



This document is strictly CONFIDENTIAL.

Development and Validation of The Relational Depth Frequency Scale

Journal:	<i>Psychotherapy Research</i>
Manuscript ID	TPSR-2018-0164.R2
Manuscript Type:	Empirical Manuscript
Keywords:	Experiential/Existential/Humanistic Psychotherapy, Alliance, Outcome Research, Statistical methodology, Test development
Keywords (user):	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Development and Validation of the Relational Depth Frequency Scale (RDFS)

Abstract

Objective: The Relational Depth Frequency Scale (RDFS) was developed to measure the frequency of specific moments of profound contact and engagement in psychotherapy. **Method:** Following an initial process of item generation and rating, Three-Step Test Interviews were conducted with eight therapists and clients to further refine potential items. Sixteen relational depth items were then taken forward for psychometric assessment in an online sample of 336 therapists and 220 clients, each divided into separate “shortening” and “checking” subsamples. **Results:** Following psychometric scale shortening involving confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and Rasch analysis, we formed a six item RDFS that could be used with both therapists and clients. The parameters of the shortened form replicated well in the independent checking subsamples with good internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .85$ and $.93$ in therapist and clients respectively), acceptable fit statistics in CFA and Rasch analysis, and moderate to high levels of convergent validity against the Working Alliance Inventory (Short Form, Revised) and Relational Depth Inventory (RDI-R2). **Conclusion:** As a brief self-report measure, the RDFS can be used to further assess the relationship between relational depth and therapeutic outcomes. Further research is needed to examine the validity of the RDFS in clinical settings.

Keywords: Relational depth, scale development, therapeutic alliance, therapist–patient relationship, measurement.

1
2
3 An extensive body of psychotherapy research suggests that the therapy relationship
4 makes “substantial and consistent” contributions to outcomes, across different types of
5 psychological treatment (Norcross & Lambert, 2018, p. 308). Although much of this evidence is
6 correlational, more advanced statistical methods, such as cross-lagged panel models,
7 demonstrate that improvements in the quality of the therapeutic relationship directly precede
8 reductions in psychological distress (e.g., Falkenström, Kuria, Othieno, & Kumar, 2018; Zilcha-
9 Mano, Dinger, McCarthy, & Barber, 2014). This suggests a causal relationship from former to
10 latter. However, to date, little is known about the specific subcomponents of the therapy
11 relationship that most strongly affect outcomes (Zilcha-Mano, 2017). This is an important area
12 for further research.

13
14 Subcomponents of the therapy relationship can be organized into three types: qualities of
15 the therapeutic interaction (e.g., cohesion in group therapy); therapist relational skills (e.g.,
16 empathy); and skills at focusing on, or attempting to manage, the therapy relationship itself (e.g.,
17 repairing alliance ruptures) (Castonguay et al., 2006). Of these, evidence is particularly robust
18 that the qualities of the therapeutic interaction are associated with outcomes. Most specifically,
19 this is for the *working alliance* (Bordin, 1979), with an average effect size from approximately
20 30,000 clients of $r = .28$, 95% CI [0.26–0.30] (Fluckiger, Del Re, Wampold, & Horvath, 2018).
21 The working alliance has been defined as the, “quality and strength of the collaborative
22 relationship between client and therapist” (Hovarth & Bedi, 2002, p.41). It has been
23 conceptualized as having three components: agreement on the goals of therapy, consensus on the
24 tasks of therapy, and the existence of a positive affective bond (Bordin, 1979).

25
26 A connected, but distinct, quality of the therapeutic interaction is the *real relationship*.
27 This is conceptualized as a personal relationship characterized by mutual genuineness and a
28 perception of the other, which befits the other (Gelso, 2004). The real relationship differs from
29 the working alliance in that it is characterized by a co-constructed experience of mutual
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 genuineness and “realism” in the relationship (Gelso, 2005). As predicted, the real relationship
4
5 has been found to make a contribution to treatment progress, above and beyond the working
6
7 alliance (Fuertes et al., 2007), with a moderate-sized association to outcome, $r = .38$ (Gelso,
8
9 Kivlighan & Markin, 2018).

10
11
12 *Mutuality* is a third quality of the therapeutic interaction that is both related to—but also
13
14 distinct from—the working alliance and the real relationship. Mutuality has been operationalized
15
16 as the bidirectional experiencing of Rogers’s (1957) core conditions (empathy, congruence, and
17
18 positive regard); with higher levels of mutuality associated with greater treatment progress
19
20 (Murphy & Cramer, 2014). As with the real relationship, mutuality implies a co-openness across
21
22 the therapy dyad. It also overlaps with the working alliance in its emphasis on collaboration.
23
24 However, with mutuality, there is a particular emphasis on the sharedness of relational qualities
25
26 across the therapeutic relationship. Closely related to mutuality, recent evidence suggests that
27
28 “congruence” (i.e., alignment or agreement) between therapists’ and clients’ ratings of the
29
30 therapeutic bond is associated with greater next session symptom improvement (Rubel, Bar-
31
32 kalifa, Atzil-Slonim, Schmidt, & Lutz, 2018).

33
34
35
36
37
38 Within the field of person-centered and humanistic psychotherapies, researchers have
39
40 proposed a further quality of the therapeutic interaction, *relational depth* (Mearns & Cooper,
41
42 2005, 2018; Knox, Murphy, Wiggins, & Cooper, 2013; Wiggins, Elliott, & Cooper, 2012).
43
44 Relational depth is defined as, “a state of profound contact and engagement between two people
45
46 in which each person is fully real with the other, and able to understand and value the other’s
47
48 experiences at a high level” (Mearns & Cooper, 2005, p. xii). Relational depth overlaps with the
49
50 bond component of the working alliance, in that it involves a warm, personal connection
51
52 between therapist and client. It also overlaps with the real relationship, in that both involve co-
53
54 genuineness; and with mutuality, in that both involve a two-way, shared relationship. However,
55
56 “relational depth” places particular emphasis on the level of interactive, inter-relational
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement between therapist and client (Mearns & Cooper, 2018). More significantly, while
4
5 qualities such as the working alliance are conceptualized as “gradient” phenomena—more or
6
7 less present in the therapy relationship—relational depth has been conceptualized, for empirical
8
9 purposes, as a “threshold” phenomenon (e.g., Cooper, 2005; Knox & Cooper, 2010): that is,
10
11 present, or not present, during specific periods of therapy. Relational depth, then, refers to
12
13 moments in therapy characterized by particularly intense contact and engagement. In this
14
15 respect, it is synonymous with Stern’s (2004) *moments of meeting*, characterized by the
16
17 interpenetration of the therapist’s and the client’s minds, where both know and feel what the
18
19 other knows and feels.
20
21
22

23
24 Qualitative research from across a range of client and therapist samples has indicated a
25
26 high degree of commonality in how moments of relational depth are experienced (Cooper,
27
28 2013). This indicates that they are real and distinctive occurrences within the therapy
29
30 relationship. Summarizing the empirical evidence, Cooper (2013) describes them as moments of
31
32 connection and flow with another person; in which both individuals feel genuine, alive, and
33
34 immersed in the relationship. Survey research indicates that nearly all therapists experience
35
36 moments of relational depth with their clients, as do approximately 80% of clients (Leung,
37
38 2008). Wiggins, Elliott and Cooper (2012) found that relational depth was present in over a third
39
40 of client–defined significant therapy events.
41
42
43

44
45 Mearns and Cooper (2005, 2018) argue that moments of relational depth can have an
46
47 important therapeutic impact by enhancing clients’ connections with—and acceptance of—their
48
49 deepest, “existential” element of self; and by facilitating their capacity to form genuine
50
51 connections with others. In support of this, qualitative research by Knox (2011) found that
52
53 clients described these moments as having a significant positive impact. With respect to
54
55 immediate effects, clients described moments of relational depth as “facilitative”, “healing”, and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 “changing”; and also described a positive impact on the therapeutic process itself. In the longer
4
5 term, the most commonly reported impact was an increased connection with their own selves.
6
7

8 Further evidence for an association between relational depth and therapeutic outcomes
9
10 comes from research based on Wiggins’s Relational Depth Inventory (RDI) (Wiggins, 2012,
11
12 2013; Wiggins, Elliott and Cooper, 2012). The RDI was developed to assess levels of relational
13
14 depth in therapy events that clients identified as “important”. Items were developed using
15
16 thematic analysis and rated by three judges for their suitability. Through psychometric analysis,
17
18 a revised 24-item measure—the Relational Depth Inventory (RDI-R)—was developed that
19
20 showed good internal consistency and convergent validity with the Working Alliance
21
22 Inventory–Short (revised) (WAI-SR) in a sample of 342 therapists and clients (Wiggins, *et al.*,
23
24 2012). Using hierarchical regression in a sample of 42 clients, Wiggins (2012) found that depth
25
26 of relating accounted for 10 to 30 per cent of the variance in improvement, as assessed by the
27
28 CORE-OM measure of psychological distress (Evans *et al.*, 2002). Moreover, RDI-R scores
29
30 predicted therapeutic outcome above and beyond scores on the Working Alliance Inventory
31
32 (Short Form, WAI-SF–Revised, Hatcher & Gillaspay, 2006). These findings provided
33
34 preliminary evidence that moments of relational depth may be an important, distinctive element
35
36 of the therapy relationship that contribute to outcomes.
37
38
39
40
41

