Supplementary Materials to: Visted, E., Osnes, B., Molde, H., Vøllestad, J. & Stige, S.H. (2026). Gatekeeping in Clinical Psychology Training: Supervisors' Responses to Suitability Doubts. Tidsskrift for Norsk psykologforening. https://doi.org/10.52734/KBHJ2237
The supplementary materials were subject to peer review but have not been copyedited, typeset or proofread.

Overview of Supplementary Materials

S01 Supplementary Methods....2
S01.01 Clinical Supervision in Norwegian Psychology Training....2
S01.02 Survey....2
S01.03 Statistical and Qualitative Analysis....3
S02: Supplementary surveys....5
S02.01: Norwegian version of the survey.....5
S02.02: English version of the survey....15
Supplementary tables....20
Table S01.....20
Table S02....21
Table S03....21
Table S04....22

S01 Supplementary Methods

S01.01 Clinical Supervision in Norwegian Psychology Training

The supervisors have students who are in the late stages of clinical training, typically from 4th through 5th year of training (with no prior undergraduate training). These years are characterized by extensive clinical training and practice with both inpatients and outpatients. In on-campus University clinics, students get clinical supervision in smaller groups of up to 4 students. In off-campus clinics, students receive individual supervision, but some also have smaller group supervision. At the on-campus clinics, most of the patient work is videotaped, and the supervision focuses on both specific clinical cases and the therapeutic and professional development of the student. Some students also videotape their sessions at off-campus clinics and use them in supervision. These supervision formats may provide supervisors with rich observational material for identifying both clinical strengths and potential suitability concerns.

S01.02 Survey

The survey was developed specifically for this study to capture supervisors' experiences with, and responses to, doubts about students' suitability in clinical practice. Item development was informed by international research on trainee professional competence problems, including documented categories of concern (e.g., interpersonal functioning, professional behavior, clinical skills, and personal problems), supervisors' procedural knowledge, and emotional experiences associated with gatekeeping roles. Item content was also informed by the Norwegian suitability regulations (Universitets- og høyskoleforskriften, 2024), particularly the list of behavioral criteria that may indicate insufficient suitability. The questionnaire assessed five domains: (a) the frequency and timing of suitability doubts, (b) behaviors or difficulties that trigger such doubts, (c) supervisors' knowledge of institutional procedures and perceived confidence, (d) actions taken when doubts arise, and (e) emotional and professional reactions. The survey included Likert-scale items, frequency ratings, multiple-choice questions, and open-ended responses, as well as background variables (e.g., institution, gender, age, years of clinical and supervisory experience). Likert-scale items were grouped into conceptual sections reflecting the predefined domains, such as

perceived knowledge (e.g., “I know the procedures that apply when I have doubts about suitability”), behavioral triggers (e.g., “Lack of willingness or ability to receive supervision”), supervisory actions (e.g., “I document my concerns in writing”), and emotional reactions (e.g., “I felt unsure how to proceed”). The survey was distributed in Norwegian; both the Norwegian and English versions are available in the supplementary materials (S01 and S02).

S01.03 Statistical and Qualitative Analysis

Descriptive statistics are reported as *n* and percentages. For Likert-type items (1–5), responses were treated as ordinal and summarized as the proportion of respondents endorsing low (1–2), mid (3), and high (4–5) categories. Frequency items were grouped as 1–2 (“never/seldom”), 3 (“sometimes”), and 4–5 (“often/very often”), whereas agreement items were grouped as 1–2 (“disagree”), 3 (“neither agree nor disagree”), and 4–5 (“agree”).

We conducted two group comparisons: 1) supervisors in internal versus external clinics, to examine the role of proximity to university staff and procedures; and 2) supervisors with versus without direct experience of doubts about suitability, to examine whether experienced supervisors viewed and responded to such concerns differently than lesser experienced supervisors. Given the ordinal nature of Likert-scale data, between-group differences were primarily tested using Mann-Whitney U tests. To control for multiple testing within each family of comparisons, *p*-values were adjusted using false discovery rate (Benjamini–Hochberg). All statistical analyses were conducted in Python (pandas, NumPy and SciPy).

