

The therapeutic alliance: A must for clinical practice

Audette Sylvestre and Suzie Gobeil

Laval University, Québec, Canada

Centre for Interdisciplinary Research in Rehabilitation (CIRRIS), Québec, Canada

Correspondance concerning this article should be addressed to Audette Sylvestre:

audette.sylvestre@fmed.ulaval.ca

Accepté pour publication le 9 janvier 2020 dans la *Revue canadienne d'orthophonie et d'audiologie*.

Sylvestre, A., & Gobeil, S. (2020, accepted). The therapeutic alliance: A must for clinical practice. *Revue canadienne d'orthophonie et d'audiologie*.

Ce document provient de CorpusUL, le dépôt institutionnel de l'Université Laval
(www.corpus.ulaval.ca)

Abstract

The role of the therapeutic alliance in the success of interventions has been well demonstrated in areas related to speech language pathology and audiology. Based on this knowledge, the purpose of this article is to present the theoretical foundations of the therapeutic alliance, distinguishing it from the therapeutic relationship. The central concept of shared decision making will then be presented, followed by factors that may influence the establishment and quality of the therapeutic alliance. A low-quality therapeutic alliance is associated with the possibility that the client will discontinue the intervention, hence the importance of paying special attention to this dimension. In situations where clinicians have difficulty establishing an alliance, it is their responsibility to identify how they may be contributing to this situation and reflect on their own actions in order to make the necessary corrections.

Keywords: therapeutic alliance, therapeutic relationship, shared decision making

1 The therapeutic alliance: A must for clinical practice

2
3 Over the last few decades, research in the field of speech-language pathology
4 (SLP) has increasingly focused on evidence-based practices (American Speech-
5 Language-Hearing Association, 2005). To reduce the uncertainty surrounding clinical
6 decisions and therapeutic choices, clinicians must actively use the knowledge deriving
7 from both scientific research and their own clinical experience (Sackett, Rosenberg,
8 Gray, Haynes, & Richardson, 1996). More recently, the need to take clients' preferences
9 and values into account has been recognized as being central to the clinical process
10 (Dollaghan, 2007; Furlong, Serry, Erickson, & Morris, 2018; Schwarz, Coccetti, &
11 Cardell, 2019). Thus, clinicians must master two types of competence. The first is
12 *clinical competence*, that is, their mastery of all the knowledge relating specifically to
13 their area of expertise. The second is *relational competence*, namely all the attitudes and
14 skills required to develop a strong therapeutic alliance with the client (Wampold, 2001).
15 Even when the intervention plan is relevant, it can only be successfully implemented
16 when the speech-language pathologist (SLP) manages to establish, develop and maintain
17 a therapeutic alliance with the client and his/her family. In each intervention, every day,
18 SLPs activate a *clinical-relational* process in their clinical work (Côté & Hudon, 2016).

19 In 2002, the American Psychological Association published findings on the
20 elements characterizing the effectiveness of interventions. The therapeutic alliance was
21 the main element cited (Norcross, 2002). The links between the quality of the therapeutic
22 alliance and the effectiveness of interventions has been empirically demonstrated in the
23 fields of psychotherapy and health-related professions (Hall, Ferreira, Maher, Latimer, &
24 Ferreira, 2010; Martin, Graskie, & Davis, 2000). Two meta-analyses focusing on adult

1 clienteles have reported a modest but significant relationship between the therapeutic
 2 alliance and intervention outcomes. The first of these meta-analyses includes 24 studies
 3 and reports an average effect size¹ of .26 (Horvath & Symonds, 1991), while the second,
 4 including 79 studies, reports an effect size of .22 (Martin et al., 2000). Two other meta-
 5 analyses, focusing on children and adolescents ($n = 49$ and $n = 23$ studies, respectively),
 6 report similar results (Karver, Handelsman, Fields, & Bickman, 2006; Shirk & Karver,
 7 2003). In the medical field, the reported effect size is .11 (Kelley, Kraft-Todd, Schapira,
 8 Kossowsky, & Riess, 2014). Although these effect sizes may appear modest at first
 9 glance, in areas where so many factors can influence outcomes (e.g., severity of the
 10 disease, psychosocial stressors), their impact is considered to be very significant
 11 (Rutledge & Loh, 2004). Taken together, these findings suggest that the therapeutic
 12 alliance is more strongly associated with the results of interventions than the specific
 13 techniques and approaches used by clinicians (Manning, 2010; Norcross, 2002; Plexico,
 14 Manning, & DiLollo, 2010). In psychotherapy and intervention involving individuals or
 15 families, the therapeutic alliance has been identified as a process that is essential to
 16 change (Elvins & Green, 2008). Indeed, it is considered to be the vehicle for delivering
 17 effective change (Lawton, Haddock, Conroy, Serrant, & Sage, 2019).

18 In the field of SLP, the therapeutic alliance is also mentioned as a key factor of
 19 the success of interventions in fluency disorders (Plexico et al., 2010), aphasia
 20 rehabilitation (Lawton et al., 2019; Lawton, Sage, Haddock, Conroy, & Serrat, 2018), and
 21 child speech and language disorders (Fourie, Crowley, & Oliviera, 2011; Freckman,

¹ An effect size is a measure of the strength of the relationship between two variables. It corresponds here to the difference between two means, divided by the standard deviation. In accordance with the guidelines published by Cohen (1988), a modest effect is set at 0.20, a moderate effect at 0.50 and a high effect at 0.80 and above.

1 Hines, & Lincoln, 2017). For example, a qualitative study involving 28 participants (19
 2 men, 9 women) having received from 6 months to more than 12 years of therapy for
 3 stuttering identified seven characteristics that were effective in promoting successful
 4 change in this regard. The clinician's ability to build a strong alliance with his/her clients
 5 was mentioned as one of the most significant factors (Plexico et al., 2010). For the
 6 participants of this study, “the clinicians who were perceived as more competent were
 7 those who were able to promote an effective therapeutic alliance” (Plexico et al., 2010, p.
 8 348).

