2017

Approaches to Supervision in Sport Psychology and their Influences on Initial Supervisees' Professional Development

Janaina Lima Fogaca

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Fogaca, Janaina Lima, "Approaches to Supervision in Sport Psychology and their Influences on Initial Supervisees' Professional Development" (2017). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 7311.

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/7311>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Approaches to Supervision in Sport Psychology and their Influences on Initial Supervisees'
Professional Development

Janaina Lima Fogaça, M.S.

Dissertation submitted
to the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences
at West Virginia University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy in Kinesiology
Sport and Exercise Psychology

Sam Zizzi, Ed.D., Chair
Monica Leppma, Ph.D.
Jack Watson II, Ph.D.
Mark Andersen, Ph.D., Halmstad University

Department of Sport Sciences

Morgantown, WV
2017

Keywords: supervision, sport psychology, service-delivery competence

Copyright 2017 Janaina Lima Fogaça

ProQuest Number: 10275346

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

ProQuest 10275346

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Abstract

Approaches to Supervision in Sport Psychology and their Influence in Initial Supervisee's Professional Development

Janaina Lima Fogaça

Supervision is important to foster supervisees' development, protect their clients from harm, and ensure competence. Sport psychology graduate programs in the United States offer a variety of supervision approaches, but there are few official guidelines on how to supervise. This dissertation had the aim of investigating the supervision approaches being used with novice supervisees in applied sport psychology in the United States, and how these approaches relate to supervisees' development of service-delivery competence. Nine supervisor-supervisee dyads were interviewed before and after the academic term in which the supervisees had their first applied experiences. Supervisees completed two journal entries regarding their supervisory experiences and development. Two researchers coded the data inductively and one did constant comparative analysis. Results showed at least three different approaches to supervision may contribute to novice supervisees' development when they have certain helpful characteristics. Additionally, factors in practitioner's background, practice, and supervision that contribute to development of service-delivery competence are discussed.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have been finished without the help, support, and contribution of several people. First, I would like to thank Dr. Zizzi for his Zen leadership. His ability to guide me while giving me the freedom to produce a work that is truly mine fostered my confidence and made me a better researcher. It was easier to trust the process of my work when I had his caring presence by my side.

Thank you, Dr. Andersen, for the contributions since the development of this idea. Your fast, passionate, and sincere feedback motivated me to be better.

Dr. Watson, thank you for helping me find a meaningful research question that can have a practical application. Thank you also for checking on me when I was working late or during breaks, and making sure that I had not lost my mind.

Dr. Leppma, thank you for contributing to my interest in supervision and helping me clarify concepts and theory. Your course inspired me, and I appreciated your support.

Rachel, I would not have done it without you. Your help with transcription, coding, and discussion of the data was incredibly valuable.

To all my participants, thank you for dedicating so much time to this project. Longitudinal data collection is challenging, and you persisted until the end. I know that your lives are busy and I appreciate your willingness to help me.

To all my friends and colleagues, thank you for the support and patience. Thank you for listening to all my complaints and frustrations, and for assuring me that it would work out in the end.

Thiago and Alice, thank you for filling my heart with love, which gives me strength to accomplish anything. Thank you, Thiago, for understanding when I had to work more intensively, for being a true partner, for tolerating my bad mood when I was stressed, and for always believing in me. Alice, thank you for being happy no matter what and sharing your warmth with me.

To my parents and sister, thank you for the unconditional support in all areas of my life, and for molding me into who I am today. I would not have gotten here if it were not for you.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Methods.....	7
Design	7
Paradigm	7
Positionality	8
Participants and Setting.....	9
Data Collection Instruments	10
Demographics.	10
Consulting skills inventory.	10
Individual interviews.	11
Interviews T1 with supervisors.....	11
Interviews T1 with supervisees.....	12
Interviews T2 with supervisors.....	12
Interviews T2 with supervisees.....	12
Journals.	12
Procedure	13
Data Analysis.....	15
Member check.....	17
Trustworthiness.....	18
Results.....	18
Supervision Approaches	19
Structure.....	19

Theory or model.....	21
Sites.....	21
Progress.....	21
Methods.....	22
Supervisees' Development.....	23
Skills.	24
Personal attributes.....	26
Knowledge.	26
Relationship Between Supervision Approach and Development.....	27
Structure.....	27
Supervisory relationship.	30
Feedback.	31
Reflection.....	31
Consulting Skills Inventory	32
Other Emerging Factors.....	33
Discussion.....	33
Approaches to Supervision	34
Novice Supervisees' Development.....	36
Consulting Skills Inventory.	39
Factors Affecting Supervisees' Service Delivery Competence	39
Most Helpful Practices in Supervision	41
Limitations and Future Research Recommendations	45
Conclusion	46

References	48
Table 1	56
Table 2	57
Figure 1	58
Figure 2	59
Figure 3	60
Figure 4	56
Figure 5	57
Figure 6	58
Figure 7	59
Figure 8	60
Appendix A	61
Appendix B	64
Appendix C	68
Appendix D	74
Appendix E	77

Introduction

Supervision is an important part of training in sport psychology (Andersen, 2012; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014) and has the aims of ensuring the clients' welfare and supervisees' professional development (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Through the development of competent and ethical sport psychology professionals, supervision contributes to the welfare of those receiving care; the health of sporting communities; individual athletes', coaches', and sport psychologists' well-being and happiness; and the credibility of the field (Andersen, 1994).

In the early 90s, scholars started to publish about sport psychology supervision (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). These publications included important recommendations, such as using models of supervision similar to the ones used in counseling supervision (e.g., Andersen & Williams-Rice, 1996), dealing with impaired supervisees (Andersen, Van Raalte, & Brewer, 2000), working on the supervisory relationship, and discussing transference and countertransference in supervision (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Since then, more authors have demonstrated interest in studying supervision and training of future sport psychology practitioners. Further recommendations discussed various aspects of supervision, such as use of case notes, role-plays, modeling, reflections, video and audio recording, group supervision, feedback, and guided reflection (Barney, Andersen, & Riggs, 1996; Keegan, 2010; Knowles, Gilbourne, Tomlinson, & Anderson, 2007; Silva, Metzler, & Lerner, 2011; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014). Further, some studies have shown the need to improve quantity and access to supervision (Petitpas, Brewer, Rivera, & Van Raalte, 1994; Watson, Zizzi, Etzel, & Lubker, 2004).

Several authors have advocated for the use of reflective practice to improve novice practitioners' competence (e.g., Anderson, Knowles, & Gilbourne, 2004; Cropley, Miles,

Hanton, & Niven, 2007; Holt & Streat, 2001; Knowles et al., 2007; McEwan & Tod, 2015; Tod & Bond, 2010). Van Raalte and Andersen (2014) suggested that reflective practice could increase supervisees' self-awareness, while Tod and Bond (2010) added that reflective practice is important for continual professional development after formal training ends. Copley et al. (2007) reported how reflection could contribute to building better rapport, connecting with clients, adapting interventions to specific client's characteristics, having an athlete-centered approach, listening better, being perceptive while engaging with the client, and improving service-delivery competence in general. Despite the advantages of reflective practice, it does not substitute for supervision (Watson, Lubker, & Van Raalte, 2011), but its benefits are increased with supervision (Knowles et al., 2007).

Recently, there have been two books (Cremades & Tashman, 2014, 2016) dedicated to supervision and training in sport psychology that show the application of many of these recommendations. These books brought experiences and cases of supervision from different parts of the world and have advanced our understanding of the elements of effective supervision in various cultural contexts. For example, Copley and Neil (2014) illustrated how a neophyte supervisor in the UK approached his first supervision experiences. Copley and Neil stressed the importance of having a mentor when starting to supervise, consulting colleagues when necessary, having a supervision philosophy, having a good working alliance with the supervisee, and using effective methods, such as reflective practice, role play, and group discussions. Rhodius and Park (2016) described a case of a supervisor using meta-supervision to ensure supervision quality. Bednarikova, Schneider, and Wieclaw (2016) illustrated the experience of an online peer supervision group that helps young practitioners improve their service-delivery competence.

Cremades and Tashman (2014, 2016) brought to light with their books the great variety of supervision approaches that exist in the world. Some places, such as Australia and United Kingdom, seem to have clear guidelines for supervision and supervisor training established (Tod, Eubank, & Andersen, 2014). In the United States, however, the Association for Applied Sport Psychology (AASP) just developed guidelines regarding the minimum number of hours a certified member (i.e., CC-AASP) should have (i.e., 40 hours) and recommended in its ethics code that “AASP members provide proper training and supervision to their employees or supervisees and take reasonable steps to see that such persons perform services responsibly, competently, and ethically” (AASP, 2011). Additionally, there is no graduate program accreditation in sport psychology in the USA, which leaves it to the programs to decide how they will supervise students. Consequently, a variety of approaches to supervision are used without knowing whether they are effective. Of course there are supervisors practicing good supervision, as has been demonstrated by Cremades and Tashman (2014, 2016), but there are also supervisors offering supervision “as needed” to neophyte supervisees, which may not be the most useful or effective practice.

Extant literature focuses on cases and recommendations. One issue with this focus is that some of these recommendations have not been assessed for their influence in the supervisees’ development in sport psychology. Furthermore, even though some of these cases indicate that these recommendations can be used in certain contexts in sport psychology, not every graduate program can apply all aspects of these recommendations. Therefore, it would be valuable to know which aspects of supervision constitute minimum requirements for effective supervision and which may be used depending on available resources. For example, it is not clear if it is necessary to have individual meetings or direct supervision with every supervisee, every week or

if a program with more supervisees and less staff could offer supervision in small groups.

Establishing a minimum threshold for the qualities and quantity of supervision across the diversity of programs in the United States would help ensure client welfare is protected, while graduate programs conform more closely to available best-practices.

One important contextual variable when discussing standards of effective supervision is the level of experience of the supervisee. Stoltenberg and McNeil (2010) have developed a supervision model called integrated developmental model, which divides practitioners into four developmental levels in eight domains of activity: intervention skills competence, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics. Supervisees can be in level one in one domain and level two in another domain (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010).

In addition, they proposed three overriding structures that help recognize development: motivation, self-/other-awareness, and autonomy. Motivation involves the supervisee's investment in training and practice; self-/other-awareness includes cognitive and affective components that reflect the supervisee's ability to understand the client's world and be aware of own strengths and weaknesses in applied work; and autonomy relates to the extent of independence of the supervisee. For instance, a level 1 practitioner in clinical psychology would be highly motivated; dependent; self-focused, but maybe not highly self-aware; and anxious. Level 2 practitioners would have wavering motivation and confidence due to the recognition that they still do not know many things; their anxiety would decrease; and their self-awareness, empathy, and autonomy would increase. Although these developmental levels have not been assessed in sport psychology practitioners, various authors (e.g., Andersen & Williams-Rice, 1996; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000) recommended adapting supervision to the supervisee's

developmental level. For example, novice supervisees would need more structure than experienced ones, because neophytes do not have the confidence to be autonomous yet (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010).

Specifically in sport psychology, researchers have tried to define what contributes to neophyte practitioners' development. Tod, Andersen, and Marchant (2009) interviewed eight master-degree students of an Australian sport psychology program about their views on what affected the development of their service-delivery competencies (SDC). Their findings indicated that participants viewed their interactions with athletes, supervision, theory and research, and other events outside formal study, such as personal psychotherapy, as the most important factors related to their development. Tod, Marchant, and Andersen (2007) also interviewed 16 students and 11 faculty of four sport psychology graduate programs in Australia and found that service-delivery experience, research and theory, social interactions with other professionals/peers, and events outside training, such as previous employment or athletic experience, were considered important for the students' learning. Similarly, McEwan and Tod (2015) interviewed 20 experienced psychologists (10 of them were sport psychologists) and found that they considered service-delivery experiences, reflective learning within supervision, and applying research and theory to clients to be the most influential experiences in the development of their SDC.

It is noteworthy, when analyzing the variables deemed as having substantial influence on SDC development, that they consisted of: background experiences; research and theory knowledge; applied practice; and experiences that help practitioners connect research and theory to practice, and reflect on their applied training. Experiences with clients discussed in supervision, and other sources of reflection about their practices, seemed to help trainees, and even experienced sport psychology practitioners, develop and continue to improve their applied

sport psychology skills. A model, based on Tod et al.'s (2007, 2009) and McEwan and Tod's (2015) findings showing this relationship and the role of supervision in SDC development, can be found in Figure 1. Experiences such as reflective practice, discussions with peers, and supervision help practitioners understand how theory is applied into practice and should receive more attention in the literature and within graduate training programs.

There have been various suggestions to improve research in supervision in sport psychology, but few have been followed. Tod et al. (2007) recommended relying less on cross-sectional designs and self-report questionnaires and more on designing longitudinal studies comparing students' and their supervisors' perceptions of training. The authors also proposed that research investigating trainees' development should increase comprehension of how practitioners grow over time, which would contribute to the improvement of training programs, supervision, and professional development. Additionally, Andersen, Van Raalte, and Brewer (1994) recommended that future studies could use small samples of supervisor and supervisee dyads and follow them longitudinally, assessing supervisors' skills and supervisees' development for the duration of the study.

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate the supervision approaches being used with novice supervisees in applied sport psychology in the United States and how they relate to supervisees' initial development of SDC. Additionally, this study explored what areas of development feature prominently during the first applied experiences of trainees. Therefore, the research questions were: (a) What are some of the supervision approaches being used with novice supervisees in applied sport psychology in the United States? (b) How do these approaches relate to supervisees' development of service-delivery competence? (c) What are the main areas of service-delivery competence development after first applied experiences in sport

psychology? The knowledge of how supervision influences supervisees' professional development and which aspects of supervision (e.g., frequency, methods) are minimally necessary in fostering supervisees' growth is an important step to develop official guidelines for supervision in the United States that can be used by a variety of programs and supervisors.

Methods

Design

A qualitative longitudinal research (QLR) design framed this study. Saldaña (2003) suggested that the main characteristic of a QLR is collecting data at least two points in time with the intention of assessing or exploring qualitatively the differences, but there are no set guidelines on how to conduct a QLR. The choice of qualitative approach aimed to provide space for the nuances of the various approaches to supervision in sport psychology emerge. The longitudinal aspect permitted the exploration of the supervisees' development throughout the academic term and the contrast of the general supervision approach each supervisor described in the first interview with the actual approach reported in the second interview at the end of the term.

Paradigm

A social constructionist epistemological stance guided the research questions of this study. In social constructionism, "all knowledge, and therefore, all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context" (Crotty, 1998, p. 42). The goal of social constructionism is to rely on the participants' views of their situations (Creswell, 2007). The belief that the supervision experience was unique to each supervision dyad and for each person in the dyad (i.e., supervisor and supervisee) guided the choice of this philosophical grounding. Using social constructionism as the epistemological basis

for the study facilitated the focus on individual development within a social context (Crotty, 1998).

Positionality

According to Creswell (2007), when using social constructionism researchers have to recognize how their backgrounds affect their interpretations and then position themselves to acknowledge these influences. I pursued my bachelor degree in psychology in Brazil. During my studies for this degree I worked in five separate internships as a trainee in different areas of psychology. In all of these internships I was supervised both at the university (i.e., by a faculty supervisor) and by a local supervisor (i.e., someone at the institution where I worked). Although the internship in clinical psychology was the most intensively supervised, it was still not as intense as the supervision provided in counseling and clinical psychology programs in the United States. That clinical supervision was, however, more structured than the one offered in my sport psychology internship. From my first supervision experiences, I learned that supervision is necessary for my growth as a professional and that sport psychology supervision tended to be less structured than what I found in clinical psychology.

After my bachelor degree, I went on to pursue a master degree in Finland, and there I had the least structured supervision experience of my trainee life. There were only a couple of group supervision meetings during the semester in which we would rarely discuss cases, and individual supervision was provided only on an “as needed” basis. Transitioning from an experience of in-depth individual supervision in my clinical psychology internship to this unstructured system was shocking, but I believed that I could still achieve professional growth during the semester-long experience. Nonetheless, I did think that in-depth supervision would have provided me the opportunity of further growth.

Finally, my two most recent supervision experiences in my doctoral degree in the United States were in counseling and sport psychology. In my counseling internship I found substantial structure, with both faculty and local supervision and the continuous use of video recorded sessions. My sport psychology supervision was also quite structured compared to previous sport psychology supervision experiences I had, with use of video recordings in the beginning, although it was still not as structured as the counseling internship. Later, my work was more autonomous than at the start, but I still had systematic supervision after I had gained substantial experience.

Because of these different supervision experiences, and my background in psychology rather than in sport sciences, my expectations regarding good quality supervision involved having a structured process that included in-depth supervision of the supervisee's activities. In addition, I expected that good sport psychology supervision would not be as structured as counseling and clinical psychology supervision, but that it would borrow some methods such as digital video recording, case management, and role-playing from these disciplines to improve the supervisee's learning.

Participants and Setting

Purposeful sampling was used to recruit participants for this study. Supervisor-supervisee dyads ($N = 11$) from 10 different sport psychology graduate programs located in the United States agreed to participate, but two dyads dropped out of the study before its end. One of the dyads dropped out because the supervisee could not continue working with the team, and the other because the supervisee did not continue the data collection. The 11 supervisors' initial interviews served to identify some of the current supervision approaches in the United States. The nine final dyads provided complete data to explore supervisees' development and its

relationship with the approach used. These nine dyads were from nine different programs across the country. Five dyads were housed in sports sciences, kinesiology, or similar departments; four were in psychology, counseling, or similar departments. Supervisees were graduate students starting their practica or similar first applied experiences in sport psychology. Previous applied sport psychology experiences, such as long-term work with athlete(s) or team(s) as the main practitioner were an exclusion criterion for supervisees. Nevertheless, previous observational experiences, such as shadowing (i.e., live observation of a more senior trainee in action) other sport psychology practitioners, and short-term consultations, such as delivering one-day workshops, did not count as long-term work, and, therefore, did not result in exclusion from the study.

Data Collection Instruments

Demographics. Supervisors and supervisees received a survey with demographic questions before their first interviews. Supervisors responded to questions about their age, educational backgrounds, supervision experiences, and training in supervision. Supervisees answered questions about their ages, educational backgrounds, experiences as coaches and athletes, past psychotherapy as clients, and applied experiences. These questions represented the background variables that Tod et al. (2007, 2009) and McEwan and Tod (2015) found as meaningful for SDC development.

Consulting skills inventory. Supervisees also answered questions on a consulting skills inventory (Brown & Hays, 2003) before the first and last interviews (see Appendix A). This inventory was presented at the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology (AAASP) in 2003, but has not been validated. It contains skills that practitioners should have and was used to follow supervisees' development. These skills are divided into four domains: (a)

foundational skills, which include relationship skills, change skills, knowledge/skills in performance excellence, knowledge of physiological aspects of performance, and knowledge of systems of consultation; (b) domain-specific knowledge, which comprises knowledge of performance consulting and its issues; (c) contextual intelligence, which encompasses aspects of communication and interaction; and (d) ethics. Supervisees rated their perceptions of competence in each skill on a scale from 1 to 10.

Individual interviews. Individual semi-structured interviews with supervisors and supervisees explored supervision experiences and the professional development of the supervisees. Semi-structured interviews involved having similar questions asked of the various participants and the flexibility of letting novel information emerge with different probes (Brinkman & Kvale, 2015). These interviews involved asking for descriptions of the participants' experiences using specific open-ended questions related to supervision and SDC. Even though AASP uses the term “mentoring” in place of the term supervision (Castillo, 2014), the interview questions used the specific term “supervision” to distinguish it from of the broader term “mentoring”, which can include general career-related, teaching or research guidance. Each participant was interviewed at the beginning (T1) and end (T2) of the applied sport psychology experience. Because the participants were spread across the country, all interviews were carried out via Skype or FaceTime. The interview guides can be found in Appendix B.