Responses to open-ended questions were analyzed descriptively using content analysis (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004) to supplement and contextualize the quantitative findings. Responses to each open-ended question were first analyzed separately (examples of reasons for suitability concerns; actions taken the last time they experienced suitability doubts; and needs for support by institutions in situations where they experience suitability doubts). Responses were read in full by the first and last author, and summarized through an inductive process in which recurring topics and patterns were identified across participants. These results were then compared with the quantitative survey results, and illustrative quotations that

either exemplified or expanded on the quantitative results were selected and translated into English. The purpose of this process was to provide contextual information and examples that could enrich interpretation of the survey findings.

S02: Supplementary surveys

S02.01: Norwegian version of the survey.

Undersøkelse om tvil om studenters skikkethet

Som veileder følger du studenter på profesjonsstudiet tett mens de forbereder seg og gjør sine første erfaringer med selvstendig pasientarbeid. En viktig del av vurderingene du gjør i dette arbeidet, er studentens skikkethet.

Formålet med skikkethetsvurdering på profesjonsstudiet i psykologi er å avgjøre om en student utgjør en mulig fare for liv, fysisk og psykisk helse, rettigheter eller sikkerhet til de pasienter, brukere eller andre studenten vil komme i kontakt med under praksis eller under framtidig yrkesutøvelse. Med skikkethet menes her om studenten har nødvendige faglige, personlige og etiske forutsetninger for å kunne utføre pasientarbeid på en forsvarlig måte. Det innebærer blant annet at studenten mangler evne eller vilje til omsorg, samarbeid, selvinnsikt og ansvar, viser alvorlige personlige problemer, truende eller uansvarlig atferd, eller ikke følger veiledning og profesjonelle krav.

Utdanningsinstitusjonene har et klart ansvar for løpende skikkethetsvurdering av studenter på profesjonsutdanningen i psykologi. Likevel er dette komplekse vurderinger og prosesser og et område vi har lite kunnskap om. Vi ønsker derfor å kartlegge erfaringene veiledere har hatt med skikkethetsvurderinger. Vi ønsker å undersøke hvordan veiledere opplever slike situasjoner, hvordan slike situasjoner håndteres, og hvordan veiledere opplever støtten og rammene rundt dette arbeidet.

Dine svar behandles anonymt. Det vil ta 5-10 minutter å svare på spørreskjemaet. Samtykker du til at svarene dine kan brukes til forskning, vil åpne spørsmål bli redigert for å ta hensyn til både deg som deltaker og eventuelle studenter som beskrives. Ikke bruk konkrete navn som kan føre til gjenkjenning av personer i dine åpne svar.

Samtykke

Jeg samtykker til at mine anonymiserte svar blir brukt til forskning.
Ingen opplysninger vil kunne spores tilbake til deg.

(1) ❍ Ja

(2) ❍ Nei

For å gjøre det mulig for deg å trekke samtykket, må du generere en kode som du skriver inn under.
Generer koden på denne måten:
Skriv siste bokstav i fornavn, andre bokstav i etternavn og siste to siffer i ditt telefonnummer
(f.eks. Ola Nordmann med telefonnummer 90000073 blir : AO73)

_____

Utdanningssted.
Jeg er tilknyttet følgende utdanningssted:

(1) ❍ Universitetet i Oslo (UiO)

(2) ❍ Universitetet i Bergen (UiB)

(3) ❍ Universitetet i Tromsø (UiT)

(4) ❍ Norges teknisk-naturvitenskapelige universitet (NTNU)

Kjønn
Jeg er...