42 However, although the RDI-R is a reliable and valid means of assessing depth in the
43
44 therapeutic interaction, its specific focus is on the intensity of relating in single events in
45
46 therapy. This provides important insights into that one, particular experience, but does not
47
48 capture the frequency of in-depth relating across the therapeutic relationship as a whole.
49
50

51 **The Present Study**

52
53 The overall purpose of this paper, therefore, was to develop a measure of the frequency
54
55 of moments of relational depth in psychotherapy: complementing both the RDI-R and other
56
57 gradient-based measures of the quality of the therapeutic interaction. We aimed to develop a
58
59
60

1
2
3 measure that would be short enough for repeated use, but with acceptable reliability and a single
4
5 factor structure. We also wanted it to have convergent validity, shown by strong, and
6
7 statistically significant correlations, at the top end of Cohen's "medium" correlation effect sizes
8
9 ($.5 \geq r \geq .3$), with working alliance inventory (WAI-SR, Hatcher & Gillaspie, 2006) scores, and
10
11 within Cohen's "large" correlation effect sizes ($.8 \geq r \geq .5$) with RDI-R2 scores—the latest
12
13 development of the RDI-R (Wiggins, personal communications, 6th July 2018). Here, we
14
15 expected the three measures to show conceptual overlap but measure different constructs, with
16
17 the RDI-R2 being nearer in theory to the RDFS than the WAI-SR. Within an initial exploration
18
19 of criterion validity, we expected that RDFS scores would show only weak relationships with
20
21 gender. As described in the relational depth literature, there have been no *a priori* hypotheses on
22
23 possible correlations with gender. Therefore, we believe it would be evidence of poor criterion
24
25 validity (as per Widaman, Little, Preacher, & Sawalani, 2011) were there strong gender effects.
26
27 In addition, despite small differences in clients' and therapists' experiences of relational depth
28
29 (e.g. Knox, 2011), we sought a measure with items that could be used with both clients and
30
31 therapists and showing similar reliability, if not necessarily similar scores, when used in both
32
33 groups.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Method

43
44 The research project was approved by the ethics committee of [DETAILS
45
46 ANONYMISED FOR PURPOSE OF BLIND REVIEW].
47
48

49 This measure development and validation study involved two phases: an initial qualitative
50
51 process of item generation and refinement, followed by a quantitative selection of items. The
52
53 process began with the generation of items and their selection and refinement through expert
54
55 rating, and *Three-Step Test Interviews* focusing on the creation of items that would address
56
57 frequency of moments of relational depth.
58
59
60

Phase 1: Qualitative process of item generation and refinement

Generating and Refining Items. We followed methods of deductive scale development, an approach considered most appropriate where there exists some theory about a construct (DeVellis, 2016; Hinkin, Tracey, & Enz, 1997). The first and final authors, and a fellow researcher, generated items reflecting relational depth, as defined in the literature (Knox, *et al.*, 2013; Mearns & Cooper, 2005; Wiggins, *et al.*, 2012). This resulted in a pool of 45 items. In addition, two external postdoctoral researchers who had conducted research on relational depth were invited to generate items, resulting in an additional 83 items, taking the total to 128 items. Items were developed to follow the stem, “Over the course of therapy with my therapist/client, there were moments where...”. For instance, “I felt I was being understood beyond my words,” and “We were deeply connected to one another.” We used this stem to capture experiences of relational depth as a threshold phenomenon. That is, we wanted to know how frequently, over the course of therapy, individuals had experienced moments of intense connection and engagement, characterized by mutual genuineness, warmth, and understanding.

This item pool was refined through a process of expert rating (Hinkin, 2005). A questionnaire with the 128 items was posted using the online data collection software Qualtrics. Seven experts rated each item on a four-point Likert scale: (1) not at all, (2) a little, (3) moderately, and (4) very well, on DeVellis’s (2016) three criteria: (a) how well it matches the target definition, (b) how well formulated it is for participants to fill in, and (c) how well, overall, it is suited to the measure. Experts included two doctoral researchers conducting studies in the field of relational depth, three postdoctoral researchers with published research on relational depth, the first author (a doctoral student in relational depth), and the final author (Professor of Counselling Psychology with multiple published research on the topic of relational depth). An average score was calculated for each item, and those under a cutpoint of 3.0 were excluded from further analysis. This left 50 items. These were reviewed by the research team

1
2
3 prior to the subsequent stage of refinement, in order to attend to any poor structure and highly
4 similar wording in the items. Two items containing multiple clauses were removed, as were 12
5 items which were nearly synonymous with other items in the scale. This resulted in a 36-item
6 scale taken forward for Three-Step Test Interviews.
7
8
9
10

11
12 **Three-Step Test Interview.** The Three-Step Test Interview (TSTI) is a cognitive
13 pretesting method that assesses the quality of self-completion questionnaires (Hak, van der Veer,
14 & Jansen, 2004). It has been used in several scale development studies (e.g., Hak, van der Veer,
15 & Ommundsen, 2006), and is considered a productive methodological tool in the refinement of
16 scales (Busse & Ferri, 2003; Jansen & Hak, 2005). The initial stage consists in the *concurrent*
17 *think aloud* process, where a participant completes the scale while saying aloud what he or she is
18 thinking. The second stage, the *focused interview*, is then used to elicit a participant's feedback
19 on any gaps the researcher observed in the thought process and noted during the initial stage.
20 The last stage—the *semi-structured interview*—is then used to elicit a participant's reflections,
21 definitions of terms, opinions, and experiences of completing the scale. Questions at this stage
22 included: “How was it for you to complete the scale?”, “What do you understand is the meaning
23 of this term?”, and “Can you give any feedback or recommendations on how we can improve
24 this scale?”
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Following Hak *et al.*'s (2004) standard procedures, we conducted interviews with four
43 therapists and four clients (five females and three males, mean age = 49 years old (range 29–90),
44 two from mixed ethnic backgrounds and six white Caucasian), achieving data saturation with
45 regard to problematic patterns of responses. Following interviews, the first author developed an
46 analysis aimed at refining the scale structure and content based on patterns in the test-takers'
47 responses, theory on relational depth, and theory in scale development. The scale was amended
48 and items were removed based on the identification of five problem clusters interpreted from the
49 data: (a) *Double-barrelled*: where the wording of the item had multiple clauses ($n = 2$ excluded);
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (b) *Confusions*: where the meaning of a word was understood differently by different
4 participants or caused uncertainty ($n = 6$ excluded); (c) *Repetitions*: where the same wording had
5 been used in another or more other items ($n = 6$ excluded); (d) *Redundant*: where the wording
6 was redundant with the opening stem or response scale ($n = 2$ excluded); (e) *Mundane*: where
7 items reflected mundane characteristics of the therapeutic relationship rather than more intense
8 levels of therapeutic engagement (as shown by most participants answering readily and selecting
9 highest frequency items on the scale, $n = 4$ excluded). Following the TSTI process, 16 items
10 remained and were taken forward for shortening (Table 1).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Phase 2: Scale Reduction and Psychometric Exploration**

22
23
24 Following the initial qualitative selection of the 16 items, data from four samples of
25 participants, identifying as therapists and as clients, were used to drive shortening of the
26 measure. To avoid problems of capitalization on chance, the four samples were merged into a
27 client and a therapist sample, which were then each separated into two random and completely
28 independent subsamples. The first random client and therapist subsamples, termed *shortening*
29 *subsamples* hereafter, were used to select items for a very short form suitable for repeated use.
30 The other randomly selected client and therapist subsamples, the *checking subsamples*, were
31 used to check that the psychometric parameters from the shortening analyses replicated to
32 exclude capitalization on chance having driven the selection of the final items.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Sample size.** Worthington & Whittaker (2006) suggested that n should be at least 50
45 when seeking a single factor. This fits with the earlier simulation work of Guadagnoli and
46 Velicer (1988) which showed that sample size is not a linear function of items but of the number
47 of factors. We sought a single factor hence we needed to power to detect a more complex
48 population factor structure had this been present. The work of Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988)
49 showed $n \geq 100$ is sufficient for robust detection of a two-factor solution so an online survey
50 was designed to produce a smallest subsample size (across the four subsamples) of 100.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We sought a sample that would be as representative as possible of current UK therapist
4 and client populations. Inclusion criteria for clients were aged 18 years old and above, and
5 currently in therapy or having attended therapy in the past. For therapists, it was qualified,
6 including both accredited and non-accredited therapists, or still in training, with a minimum of
7 one year practice. Based on a response rate for a prior study with similar recruiting methods
8 (Wiggins, Elliott, & Cooper, 2012), we estimated that the response rate would be between 15%
9 and 43% and the non-completion rate around 50%. We recruited through four methods.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Firstly, the survey was posted on social media sites that were accessed by people with an
20 interest in psychotherapy and counseling, and we sent a link via email to the research team's
21 contacts. The survey was reposted on social media sites and emailed at four time points over the
22 course of four months. Participants recruited through this method were primarily members of the
23 UK psychology and counseling community. Secondly, we approached counseling psychologist
24 trainees on eight doctoral courses in the UK. Five courses' administrators agreed for their course
25 to be approached and forwarded the survey to their trainees across the three years. For one
26 training course, the survey was also sent to clinical psychologist trainees. We estimated that the
27 survey was sent to 360 trainee psychologists, who could choose to participate as therapists or
28 clients. In total, 49 (14%) trainees completed the survey. Thirdly, we approached
29 psychotherapists and counsellors listed on the British Association for Counselling and
30 Psychotherapy (BACP) register, across 25 cities in the United Kingdom. Emails were sent
31 individually to 1,246 therapists, 139 (11%) completed the survey. Finally, we approached clients
32 at a charity in central London. Emails were sent, individually, to 92 clients. Of these, eight (9%)
33 completed the survey.