9 Lawton et al. (2018) conducted in-depth, semi-structured interviews exploring the
 10 point of view of 22 SLPs working with people with aphasia post-stroke. Their findings
 11 also point to the importance of the therapeutic alliance for the success of interventions.
 12 Their data highlight the relevance of developing shared expectations of therapy. They
 13 also emphasize the need to jointly define the goals of the intervention and the role of both
 14 the clinician and client in achieving these goals (Lawton et al., 2018).

15 The term “therapeutic alliance” is often used interchangeably with “therapeutic
 16 relationship” (e.g., Elvins & Green, 2008; Freckman et al., 2017; Lawton et al., 2018,
 17 2019). For example, Lawton et al. (2018) place equal emphasis on the “importance of
 18 showing empathy” and the need to “delineate roles.” However, we suggest that these two
 19 behaviours refer to distinct components of the *clinical-relational* process. The therapeutic
 20 relationship is thus a component of the therapeutic alliance rather than an equivalent
 21 term. To better guide clinical work, these concepts should be properly delineated.

22 Objectives

Based on the knowledge developed in SLP and related fields, the purpose of this article is to present the definitions of the therapeutic alliance, distinguishing it from the therapeutic relationship. The concept of shared decision making will also be exposed as another crucial component of the *clinical-relational* process rooted in a person-centred approach.

Definitions of concepts

Therapeutic alliance

The tripartite conceptualization of the therapeutic alliance introduced by Bordin (1979) stipulates that the clinician and client must come to an agreement on (1) the goals of the intervention and (2) the explicit tasks and intervention intensity required to meet them, by creating 3) an affective bond. The first two components of the therapeutic alliance, setting goals and establishing the necessary tasks, are relatively concrete and explicit (Freckman et al., 2017). Goal setting implies a mutual understanding of the problem about which the client is consulting, and of the client's strengths and needs. Agreeing on the tasks required to meet these goals entails defining and clearly delineating the roles of each party – clinician, client, and family. Shared decision making is the process whereby clinicians and clients work together to make these decisions (Haesebaert, Adekpedjou, Croteau, Robitaille, & Légaré, 2019).

The third dimension, the development of a bond, refers to a more abstract component of the alliance, namely its emotional component (Bordin, 1979). This bond can only be created in the context of a trusting relationship between the clinician and the client. In fact, the establishment of a trusting therapeutic relationship is the first condition of the therapeutic alliance.

1 **Therapeutic relationship**

2 The therapeutic relationship is the ground on which the therapeutic alliance is
3 constructed. It involves all the feelings and attitudes that the clinician and client have
4 towards one another and the way they are expressed (Fourie et al., 2012; Norcross, 2002).
5 On the part of the clinician, it requires respect, listening, authenticity, and empathy, as
6 well as a real interest in the personal experience of the client who is struggling with
7 communication difficulties (Di Blasi, Harkness, Georgiu, & Kleijne, 2001; Kelley et al.,
8 2014).

9 The therapeutic relationship develops right from the very first contacts between
10 the clinician and the client. It is during the evaluation of the client's needs, and sometimes
11 even the first telephone contact, that the key elements of a trusting relationship will or
12 will not be established. In this sense, the first meetings with the client are decisive for the
13 development of the therapeutic alliance. To foster this relationship of trust, the clinician
14 must engage in a real partnership with the client (Dumez, 2012; Joosten et al., 2008;
15 Plexico et al., 2010). The clinician must show openness and commitment to the client
16 (Lawton et al., 2018, 2019; Plexico et al., 2010). A good therapeutic relationship is
17 characterized by relational symmetry resulting from a complementarity of roles (Leahy,
18 2004). The SLP occupies that of the communication disorders expert, whereas the client
19 is the expert of his/her own life and, consequently, the best placed to identify and
20 communicate his/her needs, preoccupations, preferences, and so on. As stated by Weston
21 (2001, p. 438), in the medical context, "[...] physicians still have an obligation to
22 contribute their expertise to the discussion and to involve patients in such a way that
23 patients can use that expertise in making their own decisions about care." By putting the

client at the centre of the intervention, such a clinician-client partnership is aligned with World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines. These guidelines stipulate that client autonomy and empowerment are the basic values and underlying premises for the provision of healthcare (Joosten et al., 2008). Developing and maintaining a trusting therapeutic relationship requires a person-centred approach and a real conviction of the uniqueness of each client/family (Bishop, Kayes, & McPherson, 2019; Côté & Hudon, 2016).

Shared decision making

Shared decision making is defined as a collaborative process whereby clinicians and clients work together to make choices regarding therapeutic actions (Elwyn, Frosch, & Kobrin, 2016; Haesebaert et al., 2019). This process has its roots in the field of ethics, and respect for the rights and autonomy of people (Moore & Kaplan, 2018).

A number of studies have confirmed that a significant proportion of clients wish to play an active role in decisions regarding their health (Kiesler & Auerbach, 2006). Clients increasingly recognize that they are the best judges concerning these issues and in decisions regarding interventions that affect them (O'Connor et al., 2003). For these decisions to be not only shared but also informed, it is imperative for the client to have a clear understanding of the problem in question. It is also essential for the client to have a fair understanding of the different intervention options and scientific facts supporting them. In the first place, it is crucial that the clinician share and explain to the client the path of his/her clinical reasoning. It is also important for the clinician to discuss with the client the advantages and disadvantages of each of the therapeutic alternatives available (Légaré et al., 2010). Client values and preferences need to be clarified and openly

discussed (Dollaghan, 2007). The clinician must at all times ensure that the client understands what is at play and not hesitate to suggest postponing the decision if further explanation is required or the client needs time to reflect (Légaré et al., 2010). The decision must be made in full knowledge of the facts.