(1) ❍ Kvinne

(2) ❍ Mann

(3) ❍ Annet

(4) ❍ Ønsker ikke å oppgi

Alder (skriv inn antall år)

_____

Antall år som yrkesaktiv psykolog

_____

Antall år med erfaring som veileder for studenter i klinisk praksis på profesjonsstudiet

_____

Hvor er du veileder nå?
Velg Intern praksis hvis studentene har pasienter på en klinikk organisert under universitetet.
Velg Ekstern praksis hvis studentene har pasienter på en klinikk eller tjeneste organisert utenfor universitetet (offentlig helsevesen, kommunehelsetjeneste, BUFetat, etc.).

(1) ❍ Intern praksis

(2) ❍ Ekstern praksis

(3) ❍ Begge

4. Erfaring med tvil om skikkethet

Vennligst besvar med ja eller nei

	JA	NEI
1. Jeg har erfaring med å sende tvilsmelding på grunn av tvil om studenters skikkethet.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍
2. Jeg har erfaring med å være veileder for student som faktisk er under særskilt skikkethetsvurdering	(1) ❍	(2) ❍

3. Hvor mange ganger har du opplevd tvil om skikkehet hos en av dine studenter?

(1) ❍ Aldri

(2) ❍ 1 gang

(3) ❍ 2-3 ganger

(4) ❍ 4 ganger eller mer

Vennligst besvar følgende utsagn med svar fra 1 (Helt uenig) til 5 (Helt enig).

	Helt uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken/eller	Litt enig	Helt enig
4. Tvil om skikkethet oppstår ofte tidlig i veiledningsperioden.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

5. Det tar lang tid fra jeg får tvil om skikkethet til jeg faktisk melder i fra om dette videre	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
6. Tvil om skikkethet har oppstått først etter at studenten har hatt pasientkontakt.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

Da du opplevde tvil rundt en eller flere studenter, hvilke tema eller utfordringer var det som vekket bekymring hos deg?
Ranger fra aldri (1) til veldig ofte (5).

	Aldri	Sjelden	Av og til	Ofte	Veldig ofte
Manglende faglige ferdigheter	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Manglende vilje eller evne til innlevelse, empati eller omsorg til pasienter	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Manglende evne eller vilje til å skape et miljø som tar hensyn til barn, unges og voksenes sikkerhet og dere psykiske og fysiske helse	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Manglende evne til samarbeid	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

Vansker med selvinnsikt	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Unnlater å ta ansvar som rollemodell for barn og unge	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Manglende evne eller vilje til å ta imot veiledning	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Etiske problemstillinger	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Personlige vansker (f.eks. psykiske plager eller rus)	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Truende eller uansvarlig atferd	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
Problemer knyttet til ansvarliggjøring og oppfølgning av pasientarbeid	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

Andre forhold (skriv inn)

_____

_____

_____
_____
_____
_____

5. Kunnskap og trygghet i håndtering
Vennligst besvar følgende utsagn med svar fra 1 (Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt) til 5 (Stemmer helt).

	Helt uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken/eller	Litt enig	Helt enig
1. Jeg vet hvilke prosedyrer som gjelder når jeg er i tvil om skikkethet.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
2. Jeg vet hvem jeg kan kontakte for råd, drøfting og veiledning.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
3. Jeg føler meg trygg på å identifisere tegn på manglende skikkethet.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
4. Jeg opplever at universitetet jeg er tilknyttet gir tilstrekkelig informasjon om skikkethetsvurderinger.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
5. Jeg opplever at universitetet jeg er tilknyttet gir tilstrekkelig støtte i slike saker.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

6. Handlinger i tilfeller med tvil
Hva gjør du når du opplever tvil om skikkethet hos en student?
Vennligst ranger fra 1 (Aldri) til 5 (Veldig ofte).

