

The relations among supervisory working alliance, role difficulties, and supervision satisfaction: A cross-cultural comparison

Eun Jung Son[†] **Michael V. Ellis** **Sung-Kyung Yoo**
Ewha Womans University **SUNY at Albany** **Ewha Womans University**

This study compared 149 US and 168 South Korea supervisees' perceptions of the clinical supervision relationship to find out the cultural differences between two countries. Specifically, the relations among the three elements of the supervisory working alliance (emotional bond, agreement on goals, and agreement on tasks) with role difficulties and supervision satisfaction were examined. A few differences in clinical supervision were observed between the two countries. The correlations between the three supervisory working alliance elements and satisfaction with supervision were stronger for US than South Korea supervisees. The supervisory working alliance was significantly related to role difficulties and supervision satisfaction in both countries. Implications for theory, research, and practice were discussed.

Key Words: supervisory working alliance, role difficulties, role conflict, satisfaction with supervision, cross-cultural supervision

[†] This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2004-037-H00013). Eun Jung Son, (120-750) Division of psychology, Ewha Womans University, 11-1 Daehyun-dong, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, Phone:3277-4064
Email: ejson@ewha.ac.kr

The relationship between the clinical supervisor and the supervisee is vital to the efficacy of supervision, just as the relationship between the counselor and the client is critical in the counseling process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). The supervision relationship is a dynamic factor that is influential to other elements of supervision (e.g., Holloway, 1995).

In addition, the outcome of supervision is affected by the quality of the supervisory relationship (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990; Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999; Ladany & Friedlander, 1995; Olk & Friedlander, 1992; Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). Hence, to develop the supervision process efficiently it is important to understand the requisites related to forming, maintaining, and intervening in the supervisory relationship (Worthen & Isakson, 2003).

It is likely that the supervisory relationship would be different according to the cultures. Specifically, Sue (1991) stated that the previous counseling theories and techniques might be appropriate for the Western culture which respects individual autonomy, achievement, and self-actualization; whereas they might not be suitable for the Asian culture which regards harmony of relationship, hierarchical order, and authoritative relationship. According to Sue, it might be also inferred that the characteristics of the supervisory relationship found in the Western culture would not be directly applied to that in the Asian cultures.

Some empirical studies in cross-cultural supervision revealed the differences of supervisory relationship among cultures (Carter, Pak, & Goodyear, 2000; Cook & Helms, 1988; Gatmon, et

al., 2001; Haj-Yahia & Roer-Strier, 1999; Hilton, Russell, & Salmi, 1995; Killian, 2001; McRoy, Freeman, Logan, & Blackmon, 1986; Vander Kolk, 1974). There is little research, however, that investigated differences between the Asian and US cultures in the supervisee's perception of the supervisory relationship (Cook & Helms, 1988; Carter, et al., 2000; Killian, 2001).

Moreover, it is difficult to generalize these results to Korean supervisees because of the following reasons. First, most studies of cultural differences were conducted to examine the dissimilarities among Asian-American and European-Americans or other ethnics in the US. The characteristics of supervisory relationship seemed to be different for Asian-Americans as a minority in the US and for Asian Nationals as a majority in Korea. Therefore, there are some limitations to apply the result of Asian-American supervisees to Asian National supervisees (Yoo & Yoo, 2000). Second, the previous studies examined how the cultural differences between supervisors and supervisees had an effect on the supervisory relationship and supervision results. Most of people in our country have the same race and share similar cultural environments so that the problem of matching between supervisors and supervisees may not be important like the US. Hence, it may be problematic to apply the previous results of effective matching between supervisors and supervisees to Korean supervisory relationship. Consequently, it is necessary to reveal the supervision elements appropriate for Korean culture. Hence, the purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between the US and South Korea in terms of supervisees' perceptions of

the supervisory relationship in order to find out the elements appropriate for Korean clinical supervision.

Supervisory Working Alliance

Although there are many empirical studies of the supervisory relationship (Chen & Bernstein, 2000; Efstation et al., 1990; Gatmon et al., 2001; Ladany et al., 1999; Ladany & Friedlander, 1995; Ladany, Brittan-Powell, & Pannu, 1997; Magnuson, Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000; Moskowitz & Rupert, 1983; Nelson & Friedlander, 2001; Patton & Kivlighan, 1997; Ramos-Sánchez, et al., 2002), none specifically investigated Korea versus US differences. This study will focus on Bordin's (1983) supervisory working alliance model because this model may be the best-known model of the supervisory relationship (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). In addition, Bordin's model appears likely to evidence differences in the supervisory relationship between the US and South Korea cultures through its three elements.

According to Bordin's (1983) theory, the supervisory working alliance is a collaboration for change. It consists of three elements: (a) agreement on goals, (b) agreement on tasks, and (c) the emotional bond. The element of *agreement on goals* means that supervisors and supervisees understand and agree on the goals of supervision in terms of thought, feeling, and behavior. The element of *agreement on tasks* signifies the agreement and understanding of the things to do in order to achieve the goals. Bordin (1983) suggested that not only rational elements but also emotional elements influence the strength of the working alliance. In

the explanation of *emotional bond*, Bordin stated that positive feelings between the supervisee and supervisor were essential for founding and maintaining the relationship and setting the stage for supervisee's growth and change. The positive feelings include liking, care, and trust. The supervisory working alliance has been theorized to affect other aspects of clinical supervision such as satisfaction with supervision (e.g., Ellis & Ladany, 1997) and role difficulties (Olk & Friedlander, 1992).

Satisfaction with Supervision

Satisfaction with supervision is believed to encourage the supervisees' motive to learn and help the supervisees to achieve supervision goals (Ellis & Ladany, 1997). Bordin (1983) theorized that the strength of the supervisory working alliance would be directly related to satisfaction with supervision. The empirical evidence suggests that the supervisory working alliance was positively associated with supervision satisfaction (Ladany et al., 1999). Supervision satisfaction was also correlated with supervision process variables (Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Holloway & Wampold, 1983; Olk & Friedlander, 1992).

