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ABSTRACT
This article explores the potential for intermodal methods in person-centred supervision, focusing on the application of techniques from dance movement therapy (DMT) and psychodrama. The article proposes how specific structures combining psychodrama and DMT allow the supervisee to negotiate between proximity and distance, offering ways to hone in, step out or create alternative perspectives. Somatic congruence is introduced as a person-centred principle that enables the supervisor to understand and/or share somatic reactions in response to the supervisee’s material or the supervisor’s own personal process. Embodying roles and projective techniques are illustrated in the article through examples from the author’s supervisory DMT practice, demonstrating how these interventions may help symbolically crystallise supervisory issues. Caveats to these interventions and cautions to practitioners are presented, contributing to critical analyses of cross-disciplinary work. The article presents a constructive view towards future research and professional development on intermodal, creative supervisory practice.
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Introduction
The incorporation of applied art forms in supervision enables supervisees to engage with diverse, dynamic ways of integrating and processing material that arises from sessions. In person-centred therapy, creative supervision offers potential to expand on the supervisor’s and supervisees’ ability to empathise and establish unconditional positive regard (Rogers, 1961). Creative supervision also clarifies parallel processes in clinical work and within the supervisory
relationship. Panhofer, Payne, Meekums, & Parke (2011, p. 6) argue that in supervision, ‘an emphasis solely on verbalization, leaving aside the body, risks neglecting experiences that have been stored as body memories, or in other sensory modalities [...]’. Verbal processes involve creativity, but at times may negate the integral connection to the knowledge obtained from the body. Both psychodrama and dance movement therapy (DMT) enable the supervisee to act instead of only talk, with verbal processing as an adjunctive part of the work. Both possess the potential for new points of access to clinical material and provide a unique lens with which to observe, understand and interpret supervisory issues that arise. Although other creative arts therapies also provide this benefit, psychodrama and DMT will be selected for this article, with some insights from drama therapy.

The purpose of this article was to propose how specific structures combining psychodrama and DMT can offer a way to hone in, step out or create alternative perspectives in supervision. The aim of this article was not to create a model of creative supervision, but to propose ways in which intermodal interventions can be applied beyond a particular model, while still responding to the current inquiry of embodiment in supervision.

Psychodrama is founded upon the theory of Jacob L. Moreno and evolved out of Moreno’s disagreements with Freudian psychoanalysis and his belief in the self-actualisation potential of interactive work (Moreno & Fox, 1987). Psychodrama incorporates a multidimensional view of the human being, and the roles that they play in life, which are applied therapeutically and guided by the psychodramatist, termed director (Kedem-Tahar & Felix-Kellermann, 1996). The emphasis is on the individual in a group setting vs. the dynamics of group conflicts, which he later termed sociodrama (Moreno & Fox, 1987). Psychodrama requires extensive training and certification but nevertheless offers techniques that can be derived from this method and applied to creative supervision practice (Krall, Fürst, & Fontaine, 2013).

Techniques from psychodrama were chosen deliberately due to my experience in a creative supervision training course in 2012 that focused on a person-centred application of psychodrama techniques. Previously, my experience as a clinical supervisor encompassed mainly DMT-based supervision using an integrative psychotherapeutic approach, which I interweave with other arts modalities as deemed appropriate for my supervisees. Psychodrama will be considered separately from drama therapy, and although I illustrate some drama therapy research relevant to this article, the practical differences between the two fields will not be discussed.

Although psychodrama was classically aligned with psychoanalytical frameworks, its application is compatible with Rogers’ work in person-centred therapy (Kedem-Tahar & Felix-Kellermann, 1996). Karl Rogers’ three core conditions of empathy, unconditional positive regard and congruence play an integral role in the development of a supervisory relationship (Apter, 2013; Rogers, 1961). The
intersections between person-centred therapy and psychodrama are embedded in the approach of the supervisor. In a person-centred and, by extension, a humanistic approach, the structures or suggestions that a supervisor makes need to be developed from the material the supervisee brings, which are shaped and explored by the supervisee. The supervisee is accepted and understood within the same principle of unconditional positive regard as ascribed to clients. This is based on mutual understanding and acceptance on behalf of both parties. Humanistic psychodrama revolves around enabling the analyses of the issues at hand by obtaining distance through active processing (Apter, 2013). Aesthetically, distance or proximity to a particular experience may be engaged through symbolism, playing roles or a character, and/or through an embodiment of experience (Dokter, 2008; Kedem-Tahar & Felix-Kellermann, 1996). Both drama and dance/movement offer opportunities for negotiating this dance of proximity, as I will discuss in this article.