	Aldri	Sjelden	Av og til	Ofte	Veldig ofte
1. Jeg tar opp tvilen direkte med studenten.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
2. Jeg tar opp tvilen med andre veiledere/kollegaer.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
3. Jeg tar opp tvilen med studieleder/fagansvarlig.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
4. Jeg dokumenterer tvilen skriftlig.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
5. Jeg foreslår konkrete tiltak for studenten.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
6. Jeg følger opp ekstra tett etter at tvilen er tatt opp.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

7. Beskriv kort hva du faktisk gjorde i den siste situasjonen der du hadde tvil om skikkethet hos en student.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

7. Egne reaksjoner på tvil om skikkethet
Tenk på situasjoner der du har hatt tvil om en students skikkethet.
Ranger hvert svar fra 1 (Stemmer ikke i det hele tatt) til 5 (Stemmer helt).

	Helt uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken/eller	Litt enig	Helt enig
1. Jeg følte meg usikker på hvordan jeg skulle gå frem.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
2. Jeg var redd for å påvirke læringsmiljøet negativt ved å ta opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
3. Jeg var redd for å såre eller krenke studenten av å ta opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
4. Jeg var bekymret for studentens reaksjoner på å ta opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

5. Jeg var redd for å påvirke relasjonen til studenten negativt.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
6. Jeg opplevde frustrasjon eller irritasjon.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
7. Jeg opplevde skyldfølelse over å ha tvil om studenten.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
8. Jeg opplevde lettelse da jeg tok opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
9. Jeg fikk en følelse av å ikke klare å hjelpe studenten tilstrekkelig.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
10. Jeg opplevde at jeg gjorde noe viktig ved å ta opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
11. Jeg opplevde støtte og anerkjennelse fra kollegaer/ledelse når jeg tok opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
12. Jeg opplevde at det å ta opp tvilen bidro	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

til en positiv utvikling for studenten.					
13. Jeg følte meg tryggere som veileder etter å ha tatt opp tvilen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
14. Jeg opplevde at det å ta opp tvilen styrket kvaliteten på veiledningen.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍
15. Jeg opplevde at det å ta opp tvilen styrket pasientsikkerheten.	(1) ❍	(2) ❍	(3) ❍	(4) ❍	(5) ❍

8. Avsluttende spørsmål
Hva mener du universitetet du er tilknyttet kunne gjort for å ytterligere hjelpe deg å håndtere tvil om skikkethet hos studenter? Kryss av, og/eller svar på åpent felt nedenfor.

(1) ❑ Mer informasjon eller opplæring om skikkethetsvurdering

(2) ❑ Tydeligere prosedyrer og rutiner

(3) ❑ Bedre støtte fra kollegaer

(4) ❑ Bedre støtte fra ledelse/studieadministrasjon

(5) ❑ Juridisk/etisk rådgivning

Annet (vennligst skriv inn)

_____
_____
_____
_____

S02.02: English version of the survey

Survey on Doubts About Students' Suitability

As a supervisor, you work closely with students in the professional psychology program as they prepare for and begin their first experiences with independent clinical work. An important part of your assessment responsibilities in this work is evaluating the student's suitability.

The purpose of suitability assessment in the professional psychology program is to determine whether a student may pose a possible risk to the life, physical or psychological health, rights, or safety of the patients, clients, or others they will encounter during practice or future professional work. Suitability refers to whether the student has the necessary academic, personal, and ethical qualifications to conduct clinical work in a responsible manner. This includes cases where the student lacks the willingness or ability to demonstrate care, collaboration, self-insight, and responsibility, shows serious personal problems, threatening or irresponsible behavior, or fails to follow supervision and professional requirements.

Educational institutions have a clear responsibility for the continuous suitability assessment of students in the professional psychology program. Nonetheless, these are complex assessments and processes, and an area where we currently have limited knowledge. We therefore wish to map supervisors' experiences with suitability assessments. We aim to examine how supervisors experience such situations, how they are handled, and how supervisors experience the support and framework around this work.

Your responses will be treated anonymously. The questionnaire will take 5–10 minutes to complete. If you consent to research use, open-text responses will be edited to protect both you and any students you describe. Please do not use names or other identifying information in your open responses.

Consent

I consent to my anonymized responses being used for research.
No information will be traceable back to you.

