



Title	The effect of supervisor and trainee therapist gender on supervision discourse
Authors(s)	McHale, Ed, Carr, Alan
Publication date	1998-11
Publication information	McHale, Ed, and Alan Carr. "The Effect of Supervisor and Trainee Therapist Gender on Supervision Discourse." Wiley-Blackwell, November 1998. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.00095 .
Publisher	Wiley-Blackwell
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/5446
Publisher's statement	This is the author's version of the following article: The effect of supervisor and trainee therapist gender on supervision discourse. (1998-10). Journal of Family Therapy 20 which has been published in final form at http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-6427.00095
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1111/1467-6427.00095

Downloaded 2026-05-02 00:26:24

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)



© Some rights reserved. For more information

McHale, E. & Carr, A. (1998). The effect of supervisor and trainee therapist gender on supervision discourse. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 20, 395-411.

THE EFFECT OF SUPERVISOR AND TRAINEE THERAPIST GENDER ON SUPERVISION DISCOURSE

Ed McHale & Alan Carr

INTRODUCTION

Gender is central to the family therapy agenda (Avis, 1989; Walters et al, 1988; Knudson-Martin, 1997). However, rigorous research on gender in both systemic therapy and supervision systems is sparse (Gurman & Klein, 1980; Long, Lawless & Dotson, 1996). The study reported here is one contribution to this small and important literature. It is concerned with the impact of the genders of supervisors and trainee therapists on supervision discourse and the discourse style of supervisors and trainee therapists. Supervision discourse refers to the exchanges that occur between supervisors and trainee therapists during live supervision. Supervision discourse style refers to the particular way in which supervisors and therapists participate in this discourse. In this study, directive and collaborative supervisory discourse styles and co-operative and resistant therapist discourse styles are of central concern. Details of these styles will be given in the method section.

Empirical findings on gender differences in communication styles generally, and those specific to therapy and supervision are of particular relevance to this study and so will first be briefly reviewed. A recent meta-analysis of gender differences in communication styles confirm stereotypic expectations of gender roles in western industrialized cultures, that males tend to be more directive and dominant, while females tend to be more responsive, open

and affiliative (Pruett, 1989; Tannen, 1994). These studies were conducted in experimental rather than therapeutic situations. Hence they are relevant to studies of gender and communication in family therapy supervision only insofar as their results may usefully be contrasted with those from studies conducted within a therapeutic context.

Few studies of the impact of gender of family therapy process have been conducted, but those that have confirm that gender stereotypes have a clear impact on therapeutic discourse. Newberry et al (1991), in a study of first family interviews, found that father's responded more positively to structuring and directive interactions and both mothers and fathers responded more positively to non-structuring, supportive interventions from female therapists but not male therapists. Shields and McDaniel (1992) in a study of first family therapy interviews, found that male therapists spoke more than female therapists during therapy sessions and offered more explanations but male and female therapists did not differ in supportiveness to clients. Clients made more structuring comments to male therapists and disagreed more when their therapists were female.

Within the field of individual psychotherapy and counselling supervision, there is some evidence that supervisor and therapist gender influence the supervision process. Worthington and Stern (1985) found that trainee counsellors rated *relationships* with same gender, rather than opposite gender, supervisors more positively, their ratings of *competence* were associated with supervisors supervision skills rather than their gender. Robyak and colleagues (Robyak et al, 1986, 1987) in two studies of supervision in counselling have found that the gender of the counsellor had little impact on the *counsellor's* preference for supervisors to use particular power bases as part of their supervisory style. However, the gender of the supervisor had an impact on *supervisors'* power base preferences, with male supervisors preferring a referent power base in comparison with females. That is male supervisors had a preference to influence the trainee counsellors by encouraging them to identify with the supervisor (rather than appealing to expert knowledge or authoritative position).

This literature suggests that male supervisors will tend to use more a more directive style and females to use a more collaborative style; that male trainee therapists will use a more resistant style and speak more than their female counterparts and that same gender supervisor-trainee therapist pairings will be characterized by greater collaboration and co-operation. While these were our hypotheses, they were nested within the following four main questions which underpinned the design of the study. (1) What impact do the genders of supervisors and trainee therapists have on supervisor discourse style ? (2) What impact do the genders of supervisors and trainee therapists have on trainee therapist discourse style? (3) What impact do the genders of supervisors and trainee therapists have on combinations of particular supervisor and trainee therapist styles and on the degree to which the supervisor dominates the supervision discussion? (4) Are there significant relationship between supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables within same gender and opposite gender supervisor and trainee therapist systems?