DMT is the use of movement as a healing medium with therapeutic and integrative objectives (Acarón, 2010). According to Federman and Gaber (2008, p. 58), “clinical supervision in DMT […] is a creative process in which the verbal aspects of understanding and nonverbal aspects of insight are comprehended as an integrated whole”. This bodymind integration is regarded as important by body-based practitioners working in mental health settings, since ‘the bodily experience often remains disregarded and its vast source of information is not always accessed in a purely verbal context’ (Panhofer et al., 2011, p. 7). Penfield (2008) argues for the active interrelationship between verbal and nonverbal in DMT supervision. Therefore, there is a ‘consideration of “two kinds of articulation, that of the body in movement and that of the mind in thought”‘ (Bloom, 2006, p. 4). A non-dualistic bodymind perspective can illustrate the reciprocity between the thinking body and the moving mind, providing awareness of the necessity of bringing the body into supervision.

Supervision simultaneously models the therapeutic relationship and creates a space of learning through experience, processing and engaging with the material generated from the supervisee’s sessions. Interventions in supervision involve exploring and reflecting upon supervisory issues, addressing emotional stress or tensions the supervisee is experiencing, and/or employing a managerial or ethical function of the supervisee’s work (Wilkins, 1995). The creative application to supervision has been examined mostly in the past decade, with a recent trend towards the development of models integrating artistic and psychotherapeutic frameworks (Best, 2008; Federman & Gaber, 2008; Krall et al., 2013; Neswald-McCalip, Sather, Strati & Dineen, 2003; Newsome, Henderson, & Veach, 2005; Panhofer et al., 2011; Proctor, 2000; Wilkins, 1995). Arts-based supervision provides a multi-sensory medium that helps supervisees understand their clinical practice by appealing to diverse styles of processing information. This article explores kinaesthetic, rhythmic and visual engagement with the material through understanding roles, using symbolic objects and embodying clients.
In this article, I will first review some of the supervisory models that are used in DMT and multimodal frameworks. I suggest specific interventions, grounded in a person-centred framework, that employ an embodied interface between movement and psychodrama that allows proximity and distance. Finally, I will illustrate an integrative exploration of the psychodrama and movement by presenting examples from my supervisory practice, which implement a movement-oriented version of the ‘empty chair,’ ‘colleague,’ ‘doubling’ and ‘projective techniques’ from psychodrama.

It is important to note that very few scholars address the caveats or negative impact of arts-based methods on the supervisory relationship (Deaver & Shiflett, 2011). Using any creative or artistic approach in mental health practice involves responsibility over its implementation and considering it can be taken too far without adequate training (Acarón, 2011; Deaver & Shiflett, 2011). Even though creativity and its dynamic qualities are recommendable within any supervisory or therapeutic relationship, they equally carry a burden of the limitations of the supervisor’s experience with using specific techniques. Throughout this article, I will address cautions and caveats to some of these techniques. I will now review some of the supervisory models in DMT. Methods specifically including drama and movement (Butté & Hoo, 2013; Jennings, 2002, 2005; Levy, 1979) will be discussed in subsequent sections.

**Supervisory models in DMT**

The interweaving of modalities is common in DMT supervisory frameworks. Panhofer et al. (2011) propose a self-supervision model combining text writing and movement exploration in order to provide deeper insight into processes the supervisee may not be aware of during supervision. They describe a dual reflective process that can allow ‘temporal and physical distance’ (p. 12), through video documentation (when applicable) of reflections before and after movement. Best’s (2008) supervision model in DMT integrates systemic approaches and embraces multimodal ways of expression. She advocates for the necessity of bringing in the body in supervision, underlying relationships between the use of imagery, words and bodily experience. The DMT models of supervision stress that while there is not one ‘systemic’ way of engaging with supervision, researching particular ways in which the role of movement and the body can be addressed is an emergent need of the field (Best, 2008; Butté & Hoo, 2013; Frizell, 2012; Meekums, 2008; Panhofer et al., 2011; Payne, 2008; Penfield, 2008). Models of working proposed by DMTs are still being researched empirically, and the UK has responded to the need of further training and education of supervisors through courses on supervision and additional certification mechanisms.