34 **Survey questionnaire.**

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The survey form used the online data collection software Qualtrics and started with
4 detailed information about the study and the consent statement, then the questionnaires in the
5 following order.
6
7
8

9
10 ***Socio-demographics questionnaire.*** This included questions on gender, age, ethnicity,
11 whether the respondent was a mental health professional, and whether they were participating as
12 a client or a therapist. The questionnaire included additional questions on the type of profession,
13 level of training, number of years' post qualification, therapeutic orientation, and number of
14 sessions of therapy.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 ***Relational Depth Frequency Scale (RDFS).*** As described above, the RDFS items were
22 designed to measure the temporal frequency of moments of relational depth over the course of
23 therapy. This may be in a single therapy session, over several sessions, or in the overall therapy.
24 Temporal frequency can be defined as the number of occurrences of an event over a period of
25 time. A frequency scaling was chosen over an "amount" or "value" scaling because our focus
26 was on relational depth as specific moments of interaction. Despite small differences in clients'
27 and therapists' experiences of relational depth (Knox & Cooper, 2010), we opted to maintain
28 identical item wording for therapist and client versions, with minor variations in the introductory
29 paragraph. These read as follows:
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Below is a list of items representing experiences people might have in therapy. Please
46 think of your relationship with your client [for therapist version]/therapist [for client
47 version] and select how frequently you have experienced the moments described in each
48 item. There is no right or wrong answer, individuals relate differently.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Participants were then told that each item followed the statement, "Over the course of
57 therapy with my client/therapist, there were moments where..." and asked to rate each item on a
58
59
60

5-point Likert scale, where 1 = *not at all*, 2 = *only occasionally*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *most or all of the time*. Items included: “I felt a clarity of perception between us” and “I experienced a meeting that was beyond words”.

The Relational Depth Inventory (revised 2) (RDI-R2). The RDI is a 64-item measure that was developed to assess the depth of relating in particular moments in therapy (Wiggins, 2012, 2013). The RDI-R is a shortened 24-item inventory that has demonstrated good internal consistency in a pilot sample of 189 therapists and 152 clients (Cronbach’s alpha = .93; Wiggins, 2012). The RDI-R has showed a large correlation with the WAI-SR in a sample of 150 clients ($r = .72$, 95% CI .63 to .79, $p < .01$), suggesting initial convergent validity (Wiggins, et. al., 2012). The RDI-R2 is the latest development of the RDI and includes two items that were added following Wiggins et al.’s (2012) Rasch analysis to target a wider range of respondents (Wiggins, personal communications, 6th July 2018). The RDI-R2 begins with a question asking respondents to describe, in their own words, an important event experienced during a therapy session. The respondents are then asked to rate how accurately the 26 items fit this experience, using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all*, 2 = *slightly*, 3 = *somewhat*, 4 = *very much*, 5 = *completely*). Example items are “I felt a profound connection between my therapist and me,” and “I felt I had lost all sense of time”.

The Working Alliance Inventory–Short Revised (WAI-SR). The WAI-SR is one of two short versions of the 36-item WAI, which has demonstrated the strongest psychometric properties (Falkenström, Granström, & Holmqvist, 2013). The WAI-SR has two versions: a 10-item therapist version and a 12-item client version, sharing a 5-point Likert scale, and both giving scores on Bordin’s (1979) three alliance subscales (Hatcher & Gillaspie, 2006). The WAI-SR has demonstrated good internal consistency in a sample of 88 German outpatients and 243 inpatients ($\alpha = .90$, 95% CI [.87–.93]; $\alpha = .93$, 95% CI [.92–.94], respectively); and good convergent validity with the Helping Alliance Questionnaire (Pearson’s $r = .71$ for correlation

1
2
3 between total scores, $n = 237$, 95% CI [.64 to .77]) (Munder, Wilmers, Leonhart, Linster, &
4
5 Barth, 2010).
6

7
8 **Participants.** A total of 751 individuals accessed the online survey. Three (0.5%)
9
10 declined to consent and are omitted from all analyses. In total, 192 participants (25.6%) exited
11
12 the survey before they finished completing the demographics questionnaire and RDFS. This left
13
14 556 (74%) participants who completed all items on the demographics questionnaire and the
15
16 relational depth frequency items (Table 2). All these were included in the internal reliability and
17
18 scale shortening process. Of these, 436 completed the RDI-R2 and 434 (58% of the 751, 78% of
19
20 the 556) completed the full online survey, including all items of the WAI-SR, and could be
21
22 included in the explorations of convergent and divergent validity. The largest proportion of
23
24 participants (120; 16% of the 751 and 22% of the 556) exited the survey when reaching the
25
26 qualitative question on the RDI-R2.
27
28
29

30
31 Of the 556 participants, 455 (82%) were females, 100 (18%) were males, and one
32
33 identified as “other” (<1%). The mean age was 46 years old. Participants were predominantly
34
35 from a white Caucasian background (90%), other represented ethnicities were mixed ethnicity
36
37 (3%), Asian/Asian British (3%), Other (3%), and Black/Black Caribbean/Black British (1%).
38
39 There were 476 (85%) mental health professionals, of which 336 (71%) participated as
40
41 therapists and 138 (29%) participated as clients; 82 (15%) participants were laypersons
42
43 participating as clients. None of the comparisons in the client subsample between mental health
44
45 professionals and laypeople reached statistical significance. Mental health professionals
46
47 included 295 counsellors (62%), 217 psychotherapists (46%), 66 counselling psychologists
48
49 (14%), 21 clinical psychologists (4%), and 38 other (8%). Of these, 363 were qualified (76%)
50
51 and 110 were in training (24%). The majority of therapist participants were qualified (83%),
52
53 most had over 10 years-experience (57%), 34% had between five and ten years-experience, and
54
55 24% had between one to five years’ experience.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Subsample split.** The sample completing the survey as therapists was larger than that
4
5 completing it as clients ($n = 336$ and 220 respectively). This provided sufficient data to meet our
6
7 criterion of $n \geq 100$ in each of the four (shortening/checking * therapists/clients) subsamples. As
8
9 scale shortening can be distorted by capitalization on chance (see, for instance, Widaman, et al.,
10
11 2011)—that is, produce a shortened form only sound for the particular sample—our method
12
13 used a random split of the therapist and the client samples to provide two completely separate
14
15 samples, one used for the shortening, the other to check for replication of the psychometric
16
17 parameters of the chosen shortening. The splits of the therapist subsample, and of the client
18
19 subsample, into the shortening ($n = 168$ and $n = 110$ respectively) and checking subsamples ($n =$
20
21 168 and $n = 110$ respectively) were done by pseudorandom number generation.
22
23
24
25

26 The sample characteristics for the shortening and checking subsamples of therapists and
27
28 clients are summarized in Table 2. The only statistically significant difference between the
29
30 therapist and client subsamples was on age, with means of 48 and 43 years old respectively (SDs
31
32 $= 11$, $W = 46626$, $p < .0005$). As at least one statistically significant difference is likely given the
33
34 number of tests, this first random split of the samples was used in the analyses reported below.
35
36

37 **Scale shortening methods.** The objective was a short measure that would not be
38
39 prohibitive for use in routine practice, and would show respectable psychometric properties,
40
41 particularly of internal reliability and of criterion validity. There is a tension in shortening a
42
43 scale between over-focusing to maximize reliability versus losing reliability and hence,
44
45 inevitably, also losing validity (e.g., Widaman et al., 2011). Over-focusing on reliability will
46
47 inevitably lead to selection of more similar items and hence lose breadth of coverage of the
48
49 phenomenon being measured, lowering true validity. Our *a priori* criteria for shortening were:
50
51 (a) retaining acceptable internal reliability (Cronbach's α); (b) reasonable fit to a one
52
53 dimensional model, defined as acceptable fit in single factor CFA without large modification
54
55 indices for correlated residuals suggesting a higher order factor structure *and* acceptable fit to a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 single factor Rasch model; (c) plausible (medium to low end large effect size) correlations with
4
5 WAI and RDI scores within both the client and therapist samples; (d) small or non-significant
6
7 effects of gender; and finally (e) psychometric properties that were not radically different in the
8
9 client and therapist samples so that, though these are clearly different viewpoints on the
10
11 phenomena of interest, it would be possible to use the same scale for both groups. Shortening
12
13 was stopped when continuing led to deterioration in Cronbach's alpha and no improvement on
14
15 any other parameters in the analyses.
16
17