In a systematic review of shared decision making and patient outcomes in 39 studies, Shay and Lafata (2015) noted that shared decision making was associated with affective-cognitive outcomes and, to a lesser extent, behavioural and health outcomes. Affective-cognitive outcomes include knowledge, attitudinal, and affective/emotional effects. Behavioural outcomes refer to adherence to recommended interventions and health behaviours, while health outcomes include quality of life and biological measures of health.

The process of shared decision making has the effect of increasing the client's understanding of the problem, adherence to intervention, confidence, satisfaction and, more generally, health and well-being. For example, the results of a prospective cohort study involving 83 adults with neurological disabilities showed significant correlations between goal-planning engagement, goal attainment and functional outcomes (Turner-Stokes, Rose, Ashford, & Singer, 2015). The results of a cross-sectional survey of adults initiating biological treatment of autoimmune disease showed that persistence in treatment was longer for participants who engaged in shared decision-making (Lofland et al., 2017). More generally, the results of a meta-analysis ($n = 35$ studies) confirmed that clients who were involved in shared decision making, chose a treatment condition, or received their preferred intervention showed higher satisfaction, higher completion rates and better clinical outcomes (Lindhiem, Bennett, Trentacosta, & McLear, 2014). These

1 results underscore the importance of shared decision making, jointly defining with the
2 client the objectives of the intervention and the means of achieving it. This is at the heart
3 of the therapeutic alliance. Indeed, including clients in decision making has been
4 associated with more favourable outcomes for their health (Duncan, Best, & Hagen,
5 2010; Légaré et al., 2010). Shared decision making increases the quality and
6 effectiveness of interventions (Côté & Hudon, 2016).

7 In sum ...

8 The therapeutic alliance can be conceived as the organizing principle of the
9 relational dimension of the clinical-relational process. This organizing principle is
10 operationalized through two components: (1) a therapeutic relationship of trust (affective
11 bond) which favours (2) shared decision-making aimed at helping the clinician and
12 client/family develop a common view of a) the goals of the intervention, and b) the
13 explicit tasks and intervention intensity required to meet these goals. Figure 1 sets out
14 and illustrates the components of the clinical-relational process constantly in play during
15 an SLP intervention.

16 < Insert Figure 1 >

The crucial role played by the establishment of a good therapeutic alliance in the effectiveness of interventions is quite clear. However, for clinicians working with people struggling with language impairment, this can constitute a particular challenge (Lawton et al., 2018) because communication impairment can impact the degree of collaboration and the ability to reach consensus (Rosewilliam, Roskell, & Pandyan, 2011). The experience of SLPs and their in-depth knowledge of communication impairment provide them with

the keys to overcome these pitfalls (Hersh, 2010). Yet, the establishment of a therapeutic alliance, through a trusting therapeutic relationship including shared decision-making, can be positively or negatively modulated by factors relating to clinicians or clients, as well as external factors (Baldwin, Wampold, & Imel, 2007; de Roten, 2011). The sources of variability identified in studies on language impairment, are reported in Table 1.

< Insert Table 1 >

Sources of variability in the therapeutic alliance

Factors relating to clinicians

Establishing, developing and maintaining a good therapeutic relationship is easier said than done. Such a relationship implies that the clinician be constantly attentive to his/her role and to the client's subjective experience, in order to respond with empathy. The clinician should express receptiveness to the client's point of view and intervene in ways that can generate hope (Horvarth & Bedi, 2002).

Supporting the process of change requires flexibility in the application of the therapeutic approach (Côté & Hudon, 2016). Adopting a flexible approach can help clinicians meet the varied needs of clients. Indeed, clients differ with regard to their language impairment, but also their expectations when it comes to their relationship with the SLP (Lawton et al. 2018). Clinicians may consider some changes to be meaningful, but these changes may not be valued by the client (Finn, 2003). It is important for clients to have a say concerning the types of change they see as worthwhile (Manning, 2010).

However, it is important to note that while, for some clients, empathy may promote the therapeutic alliance by making them feel understood, for other clients, it can

also be perceived as an intrusion (Horvath & Bedi, 2002). To have a beneficial effect on the therapeutic alliance, the empathy demonstrated by the clinician must therefore be consistent with the preferences and perceptions of clients (Constantino, Castonguay, Zack, & DeGeorge, 2010; Horvath & Bedi, 2002). Failure to recognize the client's emotions and possible criticism, and an over-focus on detail, are all mentioned by Karver et al. (2006) as possible barriers to establishing a therapeutic alliance.

Other strategies and behaviours are also negatively associated with the therapeutic alliance. For example, pushing the client to talk when he/she does not wish to do so, or being overly formal, can compromise the quality of the therapeutic alliance. This appears to be particularly true for teenagers (Constantino et al., 2010). With this clientele, it is also important to avoid strategies that are more appropriate for young children, which can be perceived with suspicion and disinterest (DiGiuseppe, Linscott, & Jilton, 1996).

Factors relating to clients

Clients' perception of the usefulness of the intervention and expectation of change, as well as their receptivity to and motivation to change, are considered factors that can influence the establishment of a good therapeutic alliance with the clinician (Constantino et al., 2010; Karver et al., 2005; Hersoug, Hoglend, Havik, & Monsen, 2010; Ross, Polaschek, & Ward, 2008). If clients have had negative experiences in the past, this can make them wary of engaging in a new therapeutic relationship (Rooney, 2009). Where they are at in terms of the stages of therapeutic change and how they expect to be able to cope with their problem are some of the variables pertaining to the client in any intervention session (Manning, 2010).

1 Seeing the clinician as trustworthy, honest, authentic, and empathic can induce
2 positive feelings toward the clinician and lead to the development of a supportive
3 therapeutic alliance (Karver et al., 2005). Some authors state that clients may be more
4 inclined to form a therapeutic alliance with clinicians they perceive to be credible and
5 competent (Karver et al., 2005). Strong (1968) defines a credible clinician as a person
6 who presents him/herself clearly, with simplicity and authenticity. This kind of clinician
7 inspires confidence (Ackerman & Hilsenroth, 2003). In a study involving adults who
8 stuttered, clinicians who were perceived as lacking competence were described as being
9 ineffective in conveying to the client a sense of acceptance, understanding, and trust
10 (Plexico et al., 2010).