METHOD

Design

In this study the effects of supervisor and trainee therapist genders on supervision discourse were examined using a two factor design. The combination of two factors - supervisor gender and trainee therapist gender - yielded four types of supervision systems. These were male supervisor and male trainee therapist; male supervisor and female trainee therapist; female supervisor and male trainee therapist; and female supervisor and female trainee therapist. For each type of supervision system, 10 episodes of interaction between supervisors and trainee therapists during live supervision behind a one-way screen were videotaped. These 40 episodes were coded to give data on two supervisor discourse style variables and two trainee therapist discourse style variables. The supervisor

discourse variables were directive supervisor discourse style and collaborative supervisor discourse style. The principal trainee therapist discourse variables were resistant discourse style and co-operative discourse style.

Participants

Eight supervisors and nineteen trainee therapists participated in this study. All were members of the three year Professional Training Programme in Family Therapy conducted at the Clanwilliam Institute in Dublin between 1995 and 1997. Four of the supervisors were female and four were male. They had between 2 and 8 years of supervision experience and 5 to 14 years clinical experience in family therapy practice. Three had primary qualifications in clinical psychology, three in social worker, one in nursing and one in teaching. Six described their orientation as Post-Milan, social-constructionism and two were affiliated to the constructivist movement. Supervisors varied in the number of episodes they contributed to the study with the maximum being 9 and the minimum being 2. Of the nineteen trainee therapists who participated in the study, six were male and thirteen were female. There was considerable variability in the professional backgrounds of the trainee therapists. Six had primary qualifications in pastoral care; five in child or family care; three in nursing; two in teaching; two in social work; and one in clinical psychology. There was also some variability in the level of experience of trainees in family therapy. Eleven of the trainees contributed supervision episodes from their first eighteen month period in the programme. The supervision episodes of the remaining eight trainees were drawn from the second eighteen month period of the programme. Trainee therapists also varied in the number of episodes they contributed to the study with the maximum being 7 and the minimum being 1. No attempt was made, within the overall design of the study, to randomize or match the four groups of ten episodes of supervision on supervisor, therapist or client characteristics.

Instruments

The principal instruments used in this study were a video-recoding machine for recording episodes of supervisor-trainee therapist discourse and a discourse coding system. This system was based on a series of codes drawn from The Therapist Behaviour Code (Forgatch & Chamberlain, 1992) and the Therapeutic Interaction Coding System (Shields, 1987). While these systems were developed to analyse therapist-client discourse, they included codes which tapped the types of supervisor and trainee therapist discourse of central concern to the present study. Codes were selected from these systems and combined to form collaborative and directive supervisor discourse style variables and co-operative and resistant therapist discourse style variables on the basis of expert judgements of the authors informed by the literature reviewed in the introduction to this paper.

The supervisor directive discourse style composite variable was based on the sum of scores from the following codes: instruct or direct, structure, confront, interrupt or talk over, and declaration of opinion as fact. The supervisor collaborative discourse style composite variable was based on the sum of scores from the following codes: support or agree, open question, facilitate, disclose, and suggest or propose. The trainee therapist resistant discourse style composite variable was based on the sum of scores from the following codes: blame or complain, defend self, avoid or not respond, interrupt or talk over, and declaration of opinion as fact. The trainee therapist co-operative discourse style composite variable was based on the sum of scores from the following codes: agree, personal disclosure, appreciate, and humour. A reliability check on 10% of episodes yielded inter-rater agreement of 80-100% across all codes.

Procedure

All supervision episodes were drawn from sessions which occurred as part of a three year Professional Training Programme in Family Therapy at the

Clanwilliam Institute, in Dublin, Ireland. These sessions were conducted by trainee therapists who were receiving live supervision from behind a one-way mirror and who were also being observed by a group of 3-5 other trainee therapists. Before and after these sessions, supervisors and teams of 3-5 trainees conducted planning and debriefing supervision meetings. However, the supervision episodes studied in this investigation were those that occurred about mid-way through the clinical session. The average duration of these episodes was 15 minutes. During these supervision episodes the central aim of supervision was to facilitate the development of the trainee therapists' competence by giving them an opportunity to take initiative in planning future interactions with clients for the remainder of the session. Other trainees were encouraged to participate in these supervision discussions. Final clinical responsibility for all cases rested with the supervisor. Clients, trainee therapists and supervisors gave informed consent to participate in the study.