18
19 Two *a priori* decisions need further comment: the use of both CFA and Rasch analysis,
20
21 and a particular point about the CFA. It is not common to use both CFA and Rasch analyses as
22
23 they are often seen as rival methods. Other examples of using them appropriately for their
24
25 complementarity include Cahill et al., (2012) and Mavranouzouli, Brazier, Young, & Barkham,
26
27 (2011) CFA treats item scores as arithmetic values that additively reflect the underlying
28
29 dimension of interest matching how measures are generally scored using unit scores for levels of
30
31 the items. Rasch analyses do not assume this and find the best fit of the data to a model in which
32
33 the steps between response options on each item are thought to be reflections of the latent
34
35 variable. This is a better fit to the psychological realities of questionnaire completion than CFA,
36
37 while the CFA model is a better fit to how questionnaires are scored than Rasch analysis.
38
39 However, the Rasch analyses essentially check fit to the CFA assumption of a single underlying
40
41 factor and of linearity: if the Rasch model shows markedly unequal steps between response
42
43 levels for an item the CFA results, and conventional scoring, would be suspect. Our CFA is of
44
45 the pure single factor model whereas many CFA analyses reported in the literature allow
46
47 correlated item error terms to achieve high fit indices. Such analyses inevitably confound error
48
49 and true variance so we did not allow these, preferring to accept that CFA fit indices might be
50
51 less than ideal given the very short scale we sought, but knowing that interpretation of the model
52
53 would be clear.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The process of shortening, starting with all 16 items, was an evaluation of misfit to the
4
5 CFA and Rasch models with items removed which either showed most involvement in
6
7 correlated residuals in the CFA (modification indices for correlated residuals over 10), or
8
9 showed most uneven item response step locations and/or most differential item functioning
10
11 between the therapist and client subsamples. When a final shortened scale was reached, the same
12
13 Rasch and CFA analyses were conducted on the checking subsamples to assess the replicability
14
15 of the parameters. As there are many statistics from each of the CFA and Rasch analyses of two
16
17 separate shortening samples for each shortening step, these are not reported here. Full details are
18
19 available on request.
20
21
22

23
24 Analyses of the full client and therapist samples and the total dataset were planned *a*
25
26 *priori*, in order to achieve maximum precision of estimation subject to the checking analyses
27
28 refuting that the choice of items had been achieved by capitalization on chance.
29

30
31 Most analyses were conducted using R, however, as a number of tests conventional in
32
33 Rasch analyses are provided by the Winsteps program (Linacre, 2017) but not by the R
34
35 packages, the complete sample data were analyzed using Winsteps to report these values. All
36
37 scale development analyses were conducted using R version 3.4.4 (R Core Team, 2018). We
38
39 used the ltm and lordif packages to compute Lord's test of differential item functioning
40
41 (between therapist and client subsamples) (Choi, 2016; Rizopoulos, 2006); and the lavaan
42
43 package to explore the CFA of the data (Rosseel, 2012). In R, the Generalized Partial Credit
44
45 Model (GPCM) was used initially without constraints to check for poor severity step separation.
46
47
48

49 Results

50 51 Psychometric Scale Shortening

52
53 The shortening steps are summarized in Table 1. Based on analyses of the shortening
54
55 subsamples, items 1, 2 and 10 were first removed as they were involved in most of the high
56
57 correlated error modification indices (MIs) in the CFA. Item 15 was removed because it showed
58
59
60

1
2
3 strong differential item functioning (DIF) in the Rasch analyses. That is, the item behaved
4
5 differently from the others in the analyses of the client as against the therapist subsamples.
6
7

8 From the 12-item stage, item 14 was removed as it was involved in most of the high
9
10 correlated error MIs in the CFA, followed by items 5, 11, and 12 which showed poor fit in
11
12 Rasch analysis and generally significantly correlated error terms with high MIs. Item 6 was then
13
14 removed because of poor fit in Rasch analysis. Finally, item 3 was removed as it was involved
15
16 in a high MI (with item 9). At this point further shortening would result in unacceptably low
17
18 Cronbach alpha values.
19
20

21 Following this process, the final items were inspected by the authors to review their
22
23 alignment with “relational depth”, as conceptually described. As intended, most items depicted
24
25 qualities of intense moments of interpersonal encounter, for instance “We were deeply
26
27 connected to one another” and “I felt like we were totally in-the-moment together”. One item,
28
29 “it felt like a shared experience”, described a less intense moment of encounter. However, we
30
31 decided to retain it in the final scale as it remained consistent with descriptions of relational
32
33 depth, to maintain a range of item “difficulties”, and because the item would increase the face
34
35 validity of the measure with a wider range of respondents. The final six items which constituted
36
37 the RDFS were items 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, and 16 (marked on Table 1 with asterisks).
38
39
40
41

42 **Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Statistics**

43

44 Confirmatory Factor Analysis fit statistics for a six item, unidimensional measure for all
45
46 seven samples are given in Table 3. As can be seen here, CFA of the samples and the full dataset
47
48 showed statistically significantly imperfect fit ($p < .05$) for all but the replication sample of
49
50 clients ($p = .05$), RMSEA values indicated that the fit to the model is not perfect. However, all
51
52 the CFI values were excellent, as were the SRMR values. The loadings for the six items in the
53
54 seven samples are shown in table 8. The internal reliability and most other psychometric
55
56 parameters in the checking sample were better than in the shortening sample, which rules out
57
58
59
60

capitalization on chance. Analyses of the combined data have the tightest confidence intervals and greatest generalizability by virtue of the double sample size. All loadings were strong. There were some differences between the shortening and checking loadings but no consistent pattern for the loadings to be worse in the checking samples. There were stable differences between the items in their loadings within samples and loadings in the client samples were higher than in the therapist samples.

Internal consistency and Distribution Parameters for RDFS

For therapists, the internal consistency (Cronbach alpha) of the final, six item RDFS was .85 (95% CI .82–.88) and for clients it was .93 (95% CI .91–.94) (Table 5). The mean score (between a maximum of 30 and a minimum of 6) was 21.3 for therapists (95% CI 20.9–21.8) and 19.9 (95% CI 19.1–20.7) for clients. Internal consistency and distribution parameters for the RDFS in all samples and subsamples are summarized in Table 4.

Rasch Analysis

Winsteps standardized residuals had mean 0.00 and standard deviation 0.97 (marked deviations from zero and one indicate misfit to the Rasch model). The log-likelihood test of fit gave $\chi^2 = 5949.1$ with approximately 6005 ± 6 *df*, $p = .69$, suggesting the fit to the model is not statistically significantly imperfect. Similarly, the global Root-Mean-Square Residual (RMSR) was .61 with expected value: .62.

In the light of these fit indicators, the specific Rasch statistics for the scale can be considered. For the items in the full dataset the separation based on the “worst case: real” analysis in Winsteps was 8.08 and the “model” analysis was 8.32, these values equate to item reliability values of .98 and .99. The “model” analysis assumes that all misfit was down to random sampling vagaries in this dataset and that the model will replicate in all future use of the measure. The likely generalizable value is going to lie between the two. For person separation, the “real” separation was 2.60 and “model” separation was 2.89 equating to person reliabilities

of .87 and .89 respectively. In addition, visual inspection of the item response curves from the Rasch analyses showed all the response steps fairly evenly spaced and none out of their logical order.

Criterion validity

Convergent validity. Inspection of scatterplots with linear regression lines showed no marked deviation from linear relationships between the RDFS scores and any of the WAI-SR and RDI-R2 scores. The convergent validity correlations with the WAI-SR and RDI-R2 scores in the client and therapist samples are shown in Tables 5 and 6, respectively. For clients, Pearson correlations with the RDFS were .71 for the total WAI-SR scale (.40 for WAI-SR Goals, .69 for WAI-SR Tasks, and .76 for WAI-SR Bond), and .77 for the RDI-R2. All correlations are significant at $p < 4 \times 10^{-9}$. For therapists, Pearson correlations with the RDFS were .52 for the total WAI-SR scale (.40 for WAI-SR Goals, .49 for WAI-SR Tasks, and .46 for WAI-SR Bond), and .56 for the RDI-R2. All correlations were significant with $p < 0.001$.

Effects of Gender. This effect was small and not statistically significant and was of a different direction in the client and the therapist subsamples, with a higher mean for the women than the men in the therapists' subsample and *vice versa* in the clients' (Table 7).

Effect of Therapist vs. Client Status of Participant. As suggested by the means in Table 7, and shown in the boxplot in Figure 3, there was a small but statistically significant tendency for therapists to give higher RDFS scores than clients (Mann-Whitney test $W = 40,809$, $p = .03$, Cohen's $d = 0.28$, 95% CI [0.11–0.46]).