11 It is true, however, that not all clients are willing to take an active part in decision
12 making. Age-related factors, past experience of health care use, acceptance of the
13 problem, and cultural values, for example, may influence the degree to which clients wish
14 to be involved in this process (McKeown, Reininger, Martin, & Hoppmann, 2002).
15 Clinicians must thus have realistic expectations regarding the involvement of different
16 clients and adjust to the role that each is willing to play in this decision-making process
17 (Pomey et al., 2015). Take, for example, a 9-month-old child for whom a diagnosis of
18 profound hearing loss has just been confirmed. The need to intervene will be very clear
19 for both parents and stakeholders. Accordingly, the discussion will focus on defining the
20 best therapeutic approach, the short- and medium-term goals of the intervention, its
21 intensity, and the roles of the parents and clinician. By contrast, in a situation where the
22 need to intervene may appear less obvious, such as with a client with a neurodegenerative
23 disease, the discussion will have to address the client's expectations of the intervention.

1 The possible benefits will be exposed while also emphasizing the inevitable progression
2 of the disease and its consequences.

3 **External factors**

4 Other persons may also influence the establishment of a therapeutic alliance
5 between the client and the clinician, including family members, friends and other
6 significant figures in the client's life (Ross et al., 2008). Through the values they convey,
7 their perceptions and comments on the intervention, these different actors all have the
8 potential to encourage or undermine the therapeutic alliance that develops between the
9 client and his/her clinician.

10 With regard to the context of the intervention, two meta-analyses focusing on
11 adult clients receiving psychotherapy reported that intervention type did not moderate the
12 relationship between the therapeutic alliance and intervention outcomes (Horvath &
13 Symonds, 1991; Martin et al., 2000). Freckmann et al. (2017) came to the same
14 conclusion in a study comparing the strength of the therapeutic alliance between SLPs
15 and their clients in two clinical settings. More specifically, the therapeutic alliance was
16 equally as strong in both face-to-face and telepractice settings and was thus not affected
17 by the service delivery model.

18 Nevertheless, the intervention context appears to be the most important external
19 factor likely to impair the therapeutic alliance (Wolter et al., 2011). Constraints related to
20 the organization of services (e.g., a limited number of appointments granted by the
21 institution, the impossibility of meeting in the family home or the child's daycare centre)
22 are likely to interfere with the establishment of a therapeutic alliance. This is the case

1 when such constraints prevent action that the clinician considers relevant but is unable to
2 apply (Lawton et al., 2018). Moreover, prioritizing a medical model may compromise the
3 establishment of a therapeutic alliance. Such a model encourages the client to adopt a
4 passive attitude, concurring with the clinician, who chooses the intervention that he/she
5 considers best (Joosten et al., 2008). The therapeutic alliance is also largely compromised
6 in a context characterized by frequent relational discontinuity caused by high staff
7 turnover, due to illness, vacations, new employees, or restructuring of workloads in
8 institutions (Légaré et al., 2013).

9 In summary, a low-quality therapeutic alliance is associated with the possibility
10 that the client will discontinue the intervention and lose interest in any future
11 intervention. The inability of clinicians to develop an effective therapeutic alliance may
12 lead to emotions in the client such as shame, inadequacy, hopelessness, frustration, anger,
13 guilt, embarrassment, and discouragement (Plexico et al., 2010). It is thus crucially
14 important to pay particular attention to this dimension, especially during early
15 appointments (Horvarth & Bedi, 2002). In situations where the clinician has difficulty
16 establishing a therapeutic alliance, it is his/her responsibility to identify how he/she might
17 be contributing to this situation rather than putting the blame on the client's
18 characteristics. The clinician must reflect on his/her own actions and make the necessary
19 corrections. Clinical supervision is a possible avenue in such a context. Feedback is
20 recognized as a powerful tool for professional development and learning (Van de Ridder,
21 McGaghie, Stokking, & Ten Cate, 2015).

22 **Strategies for establishing, maintaining or improving the therapeutic alliance**

1 Training at both the under- and postgraduate levels is the most frequently cited
2 strategy for improving clinicians' ability to first develop and then maintain and improve
3 their skills in the relational side of the therapeutic process (e.g., Légaré et al., 2013; Rose,
4 Rosewilliam, & Soundy, 2017; Strauss et al., 2015). Such training can be implemented to
5 foster the development of a therapeutic alliance (Crits-Christoph et al., 2006) and manage
6 ruptures in this alliance (Castonguay et al., 2004). Just as the initial training of SLPs
7 prepares them to effectively execute their clinical expertise, such training should also
8 give equal emphasis to the relational side of therapy, or *how* therapy is implemented
9 (Lawton et al., 2018; Manning, 2010).

10 Engaging clinicians in a process of reflexivity could be the way to achieve this.
11 Applying reflective skills can allow clinicians to take a step back from their action and
12 identify concrete ways to improve it (Mann, 2011). Reflective practice is conceived as a
13 learning process that takes place over time, emphasizing the back and forth between
14 action and reflection. It allows for the transformation of a clinician's practice, as a result
15 of this learning (Lison, 2013). The clinician reflects on his/her own concrete experiences,
16 identifying the elements that raise questions for him/her. The clinician then analyzes
17 these elements and seeks and validates alternatives, arriving at an understanding of the
18 phenomenon that will allow for new experience. The cycle then begins again – reflective
19 practice is an iterative process. This process, together with constructive feedback,
20 facilitates awareness of what works well and what does not, and how the clinician can
21 improve (Embo et al., 2014).

