she (the trainee) had not known what to focus on. The supervisor tried very hard to persuade the trainee that the client had not changed topics quickly; rather, the trainee was the one with the problem. The supervisor insisted that the trainee had ignored important information. Below is an excerpt from the verbatim transcript:

> *C-2-049: He mentioned too many details; he kept talking about many topics. I wanted to focus on one topic.*

> *S-2-052: That's because you didn't think what he said was important. You didn't think what he said about his sister and his relationship with his family was important, so you ignored that and thought your client was constantly changing topics.*

> *C-2056: I didn't think that was unimportant.*

> *S-2-124: In our thinking process, our attention focuses on the things that appear important to us. If you don't think something is important, you would tend to ignore it. Do you agree?*

The supervisor's distortion of the intentions and the behaviors of the trainee

When the trainee referred to some information about the client or to what she had done in counseling, the supervisor—rather than collect more information—hurried to voice some comments that sometimes distorted or exaggerated what the trainee had just expressed and that sometimes constituted hastily accepted conclusions. For example, in the first session, when the trainee mentioned that she had not known how to talk to a high school student, the supervisor concluded that the client had looked like a high school student and that therefore the trainee had not liked him. However, the information on which the supervisor based this conclusion was, itself, insufficient. The supervisor easily made other comments that were based on fragments of a situation. The following is an excerpt from the verbatim transcript:

C-3-074: I have no idea about how to change the client's smoking behavior.

S-3-075: It sounds like you feel helpless, because all of the clients' problems are serious, and you always find it difficult to handle them.

C-3-075: Not every client. Is it true? Do you really feel so?

S-3-076: You think it's hard to change the client's smoking behavior, and you don't know why he exhibits such behavior. So you think it's impossible to change the client.

The supervisor's insistence on suggestions with which the trainee openly disagreed

From the dialogue in the supervision, it is obvious that the supervisor and the supervisee had different opinions about the case conceptualization. The supervisor provided some suggestions about counseling intervention, but the trainee did not accept them either because the trainee did not think that those suggestions could help in her client's situation or because she held opinions that differed from the supervisor's. The following is an excerpt from the verbatim transcript:

C-3-143: We [counselor and client] didn't talk about his family or interpersonal relationships. I wonder if we should talk about those topics.

S-3-144: Does that mean our supervision didn't have any influence on your counseling?

C-3-144: You meant the part of the collected data? In fact, you keep asking me about the client's family or interpersonal relationships, but if I collected those types of information, I would lose site of my counseling goal. Therefore, I collected only the information that was useful for the intervention.

The supervisor's failure to process the relationship issues

There were some intense interactions between the supervisor and the supervisee. The supervisor lacked adequate sensitivity to the relationship issues and focused only on the case conceptualizations. The supervisor was not sensitive to the trainee's emotions. Several times, the trainee disclosed her emotional discomfort toward the supervision; however, the supervisor failed to process the relationship issues. Even though the trainee cried in the second session and directly expressed her anxiety and frustration in the third session, the supervisor made no mention of these events' importance relative to the process. In the fourth session, the trainee again referred to her frustration and discomfort with being evaluated in the process, and the supervisor acknowledged those feelings but failed to process them properly. The following excerpt from the verbatim transcript illustrates this point:

C-4-276: When you ask me questions, I feel like I am in an exam, which is very uncomfortable. (The trainee expressed her here-and-now feelings.)

S-4-277: Maybe you expect something concrete, but I also expect other things from you. I expect you
to reflect on yourself. No matter what your counseling theory or techniques may be, you must
have your reasons. (The supervisor explained her expectation without processing the feelings of
the trainee.)

Discussion

In the present study, we investigated what happened in a prematurely terminated supervision case and
focused on the interactions between the supervisor and the supervisee. In line with our findings, we drew a
comprehensive picture of what had happened in the supervisory process. The findings supported the assertion
that many poor supervisory behaviors not only occurred but also resurfaced throughout the supervisory
process and that the dropout had resulted not from a single severe harmful event but from a series of both
mild conflictual events and severe conflictual events.