- (1) Yes
- (2) No

To enable withdrawal of consent, please generate a code and enter it below. Create the code as follows:
Write the **last letter of your first name**, the **second letter of your last name**, and the **last two digits of your phone number**
(e.g., Ola Nordmann with phone number 90000073 → **AO73**)

_____

Educational Institution

I am affiliated with:

1. University of Oslo (UiO)
2. University of Bergen (UiB)
3. University of Tromsø (UiT)
4. Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)

Gender

I am…

1. Woman
2. Man
3. Other
4. Prefer not to say

Age (enter number of years)

_____

Years of experience as a licensed psychologist

_____

Years of experience supervising students in clinical practice

_____

Current supervision setting

Choose *Internal practice* if students see patients in a clinic organized by the university.
Choose *External practice* if students see patients in services outside the university (specialist mental health care, municipal services, child welfare, etc.).

1. Internal practice
2. External practice
3. Both

---

4. Experience with Doubt About Suitability

Please answer yes or no:

1. I have experience submitting a concern report due to doubts about a student's suitability.
    - Yes / No
2. I have experience supervising a student who has been placed under an advanced suitability assessment.
    - Yes / No

---

3. How many times have you experienced doubt about a student's suitability?

1. Never
2. 1 time
3. 2–3 times
4. 4 or more times

Please rate the following statements from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree):

4. Doubts about suitability often arise early in the supervision period.
5. It takes a long time from when I first experience doubt about suitability until I actually report it further.
6. Doubts about suitability have only arisen *after* the student has had patient contact.

When you have experienced doubt about one or more students, which themes or challenges triggered your concern?

Rate from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very often):

- Insufficient professional skills
- Lack of willingness or ability for empathy, care, or emotional attunement
- Lack of ability or willingness to create a psychologically and physically safe environment for children, adolescents, or adults
- Difficulty collaborating
- Limited self-insight
- Fails to take responsibility as a role model for children and youth

- Lack of willingness or ability to receive supervision
- Ethical concerns
- Personal difficulties (e.g., mental health issues, substance use)
- Threatening or irresponsible behavior
- Problems related to responsibility or follow-up in patient work

Other (please specify):

---

5. Knowledge and Confidence in Handling Suitability Concerns

Rate each item from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree):

1. I know the procedures that apply when I have doubts about suitability.
2. I know whom to contact for advice, discussion, and supervision.
3. I feel confident identifying signs of insufficient suitability.
4. I feel that the university I am affiliated with provides sufficient information about suitability assessments.
5. I feel that the university provides sufficient support in such cases.

---

6. Actions Taken in Cases of Doubt

What do you do when you experience doubt about a student's suitability?
Rate from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very often):

1. I address my concerns directly with the student.
2. I discuss my concerns with other supervisors/colleagues.
3. I raise my concerns with the program director/academic coordinator.
4. I document my concerns in writing.
5. I suggest concrete measures or interventions for the student.
6. I follow up more closely after raising the concern.

Describe briefly what you actually did in the most recent situation where you doubted a student's suitability:

---

7. Supervisors' Own Reactions to Suitability Doubts

Think about situations where you have doubted a student's suitability.
Rate each item from 1 (Not at all true) to 5 (Completely true):

1. I felt unsure about how to proceed.
2. I was afraid of negatively affecting the learning environment by raising the concern.
3. I was afraid of hurting or offending the student by bringing it up.
4. I was worried about how the student would react.
5. I was afraid of damaging my relationship with the student.
6. I felt frustration or irritation.
7. I felt guilty about having doubts about the student.
8. I felt relief after raising the concern.
9. I felt unable to help the student sufficiently.
10. I felt that raising the concern was important.
11. I experienced support and acknowledgement from colleagues/leadership after raising the concern.
12. I felt that raising the concern contributed to positive development for the student.
13. I felt more confident as a supervisor after addressing the concern.
14. I felt that addressing the concern improved the quality of supervision.
15. I felt that addressing the concern improved patient safety.