The integration of movement into sessions provides the supervisees with yet another mode of accessing insight into their practice. Many dance movement therapists encourage their supervisees to embody their clients, in order to foster...
empathy and understanding (Payne, 2008). This can be done in many ways: for example, through a supervisory application of movement therapeutic methods such as Authentic Movement (Wyman-McGinty, 2008) or Chacian methods of DMT (Federman & Gaber, 2008). Authentic Movement can help supervisees gain proximity to supervisory issues through inner listening to somatic reactions during client sessions. Chacian methods address empathic reflection, rhythmic activities and group movement structures. Paying attention to somatic reactions and responses to the supervisory process is an incredible tool towards empathy and rapport development in the supervisory relationship (Meekums, 2008; Panhofer et al., 2011).

I will provide an example from my own supervision group at a DMT training programme. One of my supervisees working in a forensic setting needed to express her constant tension of being in a locked unit and be able to experience her clients’ encloishment. The supervisee enacted a movement exploration around spatial constrictions throughout the supervision session – literally placing herself between two walls and trying to restrict her movement in order to gain insight into her clients’ experiences of prison. She embodied her client and explored through movement how restricted space was affecting her as well. This bodily awareness of how the spatial limitations within the prison affected her body as well as her clients’ helped alleviate her own anxieties around spatial enclosure as she began to adopt an empathic stance by ‘locating’ herself in her clients’ experience.

Supervision in movement can additionally be explored through: movement warm-ups, improvisation, creating movement phrases, using gestures and shapes, among many other interventions. These can help gain some distance to the material by crystallising the situations through movement repetition and through a re-enactment in performance or video. By repeating sequences, a supervisee may be able to see the movement in others or be able to revisit a particular situation. Other examples of structures from embodied practices in DMT are asking the supervisee questions about the clients’ and supervisee’s movement behaviour, and/or responding to the gestures and postures the supervisees employ while speaking. These practices exemplify an expression of somatic congruence as I will discuss subsequently.

Creative methods in supervision can address issues surrounding supervisees’ over-identification with clients (proximity) (and conversely supervisors with supervisees) especially at a body level. Meekums (2008) describes that person-centred psychotherapeutic frameworks do not acknowledge transference and countertransference (and therefore somatic transference/countertransference). In person-centred congruence, the focus is on the therapists’ awareness and presence rather than on unconscious processes (Wilkins, 2001). ‘While congruence is a ‘personal state’ (it is possible to be congruent alone), countertransference takes place in the context of a relationship’ (Wilkins, 2001, p. 430), and this principle can be applied to its somatic counterparts. Sharing
body-based reactions (when the supervisor deems relevant and appropriate) is a manifestation of somatic congruence. Somatic congruence is not explored as a concept in person-centred therapy literature, yet it is a powerful practice, which can benefit the supervisory and/or therapeutic relationship. Tudor and Worrall (2006) point out that Rogers was conscious of bodymind non-duality as the essence of the person and their interrelationships with others and the environment. Somatic congruence extends the empathic sharing of material to include the body, compatible with congruence (Rogers, 1957) by enabling the supervisor to gauge their own degree of distance/proximity to a particular issue. This involves a delicate self-awareness on behalf of the supervisor, who needs to assess whether the sharing of material is appropriate, ethical and constructive for the supervisee.

This past section has detailed DMT supervisory interventions such as embodiment of clients, movement explorations and the creation of movement phrases, as a way to either delve deeper into an issue, or crystallising it to review or revise from an ‘outside’ perspective. I proposed somatic congruence as a tool for constructive bodymind communication between the supervisee and supervisor. Subsequently, these tools will be integrated into what is termed as psychodramatic action methods in a supervisory context.

**Embodied practices and drama-based interventions**

Embodied practices can help enhance the experience of supervision by providing the supervisee with ways in which they can access their somatic responses to a client and understand how the therapeutic process also has an impact in their own body. Some psychodramatists (Aaron, 2010; Burden & Ciotola, 2013; Ciotola, 2013; Tauvon, 2013) have incorporated somatic perspectives or bodywork in their practice but it still remains a relatively peripheral practice.

Action methods (from psychodrama) and embodied approaches (from DMT) offer structures that can allow for a multilevel approach to supervision – navigating, as Levy (1979) reiterates, different dimensions of symbolism and abstraction, creating a seamless bridge into action. In psychodrama, this need to enact a problem through action is termed act hunger, which Levy (1979) likens this process to the term ‘unfinished business’ (p. 32). There is a sense of incompletion and a need to ‘do something about’ a part of one’s life (in the case of client work). In terms of supervision, as exemplified before, act hunger can enable a supervisee to recreate unresolved issues or alternate scenarios through action. Psychodrama and DMT structures allow for this re-enactment to take place and provide potential transformation and crystallisation of experiences.