Role Difficulties

According to Olk and Friedlander (1992), role conflict and role ambiguity are common difficulties the supervisee experiences in the supervisory relationship. Concurrent with their clinical supervision, supervisees typically engage in very diverse roles such as a student, supervisee, teacher, counselor, and

colleague. Sometimes these multiple roles collide with one another. For instance, when supervisors direct a supervisee to perform a specific intervention that is contradictory to his or her theoretical or ethical beliefs, the roles of student /supervisee and counselor conflict with each other. Hence, supervisee role conflict arises (a) when supervisees are confronted by a supervisor's demand that is opposed to their own thoughts or beliefs, and (b) when supervisees are forced to engage in two or more often conflicting roles at the same time (Olk & Friedlander, 1992). Role ambiguity occurs when the supervisee could not identify or adopt the proper behavior in clinical supervision the supervisee was unclear what his or her appropriate role was (Olk & Friedlander, 1992).

Although Olk and Friedlander (1992) theorized that role conflicts are detrimental to the supervision working alliance, the research results have been equivocal. Bahrick (1990) found no significant relations between the supervisory working alliance and role difficulties. However, Ladany and Friedlander (1995) found that supervisees' perception of the supervisory working alliance was inversely related to supervisees' role difficulties. Thus, it is unclear if the inverse relation between the supervisory working alliance and supervisees' role difficulties exists as theorized.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the cultural differences between US and South Korean supervisees' perceptions of the supervisory working alliance, role difficulties, and satisfaction. Therefore, this study will examine how the three elements of the supervisory working alliance are related with the role difficulties and supervision satisfaction in different ways according to the culture.

Cultural Differences

The difference between individualism and collectivism has been studied to explain the cultural differences manifested between Western and Asian cultures (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmeleier, 2002). Asian countries including South Korea showed high score in the collectivism and the Western countries including the US showed high score in the individualism (Oyserman, et al., 2002). Among the diverse cultural differences manifested in the individualistic and collectivistic societies, the difference in the communication styles would have an important implication for supervision relationships in cross-cultural contexts. Those who have an individualistic tendency seem to keep open relationships with others either in -group or out-group. On the contrary, the depth and the level of self-disclosure are vary according to their membership with the group. They usually have distant relationship with out-group members, but close relationship with in-group members (Triandis, 1989).

The findings of the cultural characteristics of communication styles in the collectivistic culture suggest that Asian supervisees may perceive the supervisor as an out-group member, and to consider the relation with supervisor as a formal relationship. Consequently, Korean supervisees might have difficulty in opening their emotions in their supervisory relationship, and might prefer the solution-focused and goal-directed to the emotional approach in supervision.

A good number of cross-cultural counseling studies have been conducted to present the following

characteristics of counseling in Asian culture; Asian clients were shown to expect structured and directive approaches (Joo & Orlinsky, 1994; Yuen & Tinsley, 1981), and responded well to goal-directed and problem focused approaches to treatment (Tan & Dong, 2000). There have been quite a few cross-cultural studies in supervision conducted. Asian supervisees, in a qualitative study, reported that they considered their supervisors as high-ranking authority figures. Moreover, they reported to feel uncomfortable questioning their supervisors' authority (Killian, 2001).

With long history of supervision in US, several major empirical studies have been accumulated on supervisory relationship in US. Ladany et al. (1999) found that the emotional bond element in the supervisory working alliance uniquely predicted supervisees' satisfaction. However, Ladany and Friedlander (1995)'s study showed that all three elements of the supervisory working alliance were inversely related with role conflict. Hence, it is plausible that the three supervisory working alliance elements would influence role conflict and supervision satisfaction, and that the emotional bond element will be more strongly associated with the supervision outcome variables than agreements on goals and tasks for U.S. supervisees.

On the contrary, for South Korean supervisees, it is likely that the rational elements of the supervisory working alliance such as agreements on goals and agreements on tasks would likely be more strongly related to role conflict and supervision satisfaction than emotional bond. We included role ambiguity in this study to replicate previous research (Ladany & Friedlander, 1995).

However, there was insufficient theory or data to predict differences between the US and South Korea cultures in terms of the relations between the three elements of supervisory working alliance and role ambiguity.

In short, the hypotheses of this study are as follows. Hypothesis 1: (H1a) the correlation between the agreement on goals and role conflict will be stronger for South Korea than for US supervisees, (H1b) the correlation between the agreement on tasks and role conflict will be stronger for South Korea than for US supervisees, and (H1c) the correlation between the emotional bond and role conflict will be stronger for US than for South Korea supervisees. Hypotheses 2: (H2a) the correlation between the agreement on goals and satisfaction with supervision will be stronger for South Korea than for US supervisees, (H2b) the correlation between the agreement on tasks and satisfaction with supervision will be stronger for South Korea than for US supervisees, (H2c) the correlation between the emotional bond and satisfaction with supervision will be stronger for US than for South Korea supervisees. Hypothesis 3: (H3) no differences are predicted between the US and South Korea cultures in the relations of the three elements of the supervisory working alliance with role ambiguity.

Method

Participants

Power analysis

We performed an *a priori* statistical power analysis (Cohen, 1988) using Type I error rate of $p < .05$, and a conservative estimated population effect size of $f = .1379$, where it is the shrunken effect size (Haase, Ellis, & Ladany, 1989), even though the averaged effect size found in the literature was $f^2 = .157$ (e.g., Efstation et al., 1990; Horvath & Symonds, 1991; Luborsky, Crits-Cristoph, Alexander, Margolis, & Cohen, 1983; Morgan, Luborsky, Crits-Cristoph, Curtis, & Solomon, 1982). A minimum of 100 participants per culture were required to attain statistical power of .83 or greater.

Overall Sample description

Participants were at least 18 years of age, were either a mental health practicing professional or counselor-in-training, and were currently engaged in clinical supervision. Three hundred seventy eight (378) counselor supervisees from the US ($n = 185$) and Korea ($n = 193$) initially responded. Due to incomplete or spurious data, 61 initial respondents were dropped yielding a sample of 317 volunteer supervisees (149 US and 168 Korean). The sample was 29.77 ($SD = 6.48$) years old and predominantly women (89.9%). The participants were in their second year ($M = 27.59$ months, $SD = 16.33$) of a masters (39.1%) or doctoral program (42.8%) primarily in counseling psychology (63.6%). The participants had 32.03 ($SD = 28.51$) months of prior counseling experience and 23.68 ($SD = 22.62$) months of prior supervised counseling experience. They were providing an average of 7.58 ($SD = 6.52$) counseling hours per week. In terms of counselor's theoretical orientation, they were chiefly eclectic

(37.1%) or cognitive-behavioral (24.7%). In terms of clinical supervision, the participants received 1.44 ($SD = 1.34$) hours of supervision per week from a female (69.0%) supervisors. They had accrued an average of 12.05 ($SD = 15.51$) hours of individual supervision and 16.32 ($SD = 30.87$) hours of group supervision with their current supervisor. The supervisors generally endorsed an eclectic (30.0%) or psychodynamic (21.7%) theoretical orientation. Demographic characteristics by culture are presented in Table 1.

