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(ABSTRACT)

Creative supervision interventions are suggested to be supportive of mental health supervisees’ professional development. Yet, empirical evidence of the utility of such interventions is limited. The purpose of this study was to explore whether a creative intervention, specifically visual art, enhances clinical supervision. Enhancement was operationalized using likert scaled questions to measure: (1) participants’ level of enjoyment of the art task intervention, (2) participants’ perceived level of benefit derived from the art task intervention, and (3) how often participants used art tasks in counseling their own clients. Additionally, “creativity” was correlated to the dependent variables. Creativity was operationalized using the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Remote Associates Test.

The art task interventions were administered in the clinical supervision of master’s-level counseling internship students at two Universities located in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. Supervisees engaged in visual art exercises, and subsequent discussions, during the spring 2003 semester of their internship class.

Demographic information and likert-scaled responses measuring the dependent variables were reported using percentages. Dependent variables were correlated with creativity levels. Qualitative responses on the Exit Questionnaire were summarized and reported. Results suggested that participants enjoyed and benefited from supervision involving art tasks, and that a statistically significant relationship exists between creativity (as measured by the Barron-Welsh Art Scale) and enjoyment of the art tasks. While more participants overall used art in counseling their clients after participating in the study, the number of times participants used art tasks did not increase.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Clinical supervision is considered an essential element in ensuring quality care in the mental health field. Supervision begins while mental health therapists are in their training programs, and often continues throughout their professional lives. This process is defined as:

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring quality of professional services offered to the client(s) she, he, or they see(s), and serving as a gatekeeper of those who are to enter the particular profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998, p. 6).

More specifically, supervision addresses the goals of learning how to conceptualize cases, utilize appropriate techniques, and develop a theoretical orientation (Bernard & Goodyear).

Within these goals of supervision, therapists develop self-awareness (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Edwards, 1993; Lett, 1995), autonomy of action (Bernard & Goodyear), insight (Getz & Protinsky, 1994), and the ability to “relate therapeutically to clients” (Edwards, p. 214). Therapists also attempt to develop increasingly more advanced case conceptualization skills, and to become more flexible in their interventions over time (Bernard & Goodyear). As supervisees develop in all of these areas, they must also work through their own experiences of role ambiguity and explore the evolution of their personal (Getz & Protinsky) and professional selves as therapists over time (Bernard & Goodyear; Magnuson, 2000). Clearly, a broad range of developmental needs arises, and must be addressed in clinical supervision.

Therapist Development

Carl Rogers, a humanistic therapist and supervisor, shared that a primary goal of his person-centered approach was to help supervisees grow in their self-understanding and confidence (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Psychodynamic supervisors have a main goal of helping supervisees become aware of interpersonal dynamics which may influence their clinical relationships (Calisch, 1994; Robbins & Erismann, 1992). Cognitive-behavioral supervisors focus on helping supervisees develop skills. Yet, within this process of skills development, cognitive-behavioral supervisors also challenge supervisees’ thoughts and perceptions (Bernard & Goodyear). Developmental supervisors focus on facilitating supervisee growth through a
variety of stages as they evolve into competent therapists (Leach, Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Eichenfield, 1997). Experiential supervisors attempt to not only make the unconscious conscious, but also facilitate the ability in supervisees to utilize both intuition and cognition, and enhance flexibility in therapeutic interactions (Dean, 2001).

While the goals of supervision all vary in their foci, the approaches have a common theme of facilitating the development of supervisees into competent therapists. Within this theme, self-awareness and understanding is facilitated, and work is done to help supervisees recognize personal and interpersonal dynamics existing for themselves and their clients. Supervisees are supported in developing and relying upon their intuition, in addition to their cognitions, and flexibility is advocated.

The Import of Integrated Functioning

Clarkson and Leigh (1992) and Stephens (1984) discuss the essential need for supervisees to integrate verbal and nonverbal processing in clinical supervision. The authors contend that the accomplishment of this task supports supervisees in developing the separate functioning, as well as the integration, of both hemispheres of the brain. Specifically, Clarkson and Leigh discussed hemispheric functioning in terms of therapist duties. The left hemisphere supports the more logical and sequential activities associated with therapy: diagnosis, treatment planning, and evaluation. The right hemisphere supports the intuitive and empathic nature of therapy. The contributions from both hemispheres are equally important. Yet, in Western cultures, the development of left hemispheric functioning is more likely to be cultivated than that of the right hemisphere (Clarkson & Leigh).

Carson (1999) also addressed this concern in training therapists. Many training programs have made it difficult for trainees to accept themselves as innovators and creators. This is perhaps because trainees are often taught to apply the ideas of presumed “experts” and do not feel they have the freedom to express their own creative ideas or enact their own unique interventions. (p. 332)

Laughlin (2000) echoed this concern in discussing the tendency of training programs to focus on supervisees’ mastery of specific techniques. The author discussed the need to integrate support in developing creativity, as rotely using counseling techniques is not sufficient to effectively help clients. Stephens (1984) suggested that the use of one specific creative method, art tasks,
supports “fluidity of movement between verbal and nonverbal modes” (p. 34), and thus helps to
cultivate this desired integration of hemispheric functioning.

The left hemisphere’s logical and sequential functions appear to be well supported in
traditional supervision models which focus on verbal interactions between therapists and clients.
Traditional supervision models include live supervision, the review of taped counseling sessions,
feedback from peers, and various modes of questioning which help supervisees reflect upon the
cognitive, affective, and perceptual processes of counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). In
addition to supporting left-brain functions, it is recognized that these traditional supervision
methods offer some support of nonverbal communication, creativity, and intuition as well. Yet, a
review of the literature indicates that nonverbal techniques and interventions more closely
associated with the development of creative and intuitive attributes are far less frequently
discussed in publications than traditional supervision interventions.

Creative Interventions in Supervision

Because right-hemispheric brain functioning is associated with creativity and intuition, it
is not surprising that the right-brained supervisory interventions discussed in the literature tend to
be creative in nature. Visual art (Lett, 1993, 1995; Wilkins, 1995), stone sculpting (Robbins &
Erismann, 1992), relationship sculpting (Lewis, 1983), music (Bird, Merrill, Mohan, Summers,
& Woodward, 1999; Laughlin, 2000), and play therapy (Dean, 2001) have been reviewed in
publications on supervision methods. Techniques to guide supervisees in developing visual
representations of their professional genealogy have also been discussed in this literature (Getz
& Protinsky, 1994; Magnuson, 2000). Although a variety of approaches are detailed, a review of
the literature revealed no quantitative studies and only two qualitative studies on the efficacy of
these creative supervision approaches. M. J. Laughlin conducted the most recent study in 2000;
W. R. Lett conducted an earlier study in 1995.

In Laughlin’s (2000) study of five family-therapy doctoral supervisees, it was contended
that the use of a musical improvisation method in supervision facilitated the development of a
blend of practical and intuitive skills in supervisees. In a less formal analysis of the use of music
in supervision, five music therapy graduate students were said to have found the creative
supervision intervention in which they engaged, not only beneficial with client issues, but also
helpful in developing themselves personally (Bird et al., 1999). In Lett’s (1995) study of five
post-training supervisees, the author found the use of art facilitated the resolution of issues
affecting counseling relationships and that this use of art also attributed to an increased level of self-understanding during the clinical supervision process.

The teaching function of supervision is equally important in the use of creative interventions. This method of supervision serves two purposes: (1) it offers a venue for self-exploration and (2) it teaches supervisees a concrete skill for working with their own clients. Whether or not the second purpose translates into increased use of creative interventions with supervisees’ clients is unknown.

Because very little feedback is available about the supervisee’s perspective on creative supervision approaches, it is difficult to determine if certain supervisees show a stronger preference for creative approaches than other supervisees. It seems plausible that those who are more creative may enjoy creative clinical supervision interventions more than those who are less creative. Such a determination would be relevant to counseling supervisors working to determine the most appropriate interventions for supervisees. However, no literature was found which specifically addressed this issue.

Statement of the Problem

Although the literature suggests a need for the integration of more creative interventions into the clinical supervision process, no quantitative studies and only two qualitative studies were found about such interventions. A more empirical understanding of creative supervision methods is necessary to further the development and integration of this element of supervision.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore whether visual art enhances the clinical supervision process. Whether or not supervisees found the use of art in supervision to be enjoyable, beneficial, and how to increase their own use of art.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions were proposed:
(1) Do participants enjoy supervision involving art tasks?
(2) Do participants perceive supervision involving art tasks to be beneficial?
(3) Do participants use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks?
(4) Do participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ enjoyment of supervision involving art tasks?
Do participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ perceived benefit derived from supervision involving art tasks?

Do participants’ creativity levels correlate with whether they use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks?

In turn, the following hypotheses were proposed for study:

1. Participants will enjoy supervision involving art tasks.
2. Participants will perceive supervision involving art tasks to be beneficial.
3. Participants will use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks.
4. Participants’ creativity levels will positively correlate with their enjoyment of supervision involving art tasks.
5. Participants’ creativity levels will positively correlate with their perceived benefit derived from supervision involving art tasks.
6. Participants’ creativity levels will positively correlate with whether they use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks.

Methodology and Data Analysis

The art task intervention was used in the clinical supervision of master’s-level counseling internship students at two Universities in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. (The rationale for choosing art tasks specifically will be discussed in the following chapter.)

The study took place during the spring 2003 semester. Demographic information was collected and two creativity assessments were administered to measure participants’ levels of creativity. An exit questionnaire was also given to participants to measure whether or not they deemed the interventions enjoyable and beneficial, and to learn if they used these art tasks in counseling their own clients.

Demographic information and likert-scaled responses on the Exit Questionnaire were reported using percentages. Likert-scaled responses on the Exit Questionnaire were also correlated with participants’ creativity levels. Qualitative responses on the Exit Questionnaire were summarized and reported.

Definition of Terms

There are several terms which will be used throughout this manuscript which are defined below:
• **Counseling** is a process through which mental health professionals utilize helping skills and interventions to assist people in achieving their goals.

• **Creativity** is defined as a set of personological attributes which “includes imaginativeness, unconventionality, independence, intuitiveness, and ego strength” (Gough, Hall, & Bradley, 1996, p. 281).

• **Master’s-level counseling internship students** refers to supervisees obtaining a master's degree in counseling who are in a nine-month internship providing counseling services at a community school, agency, or organization, and are receiving clinical supervision of their counseling skills and interventions.

• **Group supervision** is the provision of clinical supervision in a group format.

• **Supervisees** refers to those who are engaged in clinical supervision. They may be students or post-degree therapists.

• **Supervision** is a method by which the professional services provided by less experienced mental health therapists are monitored by more senior therapists.

**Assumptions and Limitations**

Because the supervision environment is an evaluative one, the possibility existed that participants would attempt to increase their perceived desirability in the supervision environment. This may have occurred through their creative expression. Participants may have either consciously omitted items from their creative exploration, or the discussion of their work, because of the hierarchy that exists in the supervisory relationship. Such omissions may have affected participants’ level of benefit from the interventions. Efforts to increase this perceived desirability may also have occurred in participants’ responses on assessments and questionnaires. The potential impact of this evaluative environment on the honesty with which issues were explored, and responses were given, must be considered.

It is also important to recognize that not all adults are comfortable expressing themselves creatively. This discomfort may have affected participants’ ability to fully engage in the intervention. It may have also detracted from the perceived benefit of using a creative intervention in supervision.

This study was one of the few that explored the use of a creative intervention in supervision. There is little published information upon which to base the methodology for study.
Therefore, there were no previous experiences from which to learn, increasing the possibility that unanticipated concerns about the methodology may arise.

Due to the population studied, there was a limitation as well. The intensive nature of an internship course requires that enrollment be restricted. Because class sizes are small, the sample in this study was limited. This necessitates that the results be viewed with statistical caution.

It is important to recognize that the participants who engaged in this study were from satellite campuses of large universities. Both campuses are located in suburbs of the District of Columbia, and traditionally attract working professionals. Therefore, the data collected in this study, and the resultant findings, may not be generalizable to other populations.

Finally, it must be noted that the primary researcher administered the art task intervention to some of the participants, as well as collected and analyzed the study’s data. This dual relationship (of both conducting the study and administering the intervention) creates a greater possibility of the researcher biasing the results than would exist if neither person administering the intervention were involved in the analyzing of the data.

Summary

It is important to continually assess and improve upon the methods by which mental health students are trained. It is suggested that a systematic evaluation of factors that may enhance clinical supervision would provide additional information about how to better support students in their supervision experience. In a field in which client welfare is of primary importance any method that improves upon of the supervision of mental health therapists is deemed of significance. Although this study would focus on students in the counseling profession, the implications of the results would be useful in all mental health clinical supervision environments.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, clinical supervision methods integrating creativity will be more extensively reviewed. The benefits of using one specific mode of creative expression will also be discussed. Literature related to measuring creativity as a construct, and to creativity overall, will be examined. Traits associated with creative people, and factors potentially affecting the development of creativity will be reviewed.

Creative Interventions in Supervision

Publications exist which discuss modes of integrating creative approaches into the supervision of mental health therapists. Proposed creative methods range from very concrete and directed pictorial representations of information (e.g. genograms), to free form abstract expression (e.g. music and undirected art). Although the integration of these supervision methods is detailed in publications, the reported efficacy of most of these approaches is not research-supported.

Genograms

Magnuson (2000) utilized concrete visual representations in supervision. The author used a genogram (a visual representation of interpersonal relationships and dynamics) in helping counseling supervisees develop their professional identities. In developing a professional genogram, the author contended that supervisees become more aware of the identities and background of their own supervisors and mentors. In this way, the author suggested supervisees are looking at their professional family tree, and may notice influences on their own views of human nature as well as their approaches to effect change with clients. The author suggested that by exploring their professional lineage, supervisees are exploring their own professional identities.