22 Some activities, practiced individually, with a mentor or in groups, promote
23 reflective practice. One example is the case method. What is essential, however, is

1 feedback. Feedback is what provides access to a level of generalization that results in a
 2 change in practice over the long term. Becoming a reflexive clinician takes not only time
 3 (Larrivee, 2000) and a supportive environment (Mann et al., 2007) but also mentoring
 4 (Donnay & Charlier, 2008).

5 Communities of practice can also be supportive, enhancing the clinician's ability
 6 to develop a quality therapeutic alliance with the client and his/her family. Communities
 7 of practice are groups of people who share a common concern or passion. Together, they
 8 can learn to improve their practice through regular interaction with one another (Wenger-
 9 Trayner, Fenton-O'Creevy, Hutchison, Kubiak, & Wenger-Trayner, 2014).

10 **Conclusion**

11 It is essential that speech-language services be based on the latest scientific
 12 knowledge and professional best practices. However, high-level clinical expertise is not
 13 enough to ensure the effectiveness of speech-language interventions. It is also and above
 14 all the responsibility of clinicians to establish a good therapeutic alliance with their client
 15 and his/her family in order to maximize the benefits of their interventions. Developing
 16 and maintaining therapeutic relationships requires a person-centered approach and a real
 17 conviction of the uniqueness of each client/family.

18 **Acknowledgments**

19 A shorter French version of this article was published in *Langage et Pratique*, 60,
 20 14-23. The authors would like to thank the editor for authorizing its translation and
 21 adaptation for publication in English in the Canadian Journal of Speech-Language
 22 Pathology.

Appendix

Here are some interesting references for clinicians who want to deepen their knowledge of the topic of this article.

Therapeutic alliance and therapeutic relationship:

Lambert, M.J. (2013). Bergin and Garfield's Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change (6th Edition). Ottawa, ON: John Wiley & Sons. ISBN: 978-1-118-03820-8

Shared decision making:

Canada Research Chair in Shared Decision Making and Knowledge Translation. Québec, QC: Centre intégré universitaire de santé et services sociaux (CIUSSS) de la Capitale-Nationale.

References

- Ackerman, S.J., & Hilsenroth, M.J. (2003). A review of therapist characteristics and techniques positively impacting the therapeutic alliance. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 1-33. doi:10.1016/S0272-7358(02)00146-0
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (2005). *Evidence-based practice in communication disorders* [Position Statement]. Retrieved online at: www.asha.org/policy
- Baldwin, S.A., Wampold, B.E., & Imel, Z.E. (2007). Untangling the alliance-outcome correlation: Exploring the relative importance of therapist and patient variability in the alliance. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*, 842-852. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.75.6.842
- Biehal, N. (2008). Preventive services for adolescents: Exploring the process of change. *British Journal of Social Work, 38*, 444-461. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcl352
- Bordin, E.S. (1979). The generalisability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy, Theory, Research and Practice, 16*, 252-260. doi:10.1037/h0085885
- Castonguay, L. G., Schut, A. J., Aikins, D., Constantino, M. J., Laurenceau, J. P., Bologh, L., & Burns, D. D. (2004). Integrative cognitive therapy for depression: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 14*, 4-20. doi:10.1037/1053-0479.14.1.4
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- 1 Constantino, M.J., Castonguay, L.G., Zack, S.E., & DeGeorge, J. (2010). Engagement in
 2 psychotherapy: Factors contributing to the facilitation, demise, and restoration of
 3 the therapeutic alliance. In D. Castro-Blanco & M.S. Karver (Eds.), *Elusive*
 4 *alliance: Treatment engagement strategies with high-risk adolescents* (pp.21-57).
 5 Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- 6 Côté, L., & Hudon, E. (2016). L'approche clinique centrée sur le patient : des principes et
 7 des pratiques adaptées [The patient-centered clinical approach: Adapting
 8 principles and practices]. In C. Richard & M.T. Lussier (Eds.), *La communication*
 9 *professionnelle en santé (2e éd.)* [*Professional communication in health sciences*
 10 *(2nd ed.)*]. Montreal, Canada: ERPI.
- 11 Crits-Christoph, P., Gibbons, M. B. C., Crits-Christoph, K., Narducci, J., Schamberger,
 12 M., & Gallop, R. (2006). Can therapists be trained to improve their alliances? A
 13 preliminary study of alliance-fostering psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*
 14 *Research, 16*, 268-281. doi:10.1080/10503300500268557
- 15 De Roten, Y. (2011). L'alliance thérapeutique est-elle la clé du changement ? [Is
 16 therapeutic alliance the key to change?] In E. Collot (Ed.), *L'alliance*
 17 *thérapeutique : fondements et mise en œuvre* [*Therapeutic alliance: Foundations*
 18 *and implementation*], (pp. 3-16). Paris, France: Dunod.
- 19 Despland, J.-N., Zimmerman, G., & De Roten, Y. (2006). L'évaluation empirique des
 20 psychothérapies [Empirical evaluation of psychotherapy]. *Psychothérapies, 26*,
 21 91-95. doi:10.3917/psys.062.0091

- 1 Di Blasi, Z., Harkness, E., Ernst, E., Georgiu, A., & Kleijnen, J. (2001). Influence of
2 context effects on health outcomes: A systematic review. *The Lancet*, 357, 757–
3 762. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04169-6
- 4 DiGiuseppe, R., Linscott, J. et Jilton, R. (1996). Developing the therapeutic alliance in
5 child-adolescent psychotherapy. *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 5, 85-100.
6 doi:10.1016/S0962-1849(96)80002-3
- 7 Dollaghan, C.A. (2007). *The handbook for evidence-based practice in communication*
8 *disorders*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- 9 Donnay, J. & Charlier, E. (2008). *Apprendre par l'analyse de pratiques : initiation au*
10 *compagnonnage réflexif [Learning through practice analysis: initiation to*
11 *reflexive companionship]*. Namur, Belgium : Presses universitaires de Namur.
- 12 Dumez, V (2012, avril). *Le patient partenaire : Défis d'intégration et de co-construction*.
13 Présentation à la rencontre annuelle des services sociaux, Montréal, Canada.
- 14 Duncan, E., Best, C., & Hagen, S. (2010). Shared decision making interventions for
15 people with mental health conditions. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*,
16 Issue 1. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD007297.pub2
- 17 Elvins, R. & Green, J. (2008). The conceptualization and measurement of therapeutic
18 alliance: An empirical review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 1167-1187.
19 doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2008.04.002.
- 20 Elwyn, G., Frosch, D. L., & Kobrin, S. (2015). Implementing shared decision-making:
21 consider all the consequences. *Implementation Science*, 11(114), 1-10.
22 doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0480-9