Consistent with previous research that has examined negative supervisory experiences (Hutt et al.,
1983; Gray et al., 2001), the present findings suggest that most of the trainee＇s supervisory needs were
unmet in the poor supervisory interactions. During the four supervisory sessions, the supervisor failed to
follow the trainee＇s concerns, failed to give positive feedback, and too often confronted and evaluated the
trainee. A plausible explanation for the dropout hinges on the fact that the dyad did not discuss each other＇s
expectations at the beginning of the supervision process and that the supervisor was insensitive to the novice
trainee＇s developmental needs.

The supervisee was a counselor in training. A beginning counselor can be very anxious about his or her
counseling ability (Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998). Consequently, supervisees often benefit from
an abundance of acceptance, support, and encouragement. Apparently, during the four supervision sessions of
this study, the supervisee exhibited many characteristics that reflected positively on her counseling. However,
the supervisor did not at all reflect these merits on the supervisee. Indeed, the supervisor not only failed to
provide positive feedback but also repeatedly confronted and evaluated the supervisee about her personality
and ability. Scholars have demonstrated that a supportive supervisory relationship is the basic element of good
supervision (Allen et al., 1986; Kennard et al., 1987; Hutt et al., 1983; Strozier, Barnett-Queen, & Bennett,
2000); and yet, supportive interactions were absent from the four sessions of this study.

Although the supervisor tried to help the trainee consider her clients from different perspectives, the
supervisor insisted on her own assumptions and distorted the intentions and behaviors of the trainee. For
example, the supervisee disagreed with the supervisor＇s suggestions about what information should be
collected. Nonetheless, the supervisor insisted on the accuracy of her own opinions, rejected the supervisee＇
s views to the contrary, and attempted to persuade the supervisee to agree with her. In other words, difference
was not respected. Consequently, a power struggle rooted itself in the dyad＇s discussion of their respective
counseling beliefs. The same conflicts have surfaced in other studies (Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983; Nelson
& Friedlander, 2001). Researchers have demonstrated that intolerance of differences gives rise to bad, or
nonproductive, supervisory behavior (Gray et al., 2001; Magnuson et al., 2000). One implication of the
present study is that when two parties＇ counseling approaches are different, the supervisor＇s acceptance of
and respect for the difference are very important.

In the present study, the trainee exhibited many negative emotions toward the supervisor. These emotions

initially appeared in the second session and lasted through the fourth session. The intensity of the emotions increased as the supervision went on. According to studies on supervisees' nondisclosure, supervisees found it most difficult to disclose their negative emotions toward the supervisors (Hsu, 2004; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996; Yourman & Farber, 1996). Also, many studies have found that most supervisees do not disclose their negative emotions to their supervisors and that supervisees expect their supervisors to be aware of these emotions and to process them (Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983; Nelson & Friedlander, 2001). However, the supervisee of the present study actively expressed her frustration many times. Gray et al. (2001) found that when trainees disclose their negative experience, their supervisors' willingness to discuss the experience is helpful. But the supervisor in the present study neither discussed the trainee's experience of frustration nor effectively processed the trainee's disclosure in terms of the relationship issues.

Even though the supervisor became aware of the trainee's hurt feelings in the fourth session, she attributed the problem solely to the trainee, without considering her own contributions to the conflict. It appears that the supervisor lacked the ability to reflect on herself. Therefore, she did not change her views or behaviors to repair her relationship with the supervisee. When the conflict first made itself apparent, the supervisor should have examined the dynamics of the relationship and should have clarified or renegotiated three things: the two parties' roles, the supervisory style, and the goals and the tasks of the supervision. Most important, the supervisor should have displayed an open attitude toward the trainee's inner experiences, especially toward the trainee's negative emotions toward the supervisor. Also, the supervisor should have assumed responsibility in the conflictual relationship. Had the supervisor dealt with the conflicts appropriately, the problems in the supervisory relationship could have been processed. The findings of the present study highlight the importance that underlies the development and the maintenance of an effective alliance. According to Rabinowitz, Heppner, and Roehlke (1986), their study's supervisee respondents reported that clarification of the supervisor-supervisee relationship was of particular importance. The present study lends additional support to this assertion.