Getz and Protinsky (1994) also discussed an approach to integrating genograms into clinical supervision. The method, which was proposed for the supervision of marriage and family therapy supervisees, has also been used in training doctoral level students to become clinical supervisors themselves. The supervisees on whom they reported met for weekly supervision and were expected to do readings on Bowenian theory, research their own families, and create genograms of their families. These genograms were used to help supervisees identify family-of-origin issues which may affect their ability to effectively counsel clients. Getz and Protinsky
suggested that the use of genograms in supervision supported supervisees in becoming more aware of family dynamics and facilitated their ability to differentiate between emotional and intellectual functioning. In doing so, the authors contended that supervisees could not only directly address issues that arose, but also could identify how these issues may affect the therapist-client relationships in which they were engaged. The authors identified three main issues when working with supervisees: over- and under-functioning in relationships; how supervisees distance themselves or pursue others when dealing with conflict; and how supervisees triangulate, or bring in a third party, often unconsciously, to stabilize a relationship. Finally, the authors identified issues related to dynamics (parallel process and isomorphism) within the various therapeutic levels of the relationship.

**Sandtray Technique**

Another mode of integrating visual representation into supervision is the sandtray, which was utilized to support marriage and family therapy supervisees in their development (Dean, 2001). In this method, Dean provided clients with a container filled with sand, small objects, and water while a supervisee observed. The supervisor allowed clients to explore either with or without direction depending on the issues presented. It was explained to clients that this mode of expression may facilitate the exploration of issues which are difficult to put into words. In supervision, the supervisor facilitated the supervisee’s exploration of the relational and experiential aspects of creating a sandtray with the clients. The author contended that this process enabled supervisees to take a “metaposition” (Dean, p. 177) regarding family dynamics versus becoming enmeshed in the clients’ dynamics. Supervisees’ reactions were then processed in supervision and instruction was provided to help them determine how to therapeutically use these reactions in future sessions with the clients.

Dean (2001) suggested that this process helps to externalize relationship dynamics, and is helpful to both clients and supervisees. The author hypothesized that this process may create increased awareness and facilitate an understanding of issues in a new way. In the same vein, it may work to highlight interpersonal concerns of which one was not previously aware. Because of the proposed method of interacting with clients as consultant, the author hypothesized that this process also modeled for supervisees how to be a facilitator for clients versus an interpreter.

Dean (2001) went on to propose future applications which would more directly utilize the sandtray technique with supervisees. The author suggested asking supervisees to use the sandtray
to depict their own family-of-origin and familial patterns. Of a less personal nature, the author also suggested using this technique with supervisees when they present client cases to supervisors.

**Stone Sculpting**

Robbins and Erismann (1992) utilized a supervision approach offering a more free form venue, sculpting. A 5-day workshop was held which focused on a verbal case presentation format in the mornings and stone sculpting in the evenings. In discussing the utility of this approach, the leaders drew analogies between the act of sculpting and working with clients (e.g. comfort with tools and techniques; response to imperfection or incomplete work). A basic premise of the workshop was that the unconscious will most often “spill out” (Robbins & Erismann, p. 370) in artwork. The uncovering of unconscious material was proposed to be helpful in working through therapeutic issues.

Robbins and Erismann (1992) contended that sculpting offers a venue through which counter transference may be worked through. However, the authors cautioned that although facilitators may provide interpretations and meanings in this process for therapists to ponder, the process is focused on facilitating treatment, not on absolute truths. Although the authors noted that art cannot replace therapy, they suggested that this form of processing offers unique self-knowledge.

**Relationship Sculpting**

Another method of sculpting in supervision involves using actual people in the process. In this method, individuals are arranged in “various physical positions that represent their relation to each other at a particular moment in time” (Costa, 1991, p. 123). Lewis (1983) used this type of sculpting as one of many techniques with supervisees to facilitate the development of supervisees’ right brain functioning. Other techniques included using metaphors and anecdotes; noticing language choice; discussing issues symbolically; attending to affect; and learning from the way children communicate (Lewis). The author contended that sculpting relationships helps supervisees see dynamics of which they were previously unaware. According to the author, this method helped one supervisee become cognizant of, and break, a long-established pattern with a client family.
Music

Bird et al. (1999) also proposed a creative approach to supervision. However, unlike the other interventions discussed, their method focused on a peer supervision model. The supervision group consisted of five music therapy graduate students, met for a period of four years, and was designed to lessen feelings of isolation and uniqueness. The group initially met once a month and then progressed to two times a month.

Each member of the group was assigned a certain role for each meeting. For example, one group member was expected to present professional or personal material for that session and to dictate the structure of that day’s group. Another group member was to act as a recorder and take and distribute minutes of meetings. Another member was the grounder who provided a five-minute opening exercise to focus the group before beginning supervision. Another member was the timekeeper. One member each week was not assigned a specific role.

The group opened with a musical focusing activity which was followed by a verbal processing based on the material presented in the activity. Once these activities were completed, the group focused on the presenter’s concerns (Bird et al., 1999). Members of the group referred to the experience as cathartic and reportedly found that they became more comfortable with confrontation. They also examined their roles as therapists, received help with client concerns, and found the process to support them both personally and professionally. Self-report was the singular mode of data collected.

Also utilizing an aspect of music in supervision, Laughlin (2000) evaluated the method by which jazz musicians learn to improvise musically. The author then applied this knowledge to supervision and developed six stages in a supervisory relationship that facilitate improvisation. The six stages were: (a) orientation of supervisees toward improvisation, (b) helping supervisees see therapy as a relationship versus an individual technique, (c) seeing self as relationally connected to the client, (d) working to be thoughtful about one’s approach to counseling versus rote adherence to one model or theory, (e) being able to tolerate ambiguity, and (f) being able to find flexibility within the appropriate therapeutic framework.

In the first actual study cited in this review, Laughlin (2000) used a qualitative approach to evaluate a creative supervision intervention. The researcher observed five second-year family therapy doctoral supervisees who were in the practicum stage of their degree program. These supervisees were supervised with the overarching philosophy of creating a context for growth
and change versus having specific requirements for supervisees. Laughlin explored how this approach affected supervisees’ improvisational skills. Improvisation was seen as a dimension of creativity.

Research was collected in the fourth of six practica which lasted 14-weeks. The researcher attended each of the six-hour practicum sessions. Data were collected by way of tape-recording of all interactions before, during, and after the sessions. Data from phone calls between the supervisor and supervisees, informal conversations, and observations were used as well. Finally, pre- and post-practicum interviews were also used in collecting information (Laughlin, 2000).

It was found that this less-directive approach supported supervisees in developing themselves more creatively versus traditional models which support the mastery of basic counseling tasks. In this way, supervisees were supported in developing a blend of skills (Laughlin, 2000). A balance of technical mastery and the ability to improvise was suggested by Laughlin (2000) to be far more supportive of supervisees as well as their clients than traditional supervision.

Visual Art

Another avenue taken in exploring supervision issues in a creative way is that of visual art. Differing methods of using visual art in supervision are discussed in the literature. Some supervision approaches incorporate the use of art as one of several expressive interventions. Other approaches suggest visual art as the sole creative intervention in the supervision environment.

One supervision process, which used art tasks along with other modes of creative expression, used art, role reversal, and psychodrama (Wilkins, 1995). Wilkins rotated between the three techniques in stages with the artwork being used in the first stage of group supervision. During this stage, supervisees were paired and one took the role of observer while the other drew a representation of a client relationship. Once the art task was completed, the two explored the drawing with the observer taking on the role of facilitator (versus interpreter). The second stage entailed role reversal, again conducted in pairs. As with the first stage, one supervisee acted as a facilitator for this process, while the other took the role of a client. Finally, in the third stage, psychodrama was enacted as a group in which client relationships were explored in more depth.
Wilkins (1995) asserted that such techniques facilitated an awareness of previously unconscious material. The author hypothesized that supervisees developed a greater understanding of clients’ frameworks, as well as of issues that affected their ability to work effectively with clients. Wilkins also suggested that supervisees learned new skills through the use of these techniques, which resultantly improved their ability to intervene effectively with clients.

Clarkson and Leigh (1992) also discussed a supervision approach incorporating visual art. A supervision session was conducted with a supervisee who was completing her training in transactional analysis. This supervisee sought supervision with a goal to strengthen her thinking processes. The supervisors worked to facilitate this development and enhance the integration of her left and right hemispheric functioning. The supervisee was asked to engage in a number of activities, including singing, dancing, and taking on the persona of a client with whom she was working. The supervisee was also asked to engage in metaphoric visualization to facilitate the supervisee’s awareness of available resources to herself and others. Additionally, an art task was used to engage the supervisee in depicting how she believed her client saw her.

The authors (Clarkson & Leigh, 1992) suggested that the process heightened their, and the supervisee’s, awareness of the import of right-hemispheric functioning, and its integration with left-brain functions. They commented that this integration supports not only more enjoyment in the clinical process but increased effectiveness as well. The authors noted that this approach was developed specifically for work with this supervisee and did not suggest that it would be appropriate to apply to others.

Amundson (1988) also used visual art in supervising therapists, but proposed it as the sole creative intervention to be used. With this model, supervisees were asked to first focus on their clients and present client cases through “case drawing[s]” (p. 391) reflecting metaphors for client issues. The cases were then presented verbally. Once the cases were presented, supervisees were asked to shift their focus to the counseling relationship, versus client issues. A discussion ensued regarding relationship dynamics. At the end of this segment, supervisees were asked to redirect their attention to altering the initial drawing to encompass insights acquired through supervision and to reflect their newfound goals in counseling. Amundson suggested that this model supported supervisees in resolving dilemmas related to clients.
Lett (1993, 1995) conducted the second, and final study cited in this review of creative supervision interventions. Lett qualitatively explored the use of visual art as the sole creative intervention in the supervision of five post-training therapists. Lett utilized art with the goal of facilitating a “self-knowing” (1995, p. 315) in supervisees as they explored the therapist-client relationships in which they were engaged. This goal was to be accomplished through three-hour weekly group supervision sessions, which ran over 10 weeks. During supervision, supervisees were positioned at a table with a tape recorder and art supplies. They verbally presented cases simultaneously with drawing. In addition to the supervisees’ own personal verbal and nonverbal expression, the collective group process also reportedly supported their exploration.

All interactions were recorded with the supervisees’ consent. Within a week of each session, participants received transcribed text of the session and were asked to examine the text and share the main themes, as they perceived them. Lett (1995) then used the participants’ text to develop themes and meanings. These were then crosschecked with the participants themselves. From this data, the author developed a phenomenological understanding of individual supervisees’ experiences. He purposely did not pursue collective summaries of experiences, as he found this step to be in conflict with the overall goal of facilitating each person’s own self-understanding.

Lett contended that the use of art facilitated an externalization of internal processing allowing supervisees’ “elusive experience” (1995, p. 322) to be captured. Participants agreed with this assertion, and reported increased personal insight which resulted in improved counseling relationships. More specifically, one student studied originally expressed feelings of doubt and reticence through his artwork. However, he was able to work through these issues with this supervision method and reportedly became increasingly comfortable using more spontaneous interventions. This resulted in more productive work with his clients. Another student studied expressed indecisiveness with, and distance from, a client. As she explored these issues through art and discussion, she reported that she was able to tie these concerns to her family-of-origin. This awareness facilitated the resolution of these issues as they impacted her therapeutic relationships.

Most of these methods have been published in the form of theory and suggested supervision practices, not as research articles. Only two interventions discussed were subjected to empirical research, and both were qualitative studies. Lett’s (1993, 1995) supervision
approach using visual art and Laughlin’s (2000) work with the process of improvisation were the two interventions with research-supported reports of utility.

**Focusing on Visual Art**

Published supervision approaches did not exist in the field of art therapy until a little more than ten years ago. A model put forth in 1989 (Durkin, Perach, Ramseyer, & Sontag) was asserted by its authors to be the first one to integrate art into the training of art therapy students. This model was extremely general in its framework, merely offering insight into how two supervisory dyads split their focus between journal-writing and art-making. In 1993, Edwards reported that there was still little published in the art therapy field on this concept. Robbins and Erismann (1992) noted this lack of creatively based approaches in clinical supervision and stated “rarely does the traditional curriculum relate to the subject of therapeutic artistry” (p. 367). A review of the literature by this author revealed little progress in this area.

In looking at a related field, Laughlin (2000) stated that the literature “failed to provide much insight” (p. 56) into the integration of creativity into the supervision of marriage and family therapists. In the field of counseling, one article was relatively recently published in the *Journal of Counseling & Development* by Hammond and Gantt (1998). However, this article focused on the ethics of using art in counseling versus discussing a method per se. Hence, it appears that what is discussed here is fairly representative of what little has been published by mental health professionals regarding the integration of visual art methods into the training of therapists, within or outside of the art therapy field. Although quite lacking, it appears that there is far more literature to support the utility of visual art in counseling and supervision than any other method of creative exploration discussed. Thus, it is proposed that visual art offers a creative approach with enough preliminary support to suggest its utility in clinical supervision. Yet, additional empirical substantiation is needed to support this assertion.

**Benefits of Visual Art**

In addition to the literature discussed which does espouse the benefits of using art in the clinical supervision of mental health therapists (e.g. Calisch, 1994; Durkin et al., 1989; Edwards, 1993; Robbins & Erismann, 1992; Wilkins, 1995; Wix, 1995), an extensive body of literature linking the benefits of using art to the counseling of mental health clients exists as well (e.g. Appleton & Dykeman, 1996; Bertoia & Allan, 1988; Bloomgarden & Kaplan, 1993; Carson, 1999; Fryrear & Corbit, 1989; Omizo & Omizo, 1989; Snyder, 1997; Stiles & Mermer-Welly,
1998; Waller, 1992). These publications suggest that the use of visual art is supportive of exploring issues in a creative way, which supports the development of more creative life skills and personality traits. Many of the stated benefits of using visual art overlap with the traits associated with creative people.

Of crucial import to therapists, the development of creative problem-solving skills (Issacs, 1977) as well as divergent thinking is facilitated. “Imaginativeness, unconventionality, independence, intuitiveness, …ego strength” (Gough et al., 1996, p. 281), and enhanced self-esteem (Issacs; Omizo & Omizo, 1989) are purported benefits of using art. The development of relationships (Issacs) is supported, and nonverbal, as well as verbal, expression is facilitated (Issacs).