US sample

The typical US participant was a women (83.9%) who's average age was 27.49 ($SD = 4.26$) years old in the second year ($M = 31.30$ months, $SD = 17.84$) of a Ph.D. (56.5 %) program in counseling psychology (51.7%). The typical US participant had 33.65 ($SD = 28.98$) months of prior counseling experience and 29.48 ($SD = 24.93$) months of prior supervised counseling experience. They provided 8.60 ($SD = 7.36$) counseling hours per week, and their theoretical orientations was cognitive-behavioral (36.6%) or eclectic (23.4%). In terms of clinical supervision, the typical US participant received 2.34 ($SD = 1.48$) hours of supervision per week from a female (56.8%) Ph.D. psychologist supervisor (66.4%) endorsing a cognitive-behavioral (30.3%) or eclectic (20.7%) theoretical orientation.

South Korean sample

The typical Korean participant was a 31.78 ($SD = 7.40$) year old women (95.2%) in the first year ($M = 20.69$ months, $SD = 10.0$) of a masters (54.3%) program in counseling psychology (74.3%) with an

eclectic (48.8%) orientation. The typical Korean participant had 30.58 ($SD=28.10$) months of prior counseling experience and 18.31 ($SD=18.79$) months of prior supervised counseling experience. They provided 6.70 ($SD=5.58$) counseling hours per week. In terms of clinical supervision, the Korean participant had 0.66 ($SD=0.39$) hours of supervision per week from a female (79.8%) doctorate level psychologist (75.5%) endorsing an eclectic (38.1%) or psychodynamic (29.2%) orientation.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants

Characteristic	US		South Korea		
	N	%	N	%	
Gender	Male	24	16.1	8	4.8
	Female	125	83.9	160	95.2
Race	Caucasian	121	81.2		
	Native American	1	.7		
	African American	2	1.3		
	Middle – Eastern	1	.7		
	Hispanic / Latino	6	4.0		
	Biracial	4	2.7		
	Asian	11	7.4	168	100
	Multicultural	2	1.3		
Other	1	.7			
Current Program Degree	MA / MS, MSW, or CAS	38	25.9	70	54.3
	Psy D, Ph D., or Ed D	100	68.0	18	14.0
	Other	9	6.1	40	31.8
Field of Study	Counseling Psychology	77	51.7	124	74.3
	Clinical Psychology	48	32.2	10	6.0
	School, Child / adolescent Psychology	2	1.3	16	9.6
	Other	22	14.8	17	10.2
Theoretical Orientation	Cognitive / Behavioral / Cognitive –behavioral	60	41.4	23	13.7
	Psychodynamic	11	7.6	30	17.9
	Humanistic / Existential	24	16.6	28	16.7
	Eclectic	34	23.4	82	48.8
	Other	16	11.0	5	3.0

Measures

Supervision working alliance

The Supervision Working Alliance Inventory—Trainee Version (SWAI; Bahrck, 1990) assesses trainees' perceptions of the quality of the supervisory working alliance. Adapted from Horvath and Greenberg's (1986) Working Alliance Inventory (WAI), which was designed to assess Bordin's (1979) model of the therapeutic working alliance, Bahrck (1990) modified the 36-item WAI for clinical supervision. For example, she revised terms like *therapist* and *client* to *supervisor* and *trainee*, respectively. The SWAI has three subscales (Agreement on Goals, Agreement on Tasks, and Emotional Bond hereafter designated as Goals, Tasks, and Bond, respectively) that correspond to Bordin's (1983) three supervisory working alliance factors. Ratings are based on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*always*), with higher ratings reflecting a more favorable working alliance. Scale scores range from 12 to 84. Bahrck (1990, Ellis, Russin, & Deihl, 2003) provided content validity data from expert judges when adapting the WAI to supervision. Bahrck's inter-judge agreement rates ranged from 60% (Goals) to 98% (Bond) with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from .93-.94 (Tasks) to .91-.94 (Bond). To assess whether the measures were applicable to a Korean context, we computed Cronbach's alpha which yielded Goals .83 and .93, Tasks .85 and .93, and Bond .85 and .92, for Korea and US participants respectively. Thus, the scores of the measures evidenced strong reliability in both cultures. We also conducted Confirmatory Factor Analysis to examine the validity of the translated

Korean SWAI, and the model fit indexes were good, as TLI =.965, CFI=.969, RMSEA=.082. The SWAI has been used in several empirical investigations involving the supervisory working alliance (e.g., Ladany et al, 1997; Ladany, et al., 1999; Ladany & Lehrman—Waterman, 1999; Ladany, Lehrman—Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999).

Satisfaction

We used the 12-item Trainee Personal Reaction Scale (TPRS: Holloway & Wampold, 1984) to measure supervisee's perceived satisfaction with supervision using a 5-point scale that ranged from 1 (*not characteristic of my feelings*) to 5 (*highly characteristic of my feelings*). Responses were summed yielding a total score that ranged from 4 to 20 with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with self, supervisor, and level of comfort. Validity data from diverse clinical settings and supervisees for TPRS scores was offered by Heppner and Handley (1981), Holloway and Wampold (1983), Krause and Allen(1988), and Olk and Friedlander (1992). Cronbach's alphas ranged $\alpha=.85-.86$ (Ladany et al., 1999). We computed Cronbach's alpha which yielded TPRS .80 and .89, for Korea and US participants respectively. Thus, the scores of the measures evidenced strong reliability in both cultures. Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted to examine the validity of the translated Korean version. The result indicated that its validity was appropriate as the model fit indexes were TLI =.988, CFI=.992, RMSEA=.075.