Interviews T1 with supervisors. The interviews with the supervisors at the beginning of the applied sport psychology practica had the aim of understanding the supervisors' general approaches to supervision: what types of models, methods, and overall structures the supervisors used in supervision. The interview also included questions about the educational and training backgrounds of the supervisors, which served as a way of warming up and building rapport.

Interviews T1 with supervisees. The first interviews with the supervisees had the objective of exploring how the supervisees' saw their SDC before starting practica and previous experiences related to applied sport psychology (e.g., observation of a practitioner, classes taken, applied work in a related profession). Questions regarding the supervisees' expectations for their first applied work were used to warm up and start building rapport.

Interviews T2 with supervisors. The final interview with supervisors provided details of the supervision approaches that they took with their specific supervisees. The interviews also included questions regarding if and how they applied their previously explained general approaches. Additionally, the second interview contained questions about their views of their supervisees' development over the academic term.

Interviews T2 with supervisees. The second interview with the supervisees had two aims: to understand the supervisees' views of the supervision experiences and to explore their service-delivery competence development. Questions were both general (many were the same across participants) and specific to expand on what had appeared both in their first interviews and their journal entries.

Journals. The supervisees wrote journal entries in months 2 and 3 answering two open-ended items in each: (a) please describe any meaningful supervision experience in the last month, thinking specifically about verbal or written feedback you received on your work; (b) what were your biggest lessons of the month in supervision that helped in improving your ability to do applied sport psychology? They received an email through Qualtrics with a link inviting them to fill in the journal entries, which provided opportunities for reflection about supervision and their service-delivery experiences and feelings of competence (or incompetence) during the semester.

Procedure

First, the chairpersons or contact persons in half of the programs listed in the *Directory of Graduate Programs in Applied Sport Psychology* (Association for Applied Sport Psychology [AASP] publication; Burke, Sachs, & Schweighardt, 2015) were invited to participate in the research. The directory lists 37 programs that offer mandatory or optional applied experiences housed in sport sciences, kinesiology, or similar departments and 15 in housed in psychology, counseling, or similar departments. In this first round, 19 program chairpersons in the first category and eight in the second were randomly selected to be invited. The researcher first contacted program coordinators and asked if they would offer first-time practicum opportunities for students in the Fall of 2016. Twelve program coordinators responded and said that: (a) they did not have a sport psychology program ($n = 2$), (b) they would not have applied opportunities in the Fall ($n = 1$), or (c) they would not have students who would fit the participation criteria ($n = 9$). Following this first round, 12 other program coordinators housed in the same types of departments as these programs that did not have participants were randomly selected and contacted. Nine supervisors of the invited programs showed interest in participating; two indicated supervisees who were interested in participating in the study, and seven asked to be contacted closer to the beginning of the academic term. Four of these programs formed a total of five dyads when contacted again, but the other three did not have any supervisees. Each program coordinator received up to three first-contact emails, and 11 were unresponsive in these first rounds of invitations. In an attempt to increase the sample size, the researcher contacted the remaining 13 program chairs prior to the beginning of the semester, which resulted in four more dyads. Figure 2 illustrates the process of invitation and formation of dyads.

When contacted, program coordinators indicated supervisors who might have supervisees who met the participation criteria. When these supervisors demonstrated interest in participating in the study, they either contacted their own supervisees to gauge their interest or shared their email addresses with the researcher to invite them to participate. These cycles of invitations resulted in a total of 11 dyads.

Supervisors and supervisee dyads scheduled their first (separate) interviews and filled in the demographics survey online before doing the interviews. The first page of the survey contained the informed consent, which was reviewed at the beginning of the interview to provide space for questions and clarifications. Each participant received an offer of a \$20 Amazon gift card to participate in the entire research project.

After approximately one month of practicum (i.e., September/October), the supervisees received an email with the link to write the first of their journal entries. The participants received the same journal questions after another month in their practica (i.e., October/November). The researcher sent the same journal prompt up to three times to each supervisee. One supervisee dropped out of the study before completing the first journal entry. Two of the remaining 10 supervisees completed only one journal entry, and one of these two did not do the final interview.

After the end of the practicum period (i.e., December/January), supervisors and supervisees were interviewed for a second time. The order of the interviews was according to the participants' preferences (i.e., different dyads had supervisors or supervisees being interviewed first). Figure 3 shows the timeline for the data collection.

Data Analysis

The main researcher and an assistant transcribed the interviews verbatim. These same researchers coded the interviews at T1 entirely through inductive coding to allow the themes to emerge from the data. The research assistant did not have knowledge of the developmental models of supervision or the service-delivery competence literature. The first researcher trained the assistant to transcribe interviews verbatim and execute inductive and deductive coding through readings and coding samples. The type of coding used in this first step was *process coding* to focus on the actions that the participants described (Saldaña, 2013). This coding emphasized the process of supervision and practice. Researchers split the interviews between them and looked for emerging themes concurrently. They then met to discuss and, eventually, agree on final codes and themes. The main researcher wrote memos throughout the process, including a complete description of each theme and code (Lempert, 2007).

Interviews at T2 were also split between researchers to see if the coding scheme and emerging themes developed based on the first interviews worked for the second ones and to identify new codes and themes, using a mix of inductive and deductive process coding (Saldaña, 2013). After identifying new codes and themes, the two researchers met again and restructured the coding book. They went back and forth between the themes and the raw data to develop a comprehensive codebook that would serve the research purposes and also honor the experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2007). Subsequently, an external consultant assessed the clarity and organization of the coding book according to the research questions of the study. After finalizing the coding book, the two researchers went back to the data and re-coded the interviews using focused coding (Saldaña, 2013). In the beginning, the two raters' codes had relatively low agreement ($\kappa = 0.31$), but with time and experience with the data the coding became more

congruent, and the coding that was not congruent between the two researchers was discussed, modified, and eventually agreed upon. This discussion included the separation of the coding sections that were not coded by both researchers and discussion of each case based on the description of the themes and rationale for coding.

The back and forth analysis between raw data and themes had characteristics of the constant comparative analysis that Boeije (2002) suggested based on Glasser and Strauss's (1967) analysis method to develop theory grounded on data. The two first steps that Boeije (2002) suggested for this process include comparison within one single interview and comparison between interviews in the same group (e.g., between two supervisees' interviews). In the present study, the comparison within one interview looked for themes that could become central categories in the second coding cycle. The second step compared interviews of supervisees with each other and supervisors with each other to refine and group, in clear categories, the themes found in the first step. Although the researchers for the present study explored a fairly unexamined area, the intent was not to develop a theory, and the entire constant comparative analysis and coding that Glasser and Strauss originally suggested was not used. The software NVivo was used to organize and complete the coding process.

The same two researchers analyzed the journal entries using focused coding to follow up on the development of the supervision experiences throughout the semester. They provided snapshots of important events related to the supervisees' experiences and professional development.

Descriptive excerpts from the participants' interviews illustrated the participants' experiences to help the reader understand the context of the participants' experiences. These excerpts were used within ethical boundaries of confidentiality, and some details were disguised

or altered, because the sport psychology community is not large, and the identities of the members of the dyads needed to be protected.

Besides the data analysis and interpretation at each point in time, the connections between the interviews were also central in QLR. Complying with Boeije's (2002) suggestions, the researcher followed steps 3 to 5 in the constant comparison analysis to understand these connections, which are: (3) comparison of interviews from different groups (e.g., supervisors and supervisees); (4) comparison in pairs at the level of the couple (i.e., supervisor and supervisee); and (5) comparing couples (i.e., comparison among pairs to find possible patterns). These steps helped to clarify how different aspects of supervision might have contributed to various aspects of service-delivery competence development.

The pre- and post-practicum skills inventories that supervisees completed provided extra data regarding perceptions of changes in skills over time. The within participant difference (i.e., final skills self-rating minus beginning skill self-rating) showed which skills the participants perceived themselves to have improved the most. Because these individual results were somewhat inconsistent with the rest of the data (e.g., negative value – see Table 2), the sum of these differences in each skill were calculated to illustrate the overall changes in skills across participants.

Member check. The researcher sent the results section to the participants with their quotes for member checking. Supervisors were asked if they could identify their supervision experiences and characteristics of their supervisees' development. Supervisees attempted to identify their supervision experiences and their perceived experiences of development. Supervisors and supervisees also confirmed their permission to use their quotes, and the representation of meaning of these quotes. Seventeen participants considered that the results

section reflected their experiences and allowed the use of their quotes. One of the supervisees did not respond to the solicitation.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness was sought using different strategies. First, the bracketing of the researcher's previous biases helped raise consciousness of these biases and decrease their interference during interviews and data analysis. Second, triangulation of data through use of interviews of both supervisors and supervisees, journal entries, and the consultant skill inventories helped in developing trustworthiness. Triangulation of researcher was also used in coding. Additionally, prolonged engagement with the participants, the variety of cases across different types of graduate programs, and member checking contributed to the trustworthiness of the study.

Thick description facilitated the representation of the participants' narratives and provided in-depth portraits of the contexts of each supervision experience and professional development. This information helps readers understand the nuances of each supervision approach and how other supervisors may, or may not, use similar approaches. Finally, an audit trail in the form of a journal included the details of the decision-making throughout the research process.

Results

The first section of the results addresses the research question regarding the various approaches to supervision that are currently being used in some of the graduate programs in the United States. The second addresses the development of first-time practitioners in sport psychology, and the third focuses on the relationship between the supervision approaches and supervisee development. Each section centers on the themes that were most common in the

interviews for that topic. Themes related to supervision are in Figures 4 and 5, and themes related to supervisees' development are in Figures 6 and 7. The descriptions of each theme and code are in Appendix C. A fourth section includes the consulting skills inventory's results.

Supervision Approaches

Supervisors ($N = 11$) completed the first interview in which they explained their general approaches to supervision. The supervisors were between 35 and 65 years old ($M = 46$) and had between 2 and 30 years of experience as supervisors ($M = 13.5$). They had supervised between four and 260 ($M = 57$) people and were currently supervising between one and 22 students ($M = 9.5$). Their training in supervision varied from no training ($n = 3$) to taking a graduate course in supervision ($n = 2$). The other supervisors were somewhere in the middle and had experiences with meta-supervision ($n = 4$), extensive reading ($n = 2$), and workshops on supervision ($n = 4$).

The main themes of supervision that emerged from the interviews with supervisors and supervisees were: (a) structure, which referred to the general characteristics of supervision, such as types of meetings and models; (b) methods; (c) progress, which included evaluation of supervisees and areas of improvement of supervision; and (d) supervisor qualities that were related to supervision.

Structure. The approaches of the 11 supervisors tended to have three types of structure: (a) mixture of consistent individual supervision and group supervision based on discussions (which will be called *individual approach* henceforth); (b) combination of small group supervision (4-6 students) with discussions and assignments in addition to individual supervision as needed (which will be called *group approach* henceforth); (c) use of group supervision based on group discussions and multilevel supervision, but still with the option of individual supervision if requested by the supervisee (which will be called *multilevel approach* henceforth).

Only one supervisor used exclusively individual supervision as needed, but this dyad's supervisee could not continue the study due to lack of opportunities for practicum placements.

Four supervisors used the individual approach. Two of them were in a program offering both master and PhD degrees, and two of them were in a program that offered only master degrees. Half were housed in a psychology or counseling department, and half were in kinesiology or sport sciences. Two of the supervisors also used shadowing but did not have a structured multilevel approach. They tended to meet weekly, individually and in groups. One of them met biweekly individually and used a regular course instead of group supervision to discuss supervision-related issues, because they were in a program where internships were optional, and group supervision was not offered every semester. One of them offered individual supervision online (e.g., via FaceTime).

Three supervisors used the group approach. They were all in programs offering only master degrees and housed in kinesiology or sport sciences departments. They tended to use part of the group supervision for discussion and part for assignments such as case studies, DISC assessment (i.e., an assessment that measures the person's levels of dominance, influence, steadiness, and conscientiousness, and suggests how to interact with other people based on these characteristics), interpersonal process recall (i.e., assisted review of video of self practicing in which someone else asks questions that elicit reflection of practitioners' decision making and feelings during the session recorded), SWOT analysis (i.e., assessment of own strengths, weaknesses, opportunities for growth, and threats), case notes, reflections, or needs assessment. Supervisors offered individual supervision as needed, but tried to find opportunities to observe or co-consult with students, although it was not always possible. The supervisors also used shadowing, but did not have a structured multilevel approach.

The multilevel approach paired PhD or more advanced master students with beginning students to provide mentoring. They were housed in different types of department. Two of them had a more structured multilevel approach than the third in which students would work in consulting teams and gain increased responsibility as practitioners every semester, whereas the third program just assigned mentors to master students. This third program had applied experience as an optional feature of the program.

Theory or model. Regarding the supervision theory or model used, besides most of the supervisors using the same theories they use in their practice (e.g., CBT), five of them shared that they used a developmental model, although they did not state which model. They reported using higher structure and more frequent direct feedback with beginning students compared to their approaches with more seasoned supervisees. For example, one supervisor mentioned: “I think because I probably adopt more of a developmental model now in my supervision work. I tend to be more directive with first year consultants.”

Sites. The sites of practicum or internship and the approaches to choose them varied. Although 10 supervisors seemed to have relationships with teams that would regularly take students, three of them seemed to have arrangements that could work in one semester but not in another. Two supervisors mentioned the importance of providing a variety of experiences to the supervisees and the use of a team of student-practitioners at each site to enable them to work with more than one team.

Progress. One factor that seemed to influence the approaches that supervisors used and the limitations that they had in improving supervision was the competing responsibilities that they had. Five of the 11 supervisors mentioned that they would like to provide more individual supervision, but time and other academic responsibilities were barriers for them to do so. One of

the supervisors defined the choice of the approach as: “[I] try to put together something that fits our program and our students. And it might not work for every program, but it seems to work pretty well for ours.”

Methods. Eight of the 11 supervisors said that they tried to use some direct methods (i.e., directly watching supervisees’ practicing, such as through observation or video) of supervision, but one of them did not have the opportunity of using it during the academic term studied. The most frequently used methods were peer discussion, which eight supervisors used regularly, and feedback, which all of them used. All supervisors used a mixture of direct feedback and guiding questions (e.g., Socratic questions). The 11 supervisors also used some method to help supervisees explore themselves as practitioners (assisted self-reflection): six of the supervisors required that supervisees kept a journal or did another type of self-reflection; one made journaling optional; four relied mostly on guiding questions (e.g., “how did you feel in session with the client?”); and five of them also used assignments other than journals to stimulate self-reflection. Three supervisors also mentioned using interpersonal process recall.

Direct feedback was used for teaching, modeling (e.g., “I might demonstrate some things”), or relieving supervisee’s anxiety through direct advice giving (e.g., “in moments where I knew something came up with her team and she just really needed advice then I could just adapt and give her advice and not spend as much time facilitating reflection and self-discovery”). Guiding questions were used to foster reflection and critical thinking (e.g., “in moments where we had more time together, like in her case presentation, I could ask her those questions of like ‘how would you do this differently?’ or ‘what do you think is something that you can improve?’”).

Relationship development seemed to be a central aspect of supervision. Supervisees shared that they felt that it was important for them to feel supported, trust their supervisor, and feel like the supervisor was available. One supervisee said:

Support. A lot of it was support. Her manner of just being able to motivate and push me through. There were times when, during the semester, when I was just, “I can't do this anymore.” I was like, “I'm dying”, and my professor showed me it's a battle. But support is there, and being there is really like... I feel like it's some... it's small, but it... like, it does so much

Supervisors also emphasized the importance of using a collaborative approach in which there is open communication and a safe space where supervisees feel comfortable in sharing their questions and mistakes. One supervisor said: “I really work to create a safe environment where students feel safe to fail and take risks and to be vulnerable.” Having multiple professional relationships (e.g., classroom teacher and practicum supervisor) seemed to contribute to the closeness of the relationship. The availability of mentors also seemed to contribute to the perception of support by the supervisee:

It's good to have that much support, and so even outside my mentor, there's other mentors that have heard like my case study and were like, “Hey, if you need help, I can help you.” So, just having all that support is really nice.

Supervisees' Development

The nine supervisees who completed the study were between 23 and 28 years old ($M = 24.7$). Among them, seven had bachelor degrees in psychology; eight were master degree students, and two were either PhD or combined master and PhD students. Seven of them had coaching experience, and eight had experience as athletes. Three of these were high-level

athletes (e.g., NCAA) in the past. Seven of them had experience shadowing another sport psychology practitioner, and four of them had experience in another helping profession (e.g., counseling, social work).

The main themes that emerged in the supervisees' development were skills, knowledge, experience, and personal attributes. Aspirations also emerged as a theme, but did not seem to relate to their development or change with time. Skills and personal attributes were perceived as related to supervisees' development most often.

Skills. Self-awareness was a skill that students perceived they improved most throughout the academic term. It emerged four times as something to be improved and twice as something that was already well established in the first interviews, whereas in the second round of interviews and journals it emerged 38 times as something that had improved. Self-awareness was shown when supervisees were able to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses as practitioners, to examine their emotions and how they affected practice, and to understand the boundaries of their knowledge and skills. One supervisee said that, "As a consultant, I am often aware of my thoughts and feelings, but discussing them out loud and how they impact my behaviors and others proves to be key in connecting with the supervisor and receiving helpful instructions."

Among the skills, communication with individuals and skills at group presentations showed considerable improvement across the two interviews. One supervisee stated, "Knowing that I could put a good face forward and stand up in front of them, be able to have good communication with them, and being able to have fun activities and stuff like that." Among the group presentation skills, supervisees frequently reported improvement in engaging athletes and debriefing at the end of the sessions. In addition, a shift happened from the first to second

interviews from first being good at building rapport to later being able to listen, assess issues and focus the sessions, and identifying what to do. One supervisee mentioned in her second interview: “

I’ve learned even better skills at building rapport to get to the sport psychology stuff.

Some of the sport psychology stuff I’ve been able to work on, I’ve gotten to because of the strong rapport that I’ve built. Like, a couple of my athletes were embarrassed of the fear they had of the, like, the [athlete] who was afraid of one of the events, and it took a while for him to open up that he was afraid of it. And then we could get to it, so the counseling skills, I feel like, although I obviously have more room to work on it, I feel like I’ve gained a lot of skills in that respect. And then also skills of putting together a workshop, presenting workshop, getting... Getting everyone involved, being interactive, those sorts of things.

Also, a shift to client-led sessions emerged in the discourse of some supervisees:

The biggest lesson was that I don’t have to give resources and fix everything. Many times I can just listen and see what people need from me. Sometimes it’s just listening until they get a better feel for where they are at. This helped me relax and become a better listener.

Regarding changes in skills, the supervisees seemed to acquire knowledge about the implementation of techniques and mental skills and a better understanding of how to translate theory into practice. One supervisee said:

We [supervisee and her client] did a lot of PMR and we did a lot of mindful breathing, trying to work in some compassion as well as her development as an athlete. And throughout all of that, I don’t know, I don’t think I’ve bought so many books in a short

span of time [before] and integrated that into my practice. Last year, I felt a lot that it's an arbitrary technique that we use. Like, doing this imagery, I didn't really see myself doing it with an athlete and being able to actually do it, and watching myself on tape and trying to get better at it has been an experience

The skills inventory confirmed this tendency, with the biggest areas of increase across supervisees being “knowledge of theoretical model for making decisions in consultation” and “models of performance excellence.” Nevertheless, they recognized that they still had much to learn in these areas. One supervisee stated, “I definitely think that I can continue to improve on figuring out different ways to help the client.”