- 1 Embo, M. P. C., Driessen, E., Valcke, M., & Van Der Vleuten, C. P. (2014). Scaffolding
2 reflective learning in clinical practice: A comparison of two types of reflective
3 activities. *Medical Teacher*, 36, 602-607. doi:10.3109/0142159X.2014.899686
- 4 Finn, P. (2003). Evidence-based treatment of stuttering:: II. Clinical significance of
5 behavioral stuttering treatments. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 28, 209-218.
6 doi:10.1016/S0094-730X(03)00039-1
- 7 Fourie, R., Crowley, N., & Oliviera, A. (2011). A qualitative exploration of therapeutic
8 relationships from the perspective of six children receiving speech-language
9 therapy. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 31, 310-324.
10 doi:10.1097/TLD.0b013e3182353f00
- 11 Freckmann, A., Hines, M., & Lincoln, M. (2017). Clinicians' perspectives of therapeutic
12 alliance in face-to-face and telepractice speech-language pathology
13 sessions. *International journal of speech-language pathology*, 19, 287-296.
14 doi:10.1080/17549507.2017.1292547
- 15 Furlong, L., Serry, T., Erickson, S., & Morris, M. E. (2018). Processes and challenges in
16 clinical decision-making for children with speech-sound disorders. *International*
17 *Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 53, 1124-1138.
18 doi:10.1111/1460-6984.12426
- 19 Haesebaert, J., Adekpedjou, R., Croteau, J., Robitaille, H., & Légaré, F. (2019). Shared
20 decision-making experienced by Canadians facing health care decisions: A Web-
21 based survey. *CMAJ open*, 7, 210-216. doi: 10.9778/cmajo.20180202

- 1 Hall, A. M., Ferreira, P. H., Maher, C. G., Latimer, J., & Ferreira, M. L. (2010). The
2 influence of the therapist-patient relationship on treatment outcome in physical
3 rehabilitation: A systematic review. *Physical Therapy*, 90, 1099-1110.
4 doi:10.2522/ptj.20090245
- 5 Hersh, D. (2010). I can't sleep at night with discharging this lady: The personal impact of
6 ending therapy on speech-language pathologists. *International Journal of*
7 *Speech-Language Pathology*, 12, 283-291. doi:10.3109/17549501003721072
- 8 Hersoug, A.G., Høglend, P., Havik, O.E., & Monsen, J.T. (2010). Development of
9 working alliance over the course of psychotherapy. *Psychology and*
10 *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 83, 145-159.
11 doi:10.1348/147608309X471497
- 12 Horvath, A.O., & Bedi, R.P. (2002). The Alliance. In J.C. Norcross (Ed.), *Psychotherapy*
13 *relationships that work* (pp.37-69). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 14 Horvath, A., & Symonds, R.D. (1991). Relation between working alliance and outcome
15 in psychotherapy: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 139-
16 149. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.38.2.139
- 17 Joosten, E. A. G., DeFuentes-Merillas, L., de Weert, G. H., Sensky, T., van der Staak, C.
18 P. F., & de Jong, C. A. J. (2008). Systematic review of the effects of shared
19 decision-making on patient satisfaction, treatment adherence and health status.
20 *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 77, 219-226. doi:10.1159/000126073

- 1 Karver, M., Handelsman, J.B., Fields, S., & Bickman, L. (2005). A theoretical model of
2 common process factors in youth and family therapy. *Mental Health Services*
3 *Research*, 7, 35-51. doi:10.1007/s11020-005-1964-4
- 4 Karver, M., Handelsman, J.B., Fields, S., & Bickman, L. (2006). Meta-analysis of
5 therapeutic relationship variables in youth and family therapy: The evidence for
6 different relationship variables in the child and adolescent treatment outcome
7 literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26, 50-65. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2005.09.001
- 8 Kelley, J.M., Kraft-Todd, G., Schapira, L., Kossowsky, J., & Riess, H. (2014). The
9 influence of the patient-clinician relationship on healthcare outcomes: A
10 systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *PLoS One*,
11 9, e94207. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094207
- 12 Kiesler, D.J., & Auerbach, S.M. (2006). Optimal matches of patient preferences for
13 information, decision-making and interpersonal behavior: Evidence, models and
14 interventions. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 61, 319-341.
15 doi:0.1016/j.pec.2005.08.002
- 16 Larrivee, B. (2000). Transforming Teaching Practice: Becoming the critically reflective
17 teacher. *Reflective Practice*, 1, 293-307. doi:10.1080/14623940020025561
- 18 Lawton, M., Sage, K., Haddock, G., Conroy, P., & Serrant, L. (2018). Speech and
19 language therapists' perspectives of therapeutic alliance construction and
20 maintenance in aphasia rehabilitation post-stroke. *International journal of*
21 *language & communication disorders*, 53, 550-563. doi:10.1111/1460-
22 6984.12368