Role conflict and role ambiguity

The Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory

(RCRAI; Olk & Friedlander, 1992) measures role conflict (RC) and role ambiguity (RA) in clinical supervision. The 13-item RC measures supervisees' perceptions of competing expectations about supervision (Olk & Friedlander, 1992). The 16-item RA measures supervisees' perceptions of their role as a supervisee. Each item is rated using a scale of 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much so*); higher scores indicated greater role ambiguity or role conflict. The RCRAI scores evidence reliability (RA: $=.91-.92$; RC: $=.89-.90$) and validity (e.g., Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Olk & Friedlander, 1992) using supervisees from an array of clinical settings. To assess whether the measures were applicable to a Korean context, we computed Cronbach's alpha which yielded RC .83 and .90, RA .89 and .94, for Korea and US participants respectively. Thus, the scores of the measures evidenced strong reliability in both cultures. We conducted Confirmatory Factor Analysis to investigate the validity of the Korean RCRAI. The result indicated the validity of translated Korean version was appropriate as the model fit indexes were TLI = .948, CFI = .955, RMSEA = .086.

Demographic Questionnaire

A brief demographic questionnaire was used to obtain descriptive information about the samples (e.g., age, sex, race, year and field of graduate study, current degree program, months of supervised counseling experience, months of counseling experience, supervisor gender, theoretical orientation, and the supervisor's theoretical orientation).

Translation to Korean

We used the counter-translation method, which is effective in evaluation the quality of translation (Hulin, Drasgow, & Komocar, 1982). In addition, this method tends to assure that the translated version is the most similar to the original scale (Werner & Campbell, 1970). Specifically, English versions of the measures were translated into Korean by a female Korean expert with a doctorate in counseling psychology, then translated back into English by a bilingual Korean female enrolled in a doctoral reading program in the US. A native US Caucasian male student enrolled in a Ph.D. counseling psychology program in the US compared the retranslated English versions with the original English versions. Items were changed to represent faithfully the meanings of the original English versions. Finally, a Korean female associate professor of counseling psychology in Korea examined the Korean versions of the measures for accuracy.

Procedure

Electronic mail (email) messages describing the study were sent to US listservs of specific graduate programs (e.g., Syracuse University, University at Albany, University of Missouri-Columbia) as well as relevant national organizations (e.g., Association of Counselor Education and Supervision, APA Division 17 Supervision and Training Section, The Council of Counseling Psychology Training Program). Potential participants were directed to the password protected internet website for the study and participation was voluntary. After completing the questionnaire, their responses were automatically stored at the server

system without the identifying information. Participants who visited the website were eligible to enter a random drawing for two \$100 prizes which were awarded after the conclusion of the study. The participants e-mailed us the identifying information for a random drawing, however, the information did not match the responses so that we could not know which responses were theirs. Because we used email list serves in the US, we cannot determine the response rate or know how many people actually opened and read the email soliciting participation and chose not to participate. Given the response rates reported in recent supervision research in the US, we would estimate the response rate to be about 30%.

For Korean participants, 248 packets containing the research materials were given to potential participants during a conference or at college counseling centers. Of these, 198 packets were returned yielding a response rate in SK of 77%, which differs from the US general response rate. Consent was obtained from directors of the conference and the college counseling centers. We also contacted clinical supervisors directly. Participants who completed a paper-and-pencil version were given a gift worth about \$2.

Results

Phase I: Preliminary Analysis

We performed a series of tests comparing the South Korean (SK) versus the US samples on the demographic variables. Result of *t*-tests showed (a) Korean supervisees were significantly older than US

supervisees, $t(317) = -6.39, p < .001$, (b) US supervisees saw more clients per week, $t(317) = 2.54, p < .05$, but the effect size was trivial, (c) no significant results were found in the counseling experiences, and (d) US supervisees had more supervised experiences than Korean supervisees, $t(317) = 4.43, p < .001$. Nonetheless, the effects of supervised experiences did not need to be controlled because the amount of correlations among total supervised experiences and major variables were trivial ($r < .2$).

In addition, we conducted χ^2 analyses and the significant results were observed in field of study ($\chi^2_{(3, N=317)} = 46.54, p < .001$), theoretical orientation ($\chi^2_{(4, N=317)} = 49.81, p < .001$), and current program degree ($\chi^2_{(2, N=317)} = 86.14, p < .001$). Although the ratio of clinical psychology was greater for US supervisees (32.3%) than for Korean supervisees (6.0%), the ratio of counseling psychology was greater than any other fields in both countries (US=51.5%, SK=74.3%). The cognitive, behavioral, or cognitive-behavioral approach (41.4%) were the primary theoretical orientation for US supervisees, whereas eclectic approach (48.8%) was the primary theoretical orientation for Korean supervisees. While most US supervisees were in a doctoral program (68.0%), Korean supervisees were in a masters program (54.3%). On the contrary, many Korean supervisees were in post-doctoral position or in possession of masters degree (31.8%), whereas US supervisees were not (6.1%). These results indicated that the sample of US and Korean supervisees were nearly equivalent at their professional experiences.

Table 2. Correlations, Mean, and Standard Deviation among the major variables by culture

	Culture	Goals	Tasks	Bond	RC	RA	M	SD
Goals	US						65.685	12.370
	Korea						61.601	7.854
Tasks	US	.929					66.490	12.050
	Korea	.864					66.399	8.000
Bond	US	.805	.813				67.617	11.336
	Korea	.742	.766				61.191	9.583
RC	US	-.619	-.616	-.656			19.537	7.772
	Korea	-.603	-.589	-.488			28.030	7.296
RA	US	-.751	-.745	-.631	.680		31.148	13.283
	Korea	-.659	-.666	-.529	.737		32.952	9.218
TPRS	US	.782	.792	.844	-.728	-.694	47.020	8.481
	Korea	.466	.479	.405	-.452	-.459	43.893	6.620

Note: Agreement on Goals, Agreement on Tasks, and Emotional Bond are the subscales of the SWAI (Bahrck, 1990). RC and RA are Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity, respectively (Olk & Friedlander, 1992). TPRS (Holloway & Wampold, 1984) is the Trainee Personal Reaction Scale (i.e., Satisfaction with supervision). Higher scores are indicative of higher levels of the measured construct. $p < .0001$ for all correlations.

Phase II: Primary Analysis

We performed a series of analyses to test the assumptions underlying the statistical procedures used to test our three hypotheses (e.g., normal distributions, homogeneity of variances, and no multicollinearity among predictor variables).