Personal attributes. Changes in confidence and flexibility were also key in the supervisees' development. Sometimes confidence appeared as feeling comfortable in delivering services. One supervisee stated: “And so that confidence in myself and stopping the noise and stopping the overthink. So, that's been helpful.” Flexibility was coded when the supervisee was open to feedback or able to adapt to unforeseen situations such as a crisis or having the session cut short because the coach ended practice late. One supervisee shared, “I was thrown a ton of curve balls this semester and just like learning to deal with those was something that I probably developed the most.”

Knowledge. Five of the nine supervisors mentioned how they could see the development of the supervisees in their interaction with their peers in group supervision or with their shadows in terms of mentoring and giving feedback to their cases. One of them mentioned, “I think there is also a skill in providing feedback in writing and in person that is helpful or supportive as well as maybe challenging or offering different points of view.”

Relationship Between Supervision Approach and Development

The supervisees had different levels of development throughout their academic term. Factors that seemed to influence their development included background experiences, opportunities of applied work during the academic term, and frequency and quality of supervision. Background experiences that seemed helpful included: experiences as an athlete, coaching, shadowing, and role plays in previous courses. Supervisees reported that experiences as coaches and athletes were helpful for understanding sport environments, increasing their empathy towards clients, and communicating better with them. They considered shadowing and role plays as helpful to improve understanding of the process of working with a client, decrease anxiety, and, for some, it was an opportunity to build rapport with the team they would start working with as student practitioners.

Opportunities for applied work also varied among supervisees. Most of them had opportunities to work using both individual and group interventions. One supervisee, however, could work with only team workshops, and one did not have any opportunities to do group sessions. The structure of applied work opportunities seemed to be related to the structure of supervision. That is, programs with consistent supervision structures (e.g., regular meetings, regular sites) tended to offer more opportunities for applied work.

Characteristics of supervision that seemed to relate to better development included consistent structure, close supervisory relationships, mixes of direct feedback and guiding, and stimulation of self-reflection. These themes are explored in more detail below.

Structure. Consistent structure involved regular meetings with supervisors. Among supervisors who adopted the individual approach, their supervisees believed that weekly in-person meetings were more useful than the online or biweekly meetings other supervisees had.

One supervisee shared, “I would say the biggest piece, the face-to-face debriefing of sessions, is the most useful because he will often chime in with ‘okay, use these types of words’ or ‘these types of phrases’ and because he's just an expert.” Nevertheless, other informal opportunities for meetings with supervisors, such as before and after classes, seemed to compensate somewhat for less frequent individual meetings. Some supervisees in the individual approach also indicated that the group supervision meetings were not as helpful as one-on-one sessions, which could be related to the number of people in the group meetings. One supervisee noted:

It's a little hard because we have about 15 people in the class, so it is a bunch of my peers and then [supervisor] so it, it sometimes got a little tricky when people had their own opinions and things to say, and I think it's hard as a supervisor to let people talk out their thinking and then also move the discussion in a super effective way.

Among supervisees receiving supervision in the group approach, multiple professional relationships with the supervisor seemed to be related to a close supervisory relationship. In addition, the other activities in their multiple roles could provide extra opportunities for supervision. For example, they could use part of thesis advising time to check in and even do brief individual supervision. The importance of having structure for individual supervision was clear when supervisees commented that it would be better to have the supervisors at least checking on them more often:

I think that sometimes during the term it would have been nice if she checked in with me every once in a while. I checked in with her mainly. If we passed each other in the hall or something like that, she'd ask how things were going, but I think it would be nice for a supervisor to shoot out an email every couple of weeks and be like, “Hey how's it going?” just to check. I know that creates more work for them, but it would be nice so I

could be like, “Oh! Actually this is happening, and I haven’t mentioned this because I keep forgetting.” I think it would help prompting those little things.

Supervisees in the group supervision grounded in the group approach seemed to perceive the processes to be more helpful than in the individual approach, possibly due to the smaller number of people in those supervisory sessions. One supervisee considered the assignments for group supervision classes helpful to learn about practice. Both supervisees who experienced this approach considered that discussion of cases and getting their peers’ feedback was the most useful aspect of group supervision. One supervisee said:

It’s very interesting hearing about what their experiences have been like, while thinking, “oh, I would do something a little different, but I can see your point of view”, and just processing how they’re going about and thinking of ways that I could use it.”

Some supervisors across the different supervision approaches emphasized the importance of group supervision to get students used to exchanging experiences with their peers when they encounter challenging cases in the future. One supervisor explained, “I hope to [help] build their professional network, so they can use each other for consultation purposes when they may run into issues or things that may surface that they need consultation about (...) once they graduate.”

Among the supervisees receiving the multilevel approach, higher development seemed to be associated with an organized structure that included regular meetings with student mentors and main supervisor’s availability. If it happened that the student mentors were unable to help the supervisee, the supervisee could always reach out to the supervisor and feel supported. Student mentors, who were not so helpful, combined with supervisors who were not so available, resulted in a slightly slower development, with less applied opportunities, and less frequently mentioning of self-awareness changes and improvements in interpersonal skills in their

interviews. Nevertheless, even among the supervisees who were well supported by mentors, some also shared the wish of having more individual sessions with the main supervisor:

There was a couple of times we tried to do that, but it didn't match up, so we just talked on the phone, which was good. I personally like face-to-face better than talking on the phone, but it's definitely better than not. So I think that would probably be the main thing that I would change... more one-on-one, face-to-face. I know that... there are 15 of us, so I know that [the supervisor] doesn't have time to sit down with each of us for an hour each week.

Supervisory relationship. Another important factor for supervisee growth was the supervisory relationship. Eight supervisors mentioned that they tried to provide safe and collaborative environments where supervisees felt comfortable sharing their mistakes. One supervisor explained:

I think providing support, providing kind of the step-by-step developmental learning where it's ok to make mistakes, and you're not going to know everything now. You're going to learn as you go, and the more experiences you have, the more opportunities you have to learn, which will help you feel more comfortable and confident.

Their care for the supervisee's development was appreciated by the supervisees:

If there's one word that I can describe is that she's really supportive. She's encouraging, and every time she ended up [on] a good note. She would tell me "OK, you can probably improve on this, but you are doing really well in other things," so reinforcing. That helped a lot.

Furthermore, supervisor self-disclosure was appreciated by the supervisees and seemed to contribute to the connection between them. For example, one supervisee shared that, "I also

think supervision is most helpful with supervisors being able to express how their experiences in certain situations have been. Connecting on a difficult client or situation encourages comfortability and almost a stronger bond as a unit.”

Feedback. Supervisors also tended to use a mix of direct feedback and guiding questions, which the supervisees considered helpful. For example, “[supervisor] encourages us to find our own answers, yet helps to keep us in the right direction. She had me come up with my own game plan for the future and suggested a few things.” Direct feedback was usually used for teaching a skill or modeling it, suggesting a different intervention or wording, suggesting future approaches to use with the client, and raising a supervisee’s awareness to something specific noted by the supervisor. It seemed to be used more often when supervisees had limited knowledge about the subject or there was a pressing need to get a solution. Supervisees seemed to appreciate the direct feedback provided, “I’ve been getting a lot of feedback on it that isn’t always positive, but I feel like that’s a good thing.”

Guiding seemed to help increase supervisees’ self-awareness by helping them reflect on their choices and actions. One supervisee noted, “My supervisor just told me to keep my mind open and take a step back. Once I did that, I realized that I kept looking for problems instead of just observing.” In addition, it seemed like when they were guided towards a decision rather than told to follow one specific path, they felt a sense of accomplishment once their decisions worked out. For example, one supervisee said, “I sought consultation from Dr. [supervisor]. He helped me to process and come up with a plan myself of what a good session would look like, and I left feeling much better about the consultation.”

Reflection. Besides the supervisors’ guidance, self-awareness seemed to be stimulated by supervisees’ reflections and group discussions. Supervisors and supervisees considered that self-

reflection was helpful. As one supervisor noted about the supervisee, “because she was, as I said, brave or willing to self-reflect, I think that she really took the challenges and learned and grew a lot as a [practitioner].” Supervisors also mentioned that they could see the growth of their supervisees through their reflections. One said:

I think as she saw what the team’s pressing needs were, her reflection started to mimic that. And so, I think that’s always good because it’s important to reflect on what you need most help with, and often you can find that help within yourself if you engage in this insightful self-reflection.

Even though reviewing videos with supervisees was not an approach used regularly for most, supervisees who used it reported that this method was helpful to improve their self-awareness and counseling skills. Two of them mentioned it among the most helpful methods their supervisor used.

In general, supervisees were grateful and appreciative of the contributions of their supervisors made to their development. One said:

I think I’ve grown more in 3 months than I have in like the last 20 years of my life. I think my attitude towards people and sports and sport psychology has changed immensely, and I think that [supervisor] has helped a lot in my development and, I don’t know, shaped me as a human.

Consulting Skills Inventory

After subtracting scores of the initial self-assessment of supervisees’ consulting skills, from the final self-assessment scores, these values were summed within participant (across skills, per participant) and across participants (per skill). The sums of changes in skills within participants were not helpful in understanding supervisees’ improvement, because they

frequently did not seem to relate to their interviews. For example, one participant who had improved in various areas had multiple negative scores in domain-specific knowledge and ethics, which does not align with her and her supervisor's reports.

When looking into the results per skill, across participants, two questions had a high total score: *familiarity of model(s) of motivation and change* (17) and *knowledge of models of performance excellence* (16). These changes were in line with the supervisees' interviews, who stated that they could understand better how to apply theory into practice. Following these, *affiliation with professional organization(s) having ethics code* (13) and *competency in model of facilitating change* (12) were the highest scores.

Other Emerging Factors

Although there was not a question in the interview inquiring if supervisees recognized any client with mental health issues, three supervisees reported that they had clients with mental health-related issues and had to seek help from their supervisors to decide if it was necessary to refer them to psychotherapy. Another three supervisees mentioned that they had to deal with crisis situations but did not specify the issues that led to the crisis.

Discussion

The discussion of the findings focuses first on the different approaches to supervision that emerged, then on the developmental aspects of supervisees who participated of this study; and, finally, on the factors affecting supervisees' development. Aspects of supervision seen as helpful to facilitate supervisees' development are discussed, including implications for practice and future studies.

Approaches to Supervision

A broad variety of approaches to supervision in sport psychology emerged in this study, within the context of the graduate programs in the United States. A similar variety of approaches has been documented throughout the world (e.g., Cremades & Tashman, 2014, 2016). Cremades and Tashman (2014, 2016) had supervisors reporting or recommending the use of individual (e.g., Andersen, Barney, & Waterson, 2016; Dosil & Rivera, 2014) and multilevel (e.g., Braun, Myhberg, Thompson, & Yambor, 2016; Vosloo, Zakrajsek, & Grindley, 2014) approaches, and supervisees who had been part of less individualized approaches and developed student support to compensate for it (e.g., Lee, Titkov, & Mortensen, 2014). The diversity of supervision structures found in the sport psychology graduate programs that participated in this study is not encountered in counseling or clinical psychology graduate programs in the United States, where there is program accreditation and clear guidelines for practicum and supervision at least in terms of required hours of practice and mandated amount of one-on-one versus group supervision (American Psychological Association [APA], 2014; Borders et al., 2014).

The individual approach was the closest to North American counseling psychology supervision and seemed to be perceived as been most useful when carried out in person versus online. Borders et al. (2014) recommended that counselor supervisors meet face-to-face, weekly with supervisees individually, in triads, or groups. Regarding the choice among individual, triad, and group supervision, Borders et al. (2014) proposed that it should not be based on time constraints, and Jordan (2003) added that this choice should take into consideration the supervisee's skill. Specifically, less skilled supervisees would need more individualized attention and frequent meetings. Concerning in-person versus online supervision, Van Raalte, Petitpas, Andersen, and Rizzo (2016) emphasized the importance of supervisors being able to hear and see

nonverbal communication of supervisees when using Skype or FaceTime for distance supervision, and also pointed out that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed through these means. In the present study, online supervision in the individual approach was sometimes challenging due to technology issues, which may also affect the closeness of the supervisory relationship when supervisor and supervisee cannot see each other.

Supervisors used the multilevel approach when they had many supervisees and competing responsibilities. When the student mentors were supportive, and the main supervisor was still available to the supervisees, this approach seemed helpful to supervisees. Additionally, group supervision contributed to the supervisees' development and perception of closeness to the supervisor in this approach. This finding indicates that training student mentors to supervise novice trainees, and meta-supervising these mentors may be a useful approach to supervision. Meta-supervision has been recommended before as an effective method for supervisor's development and improving the quality of supervision (Barney & Andersen, 2014; Rhodius & Park, 2016; Vosloo, Zakrajsek, & Grindley, 2014).

The group approach was based on small group case discussions and assignments. Group supervision has shown to be a good practice to help supervisees receive extra feedback from peers and may help neophyte practitioners feel comfortable sharing experiences (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Bednarikova, Schneider, and Wieclaw (2016) reported that peer consultation can help create a nonjudgmental environment where neophyte practitioners feel comfortable in participating. Van Raalte and Andersen (2000), however, stressed that some supervisees may feel uncomfortable sharing their mistakes or questions in a group environment, and they recommended a combination of individual and group supervision in the first stages of development.

It is especially important to note that the three approaches fit each program's resources and structure. Number of staff, students, and types of degree offered (i.e., master, PhD) are important factors to be considered when choosing an approach to supervision. For example, a program offering only master degrees would probably not be able to implement a multilevel approach.

Novice Supervisees' Development

The supervisees' development in this study presented some similarities with Stoltenberg and McNeil's (2010) integrated developmental model. The most prominent similarity was that the three overriding structures that mark development (i.e., self-/other-awareness, autonomy, and motivation) emerged as codes in the present study (i.e., self-awareness/listening, independent, and motivated/optimistic). Changes in self-/other-awareness were evident in the coding frequency; half of the supervisees reported increased autonomy, and motivation seemed to remain stable for most supervisees.

Stoltenberg and McNeil (2010) suggested that in the beginning supervisees focus on themselves and have difficulties listening to their clients. With practice and supervision, they develop the ability to devote less energy to being self-conscious and worried, and to connect better with the client than they had before. This change also appeared in the increasing number of times that *listening* was coded on the second interviews and journals, and this shift has been documented in sport psychology trainees in the past (Cropley et al., 2007; Holt & Streat, 2001; Tod et al., 2009).

The initial focus on self that beginning supervisees experience is usually a critical one. That is, supervisees tend to feel discomfort and anxiety and evaluate themselves poorly (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). With more experience, knowledge, self-/other-awareness, and a

facilitative supervision environment, however, supervisees' confidence tends to increase and recalling theoretical knowledge while interacting with clients becomes easier (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). This increase in confidence was also noticeable in the supervisees in the present study. Supervisees reported feeling more comfortable, confident, and less anxious at the end of the study than they were at the beginning. Increases in trainees' confidence as a result of supervision had been documented in sport psychology before (Li, 2016).

Stoltenberg and McNeil (2010) also suggested that changes in autonomy and motivation mark the transition of practitioners through developmental levels. Trainees tend to first be more dependent on the supervisor, who can facilitate development through modeling and specific suggestions, and slowly become more independent and confident (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). In the present study, the frequency of coding of independence increased from the first to the second interview, but only four supervisees and their respective supervisors mentioned an increase in independence. Regarding motivation, Stoltenberg and McNeil (2010) described a shift from high motivation to ambivalence due to self-doubt and wavering confidence. This shift in motivation was not observed in most supervisees (motivation remained high for most throughout the study), and the majority of them reported increased confidence. This incongruence with the model may be attributed to the different content or difficulty of the sessions experience in sport settings, but future research may want to explore this nuance in the model.

Another important improvement in the supervisees' development was increased abilities to focus on the sessions and to identify what to do. Better self-awareness, listening actively to the client, abilities to focus on the session, and knowing what to do may show that the supervisees started to develop a comprehensive understanding of practice. In addition, this development

allowed them to be flexible and adapt their intervention plans. Stoltenberg and McNeil (2010) explained that such changes are important developmental aspects of practitioners' competencies. These skills are also in line with some of the competencies that supervisees working towards the British Association for Sport and Exercise Sciences (BASES) certification have to achieve, such as being able to apply knowledge and technical skills, to self-reflect, and to communicate effectively with clients (BASES, 2009).

In summary, most supervisees in this study showed signs of change from a level 1 to a level 2 practitioner based on the overriding structures of the integrative developmental model (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010). Some differences were observed, however, in the characteristics of each level in comparison to the original model. Level 1 practitioners seemed to be motivated, dependent, anxious, and self-focused with limited self-awareness, as proposed in the model. On the other hand, once they noticed that they still had a lot to learn, when moving into level 2, they did not report wavering motivation. Conversely, supervisees who did not have many applied opportunities tended to report changes in self-/other-awareness and autonomy less frequently, and mentioned periods of low motivation during practicum. Supervisees who moved to the second level of competence shared several themes across interviews: These supervisees: 1) Perceived to have more confidence than in the beginning even when acknowledging that they still had a lot to learn; 2) spoke of high motivation to continue learning and have more experience; 3) movement to a client-centered approach; and 4) lower anxiety than before. Additionally, Stoltenberg and McNeil (2010) suggested that the capability of feeling empathy is developed in the second level, and the supervisees in the present study seemed to have started with this ability in level one, but the capacity grew over time. This difference may be due to the nature of sport psychology compared to mental health. That is, performance-related situations

may be easier to empathize with, because everyone performs every day in several situations and contexts. Additionally, most supervisees had previous experiences as athletes or coaches, which was reported as helpful in connecting with clients.

Consulting Skills Inventory. The results of the consulting skills inventory were frequently contrary to the participants' discourses (e.g., data seemed to show negative development). One reason for this difference may be that some participants were not completely aware of their actual skills in the beginning of the academic term and may have either overestimated or underestimated them. This hypothesis is in line with the idea that they became more aware of what they did and did not know.

Second, more types of skills and knowledge emerged from the interviews than were represented in the inventory. The inventory focused on knowledge and competence using sport psychology-specific models, theories, and skills, but did not expand on counseling skills, for example, which emerged in the interviews. This broader variety of meaningful skills involved in novice supervisee consulting may indicate the usefulness of expanding this inventory in the future to include more specific counseling skills in it.

Factors Affecting Supervisees' Service Delivery Competence

Three factors seemed to influence the supervisees' development: (a) background experiences; (b) opportunities for applied work; and (c) frequency and structure of supervision. Tod et al. (2007, 2009) and McEwan and Tod (2015) suggested that these factors influence the development of SDC.

Concerning the similarities between findings in the present study and previous studies by Tod et al. (2007, 2009) and McEwan and Tod (2015), this dissertation's findings also indicated that previous experiences in helping professions, as athletes, and as coaches, and interaction with

other professionals and peers were helpful to develop SDC. In spite of that, none of the participants of the present study mentioned previous psychotherapy as influential in SDC development, contrary to what Tod et al. (2007) found. One participant, however, mentioned that her experience as an athlete receiving sport psychology interventions in the past helped her feel more confident in delivering these interventions herself.

Many supervisees considered role playing and shadowing as helpful to facilitate their SDC development and confidence going into practicum. Although McEwan and Tod (2015) found that clinical and counseling psychologists considered role plays as useful in their SDC development, they did not find the same with sport psychologists. Tod et al. (2007, 2009) and McEwan and Tod did not mention shadowing in any of their studies.