Visual art has been advocated as a mode of non-rational experiencing (Carson, 1999), and as an extremely useful tool in accessing previously unconscious material (Robbins & Erismann, 1992). This access to unconscious material may be useful to supervisees as they explore personal and interpersonal dynamics of which they are yet unaware. In this way, art becomes facilitative of an awareness which may support supervisees in self-understanding, both personally and professionally. Such awareness and self-understanding also support supervisees in the integration of their many traits and attributes and in learning to recognize themselves as distinct individuals (Bloomgarden & Kaplan, 1993).

In addition to gaining increased self-understanding, art has also been discussed as a venue for risk-taking and growth (Stiles & Mermer-Welly, 1998). Although this assertion was made regarding adolescent girls being supported in developing their identities, it appears that art can be a useful tool in helping others develop their own identities as well. Specifically, art may support mental health counseling supervisees in their growth as professionals (Wadeson, 1995). In addition to facilitating supervisees’ development, preserving this artwork can also provide a lasting chronicle of supervisees’ developmental processes (Wix, 1995).

Beyond the exploration of current roles, Wadeson (1995) noted that art tasks may also be used to facilitate supervisees’ exploration of their professional role to come. In this way, art may be a venue to confront some of the fears, issues, and concerns surrounding upcoming roles. The author went on to discuss how supervisees can explore client and professional relationships, as well as their current feelings about their work and their internship placements. Thus, art is seen
as a venue for not only the exploration of current clinical and professional issues, but also for the development of professional identity, and as a mode for exploring future professional concerns.

An Isomorphic Relationship

The benefits of using art in supervision extend beyond the benefits the person directly engaged in the creative task experiences. Integrating art into the supervision process may not only support the resolution of an impasse in supervision, but of a therapeutic impasse with clients as well (Carson, 1999). Such an impasse is often the result of unconscious material which inadvertently slows progress in a helping relationship. Often, when working in a therapeutic as well as a supervisory relationship, a parallel process will be seen between these relationships. What occurs in one situation is frequently repeated in the other. Thus, the resolution of an issue that directly affects one relationship in the system indirectly supports the other relationship as well. In this case, both the supervision and the counseling relationship, or the supervisee and the client, would be helped.

Supervisees also vicariously benefit from the integration of art even when it is used with their clients, versus using it directly themselves. This use of art with clients is purported to enhance supervisee functioning, and to facilitate a shift in supervisee thinking from linear to systemic (Van Velsor & Cox, 2000). Issacs (1977) postulated that the benefits of using art even reaches to extended associations of the therapeutic relationship. Families of clients and other helping professionals (e.g. teachers) involved in the therapeutic system may benefit as well (Issacs, 1977).

Regardless of whether proponents advocate for the use of art in counseling or supervision, the benefits may be seen as supportive of the growth of both clients and supervisees, as well as the systems with which they are involved. Carson (1999) stated that art in supervision can be used as a way to model creativity and facilitate the development of problem-solving skills with supervisees and clients. Thus, the goals of counseling and supervision cannot be easily separated. Just as counseling is reflective and educational, so is supervision. That which affects one level of the process affects the other. Counseling and supervision are both on the same continuum (Edwards, 1993).

Creativity Defined and Measured

Although creative interventions appear to have a wide range of uses, it is plausible that individuals’ creativity levels may affect their perceptions of, and experiences with, these
interventions. Individuals who are more creative may perceive creative interventions more positively than those who are less creative. Exploring the construct of creativity may help to facilitate an understanding of how this variable relates to individuals’ perceptions of the utility of creative interventions.

Defining creativity is a difficult task; little consensus appears to exist about the definition of this construct. In general, creativity may be defined by creative product, creative process, or creative ability or potential (Barron & Harrington, 1981; Tryk, 1968). It may also be viewed “as an aspect of the total person” (Tryk, 1968, p. 35). Numerous assessments exist which attempt to measure an individual’s propensity for creativity from a variety of viewpoints, including that of visual preference, verbal product, divergent thinking, divergent feeling, creative thinking through sound, independence of judgment, and originality in how one perceives nebulous objects (Shaughnessy, 1995). Much of what exists focuses on measuring creativity in children; far less has been developed for determining creativity levels in adults. Two of the predominant assessments in existence for exploring creativity in adults focus on visual preference (the Barron-Welsh Art Scale) and verbal product (the Remote Associates Test). Because these two assessments measure creativity in adults, they will be discussed in more depth here. For a more comprehensive overview of other existing creativity measures, readers are directed to Shaughnessy’s (1995) overview and Tryk’s (1968) more in-depth discussion on this topic.

As discussed, one measure for assessing creativity in adults is the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, developed by George Welsh and Frank Barron (1949). Barron (1969) defined creativity as “the ability to bring something new into existence” (p. 10), and discussed the measurement of creativity in terms of preferences for types of visual art, manifested in sketches of varying form (Barron, 1990). The choices made between these sketches are considered perceptual preferences for either that which is simple and symmetrical, or that which is complex and asymmetrical. To operationalize creativity, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale contains images that are either representational or abstract. When taking this assessment, individuals choose images they prefer. In doing so, they make choices about whether they prefer to attend to that which is orderly and stable (i.e. representational), or that which is arbitrary and relative (i.e. abstract). Although this instrument originated as a determination of creative interest and potential, over time it has evolved into a valid measure of one’s level of actual creativity as well (Gough et al., 1996).
In contrast to Barron’s focus on visual preferences, Mednick (1968) focuses on the verbal processes in creativity. Mednick defined creativity as the ability to form “mutually distant associative elements [words] into new combinations which are useful and meet specified as well as unforeseen requirements” (p. 213). Mednick explored creative thinking from the perspective that a person who could generate associations between loosely related words was deemed more creative than one who could not. The more remotely associated the words, and the greater the number of “requirements the solution meets” (Mednick, p. 213), the more creative the individual. To measure creativity in this way, Mednick developed the Remote Associates Test (RAT). This test measures one’s ability to create links, or associations, between multiple sets of words. Those who are deemed more creative when using the RAT are those who respond with more “correct” associations between the test words. This assessment has been referred to as “one of the best known attempts at measuring the trait of creativity” (Dailey, 1978, p. 1031).

The Genesis of Creativity Research

In the last decade, the construct of creativity in clinical supervision has received increased attention in the literature. However, interest in creativity in the clinical profession is not new. Professional interest in this construct dates back to the end of World War II. Before this time, mental health professionals had concentrated on mental illness (diagnosing client deficiencies) versus wellness (determining traits of healthy people). However, after the war, a need for measures that would determine positive, versus negative, attributes in people (especially those fighting wars), was deemed essential (Barron, 1969). As a result, this period in history brought with it an increased focus on psychological health and its various components.

Five years after the end of the war, however, little fruit from the labors in exploring the concept of creativity was in published form. In 1950, J.P. Guilford, parting president of the American Psychological Association, stated that at that time “only 186 out of 121,000 entries in Psychological Abstracts dealt with creative imagination” (Barron & Harrington, 1981, p. 440). This one comment by Guilford has been credited as the impetus which spurred much of the subsequent exploration of creativity as a research construct (Barron & Harrington). After Guilford’s statement, creativity increasingly became a focus of research (Benjamin, 1984; Pesut, 1990). By 1956, the number of research entries in Psychological Abstracts had doubled (Barron, 1969). More debate and discussion about creativity began to occur, and in 1967, The Journal of
Creative Behavior was launched (Barron, 1969). By the 1970’s, approximately 250 publications per year specifically focused on creativity (Barron & Harrington).

Although Guilford’s statement was credited with much of the surge of creative research to come, around the same time of Guilford’s address, work regarding creativity had already begun on several fronts. A group of researchers was investigating “personal effectiveness” (Barron, 1969, p. 6) at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research. The Rorschach, known for its ambiguous inkblots, had been developed (Tryk, 1968) by a psychiatrist of the same name. Ann Roe had already begun researching scientific creativity. And a study of imagination, Murray’s Thematic Apperception Test, had been developed. Other upcoming names in the field of creative research, Thurstone who was working with creativity within the measure of intelligence, and Torrance, who was exploring divergent thinking in children, had begun studying the creative process as well (Barron, 1969).

**Traits of Creative People**

As a result of this increased focus on creativity, a great deal of information about the characteristics of creative people is available. One study in this arena was done by Hammer when working with 18 high school students enrolled in a painting workshop at New York University. Students were categorized as either lacking creativity, moderately creative, or very creative. An in-depth analysis of the very creative students’ qualities offered a composite of the genuinely creative…[as those who] showed greater depth of feeling, stronger determination and ambition, independence, rebelliousness, tolerance of discomfort, greater need for self-expression as well as range of emotion, self-awareness, and an integration of feminine and masculine components in their natures (Barron, 1969, p. 127). Descriptions of the two other categories were not provided in Barron’s text. Benjamin (1984) also detailed a lengthy list of traits associated with creative people. Flexibility, “openness to new ideas…tolerance for ambiguity…curiosity…enthusiasm…imagination…playfulness…commitment…comfort with change…capacity for hard work…persistence, [and]…self-confidence” (p. 2) were creative traits Benjamin discussed. Akin to this lengthy list of attributes, Carson (1999) shared that “common characteristics of creative people include…acceptance of self, others, and nature; a democratic character structure; confidence; intrinsic motivation; [and] a wide range of interests” (p. 328).
**Traits of Creative Therapists**

Carson (1999) also specifically discussed the nature of creativity in mental health therapists. The author reinforced the importance of therapists recognizing and understanding their emotions, being cognizant of, and able to separate from, power imbalances in primary systems (e.g. families), and being able to express themselves constructively and safely. Carson asserted that these challenges are often accomplished when divergent thinking is utilized.

Thus, Carson (1999) stated that “creative therapists are also more likely to take risks, be willing to fail, and combine sensitivity, open-mindedness, and divergent thinking with more traditional scientific behaviors and modes of cognizing that include rigorousness, convergence, impartiality, objectivity, and tough-mindedness” (p. 330). Carson explained that therapists who have a capacity to intuit and state “hunches,” recognize connections and patterns in family systems, integrate and synthesize information, use metaphorical logic and communication, and engage in frequent checking and hypothesizing with clients…often seem to facilitate the process of discovery and change, regardless of whether their stated hunches are accurate. (1999, p. 331)

**Intelligence and Creativity**

It is possible that people, who display creative traits such as those described, may also be considered intelligent by those around them (Barron & Harrington, 1981). Thus, it is not surprising that discussions about creativity are often linked to discussions about intelligence (Barron, 1969; Barron & Harrington; Guilford, 1988). One model designed to measure the construct of intelligence is Guilford’s (1966, 1982, 1988) Structure-of-Intellect model.

Guilford’s (1966, 1982, 1988) model measures many personological traits and attributes as elements of intelligence, one of which is creativity. Specifically, Guilford (1988) views creativity as a cognitive process of human intellect. Individuals’ creativity is utilized through memory retrieval processes. Guilford (1988) categorized the two elements of memory retrieval as divergent production of semantic units (i.e. divergent thinking) and convergent production of semantic units (i.e. convergent thinking). According to Guilford (1982), “research showed that…[specifically] divergent production…[is] often seen in the process of elaborating upon ideas, such as conclusions or completed products of creative thinking” (pp. 152-153). Guilford stated that memory retrieval operations are related to problem solving, as well as decision making, and creative thinking (1985).
Linking intelligence and creativity in a different way, Barron (1969) discussed the baseline intelligence quotient (IQ) necessary for an individual to be able to engage in a creative activity, and suggested that it is relatively low. He also stated that, among those who have a sufficient baseline IQ to participate in creative tasks, creativity appears to have little correlation with intelligence. However, in a later work, Barron and Harrington (1981) stated that creative adults tend to achieve higher scores on intelligence tests. The authors went on to discuss their uncertainty about the rationale for this correlation.

In an attempt to determine whether intelligence and creativity are related, Torrance set about “tabulating 178 correlation coefficients reported in the literature” (Barron, 1969, p. 49) for intelligence and creativity measures. None of these correlations suggested a statistically significant relationship between the two constructs (Barron, 1969). Because intelligence and creativity are seemingly unrelated, it appears that creative expression has potential utility with people of varying levels of intelligence.

_Can Creativity Be Cultivated?

Because such positive attributes are associated with creative people, and creative tasks appear to be feasible with multiple populations, it then becomes of interest if and how creativity can be supported. A prominent name in the science of human behavior, B. F. Skinner, postulated that creative behavior, when it occurs, can be reinforced, but that creativity cannot be taught (Evans, 1968). However, it has been suggested that even Skinner, with his deterministic view of creativity, has produced experimental results which suggest, at minimum, that creative behavior can be shaped by outside interventions (Throne, 1976).

It appears that these outside interventions can not only support, but also inhibit, the development of creative behavior. Information compiled from studies conducted by Torrance suggests that creative children were often described by friends as “having ‘silly ideas,’ or ‘naughty ideas,’ or [were] thought of as ‘wild’ by their teachers” (Barron, 1969, p.127). It seems likely that students who are deemed “wild” would be perceived less positively by their teachers than other students. Such negative perceptions appear to not only affect students’ grades (Barron, 1969) but future displays of creativity as well. As early as the third grade, students may learn to suppress their originality (Barron, 1969). Doing so may actually enhance, not only their peers’ perceptions of them, but their teachers’ perceptions of them as well. If teachers’ views are enhanced, students’ grades may be positively affected as well.
Leo Buscaglia, an educator known for encouraging creative thinking, summarized his view of the genesis of teachers’ negative associations with creative students. Buscaglia (1982) postulated that when an art teacher asks students to draw a tree, the teacher typically means for students to mimic the teacher’s representation of a tree, versus create a representation of their own understanding of the object. If a child deems the teacher’s representation as inaccurate based on his experience, a disconnect occurs between what is expected and what is created. Buscaglia (1982) explained

But here was little Junior who knew that wasn’t a tree because he’d seen a tree such as this art teacher had never experienced! He’d fallen out of a tree, chewed a tree, smelled a tree, sat in the branches of a tree, listened to the wind blow through the leaves of a tree, and he knew that her tree was a lollipop. So he got magenta, and orange, and blue, and purple, and green, and he scribbled it all over his page and happily brought it up and gave it to her. (p. 13)

The teacher receives this drawing with grave concerns about the child’s mental ability. Thus, Sandler (1983) asks the reader how long does it take for a person to realize the true message is, “If you want to pass (here we can read instead ‘get an A,’ ‘keep up your GPA,’ ‘go to law school,’ ‘get a job’) don’t draw your tree, draw my tree” (p. 33).