Discussion

This study demonstrated the development of a brief self-report measure of relational depth, which can complement measures of the quality of the therapeutic interaction by focusing on in-depth relating as a “threshold” phenomenon. Initial processes of item refinement, followed by quantitative scale shortening led to a six item RDFS whose psychometric parameters

1
2
3 replicated remarkably well in an independent checking subsample. This supported that it had not
4
5 been capitalizing on chance sampling variations. The measure had good internal consistency
6
7 considering its brevity. Rasch analyses showed both excellent fit between data and model,
8
9 excellent reliability, even spacing of response stepping points, and no differential item
10
11 functioning across the client and therapist groups of participants. The statistical fit to a strict
12
13 single factor model was by no means perfect. This finding was unsurprising with only six items
14
15 and five response levels in the scale, implying the data are not continuous nor likely to show
16
17 correlations unaffected by the short ordinal scale. On balance, these findings support the use of
18
19 the RDFS as a reliable measure of the frequency of moments of profound contact and
20
21 engagement in psychotherapy.
22
23
24
25

26 With regards to criterion validity, the RDFS showed a strong association with the RDI-
27
28 R2 in both the client and therapist samples, with correlations that were within the predicted
29
30 range. This suggests that there is a strong relationship between the frequency with which
31
32 individuals experience moments of relational depth in therapy (RDFS), and the depth of relating
33
34 they ascribe to a single self-identified important moment in therapy (RDI-R2; Wiggins 2012).
35
36
37

38 Associations between RDFS and WAI-SR scores were overall lower, but showing
39
40 similar differences between client and therapist-completed scales. Correlations for all three
41
42 therapist-completed subscales, and the client-completed goal subscale were within the predicted
43
44 range, and the therapist-completed total scale was just above it. This association is comparable
45
46 to the convergence of the Real Relationship Inventory with the WAI-SR in a therapist sample (r
47
48 = .47; Gelso et al, 2005), and suggests that for therapists, there is a moderate association
49
50 between the quality of the working alliance and the frequency with which moments of relational
51
52 depth are experienced. It may also support the hypothesis that relational depth occurs more often
53
54 when there is already a good working alliance.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As with the RDI-R2, correlations of the RDFS with the client-completed WAI-SR total
4 scale, and the Tasks and Bond subscale were considerably larger and outside the predicted
5 range. This suggests that, for clients, there could be more overlap between the quality of the
6 alliance (in terms of bond and task agreement), and the frequency with which moments of
7 relational depth are experienced. This can also support that clients are likely to need the safety
8 of an even stronger alliance in order to experience relational depth in therapy.
9

10
11 While the RDFS was designed to be usable for both therapists and clients—and this was
12 supported in our results—psychometric parameters were, nonetheless, not expected to be the
13 same in therapists and clients. Higher internal reliability in the client sample may have
14 contributed—through “attenuation” (meaning that correlations between two less than perfectly
15 reliable measures of correlated phenomena will always be lower than the correlations between
16 those phenomena had they been measured with high reliability) —to higher correlations for
17 clients with the RDI-R2 and WAI-SR (Fisher, 2014). Another plausible explanation of this
18 difference is that therapists, by their training and experience, have a more nuanced
19 understanding of the therapy relationship, and are better able to discern different components
20 within it. This interpretation is supported by the similar trend in correlations between the RDI-
21 R2 and the WAI-SR in our client and therapist samples. Further research is needed to explain
22 these differences: particularly data collected in clinical settings from pairs of therapists and
23 clients in ongoing therapies (e.g., Rubel et al., 2018).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 While correlations for the client group were large, the largest correlation for the bond
48 component suggests that 42.2% of the variance in clients’ RDFS scores was not accounted for
49 by their WAI-SR Bond scores. This supports the argument that the RDFS is measuring a
50 separable dimension of the quality of the therapeutic interaction in even the most correlated of
51 the RDI-R2 and WAI-SR scores. This also suggests that the RDFS can be used to complement
52 the RDI-R2’s emphasis and focus: the RDFS assesses frequency of relational depth over an
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 episode of therapy, as opposed to the depth of specific moments. In addition, while the RDI-R2
4
5 functions to elicit vivid memories of such moments, the RDFS may minimize participant fatigue
6
7 in that it has only six items. As such, it may be more appropriate for regular use in clinical
8
9 practice and in research designs requiring repeated assessment.
10
11

12 Finally, we had sought and found a measure showing a low effect of gender on mean
13
14 scores. As described in our nomological net, there were no strong *a priori* hypotheses in the
15
16 literature on effects of gender. Thus, a strong gender effect would show poor criterion validity
17
18 (Widaman et al., 2011). Therefore, this finding supports initial evidence in the exploration of
19
20 criterion validity.
21
22

23
24 The study had several limitations. While a range of participants and samples were
25
26 targeted, our estimated response rates were only 9–14%. In addition, we did not control for who
27
28 responded to the survey, such that this may have been influenced by a self-selecting bias. That
29
30 is, the title of the project called for participation in a study on the quality of the therapeutic
31
32 relationship, and this could have attracted participants who were relationally-oriented. In
33
34 addition, our results may have been influenced by a social desirability bias, as therapists may
35
36 have attempted to portray their therapeutic relationship in positive terms. However, this was
37
38 controlled for when looking at reliability in the client sample, as clients would have less reason
39
40 to present themselves in this way. Another limitation of this study was that 82% of participants
41
42 were females, and fewer than 10% of participants came from an ethnic minority background.
43
44 For our therapist sample, these proportions are not unusual in the psychotherapy workforce in
45
46 the UK and the US (American Psychological Association, 2015; Orlinsky & Rønnestad, 2005);
47
48 but future research would benefit from the validation of the RDFS in more balanced and
49
50 culturally diverse samples.
51
52
53
54

55
56 Another important limitation of our study was that approximately 62% of client
57
58 participants were also mental health professionals. This meant that responses to the items may
59
60

1
2
3 not have been representative of a true population of psychotherapy clients. The RDFS, therefore,
4
5 requires validation with a client sample that is more truly representative of psychotherapy users.
6
7 A study carried out in a clinical setting would also enable more control over its procedures and
8
9 would allow for the clustering of therapist and client data. It would also allow us to test the
10
11 acceptability and clinical utility of the measure. Furthermore, data collection at multiple time
12
13 points in a clinical setting would enable further exploration of the sensitivity to change of the
14
15 RDFS in therapeutic processes over time. Further research is also needed to test the construct
16
17 validity of the RDFS against other measures, in particular the Real Relationship Inventory
18
19 (Kelley et al., 2010), and an indicator of mutuality using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship
20
21 Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 2015). Finally, the RDFS needs formal testing of divergent validity,
22
23 for instance with a measure of social desirability.
24
25
26
27

28
29 With initial validity and reliability in an online sample, the RDFS—a measure of a
30
31 unique component of the therapy relationship, moments of relational depth—can be used to
32
33 further understand the processes and mechanisms by which particular qualities of the therapeutic
34
35 interaction can lead to improved treatment outcomes. As a brief measure, the RDFS has the
36
37 potential for future use in cross-lagged panel studies and other methodologically advanced
38
39 designs to evaluate the direction of causality in any identified associations. In such a study, it
40
41 will be essential to assess the sensitivity of the RDFS to change over the course of treatment, as
42
43 well as to use other relationship measures, such as the WAI-SR and BLRI, to examine whether
44
45 moments of relational depth make a unique contribution to outcomes. Such research will help to
46
47 identify whether the greatest contribution to outcomes comes from the general quality of the
48
49 therapeutic interaction; or by the frequency of particularly intense moments of therapeutic
50
51 engagement; or, indeed, by the depth of relating in single moments in therapy, as assessed by the
52
53 RDI-R2 (Wiggins, 2012). With respect to these latter two possibilities, moments of relational
54
55 depth may function like “significant therapy events” (Elliott & Shapiro, 1992), or akin to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 episodes of “sudden change” (Tang & DeRubeis, 1999), making qualitatively distinct
4
5 contributions to therapeutic improvement. A measure of the frequency of relational depth could
6
7 also be used to extend existing research on mutuality of the core conditions, or congruence of
8
9 bond associations, across the therapeutic relationship and its association to outcomes (e.g.,
10
11 Rubel et al., 2018; Murphy & Cramer, 2014).

12
13
14
15 If relational depth is found to make a distinctive contribution to outcomes, this may have
16
17 important implications for practice. Mearns and Cooper (2018) identified a number of strategies
18
19 by which therapists may be trained to deepen their levels of relating. This includes the
20
21 development of practical skills such as “holistic listening”, and self-reflective work on
22
23 identifying one’s own “chronic strategies of disconnection” (Cooper & Knox, 2018). It also
24
25 includes a broader developmental agenda, such as developing the capacity to draw on
26
27 “existential touchstones”. There is initial evidence suggesting that therapists can learn to relate
28
29 at depth and undergo relational depth training if they have a capacity or a desire for it (Tangen &
30
31 Cashwell, 2016).