RESULTS

For convenience the results will be presented in four sections which correspond to the four questions listed at the end of the introduction. The first section will focus on the effects of supervisor and trainee therapist gender on supervisor discourse variables. The second section will focus on trainee therapist discourse variables. The third section will deal with combined supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables. The fourth section will be concerned with relationships between supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables.

ANOVA results for supervisor discourse variables.

The means and standard deviations of the four types of supervision systems on supervisor discourse variables are presented in Table 10.1 along with the results of two-way analyses of variance for each of the supervisor discourse variables.

From Table 10.1, the following conclusions may be drawn. First, supervisor gender had a statistically significant effect on the degree to which supervisors used a directive style in supervision. Female supervisors used an directive style more commonly than male supervisors. Trainee therapist gender had no effect on supervisor discourse style.

Analyses of the component discourse codes which made up the instrumental directive supervision style showed that supervisor gender had a statistically significant effect on the *structure* code, the *interrupt* code and *declaration of opinion as fact* code. Compared with male supervisors, female supervisors interrupted trainees more and made more declarations of opinions as facts. However, male supervisors made more structuring comments than female supervisors.

Thus male supervisors were more likely to make comments such as " There is a sense that a clear line of questioning to address this issue is required here...a plan about how you will tackle the next part."

Female supervisors were more likely to make interrupt trainees and make comments like

"The central problem is the marriage...not the parenting stuff."

ANOVA results for trainee therapist discourse variables.

The means and standard deviations of the four types of supervision systems on trainee therapist discourse variables are presented in Table 10.2 along with the results of two-way analyses of variance for each of the trainee therapist discourse variables. From Table 10.2 the following conclusions may be drawn. First, neither supervisor nor trainee therapist gender had a significant effect on the composite resistant or co-operative trainee therapist discourse style variables. However, trainee gender did have a significant effect on one component of the resistant discourse style and one component of the co-operative discourse style. With the resistant discourse style, female trainee therapists interrupted or talked

over supervisors more than male trainee therapists. With the co-operative discourse style, male trainee therapists used more humour than females.

Thus, female trainees were more likely to engage in discourse like

Supervisor: "So when you are asking about Tom's position, what ..."

Therapist: " (Talking over supervisor) I'm still not sure about where Mary is coming from."

Male therapists showed humour in ways like this:

Supervisor: "You have been working hard in there. What do you need to make sense of this. What do you need..eh....right now?"

Therapist: "A pint of Guinness!"

ANOVA results for combined supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables.

The means and standard deviations of the four types of supervision systems on combined supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables are presented in Table 10.3 along with the results of two-way analyses of variance for each of these variables. From Table 10.3 the following conclusions may be drawn.

First, supervisor gender had a statistically significant effect on the combined variable derived by dividing the total talk time by the amount of time the trainee spent talking. High scores on this variable reflect little trainee input to supervision discussions. Trainees with male supervisors made less input to these discussions.

Second, supervisor gender had a statistically significant effect on the combined variable derived from adding supervisors' use of a directive style and trainees use of a resistant style. Discourse characterised by this combination was more common for systems containing a female supervisor than for those containing a male supervisor. The following discourse typifies this pattern:

Supervisor: "Focus on Bill's views in a fair bit of detail first and then...well.. if it fits...check out how Sam reacts to this. This will bring Bill back in more..he's been ..well not engaging enough..."

Trainee: "I suppose I want to avoid ...well losing the thread of Sam's story. No. I should continue on with Sam..I feel like that is the way to go at..eh..at this point."

Correlational analyses of supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables discourse variables.

To assess the relationship between supervisor discourse styles and trainee therapist discourse styles, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed for each of the four types of supervisor-trainee therapist systems and across all four types of systems. These are presented in Table 10.4. Correlations between each of the main supervision styles and each of the main trainee therapist styles are also included in the table. From Table 10.4 it may be seen that when data for four supervisor-trainee therapist systems were combined together, statistically significant positive correlations occurred between the collaborative supervision style and both co-operative and resistant trainee therapist styles. However, when correlations from same and opposite gender supervisor-trainee therapist systems were computed a clear pattern emerged. For same gender supervisor-trainee therapist supervision systems, highly significant ($p < .001$) and extremely large positive correlations ($r = .78-.93$) were found between the collaborative systemic supervision styles and both co-operative and resistant trainee therapist styles. These four correlations which have been set in bold in Table 10.4 are the largest correlations between supervisor and trainee therapist styles in the entire matrix. For opposite gender supervisor-trainee therapist pairs, the correlations between supervisor collaborative style and either trainee therapist styles were far smaller and only one of these four correlations was statistically significant. This was the correlation between supervisor collaborative style and trainee therapist co-operative style for the male supervisor and female trainee therapist supervision

systems. This correlation was of a moderate size ($r=.66$) and smaller than the other four significant correlations in the matrix.

