

See Copyright Declaration at the Bottom Page

Date	11/03/10
Fund	64700
Class	STAT Theres REF
Accession No.	311 1566779

Letter of amendment addressing the required revisions in a chronological order

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
acknowledgments	1	R. Contents – typo- has referred to acknowledgements on p179, when page is actually 169 as next page is 170. Also acknowledgements should be towards beginning of thesis.	Acknowledgements were moved to the start of the document	p. 1
Contents	2	R. Contents listings and headings in body of text are different in some places e.g., sub-heading is listed as 'Summary of findings' in contents listings, yet in the thesis it is referred to as ' <i>Conclusion on findings</i> ' (p150).	Content listing was changed	p. 2-7
Abstract	3	The abstract is too long and should be presented as one single paragraph of prose without sub-headings. R. Shorten abstract; R. Produce abstract as paragraph; R. Make abstract explicitly relevant to counselling psychology; R. Place abstract immediately before introduction		p. 8
Introduction	4	R. Empirical evidence to support Selye's theory		p. 10, line 8-11
	5	R. Empirical evidence for Holmes & Rae		p. 11, line 3-4
	6	R. Provide some examples of these personality characteristics (Page 12; Line 5):		p.14, line 14-15
	7	R. If referring to a volume of research or authors [E.g., 'many reviews' (e.g., p12)] then include illustrations (references) to support this assertion.	References were included.	p. 15, line 4



Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	8	R – Make it clear why CF and VT described separately yet, the theoretical explanation of both of these processes are described together. Their descriptions seem to imply that they are conceptually different/mediated by different processes (which is borne out by the results and discussion section).		p. 21, line 15-20
	9	R – should acknowledge the psychodynamic route of transference and countertransference (and the unconscious processes involved). See p. 21-22.		p. 23, line 12-and onwards
	10	R. Should be ‘defences’ not ‘defenses’ (Page 21; Line 3)	It was changed to defences	p.25, line 2
	11	R. Should be ‘spectrum’ not ‘specter’ (Page 22; Line 11). (page 24, Line 7)	It was changed to spectrum	p.26, line 9
	12	R ‘The former duo’ is rather casual for such an important piece of work (Page 28; Line 2). (Page 29; Line 20)	“The former duo” was deleted.	p. 32, line 2
	13	R. Define ‘IES’ before using those initials; presumably it is the Impact of Event Scale (Page 29; Line 2)	IES was defined as the Impact of Event Scale	p.33, line 1
	14	R. “...common occurrence for therapists or not”; the term ‘or not’ is redundant and is poor grammar (Page 33; Line 6) (Page 35; Line 4).	“Or not” was deleted	p.37, line 4

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	15	R. Is the correlation, referred to here, positive or negative? (Page 34; Line 5)	The sentence was changed, as I realised that one of the studies was not based on a correlation, but a test of difference. Instead, it was replaced by another sentence	p.38, line 3
	16	R What is the ratio of the difference in gender? (Page 35; Line 13)	.	p.39, line 17
	17	R. It is poor punctuation to use the colon in this context. (Page 36; Line 8) (page 38, Line 7)	The colon was omitted	p.40, line 8
	18	R. This is quite a jumbled paragraph; deal with positive and negative arguments separately (Page 38; Lines 6-16)	The positive argument was deleted, as this is described elsewhere in chapter 2 (positive effects of caring). Instead the paragraph was altered	p. 42, line 3-7
	19	R. Describe the relationship reported in those studies (Page 39; Line 19). See Page 41, Line 12.		p. 43, line 12-17
	20	R. What is meant by 'grow as a person'? (Page 41; Line 10)	This expression was replaced by another sentence	P. 45, line 9-13
	21	R. 'It is often painful', bit casual for such an important piece of work (Page 43; Line 6).	This part of the quote was deleted	p.47, line 12
	22	R. '...Fortunately, it is never boring'; this is rather colloquial	This part of the quote was also deleted	p.47, line 12
	23	R. Proof required '...thereafter, he or he may not...'; (Page 44; Line 2)	Proof was added and the sentence changed	p.48, line 8-9

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	24	R. Remove the word 'please' from the reference, it is not needed (this happens elsewhere too). (Page 44; Line 7)	"Please" was removed	p.48, line 13
	25	R. What is the implication of such inter-correlations? (Page 45; Line 8)	A line was added to explain the implication of this.	p.49, line 15-16
	26	R. 'The best known pioneers...' is subjective; 'best known' to whom? (Page 48; Line 2):	'The best known pioneers' was deleted	p. 52, line 10
	27	R. 'As have been noted earlier in this introduction' (Page 49; Line 20). This is not a good academic style. This happens elsewhere too.	This was deleted, both in this part and elsewhere too.	p.54, line 5
	28	R. Proof required Omission after 'e.g.'; (Page 52; Line 11)	Proof was added	p. 56, line 13
	29	R. Consider additional opportunities to link theory with practice – e.g., CBT (p60)	Parts were added throughout the introduction that linked theory and practice	e.g., p.13, line 9-15; p. 45, line 20-24; and p.64, line 17-19
	30	R. Match sub-headings in text with those in content listings (e.g., p60; p62)	Sub-headings were matched accordingly to content listing	See contents and p. 65-66
	31	R. Clarify which groups are included in the term 'psychologists' (p61) . (Page 64; Line 9).	The following was added to clarify what was meant by 'psychologists'; '.....therapeutically as a clinical or counselling psychologist'	p.65, line 4