Although action methods require the supervisee to ‘get out of their chair’, Aaron (2010) states that ‘action is not sufficient to fully and effectively access the body’s store of memories and emotions’ (p. 1). Tauvon (2013) reviews the role of the body in Moreno’s work in psychodrama and incorporates perspectives,
which present some compatibility with the DMT integration presented here. Both Tauvon (2013) and Ciotola (2013) explore, for example, ‘body dialogues’ as an action structure in which the protagonist speaks to and from their own body, using the psychodrama technique of role reversal. Ciotola (2013, p. 1) states that “the goal is to facilitate the self’s acceptance of the body and the self’s willingness to listen to the body”, which can represent proximity through drama-based practices.

Fran Levy (1979), a dance movement therapist, proposed a method she termed psychodramatic movement therapy, which can be applicable to supervision. Levy states that both modes work in tandem to allow inner conflicts to rise to the surface from the unconscious through movement to then being able to be structured into action using dramatic structures. Levy describes that psychodrama and DMT allow for different levels of abstraction from raw, non-verbal access to emotions without needing words, to being able to extrapolate roles and actions. Adding words to movements, or taking a role and just moving silently, can work at different levels depending on the depth of the explorations and the material that is brought. Although Levy’s (1979) model is designed for therapeutic practice, the methods can be investigated in the context of supervision. Levy’s work sustains the notion of negotiated distance and proximity presented in this article.

Although I have mostly focused on psychodrama, drama therapy offers other potential areas of crossover. Jones and Dokter (2008) review the ongoing professional discourses, practices and challenges facing supervision in drama therapy and importantly cover intercultural issues, as well as considerations for supervisees with disabilities. Tselikas-Portmann’s (1999) edited book explores supervisory methods with applications to other populations (such as crisis intervention and business), as well as work with multidisciplinary groups of supervisees. Butté and Hoo (2013) explore supervisory roles and embodiment through clinical examples of drama and movement, where the use of objects, role reversal and sculpting served as bridging mechanisms of embodiment in supervision. While their work provides key insight into cross-modality work and focus on body-oriented theories, I examine the relationship, uses and caveats of integrating drama and movement in person-centred supervision, particularly in terms of proximity and distance. Drama therapist Sue Jennings’ ‘developmental paradigm of embodiment’ model called Embodiment-Projection-Role (Jennings, 2002, 2005; Powell, 2014) is particularly important for this article. Her model was originally developed for work with children, but has recently been applied to supervisory contexts (Andersen-Warren & Seymour, 2008). The supervision structure involves an embodiment stage which is body/dance/movement based, a projection stage which is visual art-based, and a role stage, which is drama-based. These are suggested as a way for the supervisor to structure and frame supervisory sessions and gain awareness of the supervisee’s use of interventions in their practice. The methods presented by Levy (1979),
Butté and Hoo (2013) and Jenning’s EPR model (2002, 2005) represent great potential for the integration of drama and dance/movement. These frameworks sustain the necessity of embodiment work in supervision. Movement becomes embedded within interventions instead of being considered separately. Below, I will describe DMT and psychodrama structures with some examples from my supervisory practice.

**Psychodrama methods in DMT supervision & examples**

At the beginning of my supervisory practice, I found myself only using words with my DMT supervisees, and supervision ended up being a very cognitive process and at times very solution-focused. As my supervisory practice evolved, I wondered why I could not apply the same movement structures from my practice into my supervision. I asked questions such as: Where did you feel this in your body? What somatic reactions took place? Can you embody how your client moves? This type of inquiry opened the door for a whole new understanding of my supervisees and their work. I shared my own somatic reactions, expressing somatic congruence when appropriate and relevant. Additionally, movement analysis brought another vector of observation that could provide some distance or alternative perspective to the supervisee. I held the space for their own movement experience and encouraged the embodiment of clients and their own experiences as therapists. After my creative supervision course, I combined methods from psychodrama, which have expanded my repertoire as a supervisor. However, I needed to carefully analyse the interventions, their purpose and how to create bridges between drama and movement that were suitable to their needs. As Levy (1979) states, drama and dance allow different levels of concretisation and abstraction. I liken this to a moving camera lens – zooming in and out of a situation, movement leading usually a clearer way in, and drama a wider angle from which to view, although different structures allow for a variety of options of focus.