32
33
34
35 The RDFS measure is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives
36
37 4.0 International licence. It should be used cautiously until larger and more diverse and
38
39 representative referential samples are collected. Nevertheless, as Zilcha-Mano (2017) states,
40
41 “more exciting work [on the alliance–outcome relationship] awaits us yet...exploring new
42
43 perspectives on the complexity of therapeutic change” (p.322). Our hope is that the RDFS will
44
45 contribute to this process.
46
47

48 49 50 **References**

51
52 American Psychological Association. (2015). *Demographics of the US psychology workforce:*
53
54 *Findings from the American Community Survey*. Washington, DC: APA. Retrieved from:
55
56 <http://www.apa.org/workforce/publications/13-demographics/index.aspx>
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Barrett-Lennard, G. T. (2015). *The Relationship Inventory: A Complete Resource and Guide*.
4
5 London: John Wiley.
6
7
8 Bordin, E. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance.
9
10 *Psychotherapy*, 16(3), 252-260. doi. 10.1037/h0085885
11
12 Busse, A., & Ferri, R. B. (2003). Methodological reflections on a three-step-design combining
13
14 observation, stimulated recall and interview. *Zentralblatt für Didaktik der Mathematik*, 35(6),
15
16 257-264. doi: 10.1007/BF02656690
17
18
19 Cahill, J., Stiles, W. B., Barkham, M., Hardy, G. E., Stone, G., Agnew-Davies, R., & Unsworth,
20
21 G. (2012). Two short forms of the Agnew Relationship Measure: The ARM-5 and ARM-
22
23 12. *Psychotherapy Research*, 22(3), 241-255.
24
25
26 Castonguay, L. G., Constantino, M. J., & Holtforth, M. G. (2006). The working alliance: Where
27
28 are we and where should we go?. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice,*
29
30 *Training*, 43(3), 271. doi: [10.1037/0033-3204.43.3.271](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-3204.43.3.271)
31
32
33 Choi, S. W. (2016). lordif: Logistic Ordinal Regression Differential Item Functioning using IRT.
34
35 R package version 0.3-3. (With contributions from Gibbons, L. E. and Crane, P. K.):
36
37 <ftp://200.236.31.3/CRAN/web/packages/lordif/lordif.pdf>
38
39
40 Cooper, M. (2005). Therapists' experiences of relational depth: A qualitative interview study.
41
42 *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 5(2), 87-95. doi: [10.1080/17441690500211130](https://doi.org/10.1080/17441690500211130)
43
44
45 Cooper, M. (2013). Experiencing relational depth in therapy: What we know so far. In R. Knox,
46
47 D. Murphy, S. Wiggins & M. Cooper (Eds.), *Relational depth: New perspectives and*
48
49 *developments* (pp. 62-76). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
50
51
52 Cooper, M., & Knox, R. (2018). Therapists' self-reported chronic strategies of disconnection in
53
54 everyday life and in counselling and psychotherapy: an exploratory study. *British Journal of*
55
56 *Guidance & Counselling*, 46(2), 185-200. doi: [10.1080/03069885.2017.1343457](https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2017.1343457)
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Vol. 26). Sage
4
5 publications.
6
7
8 Elliott, R., & Shapiro, D. A. (1992). Client and therapist as analysts of significant events. In S.
9
10 G. Toukmanian & D. L. Rennie (Eds.), *Psychotherapy Process Research: Paradigmatic and*
11
12 *Narrative Approaches* (pp. 163-186). London: Sage.
13
14
15 Evans, C., Connell, J., Barkham, M., Margison, F., McGrath, G., Mellor-Clark, J., & Audin, K.
16
17 (2002). Towards a standardised brief outcome measure: Psychometric properties and utility
18
19 of the CORE-OM. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, *180*(1), 51-60.
20
21 doi:10.1192/bjp.180.1.51
22
23
24 Falkenström F., Granström F., Holmqvist R. (2013). Therapeutic alliance predicts symptomatic
25
26 improvement session by session. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *60*, 317-328. doi.
27
28 10.1037/a0032258
29
30
31 Falkenström, F., Kuria, M., Othieno, C., & Kumar, M. (2018). Working alliance predicts
32
33 symptomatic improvement in public hospital-delivered psychotherapy in Nairobi, Kenya.
34
35 *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. doi: 10.1192/S2056474000001938
36
37
38 Fisher, C. R. (2014) A Pedagogic Demonstration of Attenuation of Correlation Due to
39
40 Measurement Error, *Spreadsheets in Education (eJSiE)*: Vol. 7: Iss. 1, Article 4. Available at:
41
42 <http://epublications.bond.edu.au/ejsie/vol7/iss1/4>
43
44
45 Fluckiger, C., Del Re, A. C., Wampold, B. E., & Horvath, A. O. (2018). The alliance in adult
46
47 psychotherapy: A meta-analytic synthesis. *Psychotherapy (Chic)*, *55*(4), 316-340. doi:
48
49 10.1037/pst0000172
50
51
52 Fuertes, J. N., Mislowack, A., Brown, S., Gur-Arie, S., Wilkinson, S., & Gelso, C. J. (2007).
53
54 Correlates of the real relationship in psychotherapy: A study of dyads. *Psychotherapy*
55
56 *Research*, *17*(4), 423-430. doi: [10.1080/10503300600789189](https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300600789189)
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Gelso, C. J. (2004, June). A theory of real relationship in psychotherapy. In *International*
4
5 *Conference of the Society for Psychotherapy Research, Rome*.

6
7
8 Gelso, C. J., Kivlighan, D. M. J., & Markin, R. D. (2018). The real relationship and its role in
9
10 psychotherapy outcome: A meta-analysis. *Psychotherapy, 55*(4), 434-445. doi:
11
12 [10.1037/pst0000183](https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000183)

13
14
15 Gelso, C. J., Kelley, F. A., Fuertes, J. N., Marmarosh, C., Holmes, S. E., Costa, C., & Hancock,
16
17 G. R. (2005). Measuring the Real Relationship in Psychotherapy: Initial Validation of the
18
19 Therapist Form. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(4), 640-649. doi. 10.1037/0022-
20
21 0167.52.4.640

22
23
24 Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. F. (1988). Relation to sample size to the stability of component
25
26 patterns. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*(2), 265-275. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.103.2.265

27
28
29 Hak, T., Van der Veer, K., & Jansen, H. (2004). *The Three-Step Test-Interview (TSTI): An*
30
31 *observational instrument for pretesting self-completion questionnaires*. Rotterdam: Erasmus
32
33 Research Institute of Management. doi: [10.18148/srm/2008.v2i3.1669](https://doi.org/10.18148/srm/2008.v2i3.1669)

34
35
36 Hak, T., van der Veer, K., & Ommundsen, R. (2006). An Application of the Three-Step Test
37
38 Interview (TSTI): A validation study of the Dutch and Norwegian versions of the 'Illegal
39
40 Aliens Scale'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 9*(3), 215-227. doi.
41
42 10.1080/13645570600656264

43
44
45 Hatcher, R. L., & Gillaspay, J. A. (2006). Development and validation of a revised short version
46
47 of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Psychotherapy Research, 16*(1), 12-25. doi:
48
49 [10.1080/10503300500352500](https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300500352500)

50
51
52 Hermida, R. (2015). The problem of allowing correlated errors in structural equation modeling:
53
54 Concerns and considerations. *Computational Methods in Social Sciences, 3*, 5–17. DOI:
55
56 [10.1177/2056305115610141](https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115610141)