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	32	R. Definitions should be presented before describing problems with the concepts (e.g., p63)	The argument about the problems with the trauma concept was moved from page 65 to rather be included in the definition of trauma section (Part 3.1.1)	p.68
	33	When a concept is mentioned for the first time, it should be referenced. Also, references should be included for any controversial/not very well established assertions (e.g., pp66-67). Follow APA reference style e.g., 'Moby Thesaurus II; Grady Ward, 2007' (p65). Only last name of author and publication year need to be included. Also, this reference is not listed in the reference list. It is also not clear why a thesaurus as opposed to a psychological source was used to provide a definition pivotal to the research.	This was done. Also, a thesaurus was used as a source to provide the definition of emotional woundendess, because no psychological source was found that could be quoted. Reference was listed in reference section	p. 70-71 p.69, line 11
	34	R. Avoid rhetorical sentences (p66 – a whole paragraph of only rhetorical questions; pp155-156)	Rhetorical sentences were changed.	e.g., p.70, line 5 p.173, line 16
	35	R. Indicate that certain terminology and concepts are rooted in particular therapeutic orientations (e.g., transference and the psychodynamic approach, p67), as this may also influence the manner in which the counselling/clinical psychologist appreciates the mechanisms of a particular psychological process. See page 69; Line 18.		p.70, line 14-20

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revisi on Numb er	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	36	R. Demonstrate an appreciation that not all therapists/counselling psychologist enter the counselling profession because their motivation to care for others is based on their own experiences of neglect – the term ‘therefore show...’ implies a factual nature of the statement.		p. 72, line 6-11
	37	R. clarify the connection between Shamans (traditional healers) and counselling/clinical psychologists (professional healers)		p.73, line 12 onwards
	38	R. Indicate any reasons why there is a gap in this important area	A paragraph was added to explain the potential reason for the lack of research on emotional woundendess in psychologists	p.77, line 18 onwards
	39	R. Develop this in the introduction (Page 77; footnote)	Footnote argument was moved to be included as a new part in the introduction	p. 78-82
	40	R. It is not explicit why clinical psychologists were included in the study – the literature review should have indicated this professions’ relevance to the study	This was indicated in a new part in the literature review	p. 78-82
	41	R. Something has gone wrong with numbering system! (Page 82 onwards)	The numbering system was changed throughout thesis	
	42	R. Delete ‘or not’ (Page 74; Line 7): ‘	Or not’, p. 74, line 7 was deleted.	p.83, line 8

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	43	R. Instead of ‘...the first theoretical chapter has demonstrated...’; use ‘...Chapter 1 has demonstrated...’. (Page 74; Line 11). This happens elsewhere too.	The following part ‘...the first theoretical chapter has demonstrated...’ was changed to ‘...Chapter 1 has demonstrated...’. Similar changes were also made including ‘the review has shown’ were changed to ‘chapter 2 has shown’ (and ‘these theoretical chapters’ to ‘chapter 1-2’ .	p. 83, line 12 p. 84, line 20. p.85, line 12
	44	R. Include more detail about the actual methodology used in studies.		p.84, line 3 onwards
	45	R. Provide methodological critique		p. 84, line 3 onwards
	46	R. Grammatical error in preposition order: should be ‘effects of therapy (e.g. CF) alone cannot...’, not ‘cannot alone’ (Page 75; Line 13). Ditto next line.	Changed accordingly	p. 85, line 20-22
	47	R. List aims and objectives so that they are clearly stated and each aim only contains one explicit and specific aim (e.g., the first aim seems to have at least two aims embedded within it.		p. 86-87
	48	R. Clearly state research question (p76)		p.86, line 9
	49	R. Inconsistency in use of terms e.g., some text refers to ‘Emotionally Wounded Scale’, yet the sub-heading and conclusion refer to it as ‘CEWS’.	It was changed to be referred to as CEWS throughout thesis	

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	50	R. Clarify why one independent variable (specialism), was a 'post-hoc group', when conceivably such participants could have been recruited directly from the two applied professions? (p82)	The specialism variable was not a post hoc group. Thus, it was changed	p.93, line 8 onwards
	51	R. It is most unlikely that this was a random sample, not unless a random number generator was employed. It is more likely that it was an 'opportunity' sample (Page 82; Line 19)	This was changed to; 'Participants were an opportunity sample of clinical...' (p. 1; Line 17)	p.93, line 17
	52	R. There is inconsistency in the definition of medium effect size: line 4 suggested 0.5; line 17 suggested 0.3. (Page 83). Reconcile this inconsistency	That is because G Power calculations define the size of an effect size according to the test used, meaning that what is a medium effect size for a t-test may be different from what is a medium effect size for a correlation.	
	53	R. Indicated how many were recruited after this process. What were the characteristics: age, gender, etc? (Page 84; Line 4)		p. 95, line 7-13
	54	R. it is more appropriate to use a specific sample size calculation for regression; power calculations are less sensitive here. Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) recommend a sample of 50, plus 8 times the number of participants. In this case that would be $50 + (8 \times 8) = 114$, so not that different, but it is important to use the correct method.	This was replaced by a specific sample size calculation for multiple regression.	p.95, line 1-6