From this pattern of correlations it may be concluded that for same gender supervisor-trainee therapist supervision systems, a collaborative supervision style led in almost all instances to greater co-operative and resistant trainee therapist styles. This discourse pattern did not occur for opposite gender systems. From Table 10.4 it may also be seen that non-significant correlations occurred between supervisor directive style and both co-operative and resistant trainee therapist styles. It may be therefore concluded that when supervisors adopted a directive style, trainee therapists did not consistently adopt either a co-operative or resistant style. Rather, their responses were unpredictable. A third noteworthy observation from Table 10.4 is that for all supervisor-trainee therapist system types, there were positive correlations between trainee therapist styles but not supervisor styles. Thus, it may be concluded that when trainee therapists co-operated a great deal, they also resisted a great deal and when they co-operated little, they also resisted little. However, there was little relationship between supervisors' use of a collaborative style and a directive style.

DISCUSSION

With respect to the first question posed in the introduction, concerning the effects of supervisor and trainee therapist gender on supervisor discourse style, it may be concluded that, contrary to our hypothesis, female supervisors used a directive style more commonly than male supervisors. They tended to interrupt trainees more and made more declarations of opinions as facts. Trainee therapist gender had no effect on supervisor discourse style.

With respect to our second question, contrary to our hypothesis we found that neither supervisor nor trainee therapist gender had an effect on the overall discourse style used by trainee therapists. However, trainee therapist gender did influence the frequency of interruptions (a component of the resistant style) and

the use of humour (a component of the co-operative style). Male trainees used more humour, while female therapists interrupted the supervisors more frequently.

With respect to the third question, concerning combined supervisor and trainee therapist discourse we found, contrary to our hypothesis, that a directive supervision style and a resistant trainee therapist style was more common for systems containing a female supervisor than for those containing a male supervisor. However, supporting one of our hypotheses in this area we found that trainees with male supervisors made less input to supervision discussions.

With respect to the relationships between supervisor and trainee discourse variables, the area addressed by our fourth question, we found that for same gender supervisor-trainee therapist supervision systems, a collaborative supervision style was correlated with both co-operative and resistant trainee therapist styles. This discourse pattern did not occur for opposite gender supervision systems, indicating that a collaborative supervision style was consistently associated with trainee therapist participation (either co-operatively or resistantly) within same gender pairings of supervisors and trainee therapists. This discourse pattern did not occur for opposite gender systems. When supervisors adopted a directive style, trainee therapists did not consistently adopted either a co-operative or resistant style. Rather, their responses were unpredictable.

The shortcomings of this study place limits on the degree of confidence that may be placed in its findings. The principal limitations of the study is its scale and the possibility that confounding variables may have influenced the results. With respect to the scale of the study, only forty episodes of supervision were examined, with only ten episodes per cell in the 2X2 design. It would have been preferable to have included far more episodes to increase the power of the statistical tests and permit subtle interactions between therapist and supervisor gender to be detected.

With respect to the possible influence of confounding variables on the obtained results, there was the possibility that characteristics of supervisors, therapists and

clients, which were neither randomized nor counterbalanced across the four conditions of the study, could have had an unknown, yet significant, effect on the results. This effect could have occurred because *separately* supervisor, therapist and client characteristics may have influenced supervisory discourse or because the way in which supervisors, therapists and clients were *combined*, may have led to some supervisory systems having different interactional characteristics than others. Ideally, supervisors, therapists and client should have been randomly assigned to the four cells of the design or at least an attempt should have been made to match episodes in all four cells so that they did not differ on important supervisor, therapist or client variables. Future studies should included this feature in their design.

On the positive side, we are fairly confident that our supervisors and trainee therapists were representative of the populations from which they were drawn. That is, they were representative of Irish supervisors and trainee therapists. Our impression from is that they were probably also representative of trainee therapists and supervisors working within other European countries, North America and Australia. We were also confident that the codes selected to operationalize the four discourse styles were both theoretically valid and reliably rated.