The results of the present study support findings that it is difficult for supervisors to process issues of conflict in supervisory relationships. Such results support the notion that supervisors need more training about how to handle issues of conflict effectively. In the training of supervisors, the ability to recognize and to deal with inevitable interpersonal challenges with trainees should be important components.

The supervisor of the present study was an experienced counselor and a trained supervisor with years of supervisory experience. However, she repeatedly exhibited many poor supervisory behaviors in the supervisory process. Apparently, experience is no guarantee that a supervisor will be effective. The results support the findings of Shanfield et al. (1993). As Watkins (1997) observed, when supervisors gain experience after years of work but lack peer consultation on supervision owing to time constraints and to missed opportunities, the supervisors' ability to supervise trainees suffers accordingly. Consequently, the construction of a good supervisory system can help ensure that the quality of supervisory work will rank high in importance.

Conclusion

Watkins (1997) suggested that every supervisor inevitably exhibits some bad supervisory behavior. However, an essential factor that damages a supervisory relationship or that negatively affects the growth of

the supervisee comprises the supervisors' persisting behaviors and styles of relating to supervisees. We dealt with the phenomenon in the present study. The seven poor supervisory behaviors that we identified surfaced throughout all four sessions. In other words, any single bad supervisory behavior may have had, by itself, no discernable negative effects. It is the persisting behavioral patterns that, in this case, damaged the supervisory relationship and hurt the supervisee. The importance of the relationship factors for both the supervisee and the supervisor is implicit in all models (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). One can argue with rigor that the related damage to the supervisory relationship led to the eventual dropout.

Limitations and Implications

In the present study, the sample size was small and the only supervisee was a counselor in training. If the supervisee had been a well-versed counselor, the supervisory interactions causing the dropout would have been different. Consequently, future studies might treat the negative supervisory experiences of experienced counselors in order to understand both the counselors' experiences and the persistence of poor supervisory behaviors. It is meaningful to understand and compare counselors' perceptions about either bad supervisory behaviors or the persistence of poor supervisory interactions insofar as these factors occur at different levels of the counselors' professional development.

Furthermore, the present study identified neither the supervisor's perspective nor the supervisee's perspective as they concerned the process of dropout; therefore, neither perspective entered into our understanding of the dyad's respective perceptions. In the future, studies about dropout can collect and can process transcripts accordingly and can thereby account for these perceptions of the supervisors and the supervisees simultaneously. In particular, supervisors' perceptions concerning their bad supervisory practices are lacking in empirical studies. If researchers were to spell out the experiences of the supervisors, researchers might better understand supervisors' perceptions of dropout causes. It would be useful to determine how the supervisors perceive/interpret negative supervisory interaction and how they treat the negative events. On the basis of these and similar studies, researchers might clarify the skills that, in the context of supervision training, can best meet supervisors' needs. In turn, practitioners could incorporate this knowledge into the design of supervisory training programs.

We also suggest that researchers study a greater number of negative supervisory dyads in order to look into conflicting supervisory relationships. For example, research in the field should determine when and how conflicts occur, how the process of conflict development unfolds, and what outcomes stem from different processes of conflict. Conflicts are common in any human relationship. Because the supervisory relationship is one kind of human relationship, conflicts can occur in supervisory interactions. This assertion is of particular importance because the differential power in the supervisory relationship makes it challenging for supervisees to talk out conflicts with supervisors. Indeed, some pivotal conflicts may never come to the attention of supervisors. Consequently, the issue of conflict in the supervision should be valued.

References

Allen, G. J., Szollos, S. J., & Williams, B. E. (1986). Doctoral students' comparative evaluations of best and worst psychotherapy supervision. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 17,* 91-99.

Burke, W. R., Goodyear, R. K., & Guzzard, C. R. (1998). Weakening and repair in supervisory alliances: A multiple-case study. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 52,* 450-462.

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

Ellis, M. V. (2001). Harmful supervision, a cause for alarm: Comment on Gray et al. (2001) and Nelson and Friedlander (2001). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48,* 401-406.

Gray, L. A., Ladany, N., Ancis, J. R., & Walker, J. A. (2001). Psychotherapy trainees＇ experience of counterproductive events in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48,* 371-383.