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	55	R. Describe the pilot study of the new questionnaire. What was used to determine success? (Page 86; Line 16). Also, elaborate on how the pilot positively shaped the main study (p93).	The pilot study and what was used to determine success was described. Also, the pilot study's positive shaping of the main study was discussed	p. 98, line 3 onwards p. 105 (line 20-21)-106 (line 1-5)
	56	R. Provide r values for concurrent validity (Page 88).	R values for concurrent validity were added.	p. 100, line 13
	57	R. The full correct name is Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Page 94; Line 13)	Changed.	p. 106, line 19
	58	R. Since this was a largely exploratory study, it would have been more appropriate to use the Enter method (Page 95; Line 12). Conduct calculation using this method	The enter method was used.	p. 107, line 17-108
Analysis	59	R. Move presentation of descriptive statistics, reliability analysis and factor analysis to back of method chapter as a 'pre-analysis' so when results section is reached, just testing of models is presented (suggestion – start results section 6.2 – Inferential statistics).	The descriptive statistics section was moved to the end of the method section and was named 'pre-analysis' Numbering was altered accordingly (see content page).	p.108-p.124
	60	R. indicate why gender was featured as a relevant factor in the literature but not presented as a factor for analysis – consider including in hypothesis and analysing.	Justified in methodology/analysis part	p.108, line 20 onwards
	61	R. Discuss that could not make gender comparisons due to unequal groups of males and females(71% female, 29% male – ratio of 2.5:1 for females to males) even though gender seen as a relevant factor (P97)	See above	p. 108, line 20

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	62	R. Mention that tests for normal distribution and other assumption checks were undertaken, and say what they were	Extensive normal distribution checks and other assumption checks were undertaken. All the analyses were consequently re-run.	p. 108, line 4-11. Also see throughout pre-analysis, p.108-124
	63	R Do not repeat material (e.g., p97, no need to report results in text form if they already in table form). Highlight or refer to findings only if results are noteworthy/ striking	Repeated material was deleted.	p. 109, line 5-12
	64	R. Normal distribution must also be undertaken across the levels of the independent variables. There also needs to be far more rigorous testing than simple histograms and box plots. The latter are good for highlighting potential outliers, but that does not mean that the data are normally distributed; nor does the absence of outliers confirm that the data are normally distributed. Box plots typically used to help locate sources of variance, once statistical data collected to report normal distribution (Page 101; Line 9).	Additional normal distribution checks were performed for all the variables, including converting skew and kurtosis statistics to z scores. Normal distribution checks were also undertaken across the levels of the IV's that were to be used in t-tests.	p. 108-124
	65	R. What was the kurtosis? Was it significantly large for the sample size?	Kurtosis statistics have been added for all the variables	p. 108-124
	66	R. Elaborate on reporting of histogram Stating that the histogram was 'peaked' is not enough (Page 103; Line 12)	Elaboration of reporting on all histograms, their kurtosis and skewness has been done	p.108-124
	67	R. Elaborate on reporting of skewness. Saying that this was somewhat skewed is not enough. What was the skew? Was it positive or negative? Was it significantly large for the sample size? (Page 103; Line 17)	See above	p. 108-124

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	68	R. Need to be consistent in the reporting of statistical results (e.g., different styles of reporting on pp p104 and p106 compared to p115)	The same style of reporting was adapted throughout the result section	
	69	R. Clarify if a score on an instrument indicates low/medium/high possession of a particular property (e.g., p102)	This was clarified	p. 115, line 7
	70	R. Could outliers be removed? (Page 103; Line 20)	Outliers were not removed, but replaced. The reasoning for this was stated.	p. 115, line 21 p. 116, line 1-4
	71	R. Discuss Central Limit Theorem in more depth (Page 104; Line 1).		p. 118, line 4-12
	72	R. Be more specific about the overall suitability for a parametric test. Saying that it was good is not sufficient (Page 105; Line 9)	After checking the skew and kurtosis statistics, it was found that it was significantly negatively skewed, and so was consequently transformed using a logarithm. This is described	p.122, line 1 onwards
	73	R. What is, and where is, Diagram X? (Page 106; Line 7).	This was changed to rather include appendix 2f.	p.122, line 19
	74	R. Do not reproduce SPSS table printouts in analysis section. These should be in appendix.	All the main tables were re-written and kept in the main analysis. SPSS table printouts from for example multiple regression assumption checks were put in the Appendix.	See throughout result section and the appendices

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	75	R. Use correlation to ensure that there is no high correlation that might affect the outcome (Page 108; Line 2).	This was added.	p.126, line 5
	76	R. It is important to state whether predictors are continuous, ordinal or categorical. If categorical, it needs to be shown whether they are dichotomous (and say why that is important, and why they should be coded as 0 and 1). (Page 111; Line 17)	All the predictor variables were continuous.	p.131, line 3
	77	R. Clarify negative and positive beta values. More specifically, positive beta values indicate that as that value increases (or tends towards 1 on a categorical predictor), the value on the outcome variable increases; negative values indicate the opposite. Why were standardised beta values used, rather than actual beta values?	This was clarified.	p. 131, line 21 onwards
	78	R. Check this effect with ANCOVA (Page 112; Line 11)	The effect was negative. Instead, the researcher realised that the finding was due to the confidence intervals.	p.132, line 19
	79	R. It would help to remind us what SOC represents. (Page 112; Line 16).	The part was already reworded, due to other corrections.	
	80	R. Overall the outcome needs to be described more clearly, Something like: "compassion fatigue was predicted by a weaker sense of coherence, greater woundedness, and greater self distraction as a coping style (Page 113; Line 4).	This was already reworded from other corrections and from the re-running of the analyses (due to transformations after the extra normal distribution checks).	p.130-133