In speculating about our findings we are reluctant to make more than a few tentative hypotheses at how they came about and their significance for the practice of supervision. We suspect that the main finding of female supervisors adopting a directive style and males adopting a collaborative style may be due to selection factors; the impact of training; or the effects of the supervisory context. Each possibility will be considered in turn. The first possibility is that men and women who opt to train in family therapy and are selected to do so may be those who do not conform to stereotypic communication styles, such as those summarised by Pruett (1989). It may be that women with a more directive style and men with a more collaborative style are selected into the profession. The second possibility is that the process of training as a professional family therapist and family therapist supervisor, impacts differently on men and women, with

women responding to training by developing a directive style and men a collaborative style, particularly in programmes which place considerable emphasis upon gender sensitivity in the course content and the supervision focus and in which males are in the minority (Burck & Daniel, 1995). The third possibility is that the supervisory context (unlike the experimental contexts within which the research on gender and communication has been conducted (Pruett, 1989) elicits a directive style from female supervisors and a collaborative style from males. Of course, some combination of selection, training and contextual factors may underpin the differences between male and female supervisors found in this study.

Clearly the study requires replication and extension. The absence of gender communication stereotypes within supervision systems found in this study requires further exploration. An interesting starting point would be a video-review study in which supervisor intentions when they communicate in non-gender-stereotypic fashion are explored qualitatively. A second issue requiring exploration is the finding that within same-gender pairs, a collaborative supervision style invariably leads to greater involvement of trainees, whereas a directive style leads to unpredictable therapist behaviour. A further study is required here to examine trainee therapists' perceptions of collaborative and directive supervision styles.

From a clinical viewpoint, the study highlights the importance of using a collaborative rather than a directive supervision style, within same gender supervision systems, since such a style leads to greater productivity in terms of both therapist co-operation and resistance. For trainee therapists engaging in a mix of co-operative and resistant discourse with supervisors probably promotes the development of professional autonomy. The study also highlights the need for supervisors and trainee therapists to be aware of the unpredictable impact of opposite gender supervision systems on trainee therapists' discourse.

SUMMARY

The effects of supervisor and trainee therapist gender on supervision discourse were examined in this study. Forty episodes of supervision discourse, with ten drawn from each of four types of supervision systems were videotaped. The systems were (1) male supervisor and male trainee therapist; (2) male supervisor and female trainee therapist; (3) female supervisor and male trainee therapist; and (4) female supervisor and female trainee therapist. The episodes of supervision discourse were analysed using a supervision discourse coding system which showed adequate inter-rater reliability. For supervisors, the system allowed a directive discourse style and a collaborative discourse style to be coded. A co-operative discourse style and a resistant discourse style could be coded for trainee therapists. Two statistically significant findings of considerable theoretical and clinical importance emerged. First, contrary to stereotypic expectations, discourse characterized a directive supervision style and a resistant trainee therapist style was more common for systems containing a female supervisor than for those containing a male supervisor. Second, for same gender supervisor-trainee-therapist supervision systems, a collaborative systemic supervision style was correlated with both co-operative and resistant trainee therapist styles. This discourse pattern did not occur for opposite gender supervision systems, indicating that a collaborative supervision discourse style is consistently associated with trainee therapist participation (either co-operatively or resistantly) within same gender pairings of supervisors and trainee therapists. These results are discussed in light of relevant literature on gender, power and supervision process and the limitations of the study are considered.

REFERENCES

- Avis, P (1989). Integrating gender into the family therapy curriculum. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 1, 3-26.