- 1
2
3 Hinkin, T. R. (2005). Scale development principles and practices. In R. A. Swanson & E. F.
4
5 Holton III (eds.) *Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry*, (pp. 161-
6
7 179). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- 8
9
10 Hinkin, T. R., Tracey, J. B., & Enz, C. A. (1997). *Scale construction: Developing reliable and*
11
12 *valid measurement instruments* [Electronic version]. Retrieved 22nd April 2018 from Cornell
13
14 University, School of Hotel Administration site:
15
16 <http://scholarship.sha.cornell.edu/articles/613>
- 17
18
19 Horvarth, A. O., & Bedi, R. P. (2002). The alliance. In J. C. Norcross (Ed.), *Psychotherapy*
20
21 *Relationships that Work: Therapist Contributions and Responsiveness to Patients* (pp. 37-
22
23 69). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 24
25
26 Jansen, H., & Hak, T. (2005). The productivity of the three-step test-interview (TSTI) compared
27
28 to an expert review of a self-administered questionnaire on alcohol consumption. *Journal of*
29
30 *Official Statistics*, 21(1), 103-120. DOI: 10.18148/srm/2008.v2i3.1669
- 31
32
33 Kelley, F. A., Gelso, C. J., Fuertes, J. N., Marmarosh, C., & Lanier, S. H. (2010). The Real
34
35 Relationship Inventory: Development and psychometric investigation of the client
36
37 form. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, 47(4), 540. DOI:
38
39 [10.1037/a0022082](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022082)
- 40
41
42 Knox, R. (2011). *Clients' experiences of relational depth*. (PhD dissertation), Glasgow:
43
44 University of Strathclyde.
- 45
46
47 Knox, R., & Cooper, M. (2010). Relationship qualities that are associated with moments of
48
49 relational depth: The client's perspective. *Person-Centered and Experiential*
50
51 *Psychotherapies*, 9(3), 236-256. doi. 10.1080/14779757.2010.9689069
- 52
53
54 Knox, R., Murphy, D., Wiggins, S., & Cooper, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Relational depth: New*
55
56 *perspectives and developments*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- 57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Leung, J. (2008). *A quantitative online study exploring the factors associated with the*
4 *experience and perception of relational depth.* (DPsych. dissertation), Glasgow: University of
5
6
7
8 Strathclyde.
- 9
10 Linacre, J.M. (2017) A user's guide to WINSTEPS MINISTEP Rasch-model computer
11
12 programs. Version 4.0.0. Winsteps.com. ISBN 0-941938-03-4.
- 13
14 Mavranouzouli, I., Brazier, J. E., Young, T. A., & Barkham, M. (2011). Using Rasch analysis to
15
16 form plausible health states amenable to valuation: the development of CORE-6D from a
17
18 measure of common mental health problems (CORE-OM). *Quality of Life Research*, 20(3),
19
20 321-333. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11136-010-9768-4>
21
22
- 23
24 Mearns, D., & Cooper, M. (2018). *Working at Relational Depth in Counselling and*
25
26 *Psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- 27
28 Mearns, D., & Cooper, M. (2005). *Working at Relational Depth in Counselling and*
29
30 *Psychotherapy*. London: Sage.
- 31
32 Munder, T., Wilmers, F., Leonhart, R., Linster, H. W., & Barth, J. (2010). Working Alliance
33
34 Inventory-Short Revised (WAI-SR): psychometric properties in outpatients and inpatients.
35
36 *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 17(3), 231-239. doi: 10.1002/cpp.658
37
38
- 39
40 Murphy, D., & Cramer, D. (2014). Mutuality of Rogers's therapeutic conditions and treatment
41
42 progress in the first three psychotherapy sessions. *Psychotherapy Research*, 24(6), 651-661.
43
44 doi: [10.1080/10503307.2013.874051](https://doi.org/10.1080/10503307.2013.874051)
45
46
- 47
48 Norcross, J. C. & Lambert, M. J. (2018). Psychotherapy relationships that work III.
49
50 *Psychotherapy*, 55 (4), 303-315. doi: 10.1037/pst0000193.
- 51
52 Orlinsky, D. E., Rønnestad, M. H., & Collaborative Research Network of the Society for
53
54 Psychotherapy Research. (2005). *How psychotherapists develop: A study of therapeutic work*
55
56 *and professional growth.* Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:
57
58 10.1037/11157-000
59
60

- 1
2
3 R Core Team (2018). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
4 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
5
6
7
8 Rizopoulos, D. (2006). ltm: An R package for Latent Variable Modelling and Item Response
9 Theory Analyses, *Journal of Statistical Software*, 17(5), 1-25. doi: 10.18637/jss.v017.i05
10
11
12 Rogers, C.R. (1957). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change.
13 *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21, 95-103. doi: [10.1037/h0045357](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045357)
14
15
16
17 Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R Package for Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of*
18 *Statistical Software*, 48(2), 1-36. doi: 10.18637/jss.v048.i02
19
20
21
22 Rubel, J. A., Bar-Kalifa, E., Atzil-Slonim, D., Schmidt, S., & Lutz, W. (2018). Congruence of
23 therapeutic bond perceptions and its relation to treatment outcome: Within-and between-dyad
24 effects.
25
26
27
28 Stern, D. N. (2004). *The Present Moment in Psychotherapy and Everyday Life*. New York: W.
29 W. Norton.
30
31
32
33 Tang, T. Z., & DeRubeis, R. J. (1999). Sudden gains and critical sessions in cognitive-
34 behavioral therapy for depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67(6),
35 894-904:
36
37 <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.488.1236&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
38
39
40
41
42 Tangen, J. L., & Cashwell, C. S. (2016). Touchstones of connection: A concept mapping study
43 of counselor factors that contribute to relational depth. *The Journal of Humanistic*
44 *Counseling*, 55(1), 20-36.
45
46
47
48
49 Widaman, K. F., Little, T. D., Preacher, K. J., & Sawalani, G. M. (2011). On creating and using
50 short forms of scales in secondary research. In K. H. Trzesniewski, M. B. Donnellan, & R. E.
51 Lucas (Eds.), *Secondary data analysis: An introduction for psychologists* (pp. 39-61).
52 Washington, DC, US: APA. doi: [10.1037/12350-003](https://doi.org/10.1037/12350-003)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Wiggins, S. (2012). *Development and testing of a measure of relational depth in counselling and psychotherapy*. (PhD thesis), University of Strathclyde, Glasgow. Retrieved 24/4/2018 from <http://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.576407>

Wiggins, S., Elliott, R., & Cooper, M. (2012). The prevalence and characteristics of relational depth events in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy Research*, 22(2), 139-158. doi: 10.1080/10503307.2011.629635

Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research: A content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6), 806-838. doi: [10.1177/0011000006288127](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006288127)

Zilcha-Mano, S. (2017). Is the alliance really therapeutic? Revisiting this question in light of recent methodological advances. *American Psychologist*, 72(4), 311-325. doi: 10.1037/a0040435

Zilcha-Mano, S., Dinger, U., McCarthy, K. S., & Barber, J. P. (2014). Does alliance predict symptoms throughout treatment, or is it the other way around? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(6), 931-935. doi: 10.1037/a0035141

Table and Figures

Table 1

Items Taken Forward for Psychometric Exploration and reasons for removal

Items	Reason for removal
01: I experienced an intense connection with him/her	Involved in most correlated error terms with high MIs (MIs over 10.0) Marked DIF in client/therapist comparison
02: I experienced a very profound engagement with her/him	
10: I felt we connected on a human level	
15: I felt we truly acknowledged each other at a very deep level	
03: I experienced what felt like true mutuality	Involved (with item 9) in one high MI (21.3)
04: We were deeply connected to one another*	
05: I felt a clarity of perception between us	Poor fit in Rasch analysis
11: I experienced a deep sense of encounter	Involved in most correlated error terms with high MIs (MIs over 10.0)
12: I experienced a meeting that was beyond words	
06: I felt intensely present with him/her	Poor fit in Rasch analysis
07: We were immersed in the present moment*	
08: There was a deep understanding between us*	

09: It felt like a shared experience*

13: I felt like we were totally in-the-moment together*

14: I felt we were really close to each other Involved in most correlated error terms with high MIs (over 10.0)

16: I felt we were completely open with each other*

Note. * Indicates inclusion in final RDFS

Table 3

Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Statistics: All Subsamples and Full Dataset

Sample	n	Chisq	Df	P	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR
Exp. Th.	168	27.5	9	.001	.94	.11	.04
Conf. Th.	168	17.3	9	.045	.98	.07	.03
Exp. Cl.	110	18.2	9	.03	.98	.10	.03
Conf. Cl.	110	17.2	9	.05	.98	.09	.03
Th.	336	32.6	9	.0002	.97	.09	.03
Cl.	220	21.4	9	.01	.99	.08	.02
All	556	38.8	9	<.0001	.98	.08	.02

Note. Exp. Th. = Shortening therapist subsample, Conf. Th. = Checking therapist subsample, Exp. Cl. = Shortening client subsample, Exp. Th. = Checking client subsample

Table 4

Reliability and Distribution Parameters for RDFS in All Samples and Subsamples

Sample	n	Mean (95% CI)	SD (95% CI)	Range	Cronbach alpha (95% CI)
Exp. Th.	168	21.2 (20.6 to 21.8)	4.2 (3.8 to 4.7)	8 to 30	.83 (.78 to .88)
Conf. Th.	168	21.5 (20.8 to 22.1)	4.3 (3.9 to 4.9)	7 to 30	.87 (.84 to .91)
Exp. Cl.	110	18.9 (17.8 to 20.1)	6.2 (5.6 to 6.9)	6 to 30	.92 (.90 to .95)
Conf. Cl.	110	20.9 (19.7 to 22.1)	6.3 (5.6 to 7.0)	6 to 30	.93 (.91 to .96)
Th.	336	21.3 (20.9 to 21.8)	4.2 (3.9 to 4.6)	6 to 30	.85 (.82 to .88)
Cl.	220	19.9 (19.1 to 20.7)	6.3 (5.8 to 6.8)	7 to 30	.93 (.91 to .94)
All	556	20.8 (20.4 to 21.2)	5.2 (4.9 to 5.5)	6 to 30	.90 (.88 to .91)

Note. Exp. Th. = Shortening therapist subsample, Conf. Th. = Checking therapist subsample, Exp. Cl. = Shortening client subsample, Exp. Th. = Checking client subsample

Table 7

Divergent Validity: Gender Effects on RDFS Scores

Sample	Female mean	Female SD	Male mean	Male SD	Cohen's d (95% CI)
Therapists	21.5	4.3	20.7	3.9	0.18 (-0.05 to 0.45)
Clients	19.8	6.4	20.4	6.0	-0.11 (-0.43 to 0.21)
All	20.8	5.3	20.6	4.8	0.04 (-0.17 to 0.26)

Table 8

Item loading table

	T(S)	T(c)	T(comb)	C(S)	C(C)	C(comb)	All
RDFST04	0.76	0.71	0.73	1.05	0.98	1.04	0.88
RDFST07	0.43	0.66	0.55	0.90	0.88	0.89	0.71
RDFST08	0.66	0.75	0.71	1.01	1.07	1.05	0.87
RDFST09	0.63	0.59	0.62	1.03	1.09	1.08	0.85
RDFST13	0.72	0.72	0.71	1.05	1.05	1.06	0.88
RDFST16	0.61	0.59	0.60	0.86	0.94	0.91	0.74




Figure 3. Boxplot of RDFS scores: clients vs. therapists.