Another interesting factor when thinking about the original model based on Tod et al.'s (2007, 2009) findings was that quantity of previous courses in sport psychology did not seem to affect the supervisees' development along the study. Supervisees who were in their first graduate courses in sport psychology, or who had already taken various courses developed similarly. Tod et al. (2007, 2009) found that knowledge of research and theory and how to apply them were important factors in SDC development in their samples. Nevertheless, all the supervisees in the present study seemed to feel confident in their basic sport psychology knowledge going into practica, and all of them had sport psychology-specific courses along the academic term of the current study. This finding may indicate that deepening learning of theory (e.g., taking an applied sport psychology course) while in practicum may also be an effective strategy to help trainees improve their understanding of application of theory into practice.

Finally, supervisees and supervisors considered supervision to be an important factor in development of SDC. Supervision can help trainees reflect on their practice and better connect

theory and practice. In addition, it has the power to facilitate other activities that foster reflection and improve SDC, such as self-reflection, development of practitioner philosophy, and interactions with peers/professionals.

The present study found similar and new emerging factors that seemed to affect SDC development in the contexts of the American programs included in this study. Figure 8 illustrates a modified model of SDC development based on previous research in Australia and the UK, and the present research in the USA. It modifies some of the background factors, maintains the influence of theory, and proposes that the central aspect of improving SDC is reflective practice and the connection of theory and practice. Reflection and connection happen in and between practice and supervision, which are also central factors influencing SDC development. Additionally, this model lists new characteristics of supervision and practice in the context of the programs studied.

Most Helpful Practices in Supervision

There have been many suggestions for effective supervision in the past (e.g., Andersen, 2012; Carr et al., 2014). In the current study, through the perception of the participants, there seemed to be no difference in how helpful each of the three approaches of supervision were. That is, all approaches had supervisees who reported being satisfied and who grew similarly as practitioners along the academic term. Nevertheless, some characteristics of supervision were perceived as helpful, no matter which approach the supervisor was using. These characteristics included consistent meetings with supervisees, using a mix of direct feedback and guiding questions, facilitating reflection, building a strong supervisory relationship, and tailoring the supervision approach to the supervisee's developmental model (see Table 1).

Supervisors using developmental understanding of the supervisee, as suggested by Andersen and Williams-Rice (1996), tended to focus on giving novice supervisees more structure and direct feedback than they would for senior students or licensed practitioners. Further, these aspects of the developmental model were applied even when supervisors did not mention the use of a developmental model in their approaches. All supervisors also applied some aspects of their own practitioner philosophies, using models such as cognitive-behavioral, person-centered, and psychodynamic in their supervision.

Reflective practice, which is strongly suggested as helpful to increase supervisees' development (Anderson, Knowles, & Gilbourne, 2004; Holt & Streat, 2001; Tod & Bond, 2010), also seemed to be helpful. These reflections contributed to increasing in supervisees' self-awareness, which was one of the biggest areas of their development. Other forms of stimulating self-reflection included supervisees watching themselves in videos (Van Raalte et al., 2016), interpersonal process recall exercises (e.g., reviewing their own session while supervisors asked questions about decision-making and feelings during the session on video), and other assignments. Tashman and Cremades (2014) recommended interpersonal process recall exercises to facilitate supervisees' reflection on their experiences and decisions and to notice supervisees' blind spots.

Another factor that is helpful for supervision in counseling, and was also seen as a critical factor throughout the three approaches, was the strength of the supervisory relationship. The supervisory relationship is a central part of supervision in counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Borders et al., 2014; Corey, Haynes, Moulton, & Muratori, 2010). Corey et al. (2010) suggested that important aspects of supervisory relationships involve: building trust, developing safe environments, facilitating self-disclosure, identifying transference and countertransference,

analyzing multicultural issues, and defining boundaries. In this study, both supervisors and supervisees considered building safe environments, where students felt comfortable to talk about their mistakes and ask all types of questions, as a key factor in supervision. Supervisors commented on how it was important for them to know that students would come to them without fear if they had a problem or had made a mistake. Supervisees repeatedly affirmed that the supervisor's support was pivotal to their improvement. It is important to highlight, however, that only one supervisor mentioned transference, countertransference, and multicultural issues, and no supervisees broached these subjects. This seemingly limited focus on multicultural aspects of supervision affirms Foltz, Fisher, Denton, and Campbell's (2015) finding that supervisees from different American graduate programs perceived that supervision should be more multiculturally relevant.

Having multiple professional relationships with the supervisor also seemed to contribute to the supervisory relationship and to increase informal opportunities for supervision. The supervisory relationships were strong and supervisees tended to feel comfortable with supervisors who were, or had also been, their teachers or advisors. Although supervisors in sport psychology recognized that problems could develop in multiple-relationship situations, they seemed to be aware of possible issues that could arise and had plans for how to deal with them. This practice is seen as sometimes problematic in counseling psychology training (Dickens, Ebrahim, & Herlihy, 2016). Dickens et al. found that counseling doctoral students were frequently confused about their roles even though faculty tried to clearly define them. Sullivan and Ogloff (1998) investigated issues that could result from these types of relationships and concluded that students should be educated on how to recognize and deal with issues related to multiple relationship with their supervisors. BASES has a similar suggestion for supervisors,

indicating in their guidelines that supervisors should let the supervisees know if they have a conflict of roles or interests (BASES, 2009).

The consistency of individual meetings was also not similar to what is found in standard North American accredited programs and internships in counseling and clinical psychology, where preference is given to weekly individual meetings unless there is benefit in providing triadic or group supervision instead (Borders et al., 2014). Although approaches using small groups seemed to provide support to supervisees' development, many supervisees mentioned that they could use more one-on-one meetings or at least that the supervisor could check in with them more frequently than they did. This factor may suggest that even when adopting other approaches, such as multilevel and small groups, the supervisor should have consistent meetings or at least "check ins" with supervisees on a weekly or bi-weekly basis depending on the volume of client contact in the applied setting.

Supervisors should also consider possible ethical issues when deciding frequency of supervision meetings. It is especially important to have frequent meetings in case there are issues beyond the supervisees' competencies when they may not know or realize that they should seek help (Li, 2016; Watson et al., 2011). For example, three of the supervisees in the present study had clients with mental health issues, and three others had to deal with crisis situations. They sought help from their supervisors, who were seen as available and supportive. If supervisees who were not seeing their supervisors regularly had been less conscientious, they could have risked using inappropriate interventions beyond their competencies. This factor is especially important to highlight because the sample of this study was self-selected, with supervisors nominating supervisees who would agree to participate. Although some supervisors listed all their supervisees who fit the study criteria, many indicated a specific supervisee who turned out

to be highly motivated and conscientious. Further investigation of these approaches to supervision with supervisees with different backgrounds and levels of motivation is warranted.

Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

One limitation of this study was the mix of research paradigms while intending to follow a social constructionist epistemology. The inclusion of a quantitative inventory to triangulate data is characteristic of an objectivist epistemological stance. Although authors of mixed methods studies may disagree on the need to follow one paradigm from beginning to end, Clark and Creswell (2008) suggested that a pragmatic approach could transcend the differences between qualitative and quantitative approaches while recognizing the possibility of combining inductive and deductive analysis, mixing of objectivism and subjectivism, and emphasized the idea of transferability over generalizability or simple description of context. Future studies mixing qualitative and quantitative methods in a similar setting could be more intentional in adopting a pragmatic approach. Additionally, a true mixed methodology study could have used the results of the skills inventory in the interviews to clarify why some of the inventory scores did not align with their discourse. Future research that uses both interviews and inventories may want to adopt this type of approach.

Another important limitation of this study was that supervisors nominated their supervisees to participate. Supervisors may have chosen strong students to take part in the study. Future research should examine the effectiveness of the three supervision approaches in different contexts and with a variety of neophyte supervisees. The current study's method of self-selection probably biased the sample to include better supervisors and supervisees who were willing to show their approaches and development. A research design that includes various supervisees in a

given program could contrast the development of supervisees receiving the same approach who have diverse backgrounds and different previous relationships with their supervisors.

Additionally, highly experienced or trained supervisors may have felt more comfortable participating in the study. Therefore, the sample from this study may be biased towards better supervision scenarios. Further investigation of supervision approaches in which there is higher anonymity could make supervisors using a wider variety of supervision approaches feel more comfortable participating.

Investigation of helpful approaches to supervision for supervisees in other levels of development should be carried out. Most supervisors in the present study cited adapting their approach to their supervisees' developmental needs, so it would be valuable to explore approaches used with more seasoned supervisees at the other end of the practitioner development spectrum.

Finally, if the neophyte supervisees' developmental characteristics and helpful supervision characteristics found in this study are also identified in other programs and contexts, the next step would be investigating these characteristics in a larger sample. Knowledge about developmental characteristics of neophyte supervisees in sport psychology could help supervisors evaluate supervisees' progress and readiness (or not being ready) for advanced supervision processes. Future development of evidence of minimum standards of good supervision could guide supervision practice and help develop training for supervisors.

Conclusion

This study has shown that, among the programs studied, there are different approaches to supervision with novice supervisees in applied sport psychology. No matter which approach, supervisees considered it helpful when supervisors included the use of consistent meetings, built

strong supervisory relationships, provided clear direct feedback, used guiding questions that help supervisees reflect, and adapted the supervision approach to the supervisees' developmental levels. Even though few supervisors could use direct supervision, such as use of video and observation, supervisees also considered it helpful. Multiple professional relationships may help the supervisory relationship, but should be openly discussed, and the different roles should be clear to both supervisors and supervisees.

This study also solidified and advanced the knowledge of characteristics of training that help novice supervisees develop SDC. Graduate programs can stimulate students to have experiences as athletes, coaches, and in other helping professions. The programs can also offer opportunities for shadowing and role play, besides helping ensuring that the practicum placements provide various practical opportunities, with varied clients and modes of interventions. Finally, further research can help determine if the integrated developmental model (Stoltenberg & McNeil, 2010) can be used as a framework to understand sport psychology practitioner development and help supervisors and these programs assess supervisees' development.

References

- American Psychological Association (2014). *Guidelines for clinical supervision in health service psychology*. Retrieved from <http://apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-supervision.pdf>
- Andersen, M. B. (1994). Ethical considerations in the supervision of applied sport psychology graduate students. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 6, 152-167.
doi:10.1080/10413209408406291
- Andersen, M. B. (2012). Supervision and mindfulness in sport and performance psychology. In S. M. Murphy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of sport and performance psychology* (pp. 725-737). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199731763.001.0001
- Andersen, M. B., Barney, S. T., & Waterson, A. K. (2016). Mindfully dynamic meta-supervision: The case of AW and M. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 330-342). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Andersen, M. B., Van Raalte, J. L., & Brewer, B. W. (1994). Assessing the skills of sport psychology supervisors. *The Sport Psychologist*, 8, 238-247. doi:10.1123/tsp.8.3.238
- Andersen, M. B., Van Raalte, J.L., & Brewer, B.W. (2000). When sport psychology consultants and graduate students are impaired: Ethical and legal issues in training and supervision. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 12, 134-150. doi:10.1080/10413200008404219
- Andersen, M. B., & Williams-Rice, B. T. (1996). Supervision in the education and training of sport psychology service providers. *The Sport Psychologist*, 10, 278-290.
doi:10.1123/tsp.10.3.278

- Anderson, A. G., Knowles, Z., & Gilbourne, D. (2004). Reflective practice for sport psychologists: Concepts, models, practical implications, and thoughts on dissemination. *The Sport Psychologist, 18*, 188-203. doi:10.1123/tsp.18.2.188
- Association for Applied Sport Psychology (2011). *Association for Applied Sport Psychology Ethical Principles and Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.appliedsportpsych.org/about/ethics/ethics-code/>
- Barney, S. T. & Andersen, M. B. (2014). Meta-supervision: Training practitioners to help others on their paths. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 339-346). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Barney, S. T., Andersen, M. B., & Riggs, C. A. (1996). Supervision in sport psychology: Some recommendations for practicum training. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 8*, 200-217. doi:10.1080/10413209608406477
- Bednarikova, M., Schneider, P., & Wieclaw, G. (2016). Looking for guidance and support among colleagues: Peer supervision and mentoring in ENYSSP. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 298-306). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *The fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and Quantity, 36*, 391-409. doi:10.1023/A:1020909529486

- Borders, L. D., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., Glosoff, H. L., Hays, D. G., Page, B., & Welfare, L. E. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 33, 26-44. doi:10.1080/07325223.2014.905225
- Braun, R., Myhrberg, A., Thompson, M. & Yambor, J. (2016). The provision of optimal performance training for a US swimming club team utilizing supervision and peer mentoring. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 290-297). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brinkman, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- British Association for Sport and Exercise Sciences. (2009). *Supervisor guidelines*. Retrieved from <http://www.bases.org.uk/Information-for-Supervisors-and-Reviewers>
- Brown, C. & Hays, K. (2003, October). *Taking inventory: Are you ready for performance consulting?* Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology 18th Annual Conference, Philadelphia, PA.
- Burke, K. L., Sachs, M. L., & Schweighardt, S. L. (2015). *Directory of graduate programs in applied sport psychology* (11th ed.). Madison, WI: Association for Applied Sport Psychology.
- Carr, B., Sachs, M., Cohen, A., Aoyagi, M., Van Raalte, J., Connole, I. ... Watson, J. (2014, October). *Coalition for the advancement of graduate education and training in the practice of sport psychology: Phase II*. Association for Applied Sport Psychology 29th Annual Conference. Las Vegas, NV.

- Castillo, S. (2014). Ethical issues in training future practitioners. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 252-259). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Clark, V. L. & Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Mixed methods reader*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Corey, G., Haynes, R., Moulton, P., & Muratori, M. (2010). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Cremades, J. G. & Tashman, L. S. (2014). *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Cremades, J. G. & Tashman, L. S. (2016). *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cropley, B., Miles, A., Hanton, S., & Niven, A. (2007) Improving the delivery of applied sport psychology support through reflective practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 475-494.
doi:10.1123/tsp.21.4.475
- Cropley, B. J. & Neil, R. (2014). The neophyte supervisor: What did I get myself into? In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 219-227). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Dickens, K. N., Ebrahim, C. H., & Herlihy, B. (2016). Counselor education doctoral students' experiences with multiple roles and relationships. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 55, 234-249. doi:10.1002/ceas.12051
- Dosil, J. & Rivera, S. (2014). The seasoned supervisor: Challenges, models, and lessons learned. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman, *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 339-346). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Foltz, B. D., Fisher, A. R., Denton, L. K., Campbell, W. L., Speight, Q. L., Steinfeldt, J., & Latorre, C. (2015). Applied sport psychology supervision experience: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 27, 449-463. doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1043162
- Glasser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago, IL: Adline.
- Holt, N. L. & Strean, W.B. (2001). Reflecting on initiating sport psychology consultation: A self-narrative of neophyte practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15, 188-204. doi:10.1123/tsp.15.2.188
- Jordan, K. (2003). Clinical training of graduate students. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 21, 29-38. doi:10.1300/J001v21n01_03
- Keegan, R. J. (2010). Teaching consulting philosophies to neophyte sport psychologists: Does it help, and how can we do it? *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action*, 1, 42-52. doi:10.1080/21520704.2010.518663
- Knowles, Z., Gilbourne, D., Tomlinson, V., & Anderson, A. G. (2007). Reflections in the application of reflective practice for supervision in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 109-122. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.1.109

- Lee, S., Titkov, A. & Mortensen, J. R. (2014). Nordic supervisee experiences in applied sport psychology. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 300-307). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Lempert, L. B. (2007). Asking questions of the data: Memo writing in the grounded theory tradition. In B. Charmaz (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of grounded theory* (pp. 245-264). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Li, H. Y. (2016). Global practice and training in applied sport psychology: Probationary team psychologist. In: J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 315-321). New York, NY: Routledge.
- McEwan, H. E. & Tod, D. (2015). Learning experiences contributing to service-delivery competence in applied sport psychologists: Lessons for sport psychologists. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 27, 79-93. doi:10.1080/10413200.2014.952460
- Petitpas, A.J., Brewer, B.W., Rivera, P.M., & Van Raalte, J. L. (1994). Ethical beliefs and behaviors in applied sport psychology: The AASP ethics survey. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 6, 135-151. doi:10.1080/10413209408406290
- Rhodium, A. & Park, M. M. (2016). Who's supervising the supervisor? A case study of meta-supervision. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 322-329). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Saldaña, J. (2003). *Longitudinal qualitative research*. New York, NY: Alta Mira Press.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Silva, J. M., Metzler, J. N., & Lerner, B. (2007). *Training professionals in the practice of sport psychology*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Stoltenberg, C. D. & McNeil, B. (2010). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sullivan, L.E., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (1998). Appropriate supervisor-graduate student relationships. *Ethics & Behavior*, 8, 229-248. doi:10.1207/s15327019eb0803_4
- Tashman, L. S., & Cremades, J. G. (2016). Incorporating technology in supervision: Using interpersonal process recall to enhance reflective practice. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 343-351). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tod, D., Andersen, M. B., & Marchant, D. B. (2009). A longitudinal examination of neophyte applied sport psychologists' development. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21(Supp. 1), S1-S16. doi:10.1080/10413200802593604
- Tod, D., Andersen M. B., & Marchant, D. B. (2011). Six years up: Applied sport psychologists surviving (and thriving) after graduation. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 23, 93-109. doi:10.1080/10413200.2010.534543
- Tod, D. & Bond, K. (2010). A longitudinal examination of a British neophyte sport psychologist's development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24, 35-51. doi:10.1123/tsp.24.1.35
- Tod, D., Eubank, M. R., & Andersen, M. B. (2014). International perspectives: Training and supervision in the United Kingdom and Australia. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 324-330). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

- Tod, D., Marchant, D. B., & Andersen M. B. (2007). Learning experiences contributing to service-delivery competence. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 317-334.
doi:10.1123/tsp.21.3.317
- Van Raalte, J. L. & Andersen, M. B., (2000). Supervision I: From models to doing. In M. B. Andersen (Ed.), *Doing sport psychology* (pp. 153-165). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Van Raalte, J. L., & Andersen, M. B. (2014). Supervision. In R. C. Eklund & G. Tenenbaum (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of sport and exercise psychology* (pp. 724-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Raalte, J. L., Petitpas, A. J., Andersen, M. B., & Rizzo, J. (2016). Using technology in supervision and training. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach* (pp. 352-359). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vosloo, J., Zakrajsek, R. & Grindley, E. (2014). From mentee to mentor: Considerations for the neophyte supervisor. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 228-235). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Watson, J. C., Lubker, J. R., & Van Raalte, J. (2011). Problems in reflective practice: Self-bootstrapping versus therapeutic supervision. In: D. Gilbourne & M. B. Andersen (Eds.), *Critical essays in applied sport psychology* (pp. 157-172). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics
- Watson, J. C., Zizzi, S. M., Etzel, E. F., & Lubker, J. R. (2004). Applied sport psychology supervision: A survey of students and professionals. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 415-429.
doi:10.1123/tsp.18.4.415

Table 1*Table 1.* Best practices of supervision with novice supervisees

	Individual	Multilevel	Group
Meetings	Regular individual meetings with supervisor, preferably weekly and in person. Group meetings provide another level of reflection.	Regular meetings with student mentor and availability of supervisor for extra meetings. Group meetings provide another level of reflection. Check in with mentor and supervisee regularly.	Small group meetings with supervisees around the same developmental level. Allotting enough time to discuss cases of every student. Creating opportunities for individual supervision and maintaining active contact with supervisee.
Feedback	Mix of direct feedback to teach and give specific suggestions, and guiding to foster self-reflection and problem-solving skills (balance them according to supervisee's developmental level).		
Facilitate reflection	Use of various strategies to stimulate self-reflection, such as journaling, review of videos, interpersonal process recall, and assignments such as case studies, SWOT analysis of self as practitioner, and DISC assessment.		
Supervisory relationship	Provide a safe space where supervisees can discuss their mistakes and ask questions. Show support and availability to the supervisee's needs. Use of self-disclosure can be appropriate to illustrate difficulties that the supervisor had in a similar situation. Multiple professional relationships can help relationship development, but roles should be discussed in supervision.		
Model	No psychotherapy-based model seems to have advantage over another; it is recommended to use a developmental model (e.g., integrative developmental model) as a framework to guide supervision approach, including use of more directive feedback and higher structure with novice supervisees.		