It appears that, although teachers, even art teachers, may believe they wish their students to display creativity, their actions suggest that they disapprove of such creative traits in their students. In attempt to gain approval and scholastic recognition from their teachers, students may well stifle this creativity (Sandler, 1983). Being that school-aged children spend a significant amount of their day with teachers, this pressure to conform is extremely important to recognize. If children’s creativity is obscured at such an early age, this skill may be left undeveloped without focused academic intervention to counter this suppression.

However, tentative research does suggest that courses focused on developing creativity positively impact students’ creative abilities (Benjamin, 1984). Thus, it is possible that educational experiences influence, not only the suppression of, but also the development of, creativity. Just as teachers’ disapproval can work to suppress creativity, when teachers are more involved in, and supportive of, the cultivation of this creativity, this skill is more likely to develop (Benjamin, 1984; Sandler, 1983).
Summary

Given the wide body of literature supporting the benefits of art in therapeutic relationships, it is surprising that more attention is not directed towards creative approaches in clinical supervision. Carson (1999) pointed out that creativity is discussed within numerous commonly used counseling theories. Specifically, Freud addressed creativity within the defense mechanism of sublimation and Adler discussed creativity as an indication of growth. Humanistic theories view creativity as inherent in risk and growth, and Gestalt theorists advocate for the need to enact new behaviors so that integration may occur. Cognitive therapies see divergent thinking as an essential prerequisite to change. And, existential theorists support risk-taking and, therefore, creative experiencing.

When reflecting upon all of the ways in which therapists work to facilitate creative expression in clients, it stands to reason that therapists themselves would also find more creative expression a helpful part of their supervision experience. Furthermore, whether or not any perceived utility of creative supervision varies by preexisting levels of creativity would be helpful in understanding with what type of student, if any, supervision involving art tasks would be most appropriate. Yet, it appears that a very limited amount of research exists which provides insight into this issue. Thus, it is suggested that research directly focused on exploring creativity as it relates to supervision involving art tasks would be useful not only to mental health supervisors, but to supervisees as well.

The assertions in this chapter are based on the results of a literature review utilizing both ERIC and PsycInfo databases. As little information is available on certain aspects of the topic being discussed, these searches were conducted with no limitation on the years to be reviewed. A more focused survey was also done of the past ten years for the Journal of Counseling & Development, the Journal of Mental Health Counseling, The Arts in Psychotherapy, Art Therapy: Journal of the American Art Therapy Association, and the Journal of Creative Behavior. Literature was searched utilizing key words specific to the use of art in supervision as well as peripheral topics related to supervision and creativity.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

A preliminary research design was discussed in chapter one regarding the use of visual art in clinical supervision. The methodology will be expanded upon in this chapter. The research design, setting of the study, and population researched will be described. Instrumentation will be discussed followed by the data collection and analysis procedures.

Research Design

A posttest only non-experimental design (Trochim, 2001) was used to examine whether art tasks enhanced the clinical supervision of master’s-level counseling internship students. The study explored the effects of an art task intervention on multiple groups yet lacked random assignment and had no control group. Multiple measures were used; however there was no pretest/posttest measure of changes from the beginning to the end of the study. Thus, the study is considered non-experimental (Trochim, 2001).

As discussed in chapter one, this research was guided by the following questions:

1. Do participants enjoy supervision involving art tasks?
2. Do participants perceive supervision involving art tasks to be beneficial?
3. Do participants use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks?
4. Do participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ enjoyment of supervision involving art tasks?
5. Do participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ perceived benefit derived from supervision involving art tasks?
6. Do participants’ creativity levels correlate with whether they use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks?

The dependent variables were operationalized using likert scaled questions. These three variables included: (1) participants’ level of enjoyment of the art task intervention, (2) participants’ level of benefit derived from the art task intervention, and (3) participant use of art tasks in counseling their own clients. The independent variable of “creativity” was operationalized using two formal assessments, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Remote Associates Test.
Setting and Participants

Students enrolled in the spring 2003 internship course at the satellite campuses of two Universities located in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area were asked to participate in the study. As courses at the satellite campuses of both Universities are typically held in the evenings, many of the students recruited were working professionals.

All students recruited were enrolled in a master’s degree program preparing them to become either school or community/agency counselors. Some course variation exists based on the University and students’ specific clinical focus, however all students’ master’s-level training culminates with a two-semester internship class. Prior to engaging in their internship course, all students were trained in basic counseling skills, techniques, and theories. The internship course provides supervised field experiences in which students are expected to demonstrate their ability to integrate classroom training and apply it to a clinical environment. Students are expected to develop as professionals and to demonstrate an understanding of the ethical standards of the profession. An overarching goal exists of facilitating the development of internship students into effective counselors.

The internship classes met an average of 1½ hours each week of the semester. One University chose to meet every other week for three hours each time, totaling eight group supervision sessions. The other University internship class met every week for 1½ hours, totaling 13 group supervision sessions. Students met with their individual supervisors regularly as well.

Students at both universities were required to come to class prepared to discuss cases of clients with whom they were currently working. The methods of supervision involved either viewing a video-taped or listening to an audio-taped session of the student and the client, or presenting a case study and receiving feedback from both peers and the University supervisor. Administrative issues were handled during the class time as well.

A total of 32 students (15 at one University and 17 at the other University) were asked to participate in this study, thus utilizing the convenience sampling method of recruiting appropriate participants because they were accessible to the researcher. The only criterion for participation was that the student was enrolled in the master’s level counseling internship course at one of the two Universities.
Instrumentation

According to the literature, there are several valid and reliable assessments of creativity designed for working with children; however, only a few valid, reliable, and commercially available assessments of creativity designed for working with adults were noted. Among the many assessments appropriate for use with children are Frank Williams’ Creativity Assessment Packet, the Starkweather Originality Test, the Group Inventory for Finding Creative Talent, and the Kranz Talent Identification Instrument (Shaughnessy, 1995).

Tryk (1968) categorized creativity assessments appropriate for adults as measuring (1) an actual capacity which exists from early in life (e.g. Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking), (2) a way of thinking (e.g. the Remote Associates Test, Welch’s Reorganization Test, Flanagan’s Ingenuity Test, and McReynolds Obscure Figures Test), or (3) an integral, and inseparable, part of a whole person (e.g. the Barron-Welsh Art Scale). Of creativity measures for adults Tryk stated, “only in the Torrance tests of creative thinking, and…the Remote Associates Test, is there…evidence of a similar commitment [as in intelligence tests] to careful test construction and adequate documentation” (1968, p. 52). With the Torrance tests however, “scoring is difficult and training in scoring procedures [are] hard to procure” (Shaughnessy, 1995, p. 8), making use of this assessment prohibitive.

The Remote Associates Test is said to have both predictive and construct validity (Fodor, 1995). It is also described as well constructed and has been called “the most thoroughly documented and…widely used” assessment (Tryk, 1968, p. 40) when compared to other assessments of creative thinking. A review in 1989 (Dacey) asserted that the Remote Associates Test was the only attempt at measuring creativity that is psychometrically successful. Thus, the Remote Associates Test appears to be more appropriate for use in studying creative thinking than other assessments measuring the same construct (e.g. Welch’s Reorganization Test, Flanagan’s Ingenuity Test, and McReynolds’ Obscure Figures Test).

Although Tryk’s review did not strongly endorse another creativity measure, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, this scale has repeatedly been shown to significantly “differentiate among [and] within groups [of adults] according to…creativity” (Gough et al., 1996, pp. 278-279). This scale has been the subject of numerous studies with thousands of participants and referenced in over 200 publications.
Thus, when accounting for the validity, reliability, suitability, and accessibility of the instruments and scoring methods, two assessments were deemed most appropriate for measuring creativity in this study. Although these two assessments, the Remote Associates Test and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, were developed 36 and 54 years ago respectively, a review of the available assessments by this author indicates that they remain two of the most valid, reliable, and accessible measures of creativity in adults.

The first assessment, the Remote Associates Test, is a paper and pencil assessment developed by Sarnoff Mednick (1967) to measure an individual’s creative mental capacity (see Appendix C). Three related words are given for each of the 30 test items. Test-takers are asked to give one word that creates a common association between all three words provided. For example, the test may give the three words “teacher fruit eye” and ask the participants to provide a word (e.g. apple) that ties all three words together. There is only one correct answer for each word triad. Final scores are the total number of triads for which the subject gave the “correct” associative word. Test-takers are given 40 minutes to complete the assessment (Mednick, 1968). If no answer is given for a triad, that lack of response to the test question is treated as an incorrect answer.

The Remote Associates Test’s reliability is reasonably high with odd-even reliability ranging from .86-.92, alternate form reliability at .81 (Tryk, 1968), and Spearman Brown at or above .91 (Mednick, 1968). Normative data is based on samples of college students, including psychology graduate students (Mednick, 1962). The scale’s validity is also sufficiently high with a .70 agreement with other creativity rating measures (Mednick, 1962; Tryk), suggesting that it is a good measure of the construct of creativity.

One study was conducted at the University of California at Berkeley using the Remote Associates Test with a population of architecture students. (The number of students studied was not provided in the article.) Professor ratings of student creativity were correlated with scores on the Remote Associates Test. The professors had been working with the students they rated for a minimum of one year. Scores on the two assessments correlated at .70, p < .01 (Mednick, 1962), again suggesting that the Remote Associates Test is a good measure of creativity.

In another study with 35 first-year psychology graduate students at the University of Michigan, professors categorized their students as either high or low in their ability to develop creative research methods or approaches (Mednick, 1962). After categorization, eight students
remained in the high creative category and seven remained in the low creative category.

“Research creativity was defined as being demonstrated if the student developed new research methods and/or pulled together disparate theory or research areas in useful and original ways” (Mednick, p. 228). Use of Fisher’s exact test of probability suggested that ratings of student creativity level corresponded to scores on the Remote Associates Test so closely that “the probability of these events occurring by chance is less than .05” (Mednick, p. 228). This data provides additional support of the test as a creativity measure.

The construct of “creativity” was also operationalized using the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, developed by George Welsh and Frank Barron (1949). This scale was designed to measure an individual’s creative preferences (see Appendix D). The scale consists of 86 “black and white designs in [a] 3- by 50-inch format. The figures range from simple geometric forms to complex and diverse patterns, with variations for symmetry, quality, and freehand versus ruled preparation…” (Gough et al., 1996, p. 253). Test-takers are asked to determine whether they “like” or “dislike” each of the images and record their responses on an answer sheet. If participants have trouble differentiating between objects because they like, or dislike all of them, they are asked to try to differentiate between the degrees of these preferences. For example, participants who like all images are asked to rate the ones they like the most with a higher rating than the ones that they moderately like (Welsh, 1987). Total scores are based on the number of abstract drawings participants stated they liked.

Gough et al.’s (1996) summary of research on this scale noted that reliability measures are strong, with an odd-even reliability coefficient of .96, test-retest reliability coefficient at or above .90, and interjudge reliability at or above .92. The scale’s external validity is also high corresponding at or above .90 with other creativity measures (Gough et al.). Normative data as summarized by Gough et al. is based on 26 samples of men and 18 samples of women from many occupational areas, including psychology graduate students. Other samples include creative writers, research scientists, and business executives. Two of the samples were studied at the University of Montana; the other 42 samples were studied at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (Gough et al.). Sample sizes ranged from 3 to 259 participants. Ten of the 44 samples had fewer than 20 participants (Gough et al.).

Specifically focusing on psychology graduate students, researchers at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR) studied populations of 259 male and 162 female
participants. The Barron-Welsh Art Scale was administered, and scores on the scale were correlated with another creativity measure, the Revised Art Scale. Correlations between the two scales were .95 for men and .96 for women (Gough et al., 1996), indicating high correlations between the two measures.

The scale has also been correlated to the Adjective Checklist and California Q-set. Researchers at the IPAR used these two assessments to rate participants on multiple adjectives. All researcher responses for each participant were then combined and frequency counts were obtained for each descriptor on the checklist. The scores of each adjective for each participant were then correlated to scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale (Gough et al., 1996). This process was conducted with 567 male and 277 female participants. Adjectives most strongly correlated with high scores “on the [Barron-Welsh Art Scale] were ‘original,’ ‘artistic,’ and ‘curious’ [for men and]…’imaginative,’ ‘individualistic,’ and ‘artistic’ [for women]” (Gough et al., p. 277). Correlations were adequate, ranging from .23 to .32 and significant at the p < .01 level (Gough et al.).

Although this scale has been used in mental health studies, a review of the literature revealed no studies using the scale in studying a creative supervision intervention. (For a complete listing of the occupational focus of the 44 samples, and a comprehensive bibliography of the numerous studies incorporating this assessment, readers are directed to Gough et al.’s 1996 summary of the last 40 years of research on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale.)

Data Collection Procedures

Prior to the actual study, a pilot study was conducted with counseling students to help ensure the instructions, questions, and procedures were clear to participants. Following approval from the University Internal Review Board, the researchers arranged to meet with the internship students to discuss the purpose of the study. What follows is a script adhered to when discussing the study. It was explained to the participants:

A study will be conducted this semester on the use of art tasks in the supervision of school and community/agency counseling internship students. Those who voluntarily agree to participate in this study will engage in these art tasks during three of their regularly scheduled supervision group sessions. In addition to the art tasks, participants will be asked to complete two questionnaires, and two assessments. One questionnaire will request basic demographic information; the other questionnaire will be given at the
end of the semester to assess your experience using art in supervision. The two assessments will be the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Remote Associates Test.