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	81	R Regression usage. At this level, a number of additional checks of assumption are needed: multicollinearity, homoscedasticity, and correlation between residuals.	Additional checks were used.	p. 131 and p. 140
	82	R. It is rather tacky to lift SPSS output directly into the report, and use that as a table. Show a table of mean data and standard deviation (at least); confidence intervals and standard error would also be useful. Then describe the statistics narratively. This goes for all results tables (Page 115; Table 8)	New tables were created throughout method and results sections.	p. 113-141
	83	R. T-test outcomes should be shown like this: $t(110) = 3.804, p < .001$ (Page 115; Line 10).	This was changed.	p. 135, line 5
	84	R. Null hypotheses should not be mentioned at this level (Page 115; Line 11).	The sentence was deleted	p.135, line 6
	85	R. Typo – fro instead of for (Page 115; Line 13):	Changed	p. 135, line 7
	86	R. Start the y axis score at 0. Anything above this as in this analysis over-emphasises effect and is very misleading. It is not clear how it adds anything to the statistical outcome This goes for all graphs (Page 116; Fig. 3).	All the graphs were deleted as they did not add anything to the statistics.	
	87	R. Clearly state whether the categorical variables were coded as 0 and 1. If not (sadly), the analysis must be re-run (Page 120; Line 11) (see p 47, Line 18).	The categorical variables were re-coded to 0 and 1	p. 139, line 20-21

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	88	R. Diagrammatic representation revisited in the discussion rather than introduced. Also, figure should be numbered in correspondence with the chapter number within which they are embedded	Diagrammatic representation of the model was introduced at the end of the result section and numbered according to chapter. All the other tables and figures were also changed to be numbered according to their chapters (see throughout thesis for examples).	p. 143
discussion	89	R. Discussion should start with summary of findings (Suggestion reduce summary of findings at end of results section, move them from results section and then put them at beginning of discussion to orientate the reader).	A summary of findings was added to the beginning of the discussion, whilst the conclusion at the end of the result section was deleted.	p. 144
	90	R. Be more precise about DSM (Page 123; Line 21)	DSM- IV was referenced. It had previously been defined in the document (p. 67, line 16).	p. 144, line 20
	91	5. R. No need to repeat statistical findings in discussion (p123)	All statistical findings in the discussion were deleted	p. 144 onwards
	92	R. No need to repeat/restate hypotheses – just to progress from whether they were supported or not (pp132,135, 137, 138, 140, 142,147)	Restated hypotheses in the discussion section were deleted	p. 144 onwards

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	93	R. It is not good to use phrases like 'as stated in the introduction' (Page 123; Line 16).	'as stated in the introduction' was deleted	p. 144, line 18
	94	R. Replace 'insignificant' with n-significant', not '. This happens elsewhere; run an 'edit/replace' check (Page 138; Line 2).	All 'insignificant' words were replaced with n-significant throughout the thesis (making use of the find and replace edit).	e.g., p. 156, line 10
	95	R. Clarify explanation of Levene's test - it simply guides us to choosing the correct line to read in the t-test; it does not explain the outcome (unless it would have been significant had 19. variances been equal; in which case, make that more specific) (Page 138; Line 3).	This part was deleted, because the Levene's test was irrelevant to the findings.	p. 158, line 4 onwards

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revisi on Numb er	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	96	<p>R. Revisit discussion of sample size (Page 137 & p162; Line 4). It is not sufficient to simply state that increasing the sample size might bring a significant effect; it is more complex than that. The outcome may have been non-significant because there was too much variation given the sample size. If that variation remained as the sample got bigger, it would make no difference to the significance. The effect of outliers is reduced in larger samples, but it is rather more complicated than simply increasing it. Also, a discussion about increasing sample size would also have considered how likely it was in the profession to find roughly equal sized groups of those who had not had therapy given the nature of the profession. Unlikely to find an ecologically meaningful sample to represent what are really likely to be real unequal proportions</p>	<p>The discussion on sample size from page 137 was deleted, as it did no longer seem relevant to the new argument I was making.</p> <p>Also, the discussion on the small sample size in the statistical limitation was altered, to also acknowledge that the n-significant results may have been due to too much variation given the sample size, or alternatively that there was no relationship between current emotional woundedness and VPTG.</p> <p>Please note however, that a discussion on groups having had therapy or not was not included in the above part, as there were no difficulties, or n-significant findings related to that calculation.</p>	<p>p. 158 line 4 onwards</p> <p>p. 185, line 9 onwards</p>