Table 2

Table 2. Change in each skill across participants. Sum of differences between pre and post self-assessment per question in the Consulting Skills Inventory.

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	T
P1	0	3	3	2	3	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	0	3	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	42
P2	1	1	2	4	2	3	3	1	2	3	-2	-1	-1	-2	-2	-1	0	2	1	0	0	0	16
P3	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	-1	0	9
P4	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	14
P5	0	0	1	4	2	3	1	3	1	-3	-1	-2	0	0	-1	0	-2	0	-2	-7	0	-1	-26
P6	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	2	1	2	-1	-1	0	4	3	3	1	19
P7	1	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	-1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	0	-1	15
P8	1	2	2	2	1	6	5	2	3	5	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	4	-1	0	51
P9	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	-1	3	1	1	4	18
T	5	7	12	4	8	17	11	2	16	11	2	4	8	6	6	5	3	8	13	5	3	6	158

Figure 1

Figure 1. Theoretical framework – model based on Tod et al. (2007), Tod et al. (2009), and McEwan and Tod (2015)

Figure 2

Figure 2. Invitation of participants' process

Figure 3

Figure 3. Timeline of data collection

Figure 4

Figure 4. Themes related to supervisees' development. The numbers on the left represent the frequency of coding in the first interviews; the ones on the right represent the sum of coding frequency of journals and second interviews.

Figure 5. Themes related to supervisees' development (continued). The numbers on the left represent the frequency of coding in the first interviews; the ones on the right represent the sum of coding frequency of journals and second interviews.

Figure 6

Figure 6. Themes related to supervision. The numbers on the left represent the frequency of coding in the first interviews; the ones on the right represent the sum of coding frequency of journals and second interviews.

Figure 7

Figure 5. Themes related to supervision (continued). The numbers on the left represent the frequency of coding in the first interviews; the ones on the right represent the sum of coding frequency of journals and second interviews.

Figure 8

Figure 8. Adapted model of service-delivery competence development based on Tod et al. (2007, 2009), McEwan and Tod (2015), and the present study.

Consulting Skills Inventory

[illegible]

[illegible]

Appendix B

Interview Guides

Baseline (T1) Supervisor Interview

1. Questions related to the demographics (i.e., education, training and experience in supervision) – clarifications.
 - a. Course work in supervision during your graduate training?
 - b. Meta-supervision experience?
 - c. Any other type of course/training in supervision?
 - d. How did this training work for you?
2. Please tell me a story of your first supervising experiences with your graduate students?
 - a. Have you supervised students in other institutions?
 - b. Have you ever supervised peers?
 - c. Have you been supervised in your own applied sport psychology work?
 - i. If yes, please describe your experience.
 - ii. How do you think having/not having been supervised may affect your role as supervisor?
3. How would you describe your approach to supervision?
 - a. How do you establish a supervisory relationship?
 - b. What kind of methods do you use?
 - c. Please describe any type of documentation of supervision?
 - d. How have you developed your approach? – Theoretical framework? Professional philosophy?

4. How have you notice that this approach impacts the students' competence to work in applied sport psychology?
5. Do you have any other type of relationship with the supervisee?
 - a. If yes, how does it affect your supervisory relationship?

Post Practicum (T2) Supervisor Interview

1. How would you describe the supervisory experience with supervisee "x"?
 - a. How was your supervisory relationship?
 - b. What kind of methods did you use? (include here specific questions related to the methods (s)he intended to use based on T1) How did they work?
 - c. Did you use ____ supervision model? (specific question regarding the model (s)he intended to use on T1) How did it work?
 - d. How did you tailor your general approach to "x's" needs?
2. How would you describe "x's" professional development along this semester?
 - a. What were his/her main difficulties? What else?
 - b. What were his/her main strengths? What else?
 - c. What were your biggest areas of growth? What else?
 - d. How do you think that supervision played a role in his/her development?

Baseline (T1) Supervisee Interview

1. Describe your previous practical experiences, if you had any, in applied sport psychology?
 - a. How about other helping professions?
 - b. And sport?
2. How do you feel about starting your first applied sport psychology experience?

3. Clarifications about educational background (based on demographics)
 - a. What kind of course work did you have in sport psychology?
4. What are your career goals?
 - a. Do you have a preference among working with applied sport psychology, research, or teaching in the future?
5. How would you describe your professional development in sport psychology so far?
 - a. What are your strengths? What else?
 - b. What can you improve? What else?
 - c. How competent do you feel in working with applied sport psychology?
 - d. What are your expectations about supervision you will receive? (Already had initial experiences)?

Post Practicum (T2) Supervisee Interview

1. Remind about confidentiality, re-build rapport.
2. How would you describe your professional development from the beginning of the semester until now?
 - a. What are your strengths? What else?
 - b. What have you improved throughout the semester? What else?
 - c. What can you still improve? What else?
3. How would you describe your supervision experience?
 - a. What were the positive aspects? What else?
 - b. What could have been better? What else?
 - c. How was the supervisory relationship?
 - d. How supported did you feel?

4. How would you describe your supervisor's approach to supervision?
 - a. What kinds of methods did (s)he use?
 - i. Which did you find most useful?
 - ii. Which did you not like or were not helpful?
 - b. Can you identify any models that (s)he uses?
 - c. How frequently did you meet? What reactions do you have about this frequency?
 - d. What kind of documentation did you keep from your consultations?
 - e. Did you also have group supervision?
 - f. If yes, how would you describe it?

Appendix C

Codebook

Name	Description
Supervisee Development	All variables influencing or result of supervisee's service-delivery competence development
Aspirations	Supervisees aspirations that may help growth
Applied career	Wants to work with applied sport and/or exercise psychology
Ph.D.	Wants to do a Ph.D.
Experience (+)	Supervisees' experiences that could (have) affect(ed) their previous, current, and future service-delivery competence development
Background	Background experiences that may help supervisee in practicum
Athlete	Having past experience as an athlete
Coach	Having past experience as a coach
Conference	Having experience going to conferences in SEP
Practical	Practical experiences related to service-delivery competence (e.g., shadowing, delivering workshops, other service delivery in help profession)
Interventions	Having experience delivering interventions in SEP or related field
Mock	Having experience delivering mock SEP interventions, such as role play in previous course
Related Field	Having experience delivering interventions in a related field, such as counseling, social work, tutoring athletes, etc.
SEP	Having experience delivering SEP interventions such as workshops or some individual consultations
Shadow	Having experience shadowing other consultants
Knowledge (+)	Having knowledge related to SEP that helps in service-delivery
Sport	Having knowledge of the sport one works with
Theory	Knowledge of theory that helps work with applied SEP (including mentioning previous course work)
Counseling	Knowing counseling theory and/or having previous course work in counseling
SEP	Knowing SEP theory and/or having previous course work in SEP
Ethics	Knowing how to identify ethical issues and apply ethical decision-making
Limited experience	Lacking or limited experience in areas that would help improve service-delivery competence
Practical	Limited/needing more practical experience
Limited Knowledge	Limited/needing to improve knowledge related to SEP service delivery

Sport	Lacking or having limited knowledge of the sport
Theory	Needing to improve theoretical knowledge
Counseling	Needing to improve theoretical knowledge in counseling
SEP	Needing to improve theoretical knowledge in SEP
Limited skill	Needing to improve skill(s) related to applied SEP
Interpersonal	Limited interpersonal skills related to SEP service-delivery
Communication with Individuals	Limited ability to communicate with individuals such as clients (coaches/athletes/cadets), supervisor, or other work-related individuals
Counseling	Needing to improve counseling skill(s)
Advanced	General limited ability to use advanced counseling skills
Boundaries	Not knowing how to maintain professional boundaries or be seen as a professional and not a friend
Identifying what to do	Having difficulty in identifying what to do after identifying the issue
Basic	Limited skill in using basic counseling skills
Focus & Assessment	Not knowing how to focus the sessions, find the issue, assess the problem
Questions & Flow	Not knowing how to ask proper questions that make the client speak and be comfortable and/or keep flow of sessions (e.g., "don't know what to say back")
Listening	Limited skill to listen to clients (e.g., "stay in own head")
Rapport	Needing to improve rapport building skills
Group Presentation	Limited/needs to improve skill related to group presentation
Interventions	Limited/needs to improve skills to deliver SEP interventions
Apply Theory	Limited/needs to improve skill to apply theory into practice
Techniques	Limited/needs to improve skills to deliver SEP techniques
Intrapersonal	Limited intrapersonal skills related to SEP service-delivery
Self-Awareness	Limited/needs to improve self-awareness
Anxiety	Limited/needs to improve skills to regulate own anxiety while delivering services
Personal Attributes	Personal attributes of the supervisee that may facilitate or indicate growth
Confidence	Being confident in own ability to deliver services and/or comfortable in doing so
Flexible	Being open to learn and being flexible (e.g., being able to "think on own feet")
Independent	Showing growth by becoming more independent
Motivated	Motivated supervisee, including being determined, goal-oriented, hard worker, and ambitious
Optimistic	Having positive expectations regarding work and growth
Professionalism	Showing professionalism, such as being punctual, responsible, and ethical
Skill (+)	Skills related to service-delivery of SEP that the supervisee already has

Interpersonal	Interpersonal skills related to SEP service-delivery that the supervisee has
Communication with Individuals	Having skill to communicate with individuals such as "speaking the athlete/coach's language", making SEP terms/theories understandable to client, able to speak with supervisor or other authorities, etc.
Counseling	Having counseling skills necessary to deliver SEP services
Advanced	Having advanced counseling skills related to SEP service-delivery
Boundaries	Being able to maintaining professional boundaries with clients; not crossing competence boundaries
Empathy	Being able to empathize with clients (e.g., "can be on their shoes")
Identify what to do	Being able to identify what to do after identifying the issue
Basic	Having basic counseling skills related to SEP service-delivery
Focus & Assessment	Knowing how to focus the session, find the issue, assess the problem
Questions & Flow	Knowing how to ask proper questions that make the client speak and be comfortable
Listening	Being able to listen to the clients and be present AS OPPOSED TO "being on own head"
Rapport	Having good rapport building skills
Group Presentation	Being able to present in front of groups, feeling comfortable there, knowing how to talk to them
Interventions	Being able to deliver SEP interventions and techniques
Apply Theory	Knowing how to apply the theory (as opposed to knowing the theory and not knowing what to do)
Technique	Knowing how to deliver mental skills techniques, like goal-setting, imagery, deep breathing, etc.
Intrapersonal	Having good intrapersonal skills related to SEP service-delivery
Self-awareness	Being self-aware; knowing own strengths and weaknesses; recognizing effect of own emotions on SEP delivery
Supervision	Characteristics of supervision and factors that affect it
Progress	How supervisors see and assess supervisee's progress; what supervisors and supervisees would like to improve in supervision; other factors affecting progress or improvement of supervision
Areas for Improvement	Areas of supervision that supervisor and/or supervisee would like to improve
Competing Responsibilities	Supervisor has competing responsibilities that affect time and/or resources to provide ideal/better supervision
Supervisee's View	Things that supervisee would like to see improved in supervision

Supervisor's View	Things that supervisors would like to see improved in supervision
Supervisee	Factors related to supervisee's progress/development
Assessment	How supervisors assess if supervisees are developing through time
Goals	Goals or purposes supervisors have for supervision/supervisees
Expectations	Supervisee's expectations for supervision
Methods	Methods used in supervision
Direct	Supervisor uses direct supervision methods (i.e., sees supervisees work as opposed to knowing through their description)
Co-Consultation	Supervisor consults with supervisee and is able to observe him or her working
Observation	Supervisor goes to the site to observe supervisee working
Video	Supervisor uses video recording as assignments to be able to watch supervisees working and/or do IPR
Distance Technology	Supervisor uses distance technology methods
Group Supervision	Online group supervision
Individual Meetings	Supervisor meets individually with supervisee online or on the phone
Email	Supervisor communicates with supervisee via email
Posts	Supervisor uses online posts as method of supervision
Feedback	Supervisor gives feedback to supervisees
Direct	Supervisor is direct: teaching the supervisee, explaining how to do something, modeling an intervention, suggesting something specific that could be done, using parallel process
Guiding	Supervisor guides supervisees, asking questions that makes them reflect rather than telling them what to do
Indirect	Supervisor uses indirect methods of supervision (i.e., knows what supervisees are doing through their description)
Discussions (peers)	Supervisor uses discussions in group supervision (e.g., case studies/presentations, talking about successes and challenges, peer feedback, brainstorm) and/or stimulates peer discussions to happen outside group supervision
Explore Self	Supervisor uses assignments that help supervisees explore themselves, learn more about themselves, and be more self-aware (e.g., reflections, journal, DISC assessment, SWOT analysis, teambuilding, developing consulting philosophy)
Multilevel or Mentor	Supervisor uses senior students to supervise beginning consultants. They may be called mentors. They may also refer to it as metasupervision (being supervised while supervising someone else)

Notes	Supervisor uses notes of supervisees sessions as a method to supervise their work (e.g., SOAP notes, time logs, reports)
Readings	Supervisor assigns readings to improve supervisee's knowledge about applied work
Relationship Development	Methods that improve supervisor-supervisee relationship
Support	Supervisor is available, supportive, has good rapport, and/or shows care towards supervisee
Setting	Supervisor is collaborative, established open communication, and builds a safe space for the supervisee
Tailoring	Supervisor adapts approach to supervision to supervisee's needs and/or preferences
Multiple Relationships	Supervisor has more than one role with supervisee due to program needs
Structure	Aspects related to the structure of supervision
Meetings	Types and frequency of supervision meetings
Group	Group supervision, its characteristics, its frequency
Individual	Individual supervision, its characteristics, its frequency
Previous Course	Supervisor mentions how previous course affects what he/she does (or does not do) in supervision
Roles	Supervisor's roles
Supervisee's Development	Supervisor's role of facilitating the supervisee's development of service delivery competence
Improve profession	Supervisor's role of improving the profession through delivering quality supervision and increasing quality of future professionals in the field; gatekeeping
Protect Client	Supervisor's role of protecting the supervisee's client
Sites	Characteristics of the client, site, and intensity of practicum experiences
Client Characteristics	Individual, team, level of sport, gender, age, etc.
Frequency	Frequency that supervisee works on the practicum site
Number of Clients	Number of clients the supervisee is working with
Theory or Model	Model or theory that are foundation to the supervisor's approach to supervision; consulting philosophy
Supervisor Qualities	Qualities or experiences of the supervisor that influence supervision approach
Experience	Previous experiences that influence supervision approach
Academic	Academic experiences that influence approach to supervision
Research	Previous research or other type of publication influences the way one supervises
Teaching	The way ones teaches influences one's approach to supervision
Training	Different types of training that have influenced one's approach to supervision
Coursework	Taking a graduate course on how to supervise
Reading	Independent reading or studying how to do supervision

Workshop	Participating of a workshop on how to do supervision
Applied	Influence of applied experiences such as counseling, consulting, being supervisor in the past, and being a supervisee influence supervision approach
Supervisee	Experience as a supervisee influences approach to supervision
Supervisor	Having experience as a supervisor in the past; learning from previous supervision experience; getting feedback from previous supervisees
Therapy or Consulting	Influence of the way one approaches counseling or consulting on the way one supervises
Personality	Personality characteristics of the supervisor that influence supervision approach and/or experience
Flexible	Supervisor is flexible
Motivation	Supervisor is motivated to supervise
Style	Supervision style
Informal	Supervisor has an informal supervision style

Appendix D

Informed Consent

Only Minimal Risk

Consent Information Form (without HIPAA)

Principal Investigator	Sam Zizzi
Department	Department of Sport Sciences
Protocol Number	1603069866
Study Title	Approaches to Supervision in Sport Psychology and their Influence in Supervisee's Professional Development
Co-Investigator(s)	Jana Lima Fogaca
Sponsor (if any)	Association for Applied Sport Psychology Research Grant

Contact Persons

In the event you experience any side effects or injury related to this research, you should contact Dr. Sam Zizzi at (304) 293 - 4641. (After hours contact: Jana Fogaca at (304) 777 - 9564). If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this research, you can contact Jana Fogaca at (304) 777 - 9564 or Dr. Zizzi at (304) 293 - 4641.

For information regarding your rights as a research subject, to discuss problems, concerns, or suggestions related to the research, to obtain information or offer input about the research, contact the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance at (304) 293-7073.

In addition if you would like to discuss problems, concerns, have suggestions related to research, or would like to offer input about the research, contact the Office of Research Integrity and Compliance at 304-293-7073.

Introduction

You, _____, have been asked to participate in this research study, which has been explained to you by Jana Fogaca. This study is being conducted by Jana Fogaca and Dr. Sam Zizzi in the Department of Sport Sciences at West Virginia University with funding provided by the Association for Applied Sport Psychology.

Purpose(s) of the Study

The purpose of this study is to capture the first supervision experiences and consequent professional development of neophyte supervisees studying in a graduate program in the United States.

Description of Procedures

This study involves an interview at the beginning of the semester and an interview at the end of it. Each interview will take approximately 60 minutes for you to complete. Supervisees will also be asked to complete two journal entries during the semester. The interview will include questions about your supervision experience and the supervisee's professional development. You may choose not to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable answering.

Discomforts

There are no known or expected risks from participating in this study, except for the mild frustration associated with answering the questions.

Alternatives

You do not have to participate in this study.

Benefits

You may not receive any direct benefit from this study. The knowledge gained from this study may eventually benefit others.

Financial Considerations

There are no special fees for participating in this study.

You will be paid \$20 in the end of the study for your participation of the entire study. If you withdraw before the end of the study, you will not receive any payment.

Confidentiality

Any information about you that is obtained as a result of your participation in this research will be kept as confidential as legally possible. Your research records and test results, just like hospital records, may be subpoenaed by court order or may be inspected by the study sponsor or federal regulatory authorities (including the FDA if applicable) without your additional consent.

In addition, there are certain instances where the researcher is legally required to give information to the appropriate authorities. These would include mandatory reporting of infectious diseases, mandatory reporting of information about behavior that is imminently dangerous to your child or to others, such as suicide, child abuse, etc.

Audiotapes or videotapes will be kept locked up and will be destroyed as soon as possible after the research is finished.

In any publications that result from this research, neither your name nor any information from which you might be identified will be published without your consent.

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate in this study at any time.

Refusal to participate or withdrawal will not affect your class standing or grades and will involve no penalty to you.

In the event new information becomes available that may affect your willingness to participate in this study, this information will be given to you so that you can make an informed decision about whether or not to continue your participation.

You have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the research, and you have received answers concerning areas you did not understand.

Upon signing this form, you will receive a copy.

I willingly consent to participate in this research.

Signatures

Signature of Subject

Printed Name

Date

Time

The participant has had the opportunity to have questions addressed. The participant willingly agrees to be in the study.

Signature of Investigator or Co-Investigator

Printed Name

Date

Time

Appendix E

Extended Review of the Literature

Supervision has an essential role in the preparation of professionals that has been recognized for thousands of years (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009) and is an important part of training in applied sport psychology (Andersen, 2012; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014). Supervisors are responsible, among other things, for facilitating the supervisees' development and serving as gatekeepers of the profession (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014). Andersen (1994) suggested that supervision is one of the most important and meaningful activities that a sport psychology professional will do. The author emphasized the important role the supervisor has in modeling professional behavior and teaching novice practitioners effective and ethical practice that they will carry out for life.