Table 5
Convergent Validity in Client Subsample against WAI-SR and RDI-R2

	RDFS	WAI-SR	WAI-SR Goal	WAI-SR Task	WAI-SR Bond	RDI
RDFS	1.00	0.71 (0.61 to 0.79)	0.4 (0.28 to 0.51)	0.69 (0.6 to 0.76)	0.76 (0.69 to 0.82)	0.77 (0.7 to 0.83)
WAI-SR	0.68 (0.59 to 0.77)	1.00	0.83 (0.78 to 0.86)	0.9 (0.86 to 0.92)	0.85 (0.81 to 0.89)	0.67 (0.57 to 0.75)
WAI-SR Goal	0.39 (0.26 to 0.52)	0.84 (0.79 to 0.88)	1.00	0.6 (0.5 to 0.68)	0.48 (0.38 to 0.59)	0.41 (0.27 to 0.53)
WAI-SR Task	0.66 (0.56 to 0.75)	0.86 (0.8 to 0.9)	0.57 (0.45 to 0.67)	1.00	0.74 (0.66 to 0.8)	0.68 (0.58 to 0.76)
WAI-SR Bond	0.74 (0.66 to 0.8)	0.82 (0.76 to 0.87)	0.46 (0.34 to 0.58)	0.7 (0.62 to 0.77)	1.00	0.66 (0.54 to 0.74)
RDI	0.75 (0.66 to 0.82)	0.63 (0.52 to 0.73)	0.39 (0.25 to 0.52)	0.66 (0.55 to 0.75)	0.63 (0.51 to 0.72)	1.00

Note. Figures above leading diagonal are Pearson correlation, figures below are Spearman coefficients.

Table 6
Convergent Validity in Therapist Subsample against WAI-SR and RDI-R2

	RDFS	WAI-SR	WAI-SR Goal	WAI-SR Task	WAI-SR Bond	RDI
RDFS	1.00	0.5 (0.41 to 0.58)	0.4 (0.29 to 0.5)	0.47 (0.37 to 0.55)	0.43 (0.33 to 0.52)	0.56 (0.48 to 0.63)
WAI-SR	0.5 (0.41 to 0.59)	1.00	0.92 (0.9 to 0.93)	0.91 (0.89 to 0.93)	0.73 (0.65 to 0.8)	0.34 (0.23 to 0.44)
WAI-SR Goal	0.42 (0.32 to 0.5)	0.91 (0.88 to 0.93)	1.00	0.82 (0.78 to 0.86)	0.47 (0.37 to 0.57)	0.23 (0.11 to 0.35)
WAI-SR Task	0.46 (0.36 to 0.54)	0.89 (0.85 to 0.91)	0.79 (0.73 to 0.83)	1.00	0.49 (0.37 to 0.59)	0.31 (0.19 to 0.42)
WAI-SR Bond	0.41 (0.3 to 0.49)	0.7 (0.64 to 0.76)	0.47 (0.39 to 0.56)	0.43 (0.34 to 0.52)	1.00	0.35 (0.23 to 0.46)
RDI	0.56 (0.48 to 0.64)	0.34 (0.23 to 0.44)	0.26 (0.14 to 0.37)	0.31 (0.2 to 0.43)	0.3 (0.17 to 0.41)	1.00

Note. Figures above the leading diagonal are Pearson correlation coefficients, figures below are Spearman coefficients.

Table 2
Sample and Subsample Characteristics

	All	Therapists	Clients		Shortening and checking subsamples			
			Mental health professionals	Laypersons	Shortening		Checking	
					Therapists	Clients	Therapists	Clients
	N = 556	N = 336	N = 138	N=82	N=168	N=110	N=168	N=110
Age (mean, SD)	46 (12)	48 (11)	43 (11)	43 (13)	48 (11)	45 (12)	49 (11)	42 (12)
Gender (N, %)								
Female	455 (82%)	274 (82%)	111 (80%)	70 (85%)	133 (79%)	86 (78%)	141 (84%)	95 (86%)
Male	100 (18%)	62 (18%)	27 (20%)	11 (13%)	35 (21%)	23 (21%)	27 (16%)	15 (14%)
Other	1 (0%)	0	0	1 (1%)	0	1 (1%)	0	0
Ethnicity								

Running head: RELATIONAL DEPTH FREQUENCY SCALE

35

White	502 (90%)	305 (91%)	124 (90%)	73 (89%)	151 (90%)	100 (91%)	154 (92%)	97 (88%)
Black/African/Caribbean	6 (1%)	4 (1%)	2 (1%)	0	2 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (1%)	1 (1%)
Mixed ethnicity	16 (3%)	7 (2%)	7 (5%)	2 (2%)	4 (2%)	3 (3%)	3 (2%)	6 (5%)
Asian/Asian British	18 (3%)	15 (4%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	7 (4%)	3 (3%)	8 (5%)	0
Other	14 (3%)	5 (1%)	4 (3%)	5 (6%)	4 (2%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	6 (5%)
Profession*								
Counsellor	295 (62%)	216 (64%)	79 (57%)	-	109 (65%)	45 (41%)	107 (64%)	34 (31%)
Psychotherapist	217 (46%)	154 (46%)	63 (46%)	-	82 (49%)	27 (25%)	72 (43%)	36 (33%)
Clinical Psychologist	21 (4%)	15 (4%)	6 (4%)	-	8 (5%)	5 (5%)	7 (4%)	1 (1%)
Counselling Psychologist	66 (14%)	45 (13%)	21 (15%)	-	20 (12%)	9 (8%)	25 (15%)	12 (11%)
Other	38 (8%)	27 (8%)	11 (8%)	-	15 (9%)	5 (5%)	12 (7%)	6 (5%)
Level								
In training	110 (24%)	57 (17%)	53 (38%)	-	29 (17%)	25 (37%)	28 (17%)	28 (40%)
Qualified	363 (76%)	278 (83%)	85 (62%)	-	138 (83%)	43 (63%)	140 (83%)	42 (60%)
Years Post-qualification								
Less than one year	31 (8%)	24 (9%)	7 (8%)	-	11 (8%)	3 (7%)	13 (9%)	4 (10%)
1-5 years	129 (35%)	94 (34%)	35 (41%)	-	44 (32%)	17 (40%)	50 (36%)	18 (43%)
5-10 years	84 (23%)	68 (24%)	16 (19%)	-	24 (25%)	8 (19%)	34 (24%)	8 (19%)
10-20 years	79 (22%)	59 (21%)	20 (24%)	-	29 (21%)	12 (28%)	30 (21%)	8 (19%)
Over 20 years	40 (11%)	33 (12%)	7 (8%)	-	20 (14%)	3 (7%)	13 (9%)	4 (10%)
Duration of therapy								
Less than 6 sessions		33 (10%)	4 (3%)	3 (4%)	12 (7%)	4 (4%)	21 (12%)	3 (3%)
6-24 sessions		107 (32%)	25 (18%)	9 (11%)	51 (30%)	16 (15%)	56 (33%)	18 (16%)
Over 24 sessions		133 (40%)	53 (38%)	27 (33%)	75 (45%)	35 (32%)	58 (35%)	45 (41%)
Therapy has ended		63 (19%)	56 (41%)	43 (52%)	30 (18%)	55 (50%)	33 (20%)	44 (40%)
Therapeutic orientation*								
Cognitive-Behavioural		56 (17%)	5 (4%)	17 (21%)		14 (13%)		8 (7%)
Psychodynamic		71 (21%)	20 (14%)	9 (11%)		16 (15%)		13 (12%)
Person-centred		144 (43%)	24 (17%)	14 (17%)		20 (18%)		18 (16%)
Integrative		167 (50%)	44 (32%)	15 (18%)		28 (25%)		31 (28%)
Psychoanalytic		16 (5%)	16 (12%)	6 (7%)		11 (10%)		11 (10%)
I don't know		-	2 (1%)	11 (13%)		7 (6%)		6 (5%)
Existential		75 (22%)	-	-				
Systemic		14 (4%)	-	-				
Other		54 (16%)	27 (20%)	10 (12%)		14 (13%)		23 (21%)

Note. *Participants could select more than one option