- Burke, C. & Daniel, G. (1995). *Gender and Family Therapy*. London: Karnac.
- Forgatch, M. & Chamberlain, P. (1992). *Therapist Resistance Code*. Oregon Social Learning Centre, Eugene Oregon.
- Frankel, B. & Piercey, F. (1990). The relationship among selected supervisor, therapist and client behaviour. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 16, 407-421.
- Gurman, A. & Klein, M. (1980). The treatment of women in marital and family conflict. Recommendations for outcome evaluation. In A. Brodsky & R. Hare-Mustin (eds.), *Research on Psychotherapy with Women*. New York: Guilford.
- Knudson-Martin, C. (1997). The politics of gender in family therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 23, 421-437.
- Long, J., Lawless, J., & Dotson, D. (1996). Supervisory styles index: Examining supervisees' perceptions of supervisory style. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 18, 589-606.
- Newberry, A., Alexander, J. & Turner, C. (1991). Gender as a process variable in family therapy. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 5, 158-175.
- Pruett, B. (1989). Male and female communication style differences: A meta analysis. In C. Lont & S. Friendly (eds.), *Beyond Boundaries: Sex And Gender Diversity In Communication*. Fairfax, VC: George Mason University Press.
- Robyak, J. Goodyear, R. & Prange, M. (1987). Effects of supervisors sex focus and experience on preference for interpersonal power bases. *Counsellor Education and Supervision*, 1987, 299-309.
- Robyak, J. Goodyear, R., Prange, M. & Donham, G. (1986). Effect of gender, supervision and presenting problem on practicum students preference for interpersonal power base. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 33, 159-163.
- Shields, C. & McDaniel, S. (1992). Process differences between male and female therapists in a first family interview. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 18, 143-151.

- Shields, C. (1987). *Therapeutic Interaction Coding System*. Department of Family Medicine, University of Rochester & Highland Hospital, New York.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walters, M., Carter, B., Papp, P. & Silverstein, O. (1988). *The Invisible Webb: Gender Patterns in Family Relationships*. New York: Guilford.
- Worthington, E. & Stern, A. (1985). Effects of supervisor degree level and gender on the supervisory relationship. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, 32, 252-262.

Table 10.1. ANOVA Results for supervisor discourse variables

Discourse codes		Groups				ANOVA effects			
		Male Supervisor & Male Trainee N = 10	Male Supervisor & Female Trainee N = 10	Female Supervisor & Male Trainee N = 10	Female Supervisor & Female Trainee N = 10	Main Effects	Supervisor Gender (SG)	Trainee Gender (TG)	SG X TG Interaction
Directive discourse									
Instruct or Direct	Mean	6.70	6.60	12.20	11.10	1.41	0.04	2.78	0.03
	SD	5.05	8.00	10.04	12.99				
Structure	Mean	2.10	0.70	1.30	0.80	2.69	4.73*	0.64	1.06
	SD	2.02	1.06	1.25	0.92				
Confront	Mean	0.10	0.10	0.90	0.20	2.62	1.98	3.27	1.98
	SD	0.32	0.32	1.45	0.42				
Interrupt	Mean	0.40	0.60	1.90	0.70	5.59**	10.35**	0.83	0.23
	SD	0.52	1.08	2.73	1.49				
Declaration of opinion as fact	Mean	5.60	1.70	7.90	0.80	4.29*	8.44**	0.14	0.71
	SD	8.55	2.95	7.78	1.03				
Total Instrumental or Directive discourse score	Mean	27.60	15.50	34.90	18.80	4.38*	7.80**	0.97	0.13
	SD	20.90	9.36	17.96	11.99				
Collaborative discourse									
Support	Mean	1.90	1.40	3.60	2.20		2.68	1.97	3.40
	SD	1.20	1.43	3.53	1.54				0.44
Open question	Mean	4.70	5.00	5.60	7.70	1.44	0.88	1.99	0.50
	SD	4.29	4.40	2.95	5.46				
Facilitate	Mean	2.90	1.50	3.60	2.50	0.53	0.73	0.34	0.01
	SD	5.67	3.10	5.10	4.30				
Disclose	Mean	1.40	0.80	0.80	0.60	0.44	0.44	0.44	0.11
	SD	2.80	1.87	0.92	1.58				
Suggest or propose	Mean	5.60	7.50	8.50	5.30	0.11	0.17	0.05	2.58
	SD	4.20	6.77	3.17	5.21				
Total Collaborative or systemic discourse score	Mean	16.50	16.20	22.10	18.30	0.72	0.32	1.12	0.23
	SD	12.53	8.05	11.65	13.07				

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 10.2 ANOVA results for trainee therapist discourse variables.