We originally planned to test the three hypotheses by performing a multivariate multiple regression such that Goals, Tasks, Bond, and culture were the predictors with RC, RA, and Satisfaction (TPRS scores) as the dependent variables. To test the assumptions underlying the statistical procedures we assessed normality, homogeneity of variances by culture (SK, US), and the intercorrelations among the predictor variables (see Cohen & Cohen, 1983). None of the variables evidences significant skew

(skewness $< \pm 2.0$). The intercorrelations among the major variables are presented in Table 2. As is readily apparent, all variables were significantly, $p < .0001$, and highly correlated, especially the predictor variables (Goals, Tasks, and Bond). We also examined Tolerance and VIF (Value Inflation Factor) to assess multicollinearity among the predictor variables. The Tolerance values were all less than .3 (recall that 1 minus Tolerance is the squared multiple correlation among the variables), and the VIF values were all greater than 2.5 (1.0 indicates predictors are independent). The intercorrelations in combination with the Tolerance and VIF statistics suggested that the predictor variables evidenced high multicollinearity (i.e., highly correlated with one another), thus violating the

assumption for multiple regression. Levene's and Cochran's tests of homogeneity of variances for the major variables by culture were significant for all variables except RA, Levene's >7.75 , $p < .006$; Cochran's $C(158,2) > .58$, $p < .035$. In addition, the multivariate test for homogeneity of variances was significant, Box's $M = 119.26$, $F(21,363443) = 5.57$, $p < .0001$. While we were able to remedy the heterogeneity of variances problem (i.e., Puri-Sen test of ranked data; Puri & Sen, 1971), we were unable to resolve the multicollinearity among the predictors. Hence, we were not able to use either a multivariate or univariate multiple regression approach to test the hypotheses. We sought to be conceptually and methodologically rigorous by revising the data analyses in such a way as to meet the assumptions underlying the statistic and still perform a rigorous test of our research hypotheses. In short, the revised analyses were essentially a univariate conceptualization of the original multivariate analyses as recommended by Hyberty and Morris (1989).

To test the major hypotheses, we conducted a series of independent samples t -tests such that the correlations between each of the predictors with each dependent variable were tested for differences by culture (Glass & Stanley, 1970, pp. 311-313). Performing these tests entailed using Fisher's Z -transformation of r . Given that our hypotheses permitted a priori directional statistical hypotheses, we used one-tailed t -tests. We adjusted the per comparison alpha to control both Type I and Type II error rates using a modified Bonferroni procedure (Holland & Copenhaver, 1988).

Hypothesis 1 (H1)

To test H1, we tested the following three statistical hypotheses regarding the relations among the three predictors (Goals, Tasks, Bond) and Role Conflict (RC): (H1a) Korea $r_{Goals-RC} > US r_{Goals-RC}$ (H1b) Korea $r_{Tasks-RC} > US r_{Tasks-RC}$ and (H1c) Korea $r_{Bond-RC} < US r_{Bond-RC}$. Hypotheses H1a and H1b were non-significant, $Zs < .379$, $ps > .35$, $\eta^2s < .0001$. H1c was statistically significant, $Z = 2.23$, $p = .013$, $\eta^2 = .013$, however, the effect size was trivial (Haase et al., 1989). Thus, the findings mostly did not confirm H1.

Hypothesis 2 (H2)

To test H2, we tested the following statistical hypotheses regarding the relations among the three predictors (Goals, Tasks, Bond) and Satisfaction (S): (H2a) Korea $r_{Goals-S} > US r_{Goals-S}$ (H2b) Korea $r_{Tasks-S} > US r_{Tasks-S}$ and (H2c) Korea $r_{Bond-S} < US r_{Bond-S}$. All tests were significant, H2a: $Z = -4.81$, $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .07$; H2b: $Z = -4.89$, $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .07$; H2c: $Z = -7.09$, $p = .0001$, $\eta^2 = .16$. The effect sizes were medium to large (Haase et al., 1989). The results confirmed H2c: There was a stronger relation between Bond and Satisfaction in the US participants than in SK participants. However, the results disconfirmed H2a and H2b; the correlations of Goals and Tasks with Satisfaction for the US participants were greater than the correlations for the Korean participants.

Hypothesis 3 (H3)

To test H3, we kept the per comparison alpha at .05 to put our hypotheses of no statistical

differences between cultures at greater risk and to maximize statistical power (see Fagley, 1985). These were two-tailed tests (i.e., $p < .025$ is the critical value). We tested the following three statistical hypotheses regarding the relations among the three predictors (Goals, Tasks, Bond) and Role Ambiguity (RA): (a) Korea $r_{Goals-RA} = USr_{Goals-RA}$ (b) Korea $r_{Tasks-RA} = USr_{Tasks-RA}$ and (c) Korea $r_{Bond-RA} = USr_{Bond-RA}$. All tests were non-significant, $Z_s < 1.62$, $p_s > .05$, $\eta^2_s < .005$. The effect sizes were also trivial (Haase et al., 1989). Hence, the results confirmed the three hypotheses and H3 overall; there were no substantive differences between the two cultures in the relations between the components of the SWAI and Role Ambiguity.

Post Hoc tests (PH). Due to the somewhat inconclusive findings regarding the three research hypotheses in combination with further assessing potential differences between the two cultures, we examined the intercorrelations among the SWAI scales (Goals, Tasks, and Bond) for cultural differences. That is, we performed the post hoc analyses for two reasons: (1) to help rule out rival hypotheses (explanations) that the pattern of results were confounded by differential correlations among the predict variables (SWAI subscales and cultural group), and (2) to provide additional data to support the construct validity of the SWAI scores. One potential reason for the inconclusive findings could have been because the cultural groups differed

in how the SWAI scales correlated with each other within each culture. If the Korean participants SWAI score intercorrelations were substantially lower than for US, it could have confounded the correlations with the dependent variables. Specifically, differential SWAI intercorrelations could explain why the US SWAI score intercorrelations with Satisfaction were significantly stronger than SK SWAI correlations. Hence, our post hoc hypotheses were that there would not be differences between the cultures in terms of the correlations among Goals, Tasks, and Bond. Thus, the per comparison alpha was set to .05 as done for H2, and $p < .025$ was the critical value for these two-tailed Z-tests: (PHa) Korea $r_{Goals-Tasks} > USr_{Goals-Tasks}$ (PHb) Korea $r_{Bond-Goals} > USr_{Bond-Goals}$ and (PHc) Korea $r_{Bond-Tasks} < USr_{Bond-Tasks}$. Two tests were non-significant (PHb, PHc), $Z_s < -1.39$, $p_s > .08$, $\eta^2_s < .003$. PHa was statistically significant, $Z = -3.01$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .026$, however, the effect size was small, accounting for less than 3% of the explained variance in the cultural differences in the correlations of Goals and Tasks (Haase et al., 1989). Hence, the finding of no substantive cultural differences in the intercorrelations among Goals, Tasks, and Bond confirmed the post hoc hypotheses. That is, the relations among the SWAI scale scores did not evidence substantive differences between the US and Korea.