The art tasks take approximately 20 minutes. Immediately following the art tasks, participants will discuss their art as a group for approximately one hour. In addition to the art tasks and subsequent discussions, the assessments and questionnaires will also be completed during class time. No work outside of the internship class is required.

There will be no penalty for not participating in this study. Participation is completely voluntary. Those who choose not to participate in the study will engage in the art tasks and discussion as part of their supervision group. However, they will not be asked to complete the assessments and questionnaires. Participation, or lack thereof, in this study will not affect your grade in this course.

Every effort will be made to protect the confidentiality of the information provided. Personal information, art tasks, and the subsequent discussions will be treated as confidential as any other supervisory communication. Personally identifiable responses on assessments and questionnaires will be accessible only to the researcher. Your University supervisor will not have access to the assessments and questionnaires.

The art tasks and subsequent discussions will be in a group environment. Therefore, other group members will be privy to the confidential information shared. Although all group members are asked to respect the confidentiality of the content of the sessions, it cannot be guaranteed that other study members will maintain confidentiality as well.

Individuals who choose to participate in this study will be asked to read and sign a form of consent, which will be provided by the researcher. Please review the document, and if you wish to participate in the study, sign the form and return it to the researcher today.

Interested students were then given the informed consent form (see Appendix A), to review and sign if they wished to participate.

Participants were then asked to complete a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B), the Remote Associates Test, and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. No instructions other than those provided with the questionnaire and assessments were given when administering the instruments.
The art task intervention was chosen to study because the researcher administered the intervention in previous supervision groups. Although deemed helpful, this perception of the intervention’s utility was not quantitatively researched prior to this study. After completing the informed consent, Demographic Questionnaire, Barron-Welsh Art Scale and Remote Associates Test, the first art task was introduced:

Today you will engage in the first art task. You are asked to create art which represents how you are experiencing your internship placement at this time. As you depict this experience, it is important to recognize that there are no expectations about the end product of this task. The art can be as representational or abstract as you would like. Artistic skill is not necessary to engage in this task. You may use any of the art media supplied for you and may use the paper in any way which you would like. You have 20 minutes to complete the task. Upon completion of the art task, all group members will convene to discuss their drawings. Please choose the supplies you would like to use for your art task and begin.

Participants had access to a variety of art media. Supplies included magic markers, watercolors, colored pencils, oil pastels, and chalk pastels. White 11x17 paper was used.

Once participants completed the art task, they were asked to date and title their art tasks. Participants and the researcher conducting the group then convened in a circle to discuss the participants’ art tasks. The researchers facilitated sharing and exploration of these art tasks in a fashion similar to facilitating group counseling. Participants were encouraged to share their art tasks, make links between each other’s art, ask open-ended questions, speak from their own experiences (versus giving advice), and share their own thoughts and emotions in reaction to each other’s art tasks. The researchers were as active or inactive as necessary to facilitate the group working in this way, and ensured that the group discussion did not exceed one hour.

This art task intervention was administered again during two other class meetings of the semester. All three sessions followed the exact same format; participants were given the same directive, materials, and time to complete each of the three art tasks. Participants were responsible for storing their own art tasks each time. The time utilized for each art task and subsequent discussion took approximately 1½ hours. After the intervention was completed, participants engaged in their regular supervision class with their University supervisor, if time allowed. Participants seeking support with issues, which could not be resolved during the art task
discussion, were directed to either their clinical supervisor, or a mental health therapist, depending upon the concern.

At the end of the third art task an exit questionnaire (see Appendix E) was given to participants for completion during that class meeting. No instructions other than those provided on the actual questionnaire were given. Participants returned responses to the instrument to the researcher immediately upon completion. Participants interested in the results of the study were directed to contact the researcher to obtain a copy of the results.

Researcher Qualifications

Two researchers administered the art task interventions. The primary researcher is a doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, who is a licensed professional counselor, a national certified counselor, and a certified alcohol and drug counselor. The researcher was trained for nine months in the administration of the art tasks as proposed in this study. The co-researcher is a University professor who has a doctoral degree in counseling, is a licensed professional counselor, and is a trained and certified art therapist.

Data Analysis

Information about participants’ gender, age, race, clinical focus, and type of internship placement was compiled using the demographic questionnaire (see Appendix B). All of these descriptors were categorical data and used for descriptive purposes. Percentages were tabulated for all of these variables. The distribution range was also calculated for the age descriptor. Participants’ creativity levels were measured using the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Remote Associates Test. Raw scores were tallied, the distribution range was calculated, and overall mean and median scores were computed.

The dependent variables (participants’ enjoyment, benefit, and use of art tasks with clients) were measured using likert scaled questions developed by the researcher (Appendix E); no psychometric data measuring these variables was found in the literature. Responses were reported using percentages. The chi square statistic was used to determine if a significant difference existed between participants’ use of art with clients from the fall semester to the spring. Dependent variables were correlated, using the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, to participants’ creativity levels. All quantitative data collected were analyzed using the Number Cruncher Statistical Systems (NCSS) software package. Qualitative data obtained from the exit questionnaire were summarized and reported.
The following table illustrates the timeline for the study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January-February 2003</td>
<td>Recruited participants, obtained informed consent, and administered the Demographic Questionnaire, Barron-Welsh Art Scale, and Remote Associates Test. Administered first art task intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2003</td>
<td>Administered second art task intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2003</td>
<td>Administered third art task intervention and Exit Questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Analyzed data and summarized findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>Presented study’s results to research committee for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2003</td>
<td>Study’s results available to participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This chapter detailed the methodology for a study of art tasks and creativity in the clinical supervision of master’s-level counseling internship students. The research design was outlined and the population studied was described. Instrumentation and data collection were discussed. And, a procedure for administering the art tasks was detailed with the intent of offering a process that could be replicated by future researchers.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether art tasks enhance clinical supervision. This chapter will review the demographic data of the sample studied. Results of the study will be discussed. Each research question will be specifically addressed.

Demographic Data

A total of 26 participants engaged in this study during their regularly scheduled internship course meeting time, representing 81% (n = 26) of those recruited for the study. All of those (19%; n = 6) who declined to participate were enrolled in an internship course during a time other than when the study was conducted. Over three-fourths (77%; n = 20) of participants were females and one-fourth (23%; n = 6) were males (see Figure 1). The participants ranged in age from 21-60 years (see Figure 2). The majority of participants were in the 21-30 (42%; n = 11) and 31-40 (42%; n = 11) year age groups. The majority of participants were Caucasian (65%; n = 17), followed by African-American (27%; n = 7). The remaining 8% (n = 2) were categorized as “Other” (see Figure 3). The category of “Other” included those of Hawaiian and Hispanic/Asian descent. All participants were training to be school counselors.

![Figure 1. Gender of Participants.](image1)

![Figure 2. Age of Participants.](image2)
During the course of the study, participants were interning in elementary school (19%; n = 5), middle school (19%; n = 5), high school (46%; n = 12), and college (4%; n = 1) settings. Twelve percent (n = 3) of participants were interning in multiple levels which constituted a combination of elementary, middle, and high school settings (see Figure 4). No community/agency counselors participated in this study.

Prior to the first art task intervention, participants were administered two creativity assessments, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Remote Associates Test. Higher scores on these assessments suggest higher levels of creativity. Creativity scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale ranged from 6 to 45, of a total possible score of 62. The overall mean score was 22.70, and the median score was 20.5. Scores on the Remote Associates Test ranged from 2 to 21, of a total possible score of 30. The overall mean score was 11.16. The median score was 11. Data for the Remote Associates Test are based on 25 sets of responses; one participant did not complete this assessment (see Figure 5).
Creativity scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Remote Associates Test measure different aspects of creativity. Therefore, creativity scores from both tests were combined to offer a composite score of each participant’s creativity level. Combined scores ranged from 10 to 57, of a total possible score of 92. The overall mean score was 33.42. The median score was 32. Creativity scores were of interest as a relative variable to which enjoyment, benefit, and use of art tasks were correlated; normative data were not relevant to the constructs studied here.

![Bar chart](image)

**Figure 5.** Scores on the Remote Associates Test and Barron-Welsh Art Scale.

Results

**Research Question One**

The first research question explored whether participants enjoyed art tasks as a component of their clinical supervision. Participants either found the art tasks to be very enjoyable (31%; n = 8), enjoyable (58%; n = 15), or were neutral (11%; n = 3) about the experience. No participants reported that they found the art tasks to not be enjoyable. These results appear to support the hypothesis that participants would deem supervision involving art tasks enjoyable (see Figure 6).

Participants were asked on the Exit Questionnaire to share why they did or did not find the art tasks to be enjoyable. Participants’ comments indicated that the intervention provided “a creative means of disclosing ideas and feelings” as well as experiences. Participants found that the experience provided a venue for expressing themselves in a different way, and that this venue helped to clarify issues for them. Participants reported increased insight resulting from engaging in the art tasks and enjoyed watching the progression in their development from the first to the final art task. Creating a lasting chronicle of participants’ development was reported as a positive aspect of the experience. Participants were surprised by the feelings that surfaced as a result of the art tasks and exploration and reportedly enjoyed gaining insight into how they experienced their internships as well as their “development both personally and professionally.” Of those participants who were neutral about engaging in the art tasks, some noted that, even so, they enjoyed the subsequent discussions.

The group environment was reported to be a part of what made the art tasks enjoyable. Participants enjoyed seeing what other group members drew, and reported that they learned a lot from others’ drawings and exploration. It was reported that listening to others’ “struggles and successes” was helpful; participants appreciated having insight into how others were experiencing their internships. The dynamics of the group exploration were described as similar to those associated with group counseling dynamics. Only one participant specifically reported that the group environment detracted from the experience, and this participant reported a dislike for groups overall.
Some participants noted that they enjoyed the art tasks and discussions because they were not seen as stressful. The art tasks were viewed as a time to relax, and were referred to as “therapeutic.” Engaging in the art tasks was described as an opportunity to focus on a part of internship other than the basic requirements.

Some participants reported being uncomfortable drawing. Comments regarding ways to improve upon the interventions suggested that different media be used in the different tasks. One participant reported enjoying the art tasks, but having a preference at times for traditional supervision. Another participant reported being tired, suggesting that this lack of energy may have affected the level of enjoyment of the intervention. A complete listing of participants’ qualitative responses to this question may be found in Appendix F.

Research Question Two

The second research question explored whether participants perceive supervision involving art tasks to be beneficial. Participants either found the art tasks to be very beneficial (54%; n = 14), beneficial (35%; n = 9), or were neutral (11%; n = 3) about the experience. These results seem to support the hypothesis that participants would deem supervision involving art tasks beneficial (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7. Perceived Benefit Derived from Art Tasks.](image)

Participants were asked on the Exit Questionnaire to share why they did or did not find the art tasks to be beneficial. Participants indicated that they found the creative venue for sharing ideas and feelings to be helpful and that they enjoyed seeing their classmates’ drawings. Participants found that self-expression through drawing provided them with new insight into
their current experiences with their internship placements. The art tasks created a “clarifying” forum in which participants focused on themselves and their feelings. Participants found that the process helped them to better understand themselves as professionals. They also reportedly viewed the art tasks as an opportunity to reflect upon their future roles. This forum was described as “non-threatening” and offered a place to “express doubt [and] dissatisfaction” as well as positive emotions. The art tasks were also found to be beneficial because they were seen as relaxing and as a mode to focus attention on something besides stressors.

Participants found similarities between each other in their experiences and deemed this beneficial. They also reported increased clarity about experiences after receiving feedback from group members. Hearing others’ perspectives on counseling and their internship placements was also reported as beneficial. One participant reported feeling “better” after engaging in the art tasks and subsequent discussion.

Participants also reported that through experiencing art tasks, they were better able to understand the benefit of using art with clients. Participants gained knowledge about art as an intervention for group counseling, as well as a new perspective on group counseling overall. They noted that even those who do not see themselves as artists were able participate in the art tasks.

It was suggested that diversity in media used and the art task directive given would enhance the intervention. Shortening the time allotted to the art tasks to ensure traditional supervision within the same meeting was also suggested. A complete listing of the participants’ qualitative responses to this question is found in Appendix F.

**Research Question Three**

The third research question explored whether participants used art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks. During both the semester prior to and of the study, of those who used art with their clients, the number of times used ranged from one to fifteen. The mean number of times art was used with clients during the semester prior to the study was six; after participating in the study art was used with clients a mean of five times. These results do not statistically support the hypothesis that participants use art tasks more often with their clients after participating in supervision involving art tasks.

Approximately one-half (54%; n = 14) of participants reported that they used art tasks when counseling their clients during the semester prior to the study, and slightly less than half
(42%; n = 11) of participants did not. The remaining 4% (n = 1) of participants was not engaged in an internship placement during this time period. During the semester in which this study was conducted, approximately two-thirds of participants (69%; n = 18) used art tasks when counseling their clients; about one-third of participants (31%; n = 8) did not.

Thus, the percent of participants using art with clients increased by 15% (n = 4) after participating in the study, although this increase was not statistically significant when comparing groups using the chi square statistic, $x^2(2, N = 26) = 2.35, p < .31$. These results suggest that a greater number of participants used art with their clients after participating in supervision involving art tasks (see Figure 8).

![Figure 8. Use of Art Tasks with Clients.](image)

Participants were asked on the Exit Questionnaire to elaborate upon how they used art with their clients. Comments revealed that participants used art tasks with clients in groups as well as with individuals. Clients reportedly worked with crayons, paints, Play-Doh®, and clay. They also made collages. Clients engaged in creating art to depict their families, friends, and themselves. Clients were asked to draw different aspects of themselves, as well as issues or emotions that they were experiencing. Participants reported that art was also used with clients who were less willing to talk.

Art was reportedly used with clients to gain more insight into individuals and their issues, as well as to offer clients an opportunity to self-reflect. Art was also used to provide a forum for non-verbal self-expression and to allow for a means to resolve discrepancies between reality and ideals. Ways to explore and resolve difficult feelings were reportedly often explored through art. Several participants specifically used art in helping clients deal with grief issues. Past and current
roles were also explored with clients using art. A complete listing of the participants’ qualitative responses to this question is found in Appendix F.