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	97	R. Typo: 'centred', not 'cantered' (Page 139; Line 9).	The spelling was changed	p. 159, line 3
	98	The work of Scragg, Bor and Watts (1999) on personality traits of potential counselling psychologists seems relevant to this study especially in light of the discussion on p139.	The findings from this study was referred to in the introduction and the discussion	p. 80., line 3 p.159, line 15
	99	R. Clarify the type of t-test (Page 140; Line 18	An "independent" t-test was added	p. 160, line 8
	100	R. Incorrect use of coordinating conjunctions (e.g., 'and' and 'but') – student has placed them at the beginning of sentences when in fact their grammatical function is to connect sentences (p144). One line sentences 'hanging' without being incorporated into paragraphs.	The word 'And' at the start of the sentence was deleted	p. 163, line 9
	101	R. Conclusion section (p150) is very sparse and needs elaborating. At the moment it is just a very brief selective summary with a model that is not even considered - simply alluded to.	The conclusion section was elaborated on	p. 167-170
	102	R. The discussion compares current findings with published findings but does not consider the findings in light of psychological theories. Similarly, the section on 'theoretical implications' (pp152-153) does not use mainstream psychology to anchor or contextualise the current findings.	The findings were anchored in mainstream psychology such as psychological theories (see throughout introduction and discussion). This was also done in the theoretical implications section.	e.g., p. 171-172

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	103	R. New material needs to be explored in the introduction before it is reviewed in the discussion [e.g. page 126 [Motta (1997)' (154); 'Motta and colleagues (1997)' (154]	Motta and colleagues' (1997) ideas were discussed in the introduction, before being referred to again in the discussion.	p. 19, line 10 p. 173, line 7 onwards
	104	R. Thesis should be written in the past tense and in third person (e.g., p155) (p 172)	This was changed throughout thesis	e.g., p. 174, line 15
	105	R. No consideration of the role of supervision, yet three relevant questions are asked about supervision and more participants received supervision than received therapy (93% v 83% respectively) only discussed as two sentences one on p156 and the other on p157	A more through discussion on the role of supervision was added	p. 175, line 16 onwards
	106	R. 'Exclusion' criteria - participants who were employed in academia - should have been considered in the discussion as this may be considered a biased/flawed recruitment strategy since many counselling psychology academics also have a practice of some sort.	This was added as a limitation of the methodology in the discussion	p. 179, line 7-12
	107	R. Discussion could consider the exclusion of potential participants on the basis of a university address (p82) 'Exclusion' criteria - participants who were employed in academia - should have been considered in the discussion as this may be considered a biased/flawed recruitment strategy since many counselling psychology academics also have a practice of some sort.	Again, as noted above, this was added as a limitation of the methodology in the discussion.	p. 179, line 7-12

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	108	Ecological validity could also be considered.	Ecological validity was considered	p. 180, line 19 onwards
	109	R Explain why the thesis suffers from similar pitfalls that had been criticised by the researcher in other previous research (e.g., S & F's 'non-standardised measures', p28; lack of generalisation across larger sample sizes, p55)	An explanation for this was added in the limitations part	p. 183, line 1 onwards
	110	R Explain why the thesis suffers from similar pitfalls that had been criticised by the researcher in other previous research (e.g., S & F's 'non-standardised measures', p28; lack of generalisation across larger sample sizes, p55)	An explanation for this was added in the limitations part	p. 183, line 1 onwards
Reflexivity	111	The student's motivation for the research was not considered. More depth on what the student has learnt (e.g., the struggle that the student refers to) would have been relevant. How the student's practice has been affected by these findings and how will disseminate the research.		p. 190-193
References	112	Examples of some authors in the text but not listed in references section: 'Linley et al (2005)' (p55) 'Sedwick (1984)' (p133); 'Kadambi and Truscott's (2004)' (p135) 'Tedeschi and Calhoun, 2006' (p138); 'Calhoun & Tedeschi, 1998'(p142); 'Zoellner and Maercker, 2004'; 'Pargament et al. (1998; 2000)' (p145) ; 'Koenig et al.(2001)' (p145); 'Weis et al., 2004' (p148); 'Motta (1997)' (154); 'Motta and colleagues (1997)' (154); Linley and Joseph, 2007 (p160)	The above authors were listed in the reference section. In addition, other authors not listed in the references section were also listed.	p. 194-214

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revisi on Numb er	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
Spelling	113	R. Use UK language and spelling throughout thesis	American spelling was changed to UK spelling	
Spelling	114	R. Examples of misspelling / incorrect /colloquial usage of basic terms used in counselling psychology e.g., 'validational properties' (validity?), p88 'charted', 'psychoteheraputically' (p106); 'non' (p108); 'insignificant' (p109; p115; P121, p138, p147); 'Lickert' (p101; 103); 'planned prior' (107, also 'a priory tests', p162 – do you mean ' <i>a priori</i> '?; 'significantly' (p112); ' <i>in tune</i> with the set hypothesis' (p115); 'The null hypothesis was thus <i>discarded</i> ' (p115); 'psychologsits' (p118); 'psychologists's' (p131); 'The psychologist's self is' (p156) The typical phrase is 'use of self' 'non-experiential' (non-experimental'?) – p158	<p>Misspelling, grammar mistakes and incorrect usage of terms were corrected:</p> <p>'charted', - changed to 'chartered'</p> <p>validational properties' – changed to 'validity'</p> <p>'psychoteheraputically'- changed to 'psychotherapeutically'</p> <p>'non'-changed to 'none' (p 127, line 16)</p> <p>'insignificant' - was replaced throughout the document by the word 'n-significant'</p> <p>'Lickert' - changed to 'Likert'</p> <p>'a priory'; -changed to 'a priori'</p> <p>'significantly' ;' this word was no longer included in the part, after the text had been re-written when the multiple regression was re-run .</p>	<p>p. 93, line 19</p> <p>p.100, line 8</p> <p>p.125, line 6</p> <p>p.126, line 16</p> <p>p. 113, line 5</p> <p>p.185, line 3</p>