Table 3. Hypotheses and Results

	Hypotheses	Results
H1: SWAI and Role Conflict	(H1a) Korea $r_{Goals-RC} > USr_{Goals-RC}$	non-significant
	(H1b) Korea $r_{Tasks-RC} > USr_{Tasks-RC}$	non-significant
	(H1c) Korea $r_{Bond-RC} < USr_{Bond-RC}$.	$Z = 2.23, p < .05, \eta^2 = .01, SK < US$
H2: SWAI and Satisfaction	(H2a) Korea $r_{Goals-S} > USr_{Goals-S}$	$Z = -4.81, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .07, SK < US$
	(H2b) Korea $r_{Tasks-S} > USr_{Tasks-S}$	$Z = -4.89, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .07, SK < US$
	(H2c) Korea $r_{Bond-S} < USr_{Bond-S}$.	$Z = -7.09, p < .0001, \eta^2 = .16, SK < US$
H3: SWAI and Role Ambiguity	(H3a) Korea $r_{Goals-RA} = USr_{Goals-RA}$	non-significant (as hypothesized)
	(H3b) Korea $r_{Tasks-RA} = USr_{Tasks-RA}$	non-significant (as hypothesized)
	(H3c) Korea $r_{Bond-RA} = USr_{Bond-RA}$	non-significant (as hypothesized)

Discussion

Our intent was to investigate cultural differences between counselor supervision and training in Korea versus the US. Specifically, we predicted that although agreement on goals and agreement on tasks would be related to role conflict and supervision satisfaction for both cultures, these relations would be strongest for Korean participants. Whereas for supervision in the US, we expected emotional bond to be most influential among the three supervisory working alliance elements (e.g., agreement on goals, agreements on tasks, and emotional bond). We did not anticipate cultural differences among the relations between the three elements of supervision alliance and role ambiguity. In terms of tests of our three hypotheses, the results (a) mostly disconfirmed H1 (no differences in the relations among task or goal and role conflict, and the trivial difference in the relation among bond and role conflict as hypothesized), (b) partly confirmed H2 (supervision in the US evidenced stronger relations between bond and supervision satisfaction as hypothesized, however the magnitude

of relations among task or goal and supervision satisfaction was greater for US than SK on the contrary to our expectation), (c) confirmed H3 (no cultural differences in the relations among working alliance elements and role ambiguity), and the post hoc hypotheses were confirmed (no cultural differences in the relations among the working alliance elements).

One of observations about our data was the extent to which supervision between the US and Korea is more similar than dissimilar: there were no cultural differences in relations among all the working alliance elements and role ambiguity, and among two working alliance elements and role conflict. In addition, when we step back and look at the data from a broader perspective, consistent with previous research (Ladany & Friedlander, 1995; Ladany et al., 1999) and with supervision theory (Bordin, 1983; Holloway, 1995), the supervisory working alliance was substantively associated with supervision satisfaction, role conflict, and role ambiguity irrespective of culture.

Where cultural differences were observed, the correlations between all three working alliance

elements and satisfaction with supervision were greater for US participants than SK participants.

One other observation of cultural differences was noteworthy. Although not done to test theory, the Korean scores on all measures except role ambiguity evidenced significantly less variation than the US scores. When we tested the assumption of homogeneity of variances in preparation for examining cultural differences, these tests were highly significant. Thus, the Korean supervisees were more homogenous in their perceptions of the supervisory working alliance, role conflict, and satisfaction with supervision. This result was consistent with Carter et al.'s (2000) findings that Asian supervisees did not show the midpoint disruption in the supervisory working alliance whereas European supervisees did. The results in these two studies indicated that Asian supervisees including Korean might have a reserved manner in their supervisory relationships. The cultural differences of response style might be another explanation of this result (Kim, Cho, & Lee, 1994). The result of comparing response styles among nations indicated that Americans showed extremism, whereas Japanese and Koreans showed centerism. (Kim, Cho, & Lee, 1994). This response difference would be responsible for bigger SD's on all the variables with the US samples than the Korean samples.

When considering the results, several strengths of this study were noteworthy. This research was a partial replication and extension of the previous research (Ladany et al., 1999). Moreover, it tested Bordin's (1983) theory, examined cultural comparison groups, and explicated unambiguous

hypotheses (Wampold, Davis, & Good, 1990). The researchers conducted an a priori statistical power analysis to determine sample size and obtained relatively large samples. Moreover, the study used psychometrically sound measures (e.g., Ellis & Ladany, 1997), assessed the internal consistency reliability of the scores in both cultures (Meier & Davis, 1990), tested the assumptions underlying the statistical procedures, reported shrunken effect sizes (Wilkinson, & APA Task Force on Statistical Inference, 1999), and systematically controlled experimentwise Type I and Type II error rates. These strengths notwithstanding, there were limitations as well.

One of the most salient limitations of the study concerns the representativeness of the two samples. Although the sample demographic data suggested that the two samples were reasonably representative of supervision in the respective country, the results observed here may not generalize to other samples. A second limitation was the inability to test the hypotheses as originally planned using multivariate multiple regression due to the highly correlated scales of the SWAI. Because the correlations among the working alliance elements were not controlled, the results should be interpreted with caution. It is difficult to know to what extent the pattern of results would continue to hold if the correlations among the SWAI scales were taken into account. Finally, the response rates differed between the US and Korea samples, thus, we recommended caution when generalizing the results to broader US and Korean supervisees.

With these strengths and limitations in mind, what tentative inferences and conclusions were

appropriate? We suggest that two tentative conclusions were prominent. First, the importance of the supervisory working alliance in clinical supervision was confirmed both among Korean supervisees and US supervisees. The supervisory working alliance was strongly and directly related to satisfaction with supervision; whereas the supervision working alliance was significantly and inversely related to both role conflict and role ambiguity. Hence, these relations appear to transcend culture, or at least the two cultures investigated here.