The majority (88%; n = 23) of participants reported that they were more inclined to use art with their clients as a result of participating in this study. The remaining participants (12%; n = 3) reported that they were neither more nor less inclined to use art with their clients after participating in the study. No participants reported being less inclined to use art after participating in the study.

Participants were also asked whether engaging in art tasks in their University supervision enhanced their use of art with clients. Forty-six percent (n = 12) of participants found that engaging in the art tasks did enhance their use of art with their clients; a smaller number of participants (23%; n = 6) did not believe engaging in the art tasks enhanced their use of art with clients. Approximately one-third (31%; n = 8) of participants responded that this question was not applicable. This number corresponds with the percent of participants who refrained from using art with their clients during the semester of the study.

**Research Question Four**

The fourth research question examined whether participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ enjoyment of supervision involving art tasks. A statistically significant negative relationship was found when correlating scores (using the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient) between the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and enjoyment of the art tasks, $r_s = -.36$, $p < .07$. A relationship nearing statistical significance was found between combined creativity scores and enjoyment of the art tasks, $r_s = -.32$, $p < .12$. No statistically significant correlation was found between the Remote Associates Test and enjoyment of the tasks, $r_s = -.15$, $p < .49$. Although a significant relationship exists, these results do not support the hypothesis that there is a *positive* relationship between creativity and enjoyment of the art task intervention (see Table 1).

**Research Question Five**

The fifth research question sought to determine whether participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ perceived benefit derived from supervision involving art tasks. Combined creativity scores did not significantly correlate, when utilizing the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, with participants’ reported benefit, $r_s = -.26$, $p < .20$. Results when separately correlating scores on the Remote Associates Test ($r_s = -.21$, $p < .32$), and Barron-
Welsh Art Scale ($r_s = -.21, p < .30$) to benefit lacked statistical significance as well. These results support the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between creativity and benefit derived from the intervention (see Table 1).

**Research Question Six**

The sixth, and final, research question explored whether participants’ creativity levels correlate with whether they use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks. The change in each participant’s amount of use of art tasks was calculated from the semester prior to the study to the semester during which the study was conducted. This change in amount of use for each participant was correlated to creativity scores (both when combined and when examined separately), using the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient. No statistically significant relationship was found between combined creativity scores and change in amount of use of art tasks ($r_s = -.17, p < .41$), nor between scores on the Remote Associates Test ($r_s = -.18, p < .40$), or Barron-Welsh Art Scale ($r_s = -.12, p < .57$) and use of art tasks. Given that there was no significant relationship between creativity and the use of art tasks by participants before or after this study, these results support the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between creativity and amount of use of the intervention (see Table 1).

Creativity scores were also correlated with participants’ raw scores for the number of times they used art tasks during the semester in which the study was conducted as well as the semester prior to the study. No significant relationship was found, using the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient, between creativity and amount of use for either the semester prior to the study ($r_s = .14, p < .67$) or the semester of the study ($r_s = .15, p < .59$). Creativity levels were also correlated with whether or not participants used art tasks at all (yes or no responses) both during the semester of the study as well as the semester prior to the study. Again, no significant relationship was found between creativity and use of art tasks during the semester prior to ($r_s = -.15, p < .47$) or the semester of the study ($r_s = .12, p < .57$) when using the Rank Order Correlation Coefficient (see Table 1).
Table 1

*Correlations Between Creativity and Enjoyment, Benefit, and Use of Art Tasks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Change in Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BWAS</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. BWAS = Barron-Welsh Art Scale. RAT = Remote Associates Test.
*p < .10.

Potential Confounds

Other factors exist which may confound the researcher’s ability to determine whether the study’s results are related to the art task interventions, or some other variable. In an attempt to control for these factors, several questions were asked on the exit questionnaire. One question asked if art tasks were used in participants’ on-site internship supervision during this study. Other questions sought to determine whether participants attributed their responses about the art task’s utility solely to the art task interventions, or if they believed the person administering the art tasks impacted their perception of the intervention’s utility as well.

Most (85%; n = 22) participants did not engage in art tasks with their on-site supervisors during the semester when the study was conducted. A small group (15%; n = 4) did use art tasks when supervised at their internship sites. Of those who did engage in art tasks with their on-site supervisors, the number of reported times used was one for all respondents. How and in what context art was used in these meetings is unknown.

The potential that the researchers influenced the results of this study was addressed as well. The majority (85%; n = 22) of participants reported that they strongly agreed (62%; n = 16) or agreed (23%; n = 6) with the statement that the person who administered the art tasks influenced their enjoyment of the tasks. The remaining participants were neutral (15%; n = 4) regarding this statement. Comments on the Exit Questionnaire elaborating upon this question described the researchers as “extremely knowledgeable,” “accepting,…nonjudgmental,”
“validating...thought provoking, and encouraging.” Participants reported that the researchers asked questions that challenged group members to reflect, and created an environment in which it was easy to share. Participants also reported that the researchers’ enthusiasm in administering the art tasks enhanced their enjoyment of the experience. One researcher was described as “skillful” in conducting the art task discussion. A complete listing of participants’ qualitative responses to this question may be found in Appendix F.

The majority (96%; n = 25) of participants reported that they strongly agreed (73%; n = 19) or agreed (23%; n = 6) with the statement that the person who administered the art tasks influenced their benefit derived from the tasks. The remaining 4% was neutral (n = 1) regarding this statement. Comments from the Exit Questionnaire elaborating upon this question revealed that the researchers enhanced the perceived benefit of engaging in art tasks through their group facilitation and enthusiasm for this mode of expression. “Great interaction” with participants and a “sense of curiosity” exuded by researchers were both deemed beneficial. Researcher feedback, questions, and insights were repeatedly noted as factors enhancing the benefit derived from the intervention as well. Participants reported that they learned how to use art in counseling their clients from this experience, and saw this to be beneficial. A complete listing of participants’ qualitative responses to this question is found in Appendix F.

Summary

In this chapter, the demographic composition of the group studied was described. Results of the study were reported, revealing statistical support for two of the six hypotheses. Results indicate that participants enjoy and benefit from supervision involving art tasks. Creativity significantly correlated with the enjoyment derived from this supervisory intervention as well. Qualitative responses from the Exit Questionnaire were summarized. Information regarding potential confounds was reported.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will interpret and summarize the results of the study conducted regarding the utility of art tasks in supervision. Results will be discussed in order of research questions asked. Potential confounds will be explored. Implications of the findings will be discussed and recommendations for further research will be made.

Summary of Results

Enjoyment of Art Tasks

Clarkson and Leigh (1992) considered enjoyment a relevant aspect of supervision when they conducted a blended approach to supervision that included art. The authors reported that their method of supervision enhanced enjoyment as well as the efficacy of the process overall. Although enjoyment was not the primary concern of these authors, it was an aspect of supervision that they found worthy of note. It seems likely that a task that is enjoyable would be repeated. If supervisees find a supervision intervention to be enjoyable, they are more likely to engage in the intervention again in the future, either for themselves or with clients. Thus, data indicating that most participants (89%; n = 23) found engaging in the art tasks in this study enjoyable or very enjoyable is considered positive.

Many participants linked enjoyment of the art tasks to the group discussion about the tasks. Participants did report an enjoyment of self-exploration, but also often linked this enjoyment to feedback and insight gained from other group members during the art task discussions. In addition to gaining personal insight, a feeling of universality appears to have played a large role in enjoyment as well. It becomes apparent that perceptions of the art tasks themselves cannot be separated from the group processing which occurred after creating the art tasks. These results suggest that when art tasks are used in supervision, it is important to emphasize the processing and discussion of the art tasks created.

Neutrality about enjoyment of the art tasks did not appear to affect most participants’ benefit derived from these tasks. Two-thirds (67%; n = 2) of the participants who were neutral about the experience used art with their clients, believed engaging in the study enhanced their use of art with their clients, and believed that they were more inclined to use art with clients as a result of participating in the study. These results suggest that being neutral about enjoyment of
the art task experience does not necessarily indicate a lower perception of the intervention’s benefit to oneself or one’s clients, or negatively affect the likelihood of using art with clients. **Perceived Benefit of Art Tasks**

Possibly of greater interest to supervisors is whether supervisees perceive art tasks to be a beneficial part of their supervision experience. Literature reflects this emphasis on benefit to supervisees. Lett (1995) focused on using art to capture participants’ “elusive experience” (p. 322). Bird et al. (1999) used music with participants and found it to be supportive of their development, both personally and professionally. Wilkins (1995) reported that using art with participants taught a new skill, enabling participants to work more effectively with clients. Laughlin (2000) found that using a musical improvisational method helped participants develop themselves more creatively and develop a blend of technical and creative skills to be used with clients. Robbins and Erismann (1992) reported that participants found sculpting to be therapeutic.

Participants in this study reported similar benefits. Engaging in the art tasks facilitated greater self-understanding, as art did with participants in Lett’s (1995) study. Participants also found art to be useful as a chronicle of their development, paralleling Bird et al.’s (1999) assertion. Concurring with Wadeson’s (1995) proposition that art facilitates supervisees’ exploration of roles and professional identity, participants also reportedly found using the art tasks to be a means of exploring their current and future roles, and oft cited exploring reactions to their internship placements as a benefit of the art task interventions. Participants also reported a greater inclination to use art tasks with clients and a greater understanding of the benefits of using art with clients as a result of participating in this study. These comments suggest participants developed comfort with a creative intervention, supporting Wilkins’ (1995) and Laughlin’s (2000) assertions that using creative interventions in supervision teaches participants a new skill. Paralleling the experience with Robbins and Erismann’s (1992) sculpting intervention, art tasks in this study were also described as therapeutic.

While participant *enjoyment* of the art tasks is desirable, participant *benefit* derived from engaging in the art tasks is likely more desirable to mental health supervisors. As many participants found engaging in the study to be beneficial (89%; n = 23) as found it to be enjoyable (89%; n = 23). This is considered a positive finding. It is likely that mental health
supervisors consider interventions that are beneficial to supervisees to be more useful than those that are enjoyable for supervisees.

All participants who were neutral about the benefit derived from participating in the study, reported that engaging in art tasks in their University supervision enhanced their use of art with clients. The majority (67%; n = 2) of those who were neutral about the benefit of the intervention also reported using art with their clients after beginning to participate in the study and being more inclined to do so again with clients in the future. These results also can be interpreted as positive; although these participants were neutral about the benefit derived from the intervention, they found art tasks to be a valuable tool for use with their clients. It is of interest that most participants who were neutral about either enjoyment or perceived benefit of the art tasks were engaged in middle school placements (67%; n = 2); the other participants who were neutral were engaged in internships in multiple levels.

Many participants linked perceived benefit of the art tasks to the group discussion about the tasks. They found hearing other’s feedback and personal experiences to be helpful in clarifying their own experiences. They appreciated a forum in which similarities between participants were highlighted. Thus, as with enjoyment, the group discussion appears to have been an essential part of benefit derived from engaging in art tasks in clinical supervision. As Lett (1995) noted in his study, this group discussion is an integral component of the use of art in supervision.

**Use of Art Tasks**

It has been suggested that creative behavior can be shaped by outside interventions (Throne, 1976). Benjamin (1984) suggested that focusing on developing creative abilities in students may facilitate the development of these abilities. Carson (1999) specifically suggested art as a way to model creativity in supervision. Previously cited qualitative responses indicate participants learned a new skill (how to use art tasks with clients) as a result of participating in this study. This study’s quantitative findings also support these authors’ assertions. During the semester in which the study was conducted, two-thirds (n = 18) of participants reported using art with their own clients, representing a 15% (n = 4) increase in participants using art from the previous semester. Although this increase is not statistically significant, it is of interest. The 15% increase suggests that participants learned a new creative behavior by engaging in art tasks in supervision.
Of those who did not use art with their clients while participating in the study, one-half (n = 4) used art with their clients the previous semester, and two-thirds (63%; n = 5) were currently in high school placements. It is plausible that participants in high school placements were less likely to consider art an appropriate intervention with their current client population than participants working with younger clients. There may be a perception that art is appropriate for use with elementary school-aged clients, but is not as useful with adolescents. Of those who did not use art with their clients while participating in the study, all reported that they were more inclined to use art with their clients as a result of participating in the study. It is unclear why participants would be more likely to use art in the future, but not at present. Perhaps these participants plan to work with an age group other than adolescents in the future, or expect to have more freedom in choosing the interventions they use as they develop as professionals.

It is of interest that participants used art in ways other than what was demonstrated in the study. Participants administered art tasks with individuals as well as with groups and with media other than that used in the study. Although the same overall goals of self-reflection and insight existed (as in the study) when using art with clients, participants gave differing directives to clients depending upon client needs. Thus, participants used creativity in administering a creative intervention. They did not rotely repeat what they experienced, but altered the intervention to fit their therapeutic goals.

Creativity and Enjoyment

It was also of interest to determine whether more creative participants were more likely to enjoy engaging in a creative task (art) than less creative participants. If a difference in perceptions of art tasks exists based on creativity level, this may affect how broadly useable art tasks would be in supervision in which enjoyment was an important element. A significant negative relationship was found between participants’ creativity scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and enjoyment of the art tasks. A negative relationship nearing significance was also found between enjoyment of the art tasks and participants’ combined creativity scores.

What is most notable is that the correlations are negative. Those who had lower creativity scores found the art task interventions more enjoyable than those with higher scores. Perhaps those with lower creativity scores found the art tasks to be novel, whereas those who are more creative did not. This novelty may have contributed to their impression of the art tasks as enjoyable. These results suggest that supervisees do not need to be creative in order to enjoy
engaging in art tasks during supervision sessions. Art tasks are an intervention that can be implemented regardless of the creativity level of supervisees or clients.

Creativity as measured by visual preferences (on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale) is the construct that appears to specifically negatively correlate with enjoyment. The reason for this possible relationship is unknown. One potential rationale is that the art tasks were considered too structured for those who obtained higher creativity scores. Those who are more creative may prefer to create art without direction.