Because of the responsibility of facilitating professional development and making sure that the neophyte practitioners are qualified to enter the job market, supervision also carries the important role of contributing to increase the credibility and effectiveness of applied sport psychology (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Sport and exercise psychology is not a well-regulated field of practice and many general counselors, consultants, and psychologists without proper specialized training may practice in the area (Petrie & Diehl, 1995). This situation opens the possibility of untrained or poorly trained practitioners delivering ineffective or even harmful interventions (Andersen, Van Raalte, & Brewer, 2000). For instance, someone only trained in psychology could ignore important aspects of sports culture or how overtraining may be influencing an athlete's emotional instability.

Despite the importance of supervision for the credibility of the field, supervision has not received the attention it deserves from the literature (Castillo, 2014; Foltz, Fisher, Denton,

Campbell, Speight, Steinfeldt, & Latorre, 2015; Hutter, Oldenhof-Veldman, & Oudejans, 2015). Besides the limited number of scientific publications in the area, published material is heavily based on discussion of the applicability of counseling and clinical psychology models and methods into sport and exercise psychology, case studies from a single program, and lessons learned by neophytes in training (Hutter et al., 2015). Although it is also possible to find some data-based studies with a wide variety of perspectives (e.g., Andersen, Van Raalte, & Brewer, 2000; Foltz et al., 2015; Watson, Zizzi, Etzel, & Lubker, 2004), they are rare and do not address all of the questions about what makes supervision more effective and how to train supervisors in sport and exercise psychology. Therefore, current research does not inform the practice of supervision satisfactorily.

The literature reviewed in this chapter includes training in applied sport psychology, supervision in counseling psychology and in sport and exercise psychology, and research in supervision in sport and exercise psychology. The first topic will help understand the importance of training and supervision in the context of applied sport psychology. The second will show the definition of supervision and where sport and exercise psychology currently stands in this area. The last section will review the research of supervision in sport and exercise psychology and identify the future directions that it should take.

Training in Applied Sport Psychology

The field of sport psychology had its first steps in North America in the end of the 19th century (Kornspan, 2009) through laboratory research, and it was not until the decade of 1940 that applied sport psychology started to receive attention from scholars and coaches (Kornspan, 2012). Important historical figures in the field such as Dorothy Yates, Richard Paynter, Bud Winter, Anna Espenchade, and Franklin Henry started to apply research results and cognitive-

behavioral techniques to help athletes to improve their performance (Kornspan, 2012).

Relaxation techniques, for example, were some of the first applied sport psychology interventions utilized in the 40s (Kornspan, 2009).

By the decade of 1960 scholars and coaches were showing interest in sport psychology and created many associations such as the North American Society for the Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity (NASPSPA) and the International Society of Sport Psychology (ISSP) (Kornspan, 2012). Nevertheless, the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology (AAASP; later changed to AASP) was only created in 1986 (Association for Applied Sport Psychology [AASP], n.d.). In the 70s the U.S. Olympic Committee's (USOC) added the first sport psychology professional to their sports medicine team and the first graduate programs in sport psychology were created (Kornspan, 2012). Despite the increased interest in applied sport psychology at the time, at first these graduate programs focused more on research and academic careers (Williams & Straub, 2006) and it was not until the 70s when the term applied sport psychology began to be well known (Silva, Metzler, & Lerner, 2011). During this decade, sport psychology started to be recognized as a separate field of sport sciences (Williams & Straub, 2006).

There are a few interesting points that are worth highlighting in this early history of sport psychology. First, sport psychology was strongly focused on research during the first decades of its existence, which seems to have affected the focus of the first graduate programs. Second, even though there was a fair mix of people with background in sport and in psychology in these first decades, sport psychology in the USA became a subfield of sport sciences in the 70s, which affects much of its structure until today, including the structure of supervision. It is also noteworthy that since the first applied sport psychology attempts the field has been borrowing

psychological interventions (e.g., relaxation) that would later require more attention to training and accreditation in the profession.

With the increased practice of applied sport psychology, in 1989 AASP decided to create criteria for certification to provide guidelines for minimal training and experience to be a sport psychology consultant (AASP, n.d.). This step was important for the organization of the field in the USA and the beginning of the efforts to ensure appropriate and ethical delivery of professional services. Certification is a form of regulation defined by professional organizations that is not legally required to work in the profession (Zizzi, Zaichkowsky, & Perna, 2013). Despite the good intentions of AASP certification, it has encountered some resistance, with the two main criticisms being that it is overexclusionary and that the certification could give the impression of supporting malpractice of credentialed professionals (Zizzi et al., 2013). However, Zizzi et al. (2013) affirmed that these criticisms are not based on legitimate arguments and that, on the contrary, certification should actually stimulate professionals to keep themselves updated and accountable. In fact, Bernard and Goodyear (2009) suggested that society expects the professions to self-regulate in return for the certainty that they will protect the clients' welfare and that professional credentialing groups offer credentials to ensure the minimal competence necessary to protect these clients. Even though the certification system may have setbacks such as lower accessibility, it is an important step for credibility of the field and increasing the likelihood of quality service delivery.

Another aspect of training that has been debated is the possibility of developing standards for program accreditation to ensure quality and improve the process of certifying consultants (Kornspan, 2012; Zizzi et al., 2013). However, AASP has not decided to pursue this path unlike many other fields in the sport sciences. This scenario illustrates different sources of resistance to

certification and accreditation that affects the field until the current days. With limited regulation, it is not surprising to find out that untrained and/or unsupervised professionals continue to work with applied sport psychology.

Despite these efforts to develop better training and certification, there is evidence that professionals without training in both sport sciences and psychology, such as those who have graduated from sport psychology graduate programs, may work with performance-related issues. Petrie and Diehl (1995) surveyed 489 members of the Clinical Division (12) of the American Psychological Association (APA) and asked them about their work with athletes and their specific training to work with performance-related issues. The results indicated that even though 96% of the total surveyed members had not received any specific training in sport psychology, 52% of the psychologists who worked in private practice had consulted with individual athletes or teams and 48% of them had provided individual therapy for athletes or sport teams. Although this survey is quite dated, it illustrates the dangers of the limited reach of accreditation in sport psychology and the importance of providing adequate training for professionals who desire to work in the field and of raising awareness of the importance of this training.

Another issue in the training of applied sport psychology has been the limited job opportunities after graduation. Worried about the expansion of graduate training programs in sport psychology and what professional paths these graduates could take, Andersen, Williams, Aldridge, and Taylor (1997) investigated employment opportunities for graduates who finished their master's or PhD degrees between 1989 and 1994. The sample of the study included 162 master and 92 doctoral graduates who were still reachable and agreed to complete the survey. The authors discovered that the majority of the graduates who tried to find paying jobs in sport psychology considered it moderately to very difficult to accomplish. Further, among those

working in applied sport psychology, master graduates spent only an average of 45% of their time working with performance-related issues, while only 8% of the doctoral graduates spent half or more of their time working with athletes. It is also noteworthy that only 21% of the master graduates who considered that applied sport psychology was their main career goal reported having practicum experience. These findings are worrisome because they show graduates with no applied experience trying to enter the applied sport psychology job marketing with high likelihood of causing harm to clients. It is even more alarming when considering that there is a high likelihood that these graduates from the beginning of the 90s are now supervising the applied work of neophytes in the field. Moreover, these surveys have been responded to voluntarily, which may have biased it to be composed by graduates who are more interested in the field and may be better trained than those who gave up working on the field.

Looking into the training and careers of the graduates in the following five years, Williams and Scherzer (2003) could identify some improvements and some setbacks. The authors surveyed 147 master's and 107 doctoral graduates in sport psychology who finished their programs between 1994 and 1999. They found that, compared to the participants who graduated between 1989 and 1994, the graduates from 1994 to 1999 reported somewhat less difficulty in finding paid sport psychology consulting work and higher confidence in being able to achieve future career goals. On the negative side, Williams and Scherzer (2003) also identified a decrease in training in applied sport psychology among doctoral graduates who had career goals of consulting with athletes and a decrease in supervised hours for master's graduates who had practicum during their training. Although master's graduates reported more confidence in achieving their career goals than in previous research, the majority of the respondents still perceived frustrations in the progress of their careers and causes included inadequate training.

Another interesting finding by Andersen et al. (1997) and Williams and Scherzer (2003) was that participants of their studies advised future graduates to also have training in other areas to complement their income with another job. The participants also suggested that training and supervision helped them be more successful in the field. Meyers, Coleman, Whelan, and Mehlenbeck (2001) surveyed 433 professionals who were members of AASP or APA Division 47 (i.e., division of sport, exercise, and performance psychology) regarding their employment, income, and frustrations. The authors found that 158 (35%) of the respondents worked primarily in private practice and that professionals trained in sport sciences tended to work less in applied settings than those trained in psychology and counseling. Moreover, even though professionals trained in psychology and counseling tended to have more opportunities of applied work, they tended to use their earnings with applied sport psychology only to supplement their income. These findings reinforce the idea that applied sport psychology may not always be a viable career without supplementing one's income with other activities. Nevertheless, it is important to consider that these results may reflect the limited training in applied sport psychology may be affecting future professionals when trying to find and maintain employment in applied settings.

In another study, Fitzpatrick, Monda, and Wooding (2016) surveyed 168 graduate students in sport psychology programs and found that the majority of students having or who had had internship experiences (69% of the 61 who fit this criterion) reported being either satisfied or very satisfied with their experience. Although this more recent data is encouraging, it is important to note that less than half of the students surveyed had internship experience. Additionally, the authors found that the students tended to have unrealistic expectations of career opportunities and future income. Fitzpatrick et al. (2016) also suggested the need to diversify career plans, because working with only high-level athletes is an unlikely career goal to be

fulfilled. Overall, these recent studies on careers in sport psychology provide evidence that applied training can be improved through additional, supervised opportunities for students in diverse settings including athletes at all levels as well as other performance domains.

Silva et al. (2011) also criticized the way that the graduate training programs are designed, focusing mostly on research and not always preparing well the graduates to work with applied sport psychology. It is possible to notice in these studies a historical trend of prioritizing research in sport psychology in detriment of improvements in training in applied sport psychology, which has resulted in difficulties in the job market and less than ideal training and supervision of graduates. Even though there have been some small improvements along the years, graduates still did not seem prepared for applied sport psychology positions and were likely to need other sources of income to survive. Considering the low number of graduates who had training in applied sport psychology, it seems like an improvement in their training was warranted.

Service-delivery competence. The concern for quality service and the need to expand the job market in sport psychology led to an increased attention to the importance of training to improve sport psychology effectiveness. For instance, the first issue of *The Sport Psychologist* included an article by Partington and Orlick (1987) presenting a consultant evaluation form to assess consultant effectiveness. This attention has spurred research in the area of training and professional development in sport psychology, although many of these studies were not developed in the USA. Tod, Marchant, and Andersen (2007) suggested that evaluating sport psychology programs could help understanding what contributes to the development of the skills necessary to be a competent consultant, that is, the sport psychology consultants' development of service-delivery competence. Service-delivery competence (SDC) is the ability to apply an

appropriate theory and use the theory-related appropriate skills and interventions while involving the client in a therapeutic relationship and using reflection (Tod et al., 2007).

Tod, Andersen, and Marchant (2009) followed eight sport psychology trainees in Australia during the two years of their master's degree training and found that the participants thought that the main sources of their development throughout these years were their interaction with athletes, supervision, theory and research, and other events outside formal study, such as personal psychotherapy. Four years later, Tod, Andersen, and Marchant (2011) re-interviewed seven of these eight trainees to explore their professional development since graduation. Regarding their postgraduate training, the participants emphasized the importance of the over 1000 supervised hours and their previous (to postgraduate training) experience in applied settings. The authors also identified themes of having sport psychology as a secondary practice to general psychology, changing to a client-led approach over time, decreasing anxiety and increasing confidence, and taking ownership for their professional development. It is also noteworthy that only three of the seven participants still sought supervision, but those who still did considered it one of the main contributors to their professional development.

In another study of competence development during graduate training, Tod et al. (2007) interviewed 16 graduate students and 11 teaching staff of a master's program to understand what contributed to their learning experiences in their training program. The authors found four major themes: service-delivery experience, research and theory when applicable to clients, social interactions with other professionals/peers, and events outside training such as previous employment or athletic experience. Tod et al. (2007) suggested that these findings are similar to what is found in the counseling psychology literature in regards to the development of SDC and that this similarity justifies the use of counseling psychology literature to improve sport

psychology service delivery. Although this is a very valuable finding, this suggestion must be taken cautiously. This study has been conducted in Australia and sport psychology programs are blended with general psychology programs there, which might have biased the results in relation to what could have been found in a similar study in the USA. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that both studies highlighted the role of practical experience, research knowledge, and supervision in the development of SDC in applied sport psychology.

Similarly to what Tod et al. (2007) found, but this time with professionals, McEwan and Tod (2015) interviewed 20 experienced psychologists (10 sport, five clinical, and five counseling) regarding what had contributed to the development of their SDC and suggested that, overall, service-delivery experiences, reflective learning with supervision, and applying research and theory to clients were the most meaningful experiences in their SDC improvement. Interestingly, the authors also found that clinical and counseling psychologists considered the use of role-plays, the availability of highly structured practicum/internship placements, and the learning of multiple theories as opposed to only cognitive-behavioral theory as very influential in their competence development. However, the sport psychologists did not have the same opportunities in these areas and tended to be more exposed to only one type of theory (i.e., CBT), have little to no experience in role-playing in supervision, and unstructured practicum placements. McEwan and Tod (2015) identified these setbacks as areas for improvement in the field. These findings illustrate the repeated theme of less than adequate applied training in sport psychology. Specifically, it shows the disadvantages of low structured internship placements and limited supervision quality (i.e., limited exposure to theories and effective methods such as role-plays) in SDC development.

When looking into these studies' results, it is noteworthy that experiences and tools that helped students connect research and theory to their applied training were the greatest influence in the development of SDC. Experience with clients connected with supervision and other sources of reflection about their practice seemed to help trainees and even more experienced sport psychology consultants to develop and hone their applied sport psychology skills. Consequently, practices that help consultants connect their theoretical knowledge and their applied work should receive more attention in training.

Professional philosophy. One type of such practice is developing a professional philosophy. Poczwadowski, Sherman, and Ravizza (2004) suggested a hierarchical structure of professional philosophy. The authors defined professional philosophy as:

The consultant's beliefs and values concerning the nature of reality (sport reality in particular), the place of sport in human life, the basic nature of human being, the nature of human behavior change, and also the consultant's beliefs and values concerning his or her potential role in, and the theoretical and practical means of, influencing their clients toward mutually set intervention goals. (Poczwadowski et al., 2004, p. 449).

These core beliefs and values would serve as the basis for the choice of one or more theoretical paradigms, which in turn would inform the choice of models of practice and practitioner's role. Finally, the models and role would inform the choice of interventions and techniques/methods utilized. This way, a clear professional philosophy would serve as the foundation of a well thought and coherent practice, which would result in higher effectiveness (Poczwadowski et al., 2004). This suggestion is in accordance to the findings in SDC research that learning to connect theory and practice is an important aspect of professional development. A professional philosophy would improve the practitioner's understanding of practical work and

how to apply theoretical frameworks in real case scenarios. In this context, the supervisor could help the supervisee to develop their own professional philosophy and actively make the connections from theory to practice.

Keegan (2010) also considered a professional philosophy to be essential to a practitioner's development. He recommended that before going into practicum and internship the students should watch videos of different practitioners' styles and participate in seminar group discussions about each style. Subsequently, once they started practicing sport psychology, they could write up their own case studies with reflections about the way they saw the connection of their interventions and the professional philosophy(s) behind them.

Reflective practice. The use of reflective practice has been suggested as means to improve neophyte practitioners' efficacy by various authors (Anderson, Knowles, & Gilbourne, 2004; Holt & Streat, 2001; Knowles, Gilbourne, Tomlinson, & Anderson, 2007; McEwan & Tod, 2015; Tod & Bond, 2010). Holt and Streat (2001) suggested that reflective practice could help trainees become more athlete-centered practitioners and increase their self-awareness. Cropley, Miles, Hanton, and Niven (2010) added that reflective practice contributes increase practitioner's competence and service-delivery effectiveness. Van Raalte and Andersen (2014) also advocated the use of self-reflection to improve supervisees' self-awareness and added that it can contribute to trainees' identification of own strengths and weaknesses to their thoughtful approach to challenging situations. Tod and Bond (2010) affirmed that even after practitioners graduate, reflective practice continues to be important for professional development.

In a detailed account of the first author's reflections, Cropley, Miles, Hanton, and Niven (2007) demonstrated how reflective practice aids in professional development. Cropley et al. concluded that reflections helped the trainee improve his ability to connect with clients,

communicate with them, and, consequently, build better rapport. Additionally, overall practice of sport psychology improved: the trainee's approach became athlete-centered, and he was better able to consider clients' individual differences.

Knowles et al. (2007) agreed that systematic reflective practice supports applied practice and suggested that there are multiple layers of reflection, including reflection with supervisor and peers, reflection through the writing of reports and receiving their feedback, and reflection while participating in conferences. Each of these layers would deepen the reflection with the input of other professionals' view of the same situation as opposed to a reflection that is limited to the own practitioner's thoughts. Consequently, reflection would be another effective way of connecting theory and practice to improve SDC. Besides, it gives the opportunity to make these connections more complex through the reflective interaction with supervisors and peers, which are also important for SDC development.

Despite the importance of reflective practice, Knowles et al. (2007) emphasized that supervision has an important role in aiding in the supervisee's self-reflection to improve their competence. Cropley et al. (2010) also found in their focus groups with sport psychologists that reflecting with others is better than self-reflection only, and Huntley and Kentzer (2013) advocated for the value of group-based reflective practice. Watson, Lubker, and Van Raalte (2011) also warned for the dangers of using self-reflection alone without supervision and cautioned that self-reflection should not be used as a replacement for supervision. Reflective practice should be used as a tool to improve the quality of supervision sessions, rather than substituting the supervision process.

Supervision. Supervision is another important factor in developing the practitioner's competence (Andersen, 1994; Holt & Streat, 2001; Hutter et al., 2015; Knowles et al., 2007;

McEwan & Tod, 2015;). Andersen, Van Raalte, and Brewer (2000) suggested that good supervision and training should help increase the credibility of the field of sport psychology. Because there are so many stereotypes attached to the word “psychology” and many untrained professionals working with athletes, there is some resistance to the use of sport psychology services (Andersen et al., 2000). Consequently, Andersen et al. (2000) defend that the field should invest in solving issues that reinforce negative attitudes towards sport psychology services through quality training, good supervision, and ethical practice.

Supervisors have an important role in the task of improving the credibility of the field by ensuring competence development and being the gatekeepers of the profession (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). If students have appropriate supervision they can provide services to athletes and coaches viewed as effective as professional services (Gentner, Fisher, & Wrisberg, 2004). Supervisors also contribute to the development of the trainee’s professional identity (Foltz et al., 2015), self-knowledge (Knowles et al., 2007), understanding of practice (Knowles et al., 2007; Tod et al., 2009), understanding of the sport/club culture (Eubank, Nesti, & Cruickshank, 2014), understanding of ethical practice (Andersen, 1994; Andersen et al., 2000; Foltz et al., 2015), and in helping relieve anxiety and worries of the trainee (Knowles et al., 2007; Tod et al., 2009). Supervisors can help the supervisee to recognize and manage blind spots in therapy and supervision (Watson et al., 2011). Former graduates from sport psychology programs referred to their supervision experience in practicum and internship as one of the most valuable experiences they had during their training (Andersen et al., 1997; Tod et al., 2009).