The second prominent tentative conclusion can be deduced from the fact that Korean supervisees' perceptions of supervision satisfaction were less influenced by the three supervision working alliance elements (Goals, Tasks, Bond) than for US supervisees. That is, the correlation between supervisory working alliance and satisfaction with supervision was stronger for the US samples than for the SK samples. An inspection of the instructions and items comprising the TPRS suggested that it measures supervisees' satisfaction with supervision in terms of their emotional reactions rather than behavioral achievements. For example, the instructions ask the respondent to evaluate supervision in terms of his or her feelings and reactions. This raised the possibility that emotional satisfaction may not be as important as behavioral achievements for the Korean supervisees. This assumption could be supported by the result that the relation between bond and satisfaction with supervision had the largest effect size among the relations of supervisory working alliance and supervision satisfaction. Moreover, as stated above, Korean supervisees were more homogeneous than

US Supervisees in their perceptions of the supervisory working alliance, role conflict, and satisfaction with supervision. These results indicated that Korean supervisees were likely to have remote and formal manners in the clinical supervision, and that behavioral attainment could be more significant than emotional contentment for them.

When considered within the context of the differences between Korean and US cultural values, and in particular the nature and structure of the supervisory relationship in the two countries, these findings made intuitive sense. Asian cultures, which include Korea, tend to have distant relationships except the intimate in-group (e.g., family, best friend), and emotional responses are rarely discussed in the relationships outside of the intimate in-group (Triandis, 1989). Thus, Korean supervisees may expect a formal approach (e.g., goal-directed, problem-focused) in the supervisory relationship similar to Korean clients' preferences in the counseling process (Joo & Orlinsky, 1994; Yuen & Tinsley, 1981). In addition, as with Korean client's satisfaction with counseling, it is likely that emotional satisfaction in clinical supervision may not be as important as behavioral achievement for the Korean supervisees (Tan & Dong, 2000). To the extent that this conclusion is tenable, it tentatively suggested that when working with Korean supervisees, supervisors might consider paying more attention to agreements on goals and tasks that accomplish behavioral outcomes than to emotional bond, especially when establishing the supervisory relationship.

The tentative conclusion that in comparison to supervision in the US, clinical supervision in Korea

emphasizes goal directed and task oriented relationships rather than emotional bond requires further investigation. Specifically, future researchers should consider assessing satisfaction with supervision that focuses on behavioral outcomes of supervision. It may also be beneficial to assess the relative importance of the emotional bond and behavioral outcomes for US and Korea supervisees. Other potential variables that could predict satisfaction among Korean supervisees (e.g., the level of devotion, expert knowledge and skill, and the system and situation of clinical supervision) could be also investigated. Additionally, in the future cross-cultural comparison study, the broader investigations of cultural differences in clinical supervision need to be conducted. SWAI is composed of one or two dimensions when we consider the high correlation among the subscales. It is noteworthy that the results of the post hoc tests supported the cross-cultural viability of SWAI scores (i.e., the scale intercorrelations were equivalent across culture). If the new measures including multiple elements in supervisory relationship could be developed and used in the cross-cultural comparison study, we could more thoroughly examine the cultural differences in supervisory relationship than this study did. In addition, the cultural variables (e.g., individualism versus collectivism) should be added to future cross-cultural comparison studies (Ellis & Ladany, 1997) in order to understand cultural differences.

In conclusion, the study reported here is the first to investigate differences in clinical supervision between the US and Korea. In spite of the cultural differences, the relations among supervisees' perceptions of the supervisory working alliance with

role conflict, role ambiguity, and satisfaction were largely consistent between the two cultures. Perhaps the most prominent difference, which requires further study, was that Korean supervisees may perceive satisfaction with supervision from the perspective of behavioral achievement outcomes more than focusing on the emotional bond. However, we encourage caution here. We suspect that the emotional bond is still important for Korean supervisees. The premise is that Korean supervisees may benefit from a stronger focus on behavioral outcomes than US supervisees. Of course, this premise awaits empirical testing. To this end, we hope the current study is a point of departure.

References

- Bahrnick, A. S. (1990). Role induction for counselor trainees: Effects on the supervisory working alliance. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 51, 1484B. (University Microfilms No. 90-14, 392).
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 16, 252-260.
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervisor. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 11, 35-42.
- Carter, J. W., Pak, J. H., & Goodyear, R. K. (2000). Cultural differences in alliance formation during

- group supervision. Paper presented at the 107th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington DC.
- Chen, E. C., & Bernstein, B. L. (2000). Relations of complementarity and supervisory issues to supervisory working alliance: A comparative analysis of two cases. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 485–497.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression / correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cook, D. A., & Helms, J. E. (1988). Visible racial / ethnic group supervisees' satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision as predicted by relationship characteristics. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 268–274.
- Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counseling supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 322–329.
- Ellis, M. V., & Blustein, D. L. (1991a). Developing and using educational and psychological tests and measures: The unificationist perspective. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 550–555.
- Ellis, M. V., & Blustein, D. L. (1991b). The unificationist perspective: A context for validity. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 561–563.
- Ellis, M. V., & Ladany, N. (1997). Inferences concerning supervisees and clients in clinical supervision: A integrative review. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.) *Handbook of Psychotherapy Supervision* (pp. 447–507). New York: John Willey & Sons.
- Fagley, N. S. (1985). Applied statistical power analysis and the interpretation of nonsignificant results by research consumers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*, 391–396.
- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Koshkarian, L. Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 102–113.
- Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C. (1970). *Statistical methods in education and psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Haase, R. F., Ellis, M. V., & Ladany, N. (1989). Multiple criteria for evaluating the magnitude of experimental effects. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 511–516.
- Haj-Yahia, M. M., & Roer-Strier, D. (1999). On the encounter between Jewish supervisors and Arab supervisees in Israel. *The Clinical Supervisor, 18*, 17–37.
- Heppner, P. P., & Handley, P. G. (1981). A study of the interpersonal influence process in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 437–444.
- Hilton, D. B., Russell, R. K., & Salmi, S. W. (1995). The effects of supervisor's race and level of support on perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 559–563.