Hsu, S. L. (2004). Nondisclosure of supervisees in the supervisory process. *Bulletin of Educational Psychology, 36,* 109-125.

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,* 118-123.

Kennard, B. D., Stewart, S. M., & Gluck, M. R. (1987). The supervision relationship: Variables contributing to positive versus negative experiences. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18,* 172-175.

Ladany, N., Hill, C. E., Corbett, M. M., & Nutt, E. A. (1996). Nature, extent, and importance of what psychotherapy trainees do not disclosure to their supervisors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43,* 12-24.

Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Norem, K. (2000). A profile of lousy supervision: Experienced counselors＇ perspectives. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39,* 189-202.

Moskowitz, S. A., & Rupert, P. A. (1983). Conflict resolution within the supervisory relationship. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 14,* 632-641.

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

Nigam, T., Cameron, P. M., & Leverette, J. S. (1997). Impasses in supervisory process: A resident＇s perspective. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 51,* 252-272.

Rabinowitz, F. E., Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1986). Descriptive study of process and outcome variables of supervision over time. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33,* 292-300.

Ramos- Sánchez, L., Esnil, E., Goodwin, A., Riggs, S., Touster, L. O., Wright, L. K., et al. (2002). Negative supervisory events: Effects on supervision satisfaction and supervisory alliance. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33,* 197-202.

Shanfield, S. B., Hetherly, V. V., & Matthews, K. L., (2001). Excellent supervision the residents＇ perspective. *Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research, 10,* 23-27.

Shanfield, S. B., Matthews, K. L., & Hetherly, V. (1993). What do excellent psychotherapy supervisors do? *American Journal of Psychiatry, 150,* 1081- 1084.

Shanfield, S. B., Mohl, P. C., Matthews, K. L., & Hetherly, V. (1992). Quantitative assessment of the behavior of psychotherapy supervisors. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 149,* 352-357.

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

Stoltenberg, C., McNeill, B., & Delworth, U. (1998). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model of supervising counselors and therapists.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strozier, A. L., Barnett-Queen, T., & Bennett, C. K. (2000). Supervision: Critical process and outcome variables. *The Clinical Supervisor, 19,* 21-39.

Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1997). The ineffective psychotherapy supervisor: Some reflections about bad behaviors, poor process, and offensive outcomes. *The Clinical Supervisor, 16,* 163-180.

Worthen, V., & McNeill, B. W. (1996). A phenomenological investigation of "good" supervision events. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43,* 25-34.

Wulf, J., & Nelson, M. L. (2000). Experienced psychologists' recollections of internship supervision and its contributions to their development. *The Clinical Supervisor, 19,* 123-145.

Yourman, D. B., & Farber, B. A. (1996). Nondisclosure and distortion in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy, 33,* 567-575.

受督導者提早結束督導：
一個督導配對的密集分析

許 韶 玲　　　　　　　　　　蔡 秀 玲
國立交通大學　　　　　　　　　中原大學
教育研究所　　　　　　　　　通識教育中心

本研究的目的乃在對一個提早終止的督導關係進行分析，分析的焦點在整個督導歷程與雙方的互動關係，由於這個督導配對共維持四次督導，因此本研究針對這四次督導歷程進行密集分析，以掌握與瞭解督導雙方的互動情形、督導關係中發生的事件，並從中找出可能造成督導關係提前結束的互動形態。 研究結果發現：受督導者之所以提早離開督導關係是因為督導歷程不斷重複出現相同的衝突事件，隨著這些與督導關係有關的衝突事件持續上場，受督導者的負向情緒逐漸積壓。本研究共找出七個重複在督導歷程出現的負向督導行為，其中最普遍的是督導者面質與負向評價受督導者、曲解受督導者的意圖與行為、以及無法聚焦於受督導者的問題與困難。研究發現關係的提早結束是可以避免的，如果督導者能察覺受督導者的受傷情形、督導關係已然受損的現實，並調整其與受督導者互動的方式與風格，那麼督導關係將有機會修復，督導也能持續進行下去。

關鍵字：受督導者、提早結束、督導者、督導歷程