Supervision has a very important role in the learning process of connecting research and practice to develop SDC. It directly aids the development of the supervisees through direct teaching and support of self-development. In addition, it ensures that the blind spots that the

supervisee cannot recognize alone are addressed. Finally, it also contributes to other forms of SDC development, such as the development of a consulting philosophy and self-reflection.

This review of training in applied sport psychology illustrates the different aspects influencing the development of SDC. It is possible to see that different factors such as supervision, professional philosophy, and self-reflection facilitate the connection between theoretical foundation and applied practice, which in turn improves SDC. Further, supervision seems to be a central factor in the practitioners' ability to improve these connections, contributing directly and indirectly to it. Figure 1 shows a model based on Tod et al.'s (2007), Tod et al.'s (2009), and McEwan and Tod's (2015) findings summarizing how all these factors contribute to SDC.

Although supervision is clearly important to SDC development, the historical tendency of American sport and exercise psychology to focus on research and leave applied training as a secondary practice seems to have limited the attention that supervision has received in sport psychology literature. Additionally, despite the historical reliance on psychological interventions and techniques, the stronger influence from sport sciences, especially coaching, in the field seems to have influenced it to rely on supervision less than other helping professions. Although there have been recent changes in some graduate programs recently that seem to be starting to value more applied sport psychology, there is still a need to focus more attention to student training and supervision in applied sport psychology.

Supervision

Two typical erroneous assumptions about supervision are that past experience as a supervisee and being an effective therapist are enough to know how to be a good supervisor (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). The development of supervision as a separate area of study has

recently shown that it involves different skills and theoretical knowledge than therapy.

According to Bernard and Goodyear (2009), supervision is one separate intervention that includes issues, theory, and techniques that are unique to it and, consequently, require specific training. With the development of supervision as an area of specialty training it has become a focus of training and professional development and more attention has been given to formal training of supervisors, documentation, and effectiveness of supervision (Corey, Haynes, Moulton, & Muratori, 2010).

Research shows that unsupervised counseling experience alone does not improve the trainees' skills, because psychotherapeutic skills need feedback and not just trial and error training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Supervision occurs when senior members of the profession provide intervention to more junior members in order to enhance their professional performance, monitor their services, and serve as gatekeepers of the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Therefore, supervision has the important role of intentionally helping the trainee to develop competence.

According to Bernard and Goodyear (2009), supervision has two main purposes: to promote supervisee's development and to guarantee client welfare. In addition, Corey et al. (2010) suggested a third goal of supervision: to empower the supervisee to self-supervise in the future by teaching skills, resources, and awareness necessary for self-evaluation. When analyzing these goals, it is possible to affirm that supervision plays a crucial role in the development of a field. Unsupervised work could allow that clients suffer harm from poorly trained professionals and hinder the credibility of the field.

The supervisor has to carry out different roles during the process of supervision. One of the roles of the supervisor is to teach, since the supervisee will learn skills and knowledge and be

evaluated by the supervisor. The supervisor may also assume the role of counselor to address supervisee's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors to increase effectiveness in the work with clients. Further, the supervisor may sometimes act as a consultant, especially when working with more advanced supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Corey et al., 2010).

Supervision also requires a number of skills and knowledge, including: formalized training in supervision, knowledge of formal contracts and agreements, ability to initiate and maintain positive supervisory relationship, ability to assess supervisees and all clients they serve, multiple modes of direct observation of the supervisee's work, policies and procedures for practice, knowledge of proper documentation methods, specific feedback and evaluation plans, effective risk management practices, knowledge of relevant ethics and legal topics and issues, knowledge of diversity topics and issues, and thorough knowledge of relevant state licensure requirements and processes (Corey et al., 2010).

One important aspect of supervision is the model of supervision adopted (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Corey et al., 2010). Because in the past supervision was based on the notion that good therapists would make good supervisors, the first models of supervision were based on psychotherapeutic processes (i.e., psychotherapy-based models) (Corey et al., 2010). Nonetheless, as supervision was developed as a field other types of models emerged, such as developmental models and integrative models. Some models may overlap and have, for example, developmental and psychotherapeutic characteristics (Corey et al., 2010).

According to Corey et al. (2010), the developmental models of supervision assume that supervision is an evolving process and the characteristics and methods of supervision will change according to the levels and needs of the supervisee. Although there are different developmental models, in general they see the beginning practitioner as having limited

confidence and basic skills and the advanced supervisee as more skilled and self-sufficient. The psychotherapy-based models employ the models from psychotherapy into supervision. They include the psychodynamic model, person-centered model, cognitive-behavioral model, reality-therapy model, family therapy model, feminist model, and solution-oriented model. Finally, the integrative models, as the name suggest, integrate different models, theories, and techniques into one approach to supervision (Corey et al., 2010).

One of the developmental models that has been widely used in counseling psychology to understand supervisees' professional development and how to adapt supervision to it is Stoltenberg and McNeil's (2009) integrated developmental model. The model describes three different levels of development and the supervisor's correspondent behavior to support the supervisee and facilitate their further growth. Each level can be evaluated based on three components: motivation, autonomy, and self-other awareness. The first level is the beginning when supervisees still have low confidence and do not have well-developed skills yet, needing high structure from supervisors. Supervisees in level two, on the other hand, already have some confidence and can start to trust their own decisions and intuition. In the third level the supervisee can start to share the responsibility of controlling the supervision process and supervision becomes a collegial rather than hierarchic relationship. This model also provides eight domains in which the supervisor can assess the supervisee's development: intervention skills competence, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics. The eight domains and three developmental levels facilitate the specific understanding of different areas of growth through supervision. It could also be argued that this model could be used to evaluate supervisee's development in sport psychology. The eight domains proposed in

the model are also important aspects of effective applied sport psychology services and the three phases seem to represent well the development of a sport psychology supervisee as well.

Approaches to supervision in sport and exercise psychology. Similarly to supervision in counseling and clinical psychology, supervision in sport and exercise psychology has the primary goal of ensuring the client's welfare (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014). The secondary, and also critical, goal is to facilitate the development of the supervisees and ensure that they become competent practitioners, thus, ensuring that the profession maintains its credibility (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Notwithstanding, in American sport psychology there are no official guidelines for supervision (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000).

In an effort to increase attention and better structure supervision in sport and exercise psychology, several authors have suggested models and methods that could be used to better structure it and ensure that its main goals are being met. Andersen and Williams-Rice (1996) borrowed some of the models used in counseling and clinical psychology and tried to adapt them to sport and exercise psychology to allow them to be used both by psychology-trained and sport sciences-trained professionals. The authors discussed some of the most commonly used psychotherapy-based models (i.e., phenomenological, psychodynamic, and behavioral), besides Stoltenberg's (1981) developmental model. They also discussed the idea of mixing more than one model and being eclectic. Van Raalte and Andersen (2000) had similar suggestions, but added the cognitive-behavioral model to the list of models discussed.

Another model suggested in the sport and exercise psychology literature is Barney, Andersen, and Rigg's (1996), which is directed specifically for graduate programs' training. The authors argued that supervision literature is not clear about how to train supervisors or how to do

supervision and that a comprehensive model for training sport psychology students was necessary to improve supervision. Their model included the supervision of novice trainees by more experienced ones (i.e., supervisors-in-training), who are in turn supervised individually by sport psychologists and their peers (i.e., group supervision). Barney et al. (1996) also adapted their supervision model to accommodate students with different levels of previous training by dividing the type of supervision provided into stages based on the developmental model suggested by Hart (1982). This model suggested an initial focus on skill acquisition, then on personal growth (i.e., development of the supervisee as a person and as a professional; interpersonal focus), and finally on integrating skills and personal growth to develop effective relationships with clients. Vosloo, Zakrajsek, and Grindley (2014) suggested a similar model, which also included meta-supervision (i.e., supervision of supervision) in graduate training to better prepare supervisees to become future supervisors.

Besides the choice of supervision model(s), Andersen (2012) defended the value of being a mindful supervisor independent of the model being used. As important as it is for practitioners to be mindful while interacting with clients, supervision should be carried out with mindful presence of both parties. Supervisors should show presence, attunement, and resonance to supervisees, who would in turn learn how to be present themselves and parallel this approach with their clients (Andersen, 2012).

Methods of supervision in sport psychology literature include the use of self-report, case notes, role-plays, brainstorming, modeling, reflections, video and tape recording, live observation, group supervision, feedback, support, and guided reflection (Barney et al., 1996; Keegan, 2010; Knowles et al., 2007; Silva et al., 2011; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014). Silva et al. (2011) also suggested the use of interpersonal process recall (IPR), which is a method from

counseling and clinical psychology that uses video recording to analyze a session in a safe place and with time to process thoughts, feelings, hypotheses, and case conceptualizations. Research has shown, however, that sport psychology trainees may be having less access to varied models and useful techniques such as role-play than counseling and clinical psychology trainees (McEwan & Tod, 2015).

Other issues related to supervision in sport psychology that have been discussed in the literature include supervisory relationship, transference and countertransference, multicultural issues, documentation and evaluation, suggestions on how to deal with time constraints, financial considerations, availability, and ethical issues (e.g., Andersen, 1994; Castillo, 2014; Silva et al., 2011; Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000; Vosloo et al., 2014). Supervisory relationship would include qualities such as empathy, trust, respect, and self-disclosure (Silva et al., 2011). Silva et al. (2011) also suggest that the supervisor should foster the supervisee's growth, development, and welfare. Transference and countertransference are concepts borrowed from general psychology and can serve as teaching material for the students (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Castillo (2014) adds that supervisors should engage their trainees in self-reflection to understand the impact of transference and countertransference in the relationship with clients.

There is evidence that multicultural issues may not be satisfactorily discussed in supervision in sport psychology (Foltz et al., 2015). Nevertheless, there are some suggestions in the literature about the importance of discussing supervisor's and supervisee's own socio-cultural background in order to facilitate the understanding of how it will affect practice and the supervision process (Silva et al., 2011). In addition, Vosloo et al. (2014) discussed some aspects of multicultural issues in supervision that should be taken into consideration, such as the supervisor's self-awareness, developing a culturally sensitive alliance, being aware of the

cultural perspectives of the supervisee and the client, and obtaining information of culturally relevant interventions.

Regarding documentation of supervision, Silva et al. (2011) suggested that it should include date and duration of each session, clinical description of each topic, identification of cases discussed, dated signature and phone number of the supervisor, and dated signature of the supervisee. The authors also suggested that supervision records should be kept for at least seven years and that additional information such as goals of supervision, outcomes of evaluations, and possible remedial plans for the supervisee could be included in the documentation. Further, evaluation of the supervisee by the supervisor should be previously and clearly defined, including a framework of how to deal with grievances from both sides of the relationship (Silva et al., 2011).

Ethical issues in supervision is one aspect of supervision that has been more extensively discussed. Andersen (1994) first reviewed ethical issues in supervision based on the idea that improving supervision would enhance the effectiveness of the field. The author believed that the focus of supervision should be the appropriate, ethical, and beneficial delivery of psychological services to the client and that the supervisor should model ethical behavior. Andersen et al. (2000) also discussed the importance of the supervisor being aware of graduate students' impairment and having a framework of how to deal with this situation if it occurs. More recently, Castillo (2014) has discussed possible ethical challenges that might affect supervision and how they could be handled to facilitate learning and preserve the supervisory relationship. These challenges included terminology (i.e., using the title of mentor to be protected of liability and potential for the client's welfare), supervisor training (i.e., untrained supervisors and the need to develop coursework in supervision), multiple relationships (i.e., importance of discussing

potential issues in the beginning of the relationship), transference and countertransference (i.e., facilitating self-reflection to better address these issues in supervision), trainee development (i.e., being aware of trainee's developmental stage and models that guide supervisors to foster further development at each stage), sexual relationships (i.e., recognize attraction early to prevent development into inappropriate relationships), and supervision versus treatment (i.e., supervisor should avoid entering into a therapeutic relationship with supervisee and should have a referral list for these cases).

Current issues in supervision in sport and exercise psychology. Even though AASP has created a certification process that includes the requirement of applied experience since the end of the 80s, it was not until the middle of the 90s that supervision started to slowly gain focus in sport psychology literature. Nonetheless, until today there is a limited number of scientific publications related to supervision in sport psychology and Watson et al. (2011) suggested that the “current status, depth, and breadth of supervision are of concern” (p. 162). Within this limited number of studies it is possible to notice that although supervision in sport psychology has improved throughout these 20 years, there are still many unanswered questions.

In 1992, Petitpas, Brewer, Rivera, and Van Raalte (1994) surveyed 508 AASP members regarding a variety ethical-related issues, including supervision. Their results showed that 62% of the student members of AASP were being supervised in their applied work. This data is worrisome, because it shows that almost 40% of the students doing applied work were not being supervised, increasing the chances of doing harm to the clients and not developing their competence appropriately (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). In addition to the low percentage of students being supervised, Petitpas et al. (1994) also found that only 57% of the professionals supervising students or other professionals had training in supervision and a quarter of these

were not trained through specific graduate coursework in supervision. Around this same time, Andersen, Van Raalte, and Brewer (1994) found that 56% of 71 the supervisors they surveyed had never had their own applied work supervised (70% of those with background in sport sciences) even though almost half of them were AASP certified.

Although these numbers are not encouraging, this survey was conducted only three years after the process of certification had been implemented by AASP. Therefore, it would be expected that these numbers would be considerably improved in the following years. In an attempt to investigate a possible improvement, Watson et al. (2004) conducted a similar study 10 years later with 322 AASP members. The authors found a considerable improvement in the percentage of students being supervised (75% were being supervised at the time), although it was still far from the ideal. Regarding general training in supervision, only about half of the respondents indicated having any training in supervision. Further, one eighth of the professionals providing supervision at the time had not received any type of training in supervision and the majority of those who had training in supervision was trained through “workshop, in-services, or independent study”. It is important to realize that this survey was voluntary and many of the respondents could be members who tended to care about the importance of ethics and supervision, and even had more training on these issues, which could have biased the sample. Hence, the situation could be even worse. Still, based on these results, Watson et al. (2004) suggested that AASP should start requiring course work in supervision for their certified consultants and that training in supervision should be included in the practica experience of students. Finally, the authors affirmed that there is a need to better understand the training in supervision provided to students and that additional research in this topic is necessary.

Despite the suggestion more than ten years ago that it would be beneficial for AASP to include training in supervision as part of its certification requirements, the association has not decided to pursue this path yet. In fact, AASP does not have any guidelines for supervision and the code of ethics only mentions: “AASP members provide proper training and supervision to their employees or supervisees and take reasonable steps to see that such persons perform services responsibly, competently, and ethically” (Association for Applied Sport Psychology [AASP], 2011), without defining what proper training is or what types of reasonable steps would help ensuring that their supervisees perform responsibly, competently, and ethically. It is also concerning that the association has decided to stop using the term supervision to avoid liability for the supervisees’ practice and start using “professional mentorship” instead, which has not been challenged legally yet (Castillo, 2014). This change has caused confusion among supervisors, who are not sure if they are legally responsible for supervisees, gatekeepers of the profession, or just mentors of their development; and supervisees, who are not sure what type of mentoring or supervision they need to seek. This confusion is also dangerous due to the risk of allowing harm to be done to clients while the supervisory/mentoring relationship may become a general guidance rather than a systematic oversight of the trainee’s work to ensure their improvement and the client’s welfare. For instance, as exemplified by Andersen et al. (2000), cases of impaired trainees such as a death in the family or previous athletic experience affecting clinical judgment could pass unnoticed without proper supervision.

Many other organizations connected to psychology and counseling such as the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) and the American Psychological Association (APA) have developed their own guidelines for supervision. APA’s guidelines, for example, do not suggest any theories or models to be followed, but provide recommendations on

important domains of supervision: supervisor competence, diversity/multicultural competence, supervisory relationship, professionalism, assessment/evaluation/feedback, problems of professional competence, and ethical, legal, and regulatory considerations (American Psychological Association [APA], 2014).

The lack of guidelines and specific training recommendations for supervision in sport psychology has probably influenced the variety of supervision experiences that students live throughout their practica and internships. Andersen et al. (1994) investigated the supervisors' skills through supervisors' self-assessment and also through their supervisees' assessment, although they could not pair the results of supervisors and supervisees. They surveyed 71 supervisors and 187 supervisees. The results of their study indicated that although supervisors and supervisees had similar means in the rating of the different supervisor's skills, the variability in the responses was greater among the supervisees. This variability may indicate that some supervisees could be working with highly skilled supervisors while others could be working with low skilled supervisors. Interestingly, the greatest variability identified was in the fulfilling supervisory skills category, which suggests that even the basic responsibilities of the supervisor may not be fulfilled consistently across the different graduate programs in sport psychology. This variability could be an effect of the lack of official guidelines and limited knowledge of what is appropriate supervision. The difference in the training received across programs could also be a threat to the field, since the clients would most likely be receiving a variety of services in terms of quality and the supervisees trained by low skilled supervisors could be having their competence development hindered. These results indicate that it is necessary to understand better the different approaches used in supervision and how they are affecting the supervisees' development and their work with clients.

When looking into the learning experiences of master's program students from Australia, Tod et al. (2007) found that although supervision was an important part of their learning, some students found the general psychologist supervisor more effective and helpful than the sport psychology supervisor. Ten years earlier Andersen and Williams-Rice (1996) had already suggested that sport psychology was not well seen by the fields of counseling and clinical psychology due to the limited of control, monitoring, and accountability of its practice. The authors argued that training in supervision, metasupervision, and peer supervision could have the potential to help out the field to establish itself. Nonetheless, not much progress has been done in the development of supervision training 20 years later. The characteristics of suitable supervisors have not been explored and many times the choice of supervisor is based simply on the fact that they are accredited or certified, which is similar to the erroneous idea that good athletes would make good coaches (Barney & Andersen, 2014; Tod & Lavalley, 2011).

One small improvement that has been achieved is AASP's creation of the 6-hour continuing education workshop at the annual conference called "essentials of mentorship" (Castillo, 2014). Counseling and clinical psychology literature shows evidence that formally trained supervisors tend to provide higher quality supervision than untrained ones, which results in better service delivery (Barney et al., 1996). Therefore, this step of the AASP certification review committee is quite significant in terms of recognition of the importance of supervision training for AASP certified members. Nevertheless, in the long-term the best course of action would be the requirement of training in supervision to become a certified consultant, ideally through a graduate course (Watson et al., 2011).

Watson, MacAlarnen, and Shannon (2014) suggested that to better train supervisors, theory and practice of supervision should be included in graduate programs to provide the

students opportunities to receive supervisory experience under the direction of a more experienced supervisor (i.e., meta-supervision). Ellis et al. (2014) have advised that inadequate and harmful supervision would be less likely to occur if supervisors had to receive training in supervision that includes supervision of supervision. Barney and Andersen (2014) agreed and added that it is especially dangerous when professionals think that they can supervise only based on their previous experience as a supervisee, especially considering the number of people who have received harmful or inadequate supervision and are not even aware of it. Considering the agreement that supervision practices could be improved through course work in supervision and meta-supervision experience in graduate programs, it seems like the fundamental problem preventing the progress of the field in the USA is the inexistence of program accreditation in sport psychology. Novice practitioners do not know where to find mentorship/supervision and when they do, they may not be receiving the best guidance to ensure their competence development as practitioners. If graduate programs would offer standardized practicum and internships, the graduates of these programs would be closer to achieving the same levels of competence by the end of their experience, no matter where they were trained. Nonetheless, it is important to first understand what type of supervision should be offered in sport psychology, but research in this area is not clear about what effective supervision is and what type of training should be provided to supervisors.