Some of the psychodrama techniques I have used in DMT supervision are the empty chair, colleague, doubling and projective techniques (Farnsworth, 2010; Jones & Dokter, 2008). During the empty chair structure, the supervisee can ascribe a role, a feeling or a subject to a chair, committing attention and focus to a ‘site’ in the space. They can act out the role by speaking and/or moving from a perspective offered by the role, which can help unpack conflicting emotions, or bring their client ‘in’ to the supervisory space. The supervisor can ask about the specific location chosen for the chair and assess the proximity or distance between where the supervisee is sitting and the angle at which the chair is set. In an embodied dramatic structure, the supervisee as a protagonist can speak/move from his or her own role, but also sit in the chair and speak/move from the other’s perspective (termed role reversal). In my supervisory practice, the empty chair has taken on roles of clients, guilt, pain, personal-self vs. therapist-self, with
many possibilities. I have adapted this structure by delimiting moving spaces instead of chairs and providing options of moving and/or talking between the spaces. Supervisees may, as an option, move the trajectories between the spaces, expressing the transitions between roles.

Role reversal, however, is contraindicated in supervision when either the supervisee has over-identified with a client or in therapeutic situations of abuse or trauma, since it would be unethical for a person to identify with their own abuser (Biancardi, 2013). The latter, of course would only be applicable to client/therapist relationships, but could apply to severe cases where the supervisee has been traumatised by the client. This contraindication needs to be communicated if supervisees are intending to use this method in their own practice.

During group supervision, other supervisees can serve as auxiliaries and embody the roles of the colleague or be witnesses of the presenting supervisee’s experience. In psychodrama, other participants can take on roles the ‘protagonist’ has presented, serving as additional extensions of the person’s reality and playing roles based on the supervisee’s life (Gimenez Hinkle, 2008). The ability to present alternative perspectives is especially relevant here, and the chairs can provide distance through activating other roles, like the colleague, and allowing these roles to emerge as possibilities. For example, one of my former supervisees was finishing her placement working with older people with dementia. The supervisees in the group served as auxiliaries, embodying her clients as she spoke/moved her goodbyes, allowing the closure she desperately needed.

A variation of the empty chair technique is the colleague chair, placed next to the supervisor (see Figure 1). The supervisor and supervisee become ‘colleagues’ discussing the supervisee’s case. The supervisee may alternate between the role of colleague (professional-self) and being ‘themselves’ (personal-self) by shifting between chairs or spaces as situations need more clarification. The ‘colleague’ role speaks/moves their feelings about the ‘supervisee’ in third person, allowing them to gain distance from the issue. The colleague role symbolically shifts the supervisee-supervisor power dynamics by enacting a different type of relational exchange, giving the supervisee the opportunity to act as a ‘peer’.

Figure 1. Colleague structure.
This mechanism allows a ‘honing in’ through embodying the supervisee role, ‘zooming out’ by becoming the colleague and moving between these positions.

An additional technique, **doubling**, involves the supervisor standing physically behind or at a backwards angle from the supervisee and speaking/moving to the ‘empty chair’ – adding an additional voice to the supervisee’s. “Doubling requires the supervisor to be able to role reverse: to see a project, or a relationship with a client, through the supervisee’s eyes” (Farnsworth, 2010, p. 2). This additional layer of voice within doubling can be **empathic** (reflecting and making sure the supervisee is being seen and understood), can express words or move in ways the supervisee is unable to express or present a **paradoxical** view of the subject – ‘highlighting an illogicality’ (Biancardi, 2013). I have doubled, for example, some of the hidden feelings the supervisee had about a difficult client, with which the supervisee felt they lost their voice and authority due to their abusive behaviour. The supervisor may express a rationale the supervisee may use for some behaviour that from an external point of view might be inconsistent. In my experience, doubling has proven very powerful and provoked a deeper connection and understanding during supervision, and at times has carried a sense of relief or empowerment in hearing the supervisee’s experience being verbalised by another. The supervisor, when doubling, always checks with the supervisee to see whether they have doubled **congruently** to their experience. Supervisees have reported that correcting my doubling has allowed them to gain clarity of their own intentions, and the fact that they felt comfortable correcting my words or emphasis was a good sign of the deepening of the supervisory relationship. Doubling allows the supervisee to actively participate in the accurate portrayal of his or her own experience. Farnsworth’s (2010), however, cautions against using doubling without engaging in co-creation with the supervisee, which can seem critical and distanced.