**Creativity and Perceived Benefit**

It was also of interest to determine whether participants’ creativity levels correlate with participants’ perceived benefit derived from supervision involving art tasks. No significant relationship was found between participants’ creativity and benefit derived from the art tasks. This lack of relationship suggests that, while more creative supervisees may enjoy art tasks less than those with lower creativity scores, creativity is not related to the perceived benefit of engaging in the art tasks. Art tasks appear to be beneficial to supervisees of varying creativity levels, potentially making the intervention more universally useful to mental health supervisors and supervisees.

**Creativity and Use of Art**

It is also feasible that those who are more creative are more prone to using creative interventions in counseling clients. Thus, the sixth, and final, research question explored whether participants’ creativity levels correlate with whether they use art tasks with their clients more after participating in supervision involving art tasks. No significant relationship was found between participants’ creativity and use of art tasks. This lack of relationship suggests that art tasks are used with clients independent of supervisees’ levels of creativity. The numerous benefits of using art are well documented (e.g. Appleton & Dykeman, 1996; Bertoia & Allan, 1988; Bloomgarden & Kaplan, 1993, Calisch, 1994; Carson, 1999; Durkin et al., 1989; Edwards, 1993; Robbins & Erismann, 1992; Wilkins, 1995; Wix, 1995). Thus, a beneficial intervention is being applied to therapeutic relationships regardless of supervisees’ own levels of creativity.

As Carson (1999) suggested, modeling art tasks in supervision also appears to have enhanced participants’ use of art with clients in this study. Close to half of participants (46%; n = 12) reported that engaging in art tasks in their University supervision enhanced their use of art with their clients. Clouding responses to this question is the fact that a small number of
participants engaged in art tasks in their University supervision in the semester prior to the study. Thus, responses to this question may be referencing art tasks conducted in the semester prior to the study, the current semester (as a part of the study), or both. Regardless of which semester they were referencing, a large portion of participants did find that using art in supervision facilitated their use of this intervention in counseling their clients. Thus, it is suggested that participants learned and became comfortable with using a new intervention by engaging in it themselves.

Perhaps more telling was that the majority of participants (88%; \( n = 23 \)) reported that they were more inclined to use art with their clients as a result of participating in this study. The remaining participants (12%; \( n = 3 \)) reported that they were neither more nor less inclined to use art with their clients. This question obtained clearer results. Most participants found that engaging in art tasks in their supervision made them more prone to use art with their clients. While this study did not significantly affect use within a three-month time span, it did reportedly create a tendency towards using art in therapeutic interactions. These results align with Throne’s (1976) and Benjamin’s (1984) assertions that creative behavior can be shaped and reinforced by outside interventions.

Potential Confounds

In an attempt to control for confounding variables that may have affected the findings, participants were asked if their internship on-site supervisors used art in their supervision. Very few participants (15%; \( n = 4 \)) engaged in art with their on-site supervisors, and no participants engaged in art with their on-site supervisors more than once. It seems possible that this exposure on-site created an environment in which these participants felt more comfortable using art with their clients. However, the percent of participants who were exposed to art on-site is relatively small. Thus, this variable appears to have had little affect, if any, on the study’s results.

The supervision environment does not exist without interactions between a supervisor and supervisee; it is relationship based. Thus, it is feasible that the researchers of the art tasks (versus the art tasks themselves) may account for participants’ perceptions of the intervention. Most participants reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the person administering the art tasks influenced their enjoyment of (85%; \( n = 22 \)) and benefit derived (96%; \( n = 25 \)) from the art tasks. Thus, the researchers appear to have very strongly affected perceptions of the art task intervention, and appear to have been an integral part of the experience. Comments elaborating
upon these two questions indicate that participants attribute much of their enjoyment and benefit to the researchers’ knowledge and skill in administering art tasks in a group environment. Participants also attributed their own enthusiasm to the enthusiasm displayed by the researchers. It is possible that the intervention is only as good as the person who administers the intervention, suggesting that supervisors need to be knowledgeable, skilled, and enthusiastic about art in supervision in order to use this intervention effectively.

While it would be helpful if the art tasks were deemed enjoyable and beneficial independent of the researcher, the results are not surprising. It seems likely similar results would be obtained in measuring a researcher’s effect on most interventions. It must be noted that participants’ responses on these two questions, and questions on the Exit Questionnaire overall, may have been affected by a desire to reflect positively on the researchers. Thus, it is possible the reported percentages may be inflated because participants liked the researchers, because participants had a relationship with the researchers prior to the study, or both.

The environment in which the study was conducted cannot be separated from the results, and likely affects the study’s results. Based on the data collected, impressions of the art tasks cannot be separated from the subsequent group discussions. This must be accounted for when applying this intervention to another supervision group. Although it is understood that the dynamics seen in the groups specific to this study cannot be replicated, group process in general appears to have enhanced the intervention studied.

It is also possible that the participants’ regular University supervision environment affected their perceptions of supervision involving art tasks. As the study was conducted during participants’ regularly scheduled class time, it is possible that participants’ overall impressions of their training experiences were intertwined with their impressions of the study itself. All participants in this study had an unexpected change in their internship course University supervisor at the beginning of the semester prior to the study. Whether this change affected the results or generalizability of the results is unknown.

The Hawthorne Effect (behaviors change because participants know they are being studied) may have created overly positive results in this study. All participants were aware that they were being studied. The increased attention received as a result of participating in the study may have enhanced participants’ perceptions of the art task intervention, the researchers, or both.
Although it was asked whether participants used art tasks in their on-site supervision during the course of the study, other exposure to creative interventions may also have affected participants’ experiences of art tasks in supervision. It is also possible that participants’ maturation affected the results of the study. As participants acquired more experience as counselors, they may also have become more comfortable with less traditional supervisory interventions.

Discussion and Implications of Results

Art has been widely touted (e.g. Appleton & Dykeman, 1996; Bertoia & Allan, 1988; Bloomgarden & Kaplan, 1993, Calisch, 1994; Carson, 1999; Durkin et al., 1989; Edwards, 1993; Robbins & Erismann, 1992; Wilkins, 1995; Wix, 1995) as a therapeutic intervention in both counseling and supervision environments. Yet, no quantitative research and little qualitative research has been conducted to substantiate the assertion that art is a useful clinical supervision tool. Thus, there is little to which to compare the results of this study.

Lett (1993, 1995) qualitatively examined the use of art in supervision, and reported that participants found the intervention facilitated greater self-understanding. Lett’s results overlap with both quantitative and qualitative responses in the study discussed here. Participants in this study reported that they benefited in general from their supervision involving art and gained a better understanding of themselves both personally and professionally. Although not directly asked, participants in Lett’s study reported experiences that suggest they benefited from their supervision involving art as well.

Laughlin (2000) also qualitatively examined a creative intervention in supervision and found that the integration of creative and more traditional modes of supervision facilitated the development of more creative skills in supervisees. Laughlin’s findings overlap with the results of this study as well. More participants in this study reported use of a creative intervention (art tasks), as well as a greater inclination to use art tasks in the future, after participating in the study.

Although some results in this study support Lett’s (1995) and Laughlin’s (2000) findings, there are more differences between these studies than similarities. While Lett and Laughlin studied creative supervision interventions qualitatively, the study discussed here sought to gather qualitative, as well as quantitative, data about participants’ experiences in supervision involving a creative intervention. Not only were participants’ enjoyment and benefit of supervision
involving art tasks measured, but why and how they were enjoyable and beneficial were examined as well. Whether or not the use of art in supervision translated into participant use of art with clients was measured. Creativity levels of participants were quantified in this study, and how participants’ responses differed by creativity level was explored.

Neither Lett (1995) nor Laughlin (2000) discussed the specific demographic characteristics of those who participated in their studies in the same depth as done in the study discussed here. Yet, it does appear that both Lett and Laughlin studied participants training to be community/agency therapists. Laughlin’s participants were family therapy doctoral students and Lett’s participants were “psychologists in their early post-training period” (p. 316). Participants in the study discussed here were all school counselors. This unintentional difference between populations studied does not appear to have altered the overall theme of participants’ perceptions of creative supervision interventions. As participants in this study were all being trained in a discipline different than participants in Lett’s and Laughlin’s studies, the scope of with whom art tasks (and creative interventions overall) may be useful has potentially been broadened.

Findings from this study provide information for mental health supervisors and educators about a creative supervision intervention that is perceived to be useful with mental health counseling supervisees. This study helps to bridge the purported gap between the need for creative supervisory interventions and the actual use of them in the field of mental health. Learning more about the utility of art task interventions in supervision, and possibly counseling, provides insight into how to integrate art into clinical supervision.

Overall, this study offers the field an empirically supported method by which supervisors may administer art task interventions in a supervision group. The art task intervention studied here was deemed enjoyable and beneficial by supervisees. Use of art in supervision in this way appears to model the intervention for supervisees so that they use art in counseling their own clients. Use of this intervention also reportedly enhances participants’ future inclinations to use art with clients.

Recommendations for Practice and Research

While results from this study provide some understanding of the utility of art in supervision, more research needs to be conducted in this area.
**External Validity**

Data collected here are the result of surveying 26 participants. Although these participants represent three internship classes across two universities, data collected from a sample of this size must be viewed with caution. All participants were training to be school counselors and were students at large universities located in suburbs of Washington, DC. Most participants were female, Caucasian, and between 21 and 40 years old. Therefore, the results are not necessarily generalizable to other populations.

**Sample Size**

A larger sample size across a broader range of supervision settings, and including both school and community/agency counselors, would be helpful in future studies. Recruiting more participants would add power to the statistical processes. External validity would be enhanced as well.

**Reliability, Validity, and Scope of Measures**

The researcher created the measure used in this study exploring the utility of art in supervision. A valid and reliable assessment of this intervention would be a positive addition to future studies. Acquiring data about supervisors’ perceptions of the utility of art task interventions would also be helpful. Supervisee reports provide useful information. However, self-report was the only mode of data collected. An intervention may achieve an intended supervisory goal and meet with supervisee disapproval. The integration of objective measures of therapist development and readiness may be useful in future studies.

The use of the Remote Associates Test provided data in measuring participants’ verbal creativity. However, participant frustration level was high while completing this assessment, reportedly due to the length of administration time (40 minutes) and high level of focused attention required to complete the instrument. It is suggested that if future researchers wish to integrate the Remote Associates Test into their studies, they better prepare participants for the length of time necessary to complete the assessment. Being that creativity scores on the Remote Associates Test did not near significant correlations with other variables studied, this instrument may not be a useful component in future studies. Future researchers interested in the construct of creativity as it relates to creative supervision interventions may prefer to use the Barron-Welsh Art Scale as the sole measure of creativity.


**Setting**

Exploring the utility of art tasks in other environments (e.g. a classroom setting) may be useful as well. Mental health educators may wish to integrate more creative modes of expression into their traditional course curriculum. Doing so would not only model the use of more creative expression in the classroom environment, but also facilitate increased comfort with such interventions at an earlier stage of counselor development prior to the use of art in clinical supervision.

**Treatment and Control Groups**

Although this study offered information about participants’ overall impressions of the utility of art in supervision, exploring the utility of art tasks with treatment and control groups would be a helpful next step in furthering research in this area. Formal measures of supervisee development and counselor readiness exist (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). With treatment and control groups, insight may be provided into whether exposure to art tasks more readily supports supervisees in becoming effective counselors than traditional supervision alone.

**Creativity**

It may also be helpful to supervisors to explore whether art tasks enhance supervisees’ levels of creativity. It seems unlikely that creativity scores would increase significantly over the period of a semester, and with only three art task interventions. However, a longer-term study in which changes in creativity scores were measured after exposure to art tasks may provide useful data to supervisors wishing to develop this trait in supervisees.

**Researcher Roles and Qualifications**

It may be useful to ensure the primary researcher does not collect data as well as administer the art task intervention in future studies. Assigning the responsibilities of administration and data analysis to separate people may help to ensure no biases in reporting of the data result from these dual roles.

Results suggest that those who administer art task interventions must be skilled not only in the administering art tasks themselves, but in facilitating group process as well. While specialized training as an art therapist is not necessary to effectively use art in supervision and counseling, a solid base level of training is necessary. Mental health supervisors must approach using art in supervision as they would any other specialized intervention and ensure they have the necessary competencies to effectively use this intervention.
Summary

This chapter summarized the results of the study and implications of the findings. Results suggest that engaging in art tasks in supervision is a positive experience for participants, and one that increases supervisees’ self-understanding and teaches a new skill in counseling clients. Limitations of the current study were also discussed. Further research is necessary to facilitate a greater understanding of the utility of art tasks in supervision and to improve upon the ways in which this intervention is integrated into the supervision, and possible counseling, environment. Possible directions for future researchers were suggested.
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APPENDIX A

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Informed Consent for Participants in Research Projects Involving Human Subjects

Title of Project: Do Art Tasks Enhance Clinical Supervision?

Researcher: D. Rachelle Bowman, M.Ed., LCPC, NCC, CSC-AD

[Co-Researcher: Mercedes B. ter Maat, Ph.D., LPC, ATR-BC]

I. Purpose of Research

The purpose of this study is to examine students’ reactions to a clinical supervision method involving art tasks in master’s-level counseling internship students’ supervision. The results of this study will be used for educational purposes, including dissertation research, presentations, articles, brochures, and other publications with the intent of sharing information to increase other people’s knowledge and skills.

II. Procedures

A convenience sample of approximately thirty students enrolled in the Counselor Education Internship Courses at...[two Universities located in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area]...will participate in this study. Each participant will be given several art tasks during their internship to be completed in class and facilitated by the researcher. After completing the tasks, participants will discuss their art as a group.

In addition to engaging in the art tasks, participants will be asked to sign a consent form, provide demographic information about themselves, complete questionnaires, and respond to assessments related to this study. The total time commitment, including art tasks, subsequent discussions, and the completion of the questionnaires and assessments, should not exceed 6 hours...

III. Risks

There are no anticipated risks associated with participating in this study.