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
			<p><i>in tune</i> with the set hypothesis' was replaced with 'in line with'</p> <p>'The null hypothesis was thus <i>discarded</i>' ; All mentioning of the null hypothesis was deleted, as not required.</p> <p>'psychologists'; the inferential statistics text had already been changed due to the re-running of the analyses, and did therefore no longer include this misspelling</p>	p.135, line 3
			'psychologists's' was corrected- psychologists'	p.152, line 1
			'The psychologist's self is' The typical phrase is 'use of self' – replaced by use of self	p. 175, line 11
			'non-experiential'- was replaced by non-experimental'	p. 181, line 4

**Letter of amendment addressing the required revisions in the order noted by
the examiners**

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revisi on Numb er	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
Abstract	1	The abstract is too long and should be presented as one single paragraph of prose without sub-headings. R. Shorten abstract; R. Produce abstract as paragraph; R. Make abstract explicitly relevant to counselling psychology; R. Place abstract immediately before introduction		p. 8
Introduction	2	R. Empirical evidence to support Selye's theory		p. 10, line 8-11
	3	R. Empirical evidence for Holmes & Rae		p. 11, line 3-4
	4	R. Provide some examples of these personality characteristics (Page 12; Line 5):		p.14, line 14-15
	5	R – Make it clear why CF and VT described separately yet, the theoretical explanation of both of these processes are described together. Their descriptions seem to imply that they are conceptually different/mediated by different processes (which is borne out by the results and discussion section).		p. 21, line 15-20
	6	R – should acknowledge the psychodynamic route of transference and countertransference (and the unconscious processes involved). See p. 21-22.		p. 23, line 12-and onwards
	7	R. Should be 'defences' not 'defenses' (Page 21; Line 3)	It was changed to defences	p.25, line 2
	8	R. Should be 'spectrum' not 'specter' (Page 22; Line 11). (page 24, Line 7)	It was changed to spectrum	p.26, line 9

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	9	R 'The former duo' is rather casual for such an important piece of work (Page 28; Line 2). (Page 29; Line 20)	"The former duo" was deleted.	p. 32, line 2
	10	R. Define 'IES' before using those initials; presumably it is the Impact of Event Scale (Page 29; Line 2)	IES was defined as the Impact of Event Scale	p.33, line 1
	11	R. "...common occurrence for therapists or not"; the term 'or not' is redundant and is poor grammar (Page 33; Line 6) (Page 35; Line 4).	"Or not" was deleted	p.37, line 4
	12	R. Is the correlation, referred to here, positive or negative? (Page 34; Line 5)	The sentence was changed, as I realised that one of the studies was not based on a correlation, but a test of difference. Instead, it was replaced by another sentence	p.38, line 3
	13	R What is the ratio of the difference in gender? (Page 35; Line 13)	.	p.39, line 17
	14	R. indicate why gender was featured as a relevant factor in the literature but not presented as a factor for analysis – consider including in hypothesis and analysing.	Justified in methodology/analysis part	p.108, line 20 onwards
	15	R. It is poor punctuation to use the colon in this context. (Page 36; Line 8) (page 38, Line 7)	The colon was omitted	p.40, line 8

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	16	R. This is quite a jumbled paragraph; deal with positive and negative arguments separately (Page 38; Lines 6-16)	The positive argument was deleted, as this is described elsewhere in chapter 2 (positive effects of caring). Instead the paragraph was altered	p. 42, line 3-7
	17	R. Describe the relationship reported in those studies (Page 39; Line 19). See Page 41, Line 12.		p. 43, line 12-17
	18	R. What is meant by 'grow as a person'? (Page 41; Line 10)	This expression was replaced by another sentence	P. 45, line 9-13
	19	R. 'It is often painful', bit casual for such an important piece of work (Page 43; Line 6).	This part of the quote was deleted	p.47, line 12
	20	R. '...Fortunately, it is never boring'; this is rather colloquial	This part of the quote was also deleted	p.47, line 12
	21	R. Proof required '...thereafter, he or he may not...'; (Page 44; Line 2)	Proof was added and the sentence changed	p.48, line 8-9
	22	R. Remove the word 'please' from the reference, it is not needed (this happens elsewhere too). (Page 44; Line 7)	"Please" was removed	p.48, line 13
	23	R. What is the implication of such inter-correlations? (Page 45; Line 8)	A line was added to explain the implication of this.	p.49, line 15-16
	24	R. 'The best known pioneers...' is subjective; 'best known' to whom? (Page 48; Line 2):	'The best known pioneers' was deleted	p. 52, line 10

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	25	R. 'As have been noted earlier in this introduction' (Page 49; Line 20). This is not a good academic style. This happens elsewhere too.	This was deleted, both in this part and elsewhere too.	p.54, line 5
	26	R. Proof required Omission after 'e.g.'; (Page 52; Line 11)	Proof was added	p. 56, line 13
	27	R. Consider additional opportunities to link theory with practice – e.g., CBT (p60)	Parts were added throughout the introduction that linked theory and practice	e.g., p.13, line 9-15; p. 45, line 20-24; and p.64, line 17-19
	28	R. Match sub-headings in text with those in content listings (e.g., p60; p62)	Sub-headings were matched accordingly to content listing	See contents and p. 65-66
	29	R. Clarify which groups are included in the term 'psychologists' (p61) . (Page 64; Line 9).	The following was added to clarify what was meant by 'psychologists'; '.....therapeutically as a clinical or counselling psychologist'	p.65, line 4
	30	R. Definitions should be presented before describing problems with the concepts (e.g., p63)	The argument about the problems with the trauma concept was moved from page 65 to rather be included in the definition of trauma section (Part 3.1.1)	p.68