Research in Supervision in Sport and Exercise Psychology

The first scientific publications in supervision in sport and exercise psychology were published only in 1994 (Van Raalte, & Andersen, 2000). As previously reviewed, the first studies in the area looked into ethical issues in supervision (Andersen, 1994), supervisors' skills (Andersen et al., 1994), current situation of supervision at AASP (Petitpas et al., 1994), and

models of supervision (Barney et al., 1996; Andersen & Williams-Rice, 1996). In the beginning of the 2000s other publications tried to further the discussion in the area. Van Raalte and Andersen (2000) discussed models of supervision and supervision-related issues. Andersen, Van Raalte, and Harris (2000) used a case study to illustrate important aspects of supervision, such as using models of supervision, supervisory relationship, and development of supervisee's self-awareness. In addition, Watson et al. (2004), as previously shown, have analyzed the current situation of supervision at the time for AASP members.

Later in the first decade of the 2000s the literature specific to supervision started to decrease and publications in professional development started to gain force. Much of these publications have been reviewed previously and a good number of them had findings reinforcing the importance of supervision in professional development (e.g., Knowles et al., 2007; Silva et al., 2011; Tod, 2007; Tod et al., 2007; Tod et al., 2009; Tod & Bond, 2010). Further, these studies showed some important aspects of supervision, such as the use of reflections and supervisory alliance. However, they did not have enough depth specifically in supervision to show what kind of supervision is more effective for professional development and what kind of training would help the supervisors be more effective.

More recently, research specific on supervision has started to grow again, including more data-based research. Eubank et al. (2014) wrote about the importance of the supervisor's guidance to understand the sport environment in elite soccer clubs. Both supervisor and supervisee were among the authors and they reflected about the supervisor's influence in decision-making and the influence of the supervisee's background in her ability to work effectively in this environment. The book *Becoming a Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology Professional: A Global Perspective* by Cremades and Tashman (2014) also brought

more attention to supervision in sport and exercise psychology and showed different approaches to supervision that are being used around the world. Chapters included description and discussion of supervision in different modalities (e.g., peer supervision, meta-supervision, and traditional dyad supervision) and in various countries (e.g., Sweden, Australia, China, UK, and Greece). Some cases, such as the Australian and UK systems, were noteworthy for the difference when comparing to the USA supervision system (or lack thereof). There, sport psychology is a field closer to psychology and they developed a structured training pathway to ensure trainee's quality development and client's welfare.

Following, Cremades and Tashman (2016) published a case study-based book of training and supervision in sport psychology. Chapters included examples of different approaches to supervision, including individual, group, peer consultation, and meta-supervision. Other supervision aspects illustrated in the book included mindful supervision, use of technology, and multicultural supervision.

Hutter et al. (2015) criticized the current literature in supervision and argued that the supervisees' voices should be heard when trying to understand how supervision should look like. In their study, the authors tried to give more voice to 14 supervisees of a graduate program by exploring what kind of issues they were interested in bringing to supervision. Hutter et al. (2015) first attempted to analyze these issues based on counseling psychology literature suggestions of common issues faced by supervisees. Data were analyzed based on the models of supervisory issues of Longabill (1982) and Sansbury (1982). Notwithstanding, Hutter et al. (2015) did not find the models applicable to the issues brought by the sport psychology students in the European graduate program where they collected data. Subsequently, the authors decided to analyze the data inductively and develop their own model of supervisory issues, which should be

more applicable to sport psychology. The final model included two major themes: *know-how* (intake, treatment plan, and execution) and *professional development* (reflections, working principles, and coping with dilemmas). Nevertheless, Hutter et al. (2015) recognized that these data could be biased towards situations and issues that supervisees were more willing to discuss and had the ability to recognize without the supervisor's influence. Despite this bias, this study showed that models from counseling and clinical psychology might not be applicable to supervision in sport psychology. This factor should be taken into consideration in future research and such studies should not assume that supervision models from counseling and clinical psychology will fit into supervisory needs in sport psychology.

Subsequent to this study, Hutter, Oldenhof-Veldman, Pijpers, and Oudejans (2017) interviewed 15 alumni of the same graduate program to investigate which learning experiences helped them achieve certain learning outcomes. The learning outcomes in this study were the supervisory issues that trainees brought to supervision in Hutter et al. (2015). The interviews included a list of learning experiences that interviewees could use to recall all their experiences, but they were not limited to mentioning only these. After analyzing the connection between learning experiences and learning outcomes, Hutter et al. (2017) concluded that traditional learning experiences (e.g., coursework) had a higher tendency to contribute to learning objectives related to *know-how* (e.g., treatment outline); *learning from others* (e.g., peers) tended to contribute to *professional development* (e.g., balance client-led/directive counseling); and *practical experience and reflective activities* (e.g., supervision) were connected to both *know-how* and *professional development*. Although this study had similar limitations to the former, it noteworthy that alumni of this graduate program considered supervision and other reflective activities to help develop most of the learning outcomes.

Another recent study looked into supervision experiences in different programs in the United States. Foltz et al. (2015) interviewed nine sport psychology trainees about their supervision experiences and found three main themes: programmatic factors, supervision process, and supervision content. Overall, the themes reflected more positive qualities of supervision in sport psychology, such as having flexible structure, different modalities, multiple perspectives, trust, collaboration, and teaching ethical and clinical competence (Foltz et al., 2015). Nonetheless, the authors also found some negative aspects of supervision, such as supervisee not recognizing a clear model of supervision and the lack of multiculturally relevant supervision.

Foltz et al.'s (2015) finding that supervisors may not be using supervision models to guide their work may reflect what is currently found in the literature. Although there are suggestions of models based on counseling and clinical psychology that could be used in sport psychology, there is no data on their use or showing their effectiveness in sport psychology. Nevertheless, they provide some structure to supervision, which is better than no structure.

Other countries have already reduced the distance between psychology and sport sciences and developed more strict requirements for supervision and supervised applied practice in graduate programs. In Australia the master's students must complete 1,000 hours of supervised practice, including a generalist placement and a specialist placement, and about 130 of these hours must be spent on supervision (Tod, Eubank, & Andersen, 2014). In addition, they have clearer standards for supervisor training, including the expected competencies of supervisors, a supervisor self-study module, face-to-face workshops, and meta-supervision/continuous assessment of own supervision. In the United Kingdom they developed key roles of the sport psychologists and the trainees are expected to fulfill these roles during their practicum

experience, including 460 days of activity with a minimum of 160 days of applied work with clients. Supervisors must be registered in the British Psychological Society, a member of its division of sport and exercise psychology, and registered in the Health Care Professions Council, besides fulfilling specific activities required from supervisors such as having a plan of training, observing supervisee's practice, giving feedback to supervisee, and holding record of supervision sessions. The supervisors must also take an online course, a face-to-face workshop, and take refresher courses along their careers (Tod et al., 2014). Tod et al. (2014) suggested that these differences in training, compared to the United States, are due to the inclusion of sport psychology as a subfield of psychology, which allowed them to structure, develop, and accredit the field in these countries. This critique is justifiable, since so far APA Division 47 has not developed guidelines for training in supervision in sport psychology.

Research in supervision in sport and exercise psychology has left various unanswered questions. Many suggestions to produce better research have been made, but few have been followed. Tod et al. (2007) suggested that longitudinal studies with the students' and their supervisors' perceptions of training being compared. The authors also noted that it would be important to evaluate training effectiveness and client satisfaction throughout training time to improve applied sport psychology training. Tod (2007) recommended that research in supervision and training should rely less on cross-sectional designs and self-report questionnaires and that understanding counselor-development should increase comprehension of how consultants grow over time, which would contribute to the improvement training programs, supervision, and consultants' development. In addition, Andersen et al. (2000) proposed that future studies could use a smaller sample of supervisor and supervisee dyads and follow them

longitudinally, assessing supervisors' skills and supervisees' development along the duration of the study.

Although these suggestions of using longitudinal studies have been made many years ago, no study looking in depth into supervision longitudinally has been carried out since then. This situation prevents organizations such as AASP from identifying guidelines for supervision practice based on research evidence. Further, the lack of empirical support for the effectiveness of different approaches to supervision in sport psychology hinders the efforts of the association of developing and requiring training in supervision for their certification. Even though AASP has created the workshop "essentials in mentorship", it is still far behind the ideal supervision training based on the current literature or what is seen in other helping professions such as counseling and clinical psychology.

There is a need to understand how supervisors should be trained and how supervision in sport and exercise psychology is most effective and now it is a good time to investigate this issue. Based on the changes in supervision of athletic trainers, Geisler (2013) suggested that before official guidelines of supervision are developed, it is important to compare the effectiveness of the current supervision approaches to be able to build from what already exists and works. Although different supervisors may use different models and approaches to supervision (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2014), it is important to know how these approaches are influencing the supervisees' professional development. Increasing the understanding of current supervision practices and their effectiveness would help to develop supervision guidelines, advance training in supervision, and improve the credibility of the field through the delivery of effective services. To support this change, future research should go beyond experience-based

advice, case studies, and cross-sectional studies and investigate longitudinally what aspects of supervision contribute to better supervisee's professional development.

References

- American Psychological Association (2014). *Guidelines for clinical supervision in health service psychology*. Retrieved from <http://apa.org/about/policy/guidelines-supervision.pdf>
- Andersen, M. B. (1994). Ethical considerations in the supervision of applied sport psychology graduate students. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 6, 152-167.
doi:10.1080/10413209408406291
- Andersen, M. B. (2012). Supervision and mindfulness in sport and performance psychology. In S. M. Murphy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of sport and performance psychology* (pp. 725-737). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199731763.001.0001
- Andersen, M. B., Van Raalte, J. L., & Brewer, B. W. (1994). Assessing the skills of sport psychology supervisors. *The Sport Psychologist*, 8, 238-247. doi:10.1123/tsp.8.3.238
- Andersen, M. B., Van Raalte, J. L., & Brewer, B. W. (2000). When sport psychology consultants and graduate students are impaired: Ethical and legal issues in training and supervision. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 12, 134-150. doi:10.1080/10413200008404219
- Andersen, M. B., Van Raalte, J. L., & Harris, (2000). Supervision II: A case study. In M. B. Andersen (Ed.), *Doing sport psychology* (pp. 153-165). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Andersen, M. B., Williams, J. M., Aldridge, T., & Taylor, J. (1997). Tracking the training and careers of graduates of advanced degree programs in sport psychology, 1989 to 1994. *The Sport Psychologist*, 11, 326-344. doi:10.1123/tsp.11.3.326
- Andersen, M. B., & Williams-Rice, B. T. (1996). Supervision in the education and training of sport psychology service providers. *The Sport Psychologist*, 10, 278-290.
doi:10.1123/tsp.10.3.278

- Anderson, A. G., Knowles, Z., & Gilbourne, D. (2004). Reflective practice for sport psychologists: Concepts, models, practical implications, and thoughts on dissemination. *The Sport Psychologist, 18*, 188-203. doi:10.1123/tsp.18.2.188
- Association for Applied Sport Psychology (n.d.). *Our history*. Retrieved from <http://www.appliedsportpsych.org/about/our-history/>
- Association for Applied Sport Psychology (2011). *Association for Applied Sport Psychology Ethical Principles and Standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.appliedsportpsych.org/about/ethics/ethics-code/>
- Barney, S. T. & Andersen, M. B. (2014). Meta-supervision: Training practitioners to help others on their paths. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 339-346). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Barney, S. T., Andersen, M. B., & Riggs, C. A. (1996). Supervision in sport psychology: Some recommendations for practicum training. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 8*, 200-217. doi:10.1080/10413209608406477
- Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *The fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson.
- Castillo, S. (2014). Ethical issues in training future practitioners. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 252-259). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Corey, G., Haynes, R., Moulton, P., & Muratori, M. (2010). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

- Cremades, J. G. & Tashman, L. S. (2014). *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Cremades, J. G. & Tashman, L. S. (2016). *Global practices and training in applied sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A case study approach*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Cropley, B., Miles, A., Hanton, S., & Niven, A. (2007) Improving the delivery of applied sport psychology support through reflective practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 475-494. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.4.475
- Cropley, B., Miles, A., Hanton, S., & Niven, A. (2010). Exploring the relationship between effective and reflective practice in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 521-541. doi:10.1123/tsp.24.4.521
- Ellis, M. V., Berger, L., Hanus, A. E., Ayala, E. E., Swords, B. A., & Siembor, M. (2014). Inadequate and harmful supervision: Testing a revised framework and assessing occurrence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 42, 434-472. doi:10.1177/0011000013508656
- Eubank, M., Nesti, M., & Cruickshank, A. (2014). Understanding high performance sport environments: Impact for the professional training and supervision of sport psychologists. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review*, 10(2), 30-34.
- Fitzpatrick, S. J., Monda, S. J., & Wooding, C. B. (2016). Great expectations: Career planning and training experiences of graduate students in sport and exercise psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 28, 14-27. doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1052891
- Foltz, B. D., Fisher, A. R., Denton, L. K., Campbell, W. L., Speight, Q. L., Steinfeldt, J., & Latorre, C. (2015). Applied sport psychology supervision experience: A qualitative

- analysis. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 27, 449-463. doi:
10.1080/10413200.2015.1043162
- Geisler, P. R. (2013). The elephant in the room: Adequate supervision, not direct supervision. *Athletic Training & Sports Health Care*, 5(4), 151-154. doi:10.3928/19425864-20130709-10
- Gentner, N. B., Fisher, L. A., & Wrisberg, C. A. (2004). Athletes' and coaches' perceptions of sport psychology services offered by graduate students at one NCAA Division I university. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 213-216. doi:10.2466/pr0.94.1.213-216
- Hart, G.M. (1982). *The process of clinical supervision*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Holt, N. L. & Strean, W. B. (2001). Reflecting on initiating sport psychology consultation: A self-narrative of neophyte practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 15, 188-204. doi:
10.1123/tsp.15.2.188
- Huntley, E., & Kentzer, N. (2013). Group-based reflective practice in sport psychology: Experiences of two trainee sport and exercise scientists. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review*, 9(2), 57-68.
- Hutter, R. I., Oldenhof-Veldman, T., & Oudejans, R. D. (2015). What trainee sport psychologists want to learn in supervision. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 16, 101-109. doi:
doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.08.003
- Hutter, R. I., Oldenhof-Veldman, T., & Oudejans, R. D. (2017). Professional development in sport psychology: Relating learning experiences to learning outcomes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 29, 1-16. doi:10.1080/10413200.2016.1183152

- Keegan, R. J. (2010). Teaching consulting philosophies to neophyte sport psychologists: Does it help, and how can we do it? *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, 1*, 42-52.
doi:10.1080/21520704.2010.518663
- Kornspan, A. S. (2009). *Fundamentals of sport and exercise psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kornspan, A.S. (2012). History of sport and performance psychology. In S. M. Murphy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of sport performance psychology* (pp. 3-23). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Knowles, Z., Gilbourne, D., Tomlinson, V., & Anderson, A. G. (2007). Reflections in the application of reflective practice for supervision in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist, 21*, 109-122. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.1.109
- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*, 3-42. doi:10.1177/0011000082101002.
- McEwan, H. E. & Tod, D. (2015). Learning experiences contributing to service-delivery competence in applied sport psychologists: Lessons for sport psychologists. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 27*, 79-93. doi:10.1080/10413200.2014.952460
- Meyers, A. W., Coleman, J. K., Whelan, J. P., & Mehlenbeck, R. S. (2001). Examining careers in sport psychology: Who is working and who is making money. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 32*, 5-11. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.32.1.5
- Partington, J. & Orlick, T. (1987). The sport psychology consultant evaluation form. *The Sport Psychologist, 1*, 309-317. doi:10.1123/tsp.1.4.309

- Petitpas, A. J., Brewer, B. W., Rivera, P. M., & Van Raalte, J. L. (1994). Ethical beliefs and behaviors in applied sport psychology: The AASP ethics survey. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 6, 135-151. doi:10.1080/10413209408406290
- Petrie, T. A. & Diehl, N. S. (1995). Sport psychology in the profession of psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 26, 288-291. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.26.3.288
- Poczwardowski, A., Sherman, C. P., & Ravizza, K. (2004). Professional philosophy in the sport psychology service delivery: Building on theory and practice. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 445-463. doi:10.1123/tsp.18.4.445
- Sansbury, D. L. (1982). Developmental supervision from a skills perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 10, 53-57. doi:10.1177/0011000082101006.
- Silva, J. M., Metzler, J. N., & Lerner, B. (2011). *Training professionals in the practice of sport psychology* (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 59-65. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.28.1.59
- Stoltenberg, C. D. & McNeil, B. (2009). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tod, D. (2007). The long and winding road: Professional development in sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 94-108. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.1.94
- Tod, D., Andersen, M. B., & Marchant, D. B. (2009). A longitudinal examination of neophyte applied sport psychologists' development. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21(Supp. 1), S1-S16. doi:10.1080/10413200802593604

- Tod, D., Andersen, M. B., & Marchant, D. B., (2011). Six years up: Applied sport psychologists surviving (and thriving) after graduation. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 23, 93-109. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2010.534543
- Tod, D. & Bond, K. (2010). A longitudinal examination of a British neophyte sport psychologist's development. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24, 35-51. doi:10.1123/tsp.24.1.35
- Tod, D., Eubank, M. R., & Andersen, M. B. (2014). International perspectives: Training and supervision in the United Kingdom and Australia. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 324-330). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Tod, D. & Lavallee, D. (2011). Taming the wild west: Training and supervision in applied sport psychology. In D. Gilbourne & M. B. Andersen (Eds.), *Critical essays in applied sport psychology* (pp. 193-215). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Tod, D., Marchant, D., & Andersen M. B. (2007). Learning experiences contributing to service-delivery competence. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 317-334. doi:10.1123/tsp.21.3.317
- Van Raalte, J. L. & Andersen, M. B., (2000). Supervision I: From models to doing. In M.B. Andersen (Ed.), *Doing sport psychology* (pp. 153-165). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Van Raalte, J. L., & Andersen, M. B. (2014). Supervision. In R. C. Eklund & G. Tenenbaum (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of sport and exercise psychology* (pp. 724-727). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Vosloo, J., Zakrajsek, R., & Grindley, E. (2014). From mentee to mentor: Considerations for the neophyte supervisor. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 228-235). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

- Watson, J. C., Lubker, J. R., & Van Raalte, J. (2011). Problems in reflective practice: Self-bootstrapping versus therapeutic supervision. In D. Gilbourne & M. B. Andersen (Eds.), *Critical essays in applied sport psychology* (pp. 157-172). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Watson, J. C., McAlarnen, M. M., & Shannon, V. (2014). Facilitating our future: Roles, responsibilities, and the development of the sport, exercise, and performance supervisor. In J. G. Cremades & L. S. Tashman (Eds.), *Becoming a sport, exercise, and performance psychology professional: A global perspective* (pp. 236-242). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Watson, J. C., Zizzi, S. M., Etzel, E. F., & Lubker, J. R. (2004). Applied sport psychology supervision: A survey of students and professionals. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 415-429. doi:10.1123/tsp.18.4.415
- Williams, J. M., & Scherzer, C. B. (2003). Tracking the training and careers of graduates of advanced degree programs in sport psychology, 1994 to 1999. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15, 335-353. doi:10.1080/714044201
- Williams, J. M. & Straub, W. F. (2006). Sport psychology: Past, present, future. In J. M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (5th ed., pp. 1-14). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Zizzi, S. J., Zaichkowsky, L., & Perna, F. (2013). Certification in sport and exercise psychology. In J. L. Van Raalte & B. W. Brewer (Eds.), *Exploring sport and exercise psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 467-484). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.