- 1 Lawton, M., Haddock, G., Conroy, P., Serrant, L., & Sage, K. (2019). People with
2 aphasia's perspectives of the therapeutic alliance during speech-language
3 intervention: A Q methodological approach. *International Journal of Speech-*
4 *Language Pathology*. Advance online publication.
5 doi:10.1080/17549507.2019.1585949
- 6 Leahy, M. M. (2004). Therapy talk: Analyzing therapeutic discourse. *Language, Speech*
7 *and Hearing Services in Schools*, 35, 70-81. doi: 10.1044/0161-1461(2004/008)
- 8 Lecomte, C., Savard, R., Drouin, M.S., & Guillon, V. (2004). Qui sont les
9 psychothérapeutes efficaces? Implications pour la formation en psychologie.
10 [Who are the efficient psychotherapists? Implications for training in psychology].
11 *Revue québécoise de psychologie*, 25, 73-102.
- 12 Légaré, F., Ratté, S., Stacey, D., Kryworuchko, J., Gravel, K., Graham, I.D.,... Turcotte,
13 S. (2010). Interventions for improving the adoption of shared decision making by
14 healthcare professionals. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 5.
15 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD006732.pub2.
- 16 Légaré, F., Stacey, D., Brière, N., Fraser, K., Desroches, S., Dumont, S., . . . Aubé, D.
17 (2013). Healthcare providers' intentions to engage in an interprofessional
18 approach to shared decision-making in home care programs: A mixed methods
19 study. *Journal of Interprofessional Care*, 27, 214-222.
20 doi:10.3109/13561820.2013.763777
- 21 Lindhiem, O., Bennett, C. B., Trentacosta, C. J., & McLearn, C. (2014). Client preferences
22 affect treatment satisfaction, completion, and clinical outcome: A meta-
23 analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 34, 506-517. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2014.06.002

- 1 Lison, C. (2013). La pratique réflexive en enseignement supérieur: d'une approche
 2 théorique à une perspective de développement professionnel [Reflective practice
 3 in higher education: From a theoretical approach to a professional development
 4 perspective]. *Phronesis*, 2(1), 15-27. doi:10.7202/1015636ar
- 5 Lofland, J. H., Johnson, P. T., Ingham, M. P., Rosemas, S. C., White, J. C., & Ellis, L.
 6 (2017). Shared decision-making for biologic treatment of autoimmune disease:
 7 Influence on adherence, persistence, satisfaction, and health care costs. *Patient*
 8 *preference and adherence*, 11, 947-958. doi:10.2147/PPA.S133222
- 9 Mann, K.V. (2011). Therotical perspectives in medical education: Past experience and
 10 future possibilities. *Medical Education*, 45, 60-68. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
 11 2923.2010.03757.x.
- 12 Mann, K., Gordon, J., & MacLeod, A. (2009). Reflection and reflective practice in health
 13 professions education: A systematic review. *Advances in Health Sciences*
 14 *Education*, 14, 595-621. doi:10.1007/s10459-007-9090-2
- 15 Manning, W.H. (2010). Evidence of clinically change: The therapeutic alliance and the
 16 possibilities of outcomes-informed care. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 31,
 17 207-216. doi: 10.1055/s-0030-1265754.
- 18 Martin, D.J., Graskie, J.P., & Davis, M.K. (2000). Relation of the therapeutic alliance
 19 with outcome and other variables: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting*
 20 *and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 438-450. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.68.3.438

- 1 McKeown, R.E., Reininger, B.M., Martin, M., & Hoppmann, R.A. (2002). Shared
2 decision making: Views of first-year residents and clinic patients. *Academic*
3 *Medicine*, 77, 438–45. doi:10.1097/00001888-200205000-00020
- 4 Moore, C.L., & Kaplan, S.L. (2018). A framework and resources for shared decision
5 making: Opportunities for improved physical therapy outcomes. *Physical*
6 *Therapy*, 98, 1022-1036. doi:10.1093/ptj/pzy095
- 7 Norcross, J.C. (2002). Empirically supported therapy relationships. In J.C. Norcross
8 (Ed.), *Psychotherapy Relationships that Work* (pp.3-16). New York, NY: Oxford
9 University Press.
- 10 O'Connor, A.M., Drake, E., Wells, G., Tugwell, P., Laupacis, A., & Elmslie, T. (2003).
11 A survey of the decision-making needs of Canadians faced with complex health
12 decisions. *Health Expectations*, 6, 97-109. doi:10.1046/j.1369-6513.2003.00215.x
- 13 Plexico, L. W., Manning, W. H., & DiLollo, A. (2010). Client perceptions of effective
14 and ineffective therapeutic alliances during treatment for stuttering. *Journal of*
15 *Fluency Disorders*, 35, 333-354. doi:10.1016/j.jfludis.2010.07.001
- 16 Pomey, M., Flora, L., Karazivan, P., Dumez, V., Lebel, P., Vanier, M.,...Jouet, E. (2015).
17 Le « Montreal model »: enjeux du partenariat relationnel entre patients et
18 professionnels de la santé. [The "Montreal model": Issues related to the relational
19 partnership between patients and health professionals.] *Santé Publique*, 51(HS),
20 41-50. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3917/spub.150.0041>
- 21 Roddam, H., & Skeat, J. (2010). What does EBP mean to speech and language therapists?
22 In H. Roddam & J. Skeat (Eds.), *Embedding evidence-based practice in speech*

- 1 *and language therapy: International examples*. Chichester, United Kingdom:
 2 Wiley-Blackwell.
- 3 Rooney, R. H. (2009). *Strategies for Work with Involuntary Patients*. New York, NY:
 4 Columbia University Press.
- 5 Rose, A., Rosewilliam, S., & Soundy, A. (2017). Shared decision making within goal
 6 setting in rehabilitation settings: A systematic review. *Patient Education and*
 7 *Counseling*, 100, 65-75. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.07.030
- 8 Rosewilliam, S., Roskell, C. A., & Pandyan, A. D. (2011). A systematic review and
 9 synthesis of the quantitative and qualitative evidence behind patient-centred goal
 10 setting in stroke rehabilitation. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, 25, 501-514.
 11 doi:10.1177/0269215510394467
- 12 Ross, E.C., Polaschek, D.L.L., & Ward, T. (2008). The therapeutic alliance: A theoretical
 13 revision for offender rehabilitation. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13, 462-
 14 480. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.07.003
- 15 Rutledge, T., & Loh, C. (2004). Effect sizes and statistical testing in the determination of
 16 clinical significance in behavioral medicine research. *Annals of Behavioral*
 17 *Medicine*, 27, 138–145. doi:10.1207/s15324796abm2702_9
- 18 Sackett, D.L., Rosenberg, W.M.C., Gray, J.A.M., Haynes, R.B., & Richardson, W.S.
 19 (1996). Evidence based medicine: What it is and what it isn't. *British Medical*
 20 *Journal*, 312, 71-72. doi:10.1136/bmj.312.7023.71
- 21 Schapira, L. (2013). The essential elements of a therapeutic presence. *Cancer*, 119, 1609-
 22 1610. doi: 10.1002/cncr.27946