IV. Benefits

The possible benefit of such personal exploration is that you will be able to resolve issues and concerns of which you were previously unaware. It is important that you recognize that no benefit can be assured as a result of your involvement, and no guarantee of benefits will be made to encourage you to participate in this study. The overarching potential benefit is that counseling supervisors may learn more about a supervision method which may further support students in their clinical development.
If desired, you may contact the researcher in the fall of 2003 for a summary of the research results. The researcher may be reached by email: drbowman@vt.edu.

V. Confidentiality

All information obtained during the course of this study will remain confidential. Names and specific identifying information will be omitted when analyzing and reporting the data. The researcher will be the only person to have access to the actual names of participants and will be bound by confidentiality.

It is important to note that, as this is a group environment, other participants will also be privy to the discussions in the class. Group participants are instructed to respect the confidentiality of the content of the sessions. However, the researcher cannot guarantee other study participants will maintain confidentiality as well.

Finally, the researcher will store the data collected in the study in a safe deposit box until the completion of the research project and the final defense of the dissertation.

VI. Compensation

No compensation is offered for participation in this study.

VII. Withdrawal Procedures

Participation is voluntary; you are free to withdraw from this study at any time.

VIII. Approval of Research

This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, by the Department of Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB Approval Date</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

IX. Participant’s Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I have the following responsibilities:

- To engage in the art tasks as assigned and verbally explore the artwork that I have created with other participants.
- To complete the questionnaires and assessments and return them to the researcher.
- To support other participants in the exploration of their artwork and to respect the confidentiality of their artwork and exploration.
- To withdraw from this study if I feel it is necessary.
X. Subject’s Permission

I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent:

Participant’s Signature ___________________________ Date ______________

Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact the researcher:

**Researcher**  
Rachelle Bowman  (301) 949-2788  drbowman@vt.edu

**Faculty Advisor**  
Dr. Octavia Madison-Colmore  (703) 538-8483  omadison@vt.edu

**Committee Co-Chair**  
Dr. Mercedes B. ter Maat  (703) 549-6935  mtermaat@gwu.edu

**Chair, IRB**  
Dr. David Moore  (540) 231-4991  moored@vt.edu
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions about you. This information will be treated as confidentially as all other information collected in this study.

Place a check mark next to your answer for each of the following questions.

1) Age:  
   _____ 21-30 years old  _____ 31-40 years old  _____ 41-50 years old  
   _____ 51-60 years old  _____ 61-70 years old  _____ 71+ years old

2) Gender:  
   ____ Male  ____ Female

3) Race:  
   ____ Caucasian  ____ African-American  ____ Hispanic/Latino  
   ____ Asian  ____ Other. Please specify: _____________________

4) Counseling track for which you are currently being trained:  
   ____ School  ____ Community/Agency

5) What type of internship placement are you in this semester?  
   School:  ____ Elementary  ____ Middle  ____ High
   Community/Agency:  ____ Mental Health Center  ____ Non-Profit Public Agency  
   Agency:  ____ Private Practice  ____ Other. Please specify: _____________________

Please return the completed questionnaire to the researcher.

Thank you. Your participation is appreciated.
BEFORE YOU PROCEED WITH THE TEST, FILL IN ALL THE INFORMATION CALLED FOR ON THE BACK OF THIS TEST BOOKLET.

INSTRUCTIONS: In this test you are presented with three words and asked to find a fourth word which is related to all three. Write this word in the space to the right.

For example, what word do you think is related to these three?

cookies   sixteen   heart

The answer in this case is “sweet.” Cookies are sweet: sweet is part of the phrase “sweet sixteen” and part of the word “sweetheart.”

Here is another example:

poke       go       molasses

You should have written “slow” in the space provided. “Slow poke,” “go slow,” “slow as molasses.” As you can see, the fourth word may be related to the other three for various reasons.

Try these next two:

A. surprise   line   birthday
B. base       snow    dance

The answers are at the bottom of the page.

The answers are: A. party; B. ball.
1. stop petty sneak
2. elephant lapse vivid
3. lick sprinkle mines
4. shopping washer picture
5. stalk trainer king
6. sea home stomach
7. walker main sweeper
8. mouse sharp blue
9. envy golf beans
10. board magic death
11. athletes web rabbit
12. pot butterflies pump
13. bald screech emblem
14. note dive chair
15. cherry time smell
16. Southern console station
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>chocolate</td>
<td>fortune</td>
<td>tin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>bass</td>
<td>complex</td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>wicked</td>
<td>bustle</td>
<td>slicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>skunk</td>
<td>kings</td>
<td>boiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>habit</td>
<td>pouch</td>
<td>Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>soap</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>tissue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>blood</td>
<td>music</td>
<td>cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>room</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>salts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td>bite</td>
<td>monkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>chamber</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>inch</td>
<td>deal</td>
<td>peg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>puss</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>spoiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>kill</td>
<td>bliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>sore</td>
<td>shoulder</td>
<td>sweat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
SAMPLE ITEMS FROM THE BARRON-WELSH ART SCALE
APPENDIX E

EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions about your experience with supervision involving art tasks. Your responses to these questions will be treated as confidential as all other information collected in this study. Please check or circle the most appropriate response, and choose only one answer for each question.

1) Using art tasks in my University supervision class was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Enjoyable</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Not Enjoyable at All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Please explain why you did or did not find the art tasks enjoyable:


3) Using art tasks in my University supervision class was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Beneficial</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Not Beneficial at All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Please explain why you did or did not find the art tasks beneficial:


5) Did you use art tasks at your internship site when counseling your clients last semester?

_____ Yes  _____ No  If yes, how many times? ______ 

6) Did you use art tasks at your internship site when counseling your clients this semester?

_____ Yes  _____ No  If yes, how many times? ______
7) If you answered “yes” to question 6, please explain how you used the art tasks:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

8) Did your on-site internship supervisor use art tasks in your supervision this semester?

_____ Yes  _____ No  If yes, how many times? _____

9) Did the art tasks used in your University supervision enhance your use of art with your clients?

_____ Yes  _____ No  _____ Not Applicable

10) As a result of your participation in this study, are you more or less inclined to use art with clients?

_____ More  _____ Less  _____ Neither

11) The person who administered the art tasks influenced my enjoyment of the tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

12) The person who administered the art tasks influenced the benefit I derived from the tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Please return the completed questionnaire to the researcher.

Thank you. Your participation is appreciated.
APPENDIX F

EXIT QUESTIONNAIRE VERBATIM QUALITATIVE RESPONSES

Question 2: Please explain why you did or did not find the art tasks enjoyable:

- I found it enjoyable because it’s a creative means of disclosing ideas and feelings.
- I liked expressing my internship experience through drawing, it helped me understand where I was.
- I enjoyed seeing the progression from the 1st task to the last.
- Drawing is hard for me, but I still very much enjoyed trying.
- Considered neutral because I don’t necessarily enjoy groups to begin with and superimposed upon that was the task of drawing and sharing drawing—neither of which I enjoy. I didn’t mark a “5”, however because I also realized, at the same time, that I was gaining a great deal not only from my reflection but the reflection of others as well.
- It was fun drawing experiences but I really enjoyed seeing what others in the group drew.
- Not stressful.
- I didn’t really enjoy the physical task of drawing, but found the discussion and explanations amazing! There was quite a bit of unexpected feelings expressed in the pictures.
- It was great down time to think about myself for once. It would have been neat to use different mediums, like clay maybe.
- I was tired.
- I thought this was a great experience. The program taught me a lot about myself.
- Art is a great way to release emotions in a positive way and at the end there is something to keep that will provide a means of reflection at a later time.
• Very expressive! Very free flowing! Evolves into group process!

• I was able to evaluate my life and express my thoughts through art.

• Gave me a lot of insight into where I am in the program and where my classmates are as well.

• I liked hearing about other people’s experiences and expressing mine in a different fashion.

• The art tasks were very therapeutic and allowed us the opportunity to focus on something other than “requirements.”

• It was very relaxing. It also helped me clarify for myself how I was feeling. Others’ artwork inspired me.

• It was therapeutic.

• I liked the art, but at times wished for regular supervision.

• I’m not an artist.

• It was enjoyable (VERY) at first. I was disappointed that we basically did the same thing three times. Even though the “theme” of the drawing differed, the medium did not. I was hoping for a more eclectic experience.

• Good—because afforded me time [to] relax and release stress.

• Let me express how I was feeling about the counseling journey and also hear others’ struggles and successes.

• It allowed me [to] reflect about my development both personally and professionally.

Question 4: Please explain why you did or did not find the art tasks beneficial:

• Laugh at my classmates’ drawings. Same as above. [I found it enjoyable because it’s a creative means of disclosing ideas and feelings.]
• Same as above. [I liked expressing my internship experience through drawing, it helped me understand where I was.]
• The drawings made me stop, think, and express what I was feeling at the time.
• Helped me to integrate my understanding of myself as a professional.
• The art tasks were beneficial because they made me really think about my internship experience.
• Relaxing and kept my mind off other life stressors.
• The art tasks proved beneficial because they tapped into the frustrations as well as the successes of counseling. Also a non-threatening format to express doubt, dissatisfaction, etc…
• It’s good to hear about the similarities among my classmates.
• The experience gave me a chance to reflect on my future.
• The art tasks allowed me to express what I was feeling and the feedback from classmates was even more clarifying for me.
• Even non-artists can participate!
• I was able to speak with classmates and explain my plans as a future counselor. I was also able to better understand the power of art therapy.
• I learned from the experience, have used it in group and I feel better afterward.
• It was helpful to express myself differently and get feedback from others.
• It was beneficial because it gave me time to reflect—something I have very little of lately.
• Gave a different perspective on group counseling.
• While I enjoyed the art, I felt that supervision-wise, regular class would have been more beneficial. Perhaps making it so art was ½ the class and regular class was the rest.
• Did help to hear others’ point-of-view.
• Exact same as above—not enough diversity.
• Good because it afforded me time to self-reflect.
• Same as above—allowed me to express myself.
• It was beneficial because it enabled me to see other points of view regarding the counseling experience.

Question 7: If you answered “yes” to question 6, please explain how you used the art tasks:

• [In previous semester] In a group on social skills, they drew an outline of a student, then drew different feelings about that person.
• [In previous semester] Classroom guidance where students…expressed their feelings through a drawing.
• In the first session of groups, the students drew on their folders (changing family—drew their family).
• To draw study space, draw using a cool headed response, draw what a friend is, draw a magic shield, and I can’t remember the other one—but used it when talking or writing about a situation would be hard for the client to do.
• Student was using imagery to describe his vision of how he presented himself to world (wearing either a “paper bag” or “mask”) and had him draw what these looked like to him.
• Students drew their different life roles (chronic illness group). Students drew how they are helpful to their parents (changing families group).
• When I 1st meet with a client, I always offer crayons and paper. At times, I ask clients to
draw pictures of themselves or family to gain information and insight about something
not verbalized.
• Family drawing, coloring, collages.
• I used art in the lab to give a client a chance to talk about his current problems.
• When working with small children, it is important to give them a better way to express
themselves than by just talking.
• Students who have lost someone or experiencing anger!
• I used the art tasks for the students to express themselves and express themselves without
words.
• In group, I had advisors draw their jobs and a second time I asked group members to
draw whatever was on their minds that day.
• I asked my client to draw how she was feeling when she would not talk. I asked my
group to draw a happy family member and an unhappy family memory.
• I had our group to draw a t-shirt with how they thought others saw them on the front, and
how or who they really were on the back.
• [In previous semester] A client had difficulty controlling anger, so I asked her to draw
pictures in order to cool down.
• Lots of drawing of self, family, etc. Also, play-doh and painting. Mostly to have the kids
self-reflect and gain more insight into them.
• Collage, “t-shirt” where you draw who you are on one side, and who/what people see one
the other, group poster/picture, colors/symbols to express how/what client is feeling.
• Used art with ESOL students and with a grief group.
• Doodles and have kids explain what drawing meant. Draw family.

• A) Sketching a picture of one’s feelings. B) Drawing a picture of family life (reality and ideal)—how to bridge the two worlds, if possible.

Question 11: The person who administered the art tasks influenced my enjoyment of the tasks.

• I enjoyed you working with us. You have a lot to offer and are extremely knowledgeable.

• Good group leadership and facilitation, great interaction with students.

• She was very enthusiastic about the drawings and seemed to enjoy finding meaning and getting to know us through the drawings.

• Very accepting and nonjudgmental, an “easy” way/demeanor; asked very good questions that encouraged reflection and group interaction.

• The more familiar I am with the tasks the more comfortable I will be in the future administering them.

• I already enjoyed art tasks.

• She was very good at asking questions that challenged the artist to think about current role/position.

• Great experience!

• When we first did the art tasks she also participated and shared and that made it easy for me to share.

• Made all feel affirmed and comfortable!

• [The researcher] made my art experience wonderful because now I can better evaluate my client’s artwork.

• She was excited about art which made me excited.

• Yes, she was validating and thought provoking and encouraging.
• Was very skillful in using this method—it didn’t seem like therapy though it was.
• The enthusiasm she put out there helped me enjoy it more.
• I have no one to compare the instructor to.

Question 12: The person who administered the art tasks influenced the benefit I derived from the tasks.

• Same as response to item 11 [Good group leadership and facilitation, great interaction with students.]
• See above. [She was very enthusiastic about the drawings and seemed to enjoy finding meaning and getting to know us through the drawings.]
• Had a sense of curiosity that encouraged greater reflection; as above, asked questions that elicited greater personal meaning, comments/paraphrasing etc. used in such a way that our same ideas were repeated in different words but rather took our ideas further, leading to greater insight, etc.
• The discussion directed by the…[researcher] was helpful (hearing other’s thoughts made me feel better about myself).
• Yes—with comments and feedback.
• Great feedback.
• Her feedback was very important and her interpretation was also important for clarifying.
• Integrated with the unique personalities of the room!
• Comments were very helpful in showing how art can be used in therapy.
• I enjoyed the feedback from the students which was encouraged.
• [The researcher] is very knowledgeable when it comes to interpreting art and how it relates to the “artist.”
• Yes, because I felt like I learned how to administer art tasks myself.

• This is due to her skill as an art therapist.

• I used some of these same tasks with my clients!

• Her questions helped guide discussions.

• The person who administered the art tasks always provided useful insight.
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