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	31	R. Indicate that certain terminology and concepts are rooted in particular therapeutic orientations (e.g., transference and the psychodynamic approach, p67), as this may also influence the manner in which the counselling/clinical psychologist appreciates the mechanisms of a particular psychological process. See page 69; Line 18.		p.70, line 14-20
	32	R. Demonstrate an appreciation that not all therapists/counselling psychologist enter the counselling profession because their motivation to care for others is based on their own experiences of neglect – the term ‘therefore show...’ implies a factual nature of the statement.		p. 72, line 6-11
	33	R. clarify the connection between Shamans (traditional healers) and counselling/clinical psychologists (professional healers)		p.73, line 12 onwards
	34	R. Indicate any reasons why there is a gap in this important area	A paragraph was added to explain the potential reason for the lack of research on emotional woundendess in psychologists	p.77, line 18 onwards
	35	R. It is not explicit why clinical psychologists were included in the study – the literature review should have indicated this professions’ relevance to the study	This was indicated in a new part in the literature review	p. 78-82
	36	R Include more detail about the actual methodology used in studies.		p.84, line 3 onwards

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	37	R. Provide methodological critique		p. 84, line 3 onwards
	38	R. List aims and objectives so that they are clearly stated and each aim only contains one explicit and specific aim (e.g., the first aim seems to have at least two aims embedded within it.		p. 86-87
	39	R. Clearly state research question (p76)		p.86, line 9
Method	40	R. Inconsistency in use of terms e.g., some text refers to 'Emotionally Wounded Scale', yet the sub-heading and conclusion refer to it as 'CEWS'.	It was changed to be referred to as CEWS throughout thesis	
	41	R. Clarify why one independent variable (specialism), was a 'post-hoc group', when conceivably such participants could have been recruited directly from the two applied professions? (p82)	The specialism variable was not a post hoc group. Thus, it was changed	p.93, line 8 onwards
	42	R. 'Exclusion' criteria - participants who were employed in academia - should have been considered in the discussion as this may be considered a biased/flawed recruitment strategy since many counselling psychology academics also have a practice of some sort.	This was added as a limitation of the methodology in the discussion	p. 179, line 7-12
Analysis	43	R. Move presentation of descriptive statistics, reliability analysis and factor analysis to back of method chapter as a 'pre-analysis' so when results section is reached, just testing of models is presented (suggestion – start results section 6.2 – Inferential statistics).	The descriptive statistics section was moved to the end of the method section and was named 'pre-analysis' Numbering was altered accordingly (see content page).	p.108-p.124

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	44	R. Do not reproduce SPSS table printouts in analysis section. These should be in appendix.	All the main tables were re-written and kept in the main analysis. SPSS table printouts from for example multiple regression assumption checks were put in the Appendix.	See throughout result section
	45	R. Need to be consistent in the reporting of statistical results (e.g., different styles of reporting on pp p104 and p106 compared to p115)	The same style of reporting was adapted throughout the result section	
	46	R. Delete 'or not' (Page 74; Line 7): ,	Or not', p. 74, line 7 was deleted.	p.83, line 8
	47	R. Instead of '...the first theoretical chapter has demonstrated...'; use '...Chapter 1 has demonstrated...'. (Page 74; Line 11). This happens elsewhere too.	The following part '...the first theoretical chapter has demonstrated...' was changed to '...Chapter 1 has demonstrated...'. Similar changes were also made including 'the review has shown' were changed to 'chapter 2 has shown' (and 'these theoretical chapters' to 'chapter 1-2' .	p. 83, line 12 p. 84, line 20. p.85, line 12
	48	R. Grammatical error in preposition order: should be 'effects of therapy (e.g. CF) alone cannot...', not 'cannot alone' (Page 75; Line 13). Ditto next line.	Changed accordingly	p. 85, line 20-22

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	49	R. Develop this in the introduction (Page 77; footnote)	Footnote argument was moved to be included as a new part in the introduction	p. 78-82
	50	R. Something has gone wrong with numbering system! (Page 82 onwards)	The numbering system was changed throughout thesis	
	51	R. It is most unlikely that this was a random sample, not unless a random number generator was employed. It is more likely that it was an 'opportunity' sample (Page 82; Line 19)	This was changed to; 'Participants were an opportunity sample of clinical...' (p. 1; Line 17)	p.93, line 17
	52	R. There is inconsistency in the definition of medium effect size: line 4 suggested 0.5; line 17 suggested 0.3. (Page 83). Reconcile this inconsistency	That is because G Power calculations define the size of an effect size according to the test used, meaning that what is a medium effect size for a t-test may be different from what is a medium effect size for a correlation.	
	53	R. Indicated how many were recruited after this process. What were the characteristics: age, gender, etc? (Page 84; Line 4)		p. 95, line 7-13
	54	R. it is more appropriate to use a specific sample size calculation for regression; power calculations are less sensitive here. Tabachnick & Fidell (2007) recommend a sample of 50, plus 8 times the number of participants. In this case that would be $50 + (8 \times 8) = 114$, so not that different, but it is important to use the correct method.	This was replaced by a specific sample size calculation for multiple regression.	p.95, line 1-6