- Holland, B. S., & Copenhaver, M. D. (1988). Improved Bonferroni-type multiple testing procedures. *Psychological Bulletin, 104*, 145-149.
- Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. London: Sage.
- Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1983). Patterns of verbal behavior and judgments of satisfaction in the supervision interview. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 227-234.
- Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1984). *Dimensions of satisfaction in the supervision interview*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association Convention, Toronto, Canada.
- Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1986). Development and validation of the alliance inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 223-233.
- Horvath, A. O., & Symonds, B. D. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 139-149.
- Huberty, C. J., & Morris, J. D. (1989). Multivariate analysis versus multiple univariate analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*, 302-308.
- Hulin, C. L., Drasgow, F., & Komocar, J. (1982). Applications of item response theory to analysis of scale translation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 818-825.
- Joo, E., & Orlinsky, D. E. (1994). *Psychotherapeutic relationship in different cultures*. Proceedings of 16th International Congress of Psychotherapy, Korea.
- Killian, K. D. (2001). Differences making a difference: Cross-cultural interactions in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy, 12*, 61-103.
- Kim, S., Cho, K., & Lee, S. (1994). The analyses method of Likert scale data including response bias. *Journal of Statistical Theory and Methods, 5*, 107-116.
- Krause, A. A., & Allen, G. J. (1988). Perceptions of counselor supervision: An examination of Stoltenberg's model from the perspectives of supervisor and supervisee. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 77-80.
- Ladany, N., Brittan-Powell, C. S., & Pannu, R. K. (1997). The influence of supervisory racial identity interaction and racial matching on the supervisory working alliance and supervisee multicultural competence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*, 284-304.
- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Therapy, 77*, 447-455.
- Ladany, N., & Friedlander, M. L. (1995). The relationship between the supervisory working alliance and trainees' experience of role conflict and role ambiguity. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 220-231.
- Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. (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*, 161-176.
- Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D., Molinaro,

- M., & Wolgast, B. (1999). Psychotherapy supervisor ethical practices: Adherence to guidelines, the supervisory working alliance, and supervisee satisfaction. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 443–475.
- Luborsky, L., Crits-Cristoph, P., Alexander, L., Margolis, M., & Cohen, M. (1983). Two helping alliance methods for predicting outcomes of psychotherapy: A counting signs vs. a global rating method. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 171*, 480–491.
- Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Norem, K. (2000). Clinical supervision of prelicensed counselors: Recommendation for consideration and practice. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 22*, 176–188.
- McRoy, R. G., Freeman, E. M., Logan, S. L., & Blackmon, B. (1986). Cross cultural field supervision: Implications for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education, 22*, 50–56.
- Meier, S. T., & Davis, S. R. (1990). Trends in reporting psychometric properties of scales used in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 113–115.
- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment. *American Psychologist, 50*, 741–749.
- Morgan, R., Luborsky, L., Crits-Cristoph, P., Curtis, H., & Solomon, J. (1982). Predicting the outcomes of psychotherapy by the Penn Helping Alliance Rating Method. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 39*, 397–402.
- Moskowitz, S. A., & Rupert, P. A. (1983). Conflict resolution within the relationship. *Professional Psychology, 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.
- Olk, M. E., & Friedlander, M. L. (1992). Trainees' experience of role conflict/role ambiguity in supervisory relationship. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 389–397.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Klemmmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3–72.
- Patton, M. J., & Kivlighan, D. M., Jr. (1997). Relevance of the supervisory alliance to the counseling alliance and to treatment adherence in counselor training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 108–115.
- Puri, M. L., & Sen, P. K. (1971). *Nonparametric methods in multivariate analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Ramos-Sánchez, L., Esnil, E., Goodwin, A., Riggs, S., Touster, L. O., Wright, L. K., Ratanasiripong, P., & Rodolfa, E. (2002). Negative supervisory events: Effects on supervision satisfaction and supervisory alliance. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*, 197–202.
- Sue, D. W. (1991). A model for cultural diversity training. *Journal of Counseling Development, 70*, 99–105.
- Tan, S., & Dong, N. J. (2000). Psychotherapy with members of Asian American churches and spiritual traditions. In P. S. Richards & A. E.

- Bergin (Eds.) *Handbook of psychotherapy and religious diversity* (pp. 421–444). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tracey, T. J. G., & Glidden-Tracey, C. E. (1999). Integration of theory, research design, measurement, and statistics: Toward a reasoned argument. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 27, 299–324.
- Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 3, 506–520.
- Vander Kolk, C. J. (1974). The relationship of personality, values, and race to anticipation of the supervisory relationship. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 18, 41–46.
- Wampold, B. E., Davis, B., & Good, R. H., III (1990). Hypothesis validity of clinical research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 58, 360–367.
- Werner, O., & Campbell, D. (1970). Translating, working through interpreters, and the problem of decentering. In R. Naroll and R. Cohen (Eds.), *A handbook of methods in cultural anthropology*. New York: American Museum of Natural History.
- Wilkinson, L., & APA Task Force on Statistical Inference. (1999). Statistical methods in psychology journals: Guidelines and explanations. *American Psychologist*, 54, 594–604.
- Worthen, V. E., & Isakson, R. L. (2003). *Enhancing supervision relationship*. Paper presented at the 111th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. Toronto, Canada.
- Yoo, S., & Yoo, J. (2000). Individualism–collectivism and tolerance of stigma associated with help seeking. *The Korean Journal of Counseling and Psychotherapy*, 12, 19–32.
- Yuen, K. W., & Tinsley, H. (1981). International and American student's expectations about counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 66–69.
- 1 차원고접수 : 2007. 10. 10.
수정원고접수 : 2007. 11. 28.
최종게재결정 : 2007. 12. 3.

수퍼비전 작업 동맹, 역할 어려움, 수퍼비전 만족도 간의 관계: 비교문화 연구

손 은 정	Michael V. Ellis	유 성 경
이화여자대학교	SUNY at Albany	이화여자대학교

이 연구는 수퍼비전 관계의 문화적 차이를 살펴보기 위해 미국 상담수련생 149명, 한국 상담수련생 168명을 대상으로 수퍼비전에 대한 지각을 비교하였다. 특히, 수퍼비전 작업동맹의 세 가지 요소(정서적인 유대, 목표에 대한 동의, 과업에 대한 동의)와 역할 어려움 및 수퍼비전 만족도 간의 관계에 대하여 살펴보았다. 분석 결과 수퍼비전 작업 동맹과 수퍼비전 만족도 간의 관계에서 한국보다 미국의 상담수련생들이 더 높은 점수를 나타내었다. 또한, 수퍼비전 작업 동맹은 두 나라 모두에서 역할 어려움 및 수퍼비전 만족과 유의미한 관계가 있었다. 본 연구의 결과가 이론, 연구, 실제에 대해 함의하는 바를 논의하였다.

주요어: 수퍼비전 작업동맹, 역할 모호함, 역할 갈등, 수퍼비전 만족도, 비교문화 수퍼비전