Discourse codes		Groups				ANOVA effects			
		Male Supervisor & Male Trainee N = 10	Male Supervisor & Female Trainee N = 10	Female Supervisor & Male Trainee N = 10	Female Supervisor & Female Trainee N = 10	Main Effects	Supervisor Gender (SG)	Trainee Gender (TG)	SG X TG Interaction
Resistant discourse codes									
Blame or complain	Mean	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	SD	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.00				
Defend self	Mean	0.00	0.10	0.30	0.20	1.09	0.00	2.18	0.55
	SD	0.00	0.32	0.67	0.42				
Avoid or not respond	Mean	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	SD	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00				
Interrupt or talk over	Mean	0.10	0.00	1.30	1.50	3.75*	0.01	7.50**	0.09
	SD	0.32	0.00	1.83	2.51				
Declaration of opinion as fact	Mean	1.50	1.00	0.84	3.30	0.65	0.93	0.38	1.97
	SD	2.88	1.83	0.84	6.40				
Total resistant discourse score	Mean	1.60	1.20	2.30	5.00	1.37	0.57	2.18	1.03
	SD	2.83	2.44	1.49	8.83				
Co-operative discourse codes									
Agree	Mean	2.60	3.20	4.10	5.80	1.39	0.67	2.12	0.15
	SD	2.41	2.90	5.89	5.73				
Personal Disclosure	Mean	2.40	3.40	4.20	4.40	1.59	0.49	2.69	0.22
	SD	2.12	3.03	3.28	2.22				
Appreciate	Mean	0.10	2.10	1.20	0.50	0.22	0.39	0.06	1.67
	SD	0.32	5.28	3.79	1.08				
Humour	Mean	0.50	0.70	0.30	0.00	2.21	0.05	4.36*	1.35
	SD	0.71	1.06	0.48	0.00				
Total Co-operative discourse score	Mean	5.60	9.40	9.80	10.70	1.01	0.85	1.16	0.32
	SD	2.76	9.42	10.53	7.30				

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 10.3. ANOVA results for combined supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables.

Discourse codes		Groups				ANOVA effects			
		Male Supervisor & Male Trainee N = 10	Male Supervisor & Female Trainee N = 10	Female Supervisor & Male Trainee N = 10	Female Supervisor & Female Trainee N = 10	Main Effects	Supervisor Gender (SG)	Trainee Gender (TG)	SG X TG Interaction
Combined variables based on sum of supervisor and trainee therapist raw scores									
Supervisor directive plus trainee therapist co-operative	Mean	33.20	24.90	44.10	29.30	2.53	3.52	1.54	0.28
	SD	21.86	12.72	25.28	15.45				
Supervisor directive plus trainee therapist resistant	Mean	29.20	16.70	36.60	23.60	3.67*	5.58*	1.75	0.00
	SD	21.87	8.83	18.27	16.61				
Supervisor collaborative trainee therapist co-operative	Mean	22.10	25.60	31.90	29.00	0.71	0.00	1.42	0.34
	SD	14.72	13.73	20.60	19.86				
Supervisor collaborative plus trainee therapist resistant	Mean	18.10	17.40	24.40	23.30	0.89	0.04	1.75	0.00
	SD	14.59	8.19	12.38	20.43				
Combined variable based on sum of supervisor and trainee therapist ratio scores									
Ratio of supervisor collaborative to directive plus ratio of trainees co-operative to resistant	Mean	5.18	8.18	5.08	3.20	1.80	0.05	3.36	3.87
	SD	3.23	4.70	2.20	0.87				
Ratio of total discourse to trainee discourse									
Ratio of trainee therapist's plus supervisor's total discourse to trainee therapist total discourse	Mean	3.40	2.05	3.22	1.81	5.57**	10.89**	0.25	0.01
	SD	1.79	0.64	1.78	0.37				

*p<.05; **p<.01

Table 10.4. Correlational analyses of supervisor and trainee therapist discourse variables

	Pairs of variables on which correlations are based	Male Supervisor & Male Trainee Therapist	Male supervisor & Female trainee therapist	Female supervisor & Male trainee therapist	Female supervisor & Female trainee therapist	Total
Correlations between supervisor & trainee therapist style variables	Supervisor directive style & trainee therapist co-operative style	.40	.51	-.07	-.08	.19
	Supervisor directive style & trainee therapist resistant style	.28	.16	-.45	.07	.09
	Supervisor collaborative style & trainee therapist co-operative style	.93***	.66**	.36	.78***	.58**
	Supervisor collaborative style & trainee therapist resistant style	.90***	.41	.46	.82***	.49**
Correlation between supervisor style variables	Supervisor directive style & supervisor collaborative style	.26	.50	-.50	.51	.47
Correlations between trainee therapist style variables	Trainee therapist co-operative style & trainee therapist resistant style	.92***	.81***	.90***	.77**	.63**

p<.01; *p<.001