**Projective techniques** are methods in drama therapy and psychodrama in which objects take on symbolic form (Jones & Dokter, 2008). In supervision, I used a specific layout of objects called a **spectrogram** (Lahad, 2000). A spectrogram has miniature objects usually placed on a defined small space such as the surface of a table or a tray (see example in Figure 2). The objects may represent people, relationships or situations, recreated as a micro-reality that can potentially offer distance from a particular situation. Objects can be miniature animals, small objects from the room, miniature chairs or any other object the supervisee can identify has some relevance/relationship to the issue at hand. Object qualities such as colour, texture, size and shape can take on symbolic qualities and give essential information to the supervisor and clarity on an issue. Distance between objects can give a sense of relational dynamics, where the supervisee is in relationship to their client or the situation.

I integrated movement into projective techniques in my sessions using a version of the spectrogram below (Figure 1), which I expanded by using larger props. First, the supervisees laid out their situation using small objects in a tray...
or designated space and used the psychodrama techniques detailed above, but using the objects to symbolise people. We used this structure, for example, when one of the supervisees expressed difficulty in being able to gain perspective on two parent–child client dyads, as one dyad was very disengaged and the other very symbiotic. We took this miniature representation into movement and re-enacted it on a larger scale within the supervisory space, laying out props throughout the room. We could then enact the distance and proximity between the objects and visualise her relationship to the clients from various perspectives using scale and space. She identified places in the room for her clients, and where she was positioned, which allowed clarity on her interventions, and increased awareness of how she was at times positioned too far away from the dyads, which limited her engagement. We then ‘practised’ scenarios with the dyads and discussed her own level of comfort with proximity. This tool became useful when complex situations were presented or the supervisee/supervisor/group expressed feeling ‘lost’ in a particular issue. After using objects, however, an important ritual was to ‘de-role’ the objects that had acquired meaning.

Figure 2. Projective techniques: The Miniature Chair tray.
throughout the sessions. The clearing of the space and the objects within it by the supervisees can help transition them back into their own selves and enable an adequate closure of the session.

Here, drama and/or movement were brought forth for their contributions to the unmasking, expanding, clarifying of the issues presented by the supervisee. Embodied action methods can provide the supervisee with opportunities to re-enact events from the clinical sessions, with additional opportunities to provide alternative scenarios when necessary.

**Conclusion**

In supervision, it is essential to establish a safe space in which expressivity is encouraged and where there is respect and non-judgment towards any creative manifestation of experience. Integrating methods that incorporate drama and movement can help supervisees obtain additional viewpoints of their supervisory practice and alternate between proximity to and/or distance from a particular issue. Recently, cross-modality creative supervision has been researched for its potential to draw on strengths of each modality, purporting advantages to its application (Best, 2008; Butté & Hoo, 2013; Chesner & Zografou, 2013; Federman & Gaber, 2008; Jones & Dokter, 2008; Lahad, 2000; Krall et al., 2013; Proctor, 2000; Neswald-McCalip et al., 2003; Newsome et al., 2005; Panhofer et al., 2011; Wilkins, 1995). This article examined distance and proximity to supervisory issues through the intersection between psychodrama and DMT, and the potential of integration of the use of roles and projective techniques into movement structures from a humanistic, person-centred philosophy. Somatic congruence is introduced as a way in which bodily experience is shared between supervisor and supervisee as a way to clarify, bridge or illustrate particular aspects of the supervisory relationship. Psychodramatic movement structures can be seamlessly integrated within supervision given the familiarity with the interventions, the comfort level of the supervisee/supervisor and the stage of development of the supervisory relationship. Roles and projective techniques can offer distance and multiple perspectives, while dance/movement can provide proximity and inner listening to somatic reactions. Conversely, enacting roles can help deepen understanding and gain proximity to supervisory and clinical processes, while dance/movement structures can help solidify and crystallise an issue through movement phrases or choreographing movement.

Although there are many benefits to using the body and creativity in supervision, additional training is necessary for an informed application of these methods. I agree with Scholl and Smith-Adcock (2007) that because of the anecdotal focus of most research on creative approaches supervision, both qualitative research and supervisee-driven inquiry is needed, especially in the areas of intersection between psychodrama and DMT. I conclude that the application of drama-based approaches and the inclusion of the body in supervision can
help deepen the supervisory relationship and gain a wider understanding of the supervisees’ practice, providing an enhanced awareness of the lived experience of both supervisors and supervisees through the negotiation of distance and proximity.

Note
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