---

8. Final Question

What do you think your university could do to better support you in handling doubts about students' suitability?
Please tick all that apply and/or write below:

- More information or training about suitability assessment
- Clearer procedures and routines
- Better support from colleagues
- Better support from leadership/administration
- Legal/ethical guidance

Other:

Supplementary tables

Table S01.

Full response distributions for supervisors concerns that triggered doubt about suitability.

	Often/Very often		Sometimes		Never/Seldom	
Concern	n	%	n	%	n	%
Limited self-insight	23	79.3	6	20.7	0	0.0
Poor collaboration	16	55.2	10	34.5	3	10.3
Personal difficulties (e.g., mental health/substance use)	16	55.2	7	24.1	6	20.7
Resistant to supervision	15	51.7	9	31.0	5	17.2
Lack of empathy/care for patients	9	31.0	9	31.0	11	37.9
Lack of academic skills	7	24.1	13	44.8	9	31.0
Not creating a safe, healthy environment	4	13.8	9	31.0	16	55.2
Ethical concerns	2	6.9	14	48.3	13	44.8
Problems with accountability in patient work	2	6.9	12	41.4	15	51.7
Not accepting role-model responsibilities	0	0.0	5	17.2	24	82.8
Threatening/irresponsible behavior	0	0.0	6	20.7	23	79.3

Note. N = 29.

Table S02

Full response distributions for supervisors' knowledge and perceived support

	Agree		Neither		Disagree	
Item	n	%	n	%	n	%
I know whom to contact for advice/discussion/guidance	42	79.2	1	1.9	9	17.0
I know the procedures when I have doubt	36	67.9	2	3.8	14	26.4
I feel confident identifying lack of suitability	36	67.9	5	9.4	11	20.8
The university provides sufficient information	30	56.6	4	7.5	18	34.0
The university provides sufficient support	29	54.7	18	34.0	5	9.4

Note. N = 53

Table S03

Full response distrubutions for supervisors' actions when experiencing doubt about suitability in students.

	Often/Very often		Sometimes		Never/Seldom	
Item	n	%	n	%	n	%
Consult colleagues	41	77.4	8	15.1	1	1.9
Contact university staff	40	75.5	5	9.4	5	9.4
Provide more supervision for the student	40	75.5	7	13.2	2	3.8
Implement measures with the student	37	69.8	9	17.0	3	5.7
Confront the student	35	66.0	12	22.6	3	5.7
Document	29	54.7	9	17.0	11	20.8

Note. N = 53

Table S04

Supervisors negative and positive reactions when experiencing suitability doubts.

	Agree		Neither		Disagree	
Negative reactions	n	%	n	%	n	%
I felt I did something important by addressing the doubt	28	96.6	1	3.4	0	0.0
I felt supported/acknowledged when addressing the doubt	24	82.8	3	10.3	2	6.9
I felt more confident as a supervisor after addressing the doubt	24	82.8	4	13.8	1	3.4
Addressing doubt improved patient safety	23	79.3	4	13.8	2	6.9
I felt relief after addressing the doubt	22	75.9	6	20.7	1	3.4
Addressing doubt improved supervision quality	16	55.2	12	41.4	1	3.4
Addressing doubt helped the student positively	14	48.3	10	34.5	5	17.2
	Agree		Neither		Disagree	
Positive reactions	n	%	n	%	n	%
I worried about the student's reactions	23	79.3	1	3.4	5	17.2
I feared hurting/offending the student	21	72.4	2	6.9	6	20.7
I felt unsure how to proceed	18	62.1	1	3.4	10	34.5
I feared harming the learning environment	16	55.2	1	3.4	12	41.4
I felt frustration/irritation	15	51.7	4	13.8	10	34.5
I feared harming the student relationship	14	48.3	6	20.7	9	31.0
I felt unable to help the student sufficiently	12	41.4	3	10.3	14	48.3
I felt guilt	5	17.2	2	6.9	22	75.9

Note. N = 29