- 1 Schelstraete, M.A. (2011). *Traitement du langage oral chez l'enfant. Interventions et*
2 *indications cliniques. [Treatment of oral language in children. Interventions and*
3 *clinical indications.]* Issy-les-Moulineaux, France: Elsevier Masson.
- 4 Schwarz, M., Coccetti, A., & Cardell, E. (2019). Clinical decision-making for complex
5 feeding decisions: A national survey of current approaches and
6 perspectives. *Australasian Journal on Ageing*. 2019(00). doi:10.1111/ajag.12708
- 7 Shay, L. A., & Lafata, J. E. (2015). Where is the evidence? A systematic review of shared
8 decision making and patient outcomes. *Medical Decision Making*, 35, 114-131.
9 doi:10.1177/0272989X14551638
- 10 Shirk, S.R., & Karver, M. (2003). Prediction of treatment outcome from relationship
11 variables in child and adolescent therapy: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of*
12 *Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 452-464. doi: 10.1037/0022-
13 006X.71.3.452
- 14 Simmons-Mackie, N., & Schultz, M. (2003). The role of humour in therapy for
15 aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 17, 751-766. doi:10.1080/02687030344000229
- 16 Stewart, M., Brown, J.B., Weston, W.W., McWhinney, I.R., McWilliam, C.L., Freeman,
17 T.R. (1995). *Patient-Centered Medicine. Transforming the Clinical Method*.
18 Thousand Oaks, CA : SAGE Publications.
- 19 Strauss, K., Benvenuto, A., Battan, B., Siracusano, M., Terribili, M., Curatolo, P., &
20 Fava, L. (2015). Promoting Shared Decision Making to strengthen outcome of
21 young children with Autism Spectrum Disorders: The role of staff

- 1 competence. *Research in developmental disabilities*, 38, 48-63.
- 2 doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2014.11.016
- 3 Strong, S.R. (1968). Counseling: An interpersonal influence process. *Journal of*
- 4 *Counseling Psychology*, 15, 215-224. doi:10.1037/h0020229
- 5 Turner-Stokes, L., Rose, H., Ashford, S., & Singer, B. (2015). Patient engagement and
- 6 satisfaction with goal planning: Impact on outcome from
- 7 rehabilitation. *International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 22, 210-216.
- 8 doi:10.12968/ijtr.2015.22.5.210
- 9 Van de Ridder, J.M.M., McGaghie, W.C., Stokking, K.M., & ten Cate, O.T.J. (2015).
- 10 Variables that affect the process and outcome of feedback, relevant for medical
- 11 training: A meta-review. *Medical Education*, 49, 658-673.
- 12 doi:10.1111/medu.12744.
- 13 Wampold, B. E. (2001). *The great psychotherapy debate: Models, methods, and findings*.
- 14 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 15 Wenger-Trayner, E., Fenton-O'Creevy, M., Hutchison, S., Kubiak, C., & Wenger-
- 16 Trayner, B. (2014). *Learning in Landscapes of Practice. Boundaries, identity,*
- 17 *and knowledgeability in practice-based learning*. London, England: Routledge.
- 18 Weston, W.W. (2001). Informed and shared decision-making: The crux of patient-
- 19 centered care. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 165, 438-439.
- 20 Wolter, J.A., Corbin-Lewis, K., Self, T., & Elswailer, A. (2011). An evidence-based
- 21 practice model across the academic and clinical settings. *Communication*
- 22 *Disorders Quarterly*, 32, 118-132. doi:10.1177/1525740109344219

Table 1

Factors Relating to Clinicians, Clients and the Context of the Intervention

	Type of clients	References
Factors relating to clinicians		
Adapt their behaviour and style of communication to degree of severity of language impairment presented by client	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2019 Slingsby, 2006
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persons with severe impairment, attending therapy over a long period (e.g., persons with severe aphasia) valued therapeutic empathy, enjoyment of therapy and hope 	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2019
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Persons with mild therapy valued professional competence, therapeutic challenge and firmness 	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2019

Adapt to individuals' relational preferences and needs	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Propose relational proximity, not as a friend, but not too formal	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Give honest feedback on progress and recovery	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Use humour sparingly: can foster solidarity and togetherness	Adults with aphasia	Simmons-Mackie & Schultz, 2003
Acknowledge the person's lived experience	Adults with aphasia	Simmons-Mackie & Damico, 2011
Demonstrate passion for assisting the client	Adults with stuttering	Plexico et al., 2010
Communicate clearly their understanding of the client's experience	Adults with stuttering	Plexico et al., 2010
Listen carefully and focus on the client's unique goals and capabilities	Adults with stuttering	Plexico et al., 2010
In paediatric context: make sure the therapy is enjoyable	Children with language difficulties	Fourie et al., 2011

Factors relating to clients

Motivated to participate in shared decision-making process	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Perceive that they play an active role in the therapeutic process	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
External factors		
Service delivery model prioritizing impairment-based approach and time constraints	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Limited time resources	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Relational discontinuity	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
Medical model	Adults with aphasia	Lawton et al., 2018