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	55	R. Describe the pilot study of the new questionnaire. What was used to determine success? (Page 86; Line 16). Also, elaborate on how the pilot positively shaped the main study (p93).	The pilot study and what was used to determine success was described. Also, the pilot study's positive shaping of the main study was discussed	p. 98, line 3 onwards p. 105 (line 20-21)-106 (line 1-5)
	56	R. Provide r values for concurrent validity (Page 88).	R values for concurrent validity were added.	p. 100, line 13
	57	R. The full correct name is Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Page 94; Line 13)	Changed.	p. 106, line 19
	58	R. Since this was a largely exploratory study, it would have been more appropriate to use the Enter method (Page 95; Line 12). Conduct calculation using this method	The enter method was used.	p. 107, line 17-108
	59	R. Mention that tests for normal distribution and other assumption checks were undertaken, and say what they were	Extensive normal distribution checks and other assumption checks were undertaken. All the analyses were consequently re-run.	p. 108, line 4-11. Also see throughout pre-analysis , p.108-124
	60	R Do not repeat material (e.g., p97, no need to report results in text form if they already in table form). Highlight or refer to findings only if results are noteworthy/ striking	Repeated material was deleted.	p. 109, line 5-12

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	61	R. Normal distribution must also be undertaken across the levels of the independent variables. There also needs to be far more rigorous testing than simple histograms and box plots. The latter are good for highlighting potential outliers, but that does not mean that the data are normally distributed; nor does the absence of outliers confirm that the data are normally distributed. Box plots typically used to help locate sources of variance, once statistical data collected to report normal distribution (Page 101; Line 9).	Additional normal distribution checks were performed for all the variables, including converting skew and kurtosis statistics to z scores. Normal distribution checks were also undertaken across the levels of the IV's that were to be used in t-tests.	p. 108-124
	62	R. What was the kurtosis? Was it significantly large for the sample size?	Kurtosis statistics have been added for all the variables	p. 108-124
	63	R. Elaborate on reporting of histogram Stating that the histogram was 'peaked' is not enough (Page 103; Line 12)	Elaboration of reporting on all histograms, their kurtosis and skewness has been done	p.108-124
	64	R. Elaborate on reporting of skewness. Saying that this was somewhat skewed is not enough. What was the skew? Was it positive or negative? Was it significantly large for the sample size? (Page 103; Line 17)	See above	p. 108-124
	65	R. Could outliers be removed? (Page 103; Line 20)	Outliers were not removed, but replaced. The reasoning for this was stated.	p. 115, line 21 p. 116, line 1-4
	66	R. Discuss Central Limit Theorem in more depth (Page 104; Line 1).		p. 118, line 4-12

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	67	R. Be more specific about the overall suitability for a parametric test. Saying that it was good is not sufficient (Page 105; Line 9)	After checking the skew and kurtosis statistics, it was found that it was significantly negatively skewed, and so was consequently transformed using a logarithm. This is described	p.122, line 1 onwards
	68	R. What is, and where is, Diagram X? (Page 106; Line 7).	This was changed to rather include appendix 2f.	p.122, line 19
	69	R. Use correlation to ensure that there is no high correlation that might affect the outcome (Page 108; Line 2).	This was added.	p.126, line 5
	70	R. It is important to state whether predictors are continuous, ordinal or categorical. If categorical, it needs to be shown whether they are dichotomous (and say why that is important, and why they should be coded as 0 and 1). (Page 111; Line 17)	All the predictor variables were continuous.	p.131, line 3
	71	R. Check this effect with ANCOVA (Page 112; Line 11)	The effect was negative. Instead, the researcher realised that the finding was due to the confidence intervals.	p.132, line 19
	72	R. Clarify negative and positive beta values. More specifically, positive beta values indicate that as that value increases (or tends towards 1 on a categorical predictor), the value on the outcome variable increases; negative values indicate the opposite. Why were standardised beta values used, rather than actual beta values?	This was clarified.	p. 131, line 21 onwards
	73	R. It would help to remind us what SOC represents. (Page 112; Line 16).	The part was already reworded, due to other corrections.	

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	74	R. Overall the outcome needs to be described more clearly, Something like: “compassion fatigue was predicted by a weaker sense of coherence, greater woundedness, and greater self distraction as a coping style (Page 113; Line 4).	This was already re-worded from other corrections and from the re-running of the analyses (due to transformations after the extra normal distribution checks).	p.130-133
	75	R Regression usage. At this level, a number of additional checks of assumption are needed: multicollinearity, homoscedasticity, and correlation between residuals.	Additional checks were used.	p. 131 and p. 140
	76	R. It is rather tacky to lift SPSS output directly into the report, and use that as a table. Show a table of mean data and standard deviation (at least); confidence intervals and standard error would also be useful. Then describe the statistics narratively. This goes for all results tables (Page 115; Table 8)	New tables were created throughout method and results sections.	p. 113-141
	77	R. T-test outcomes should be shown like this: $t(110) = 3.804, p < .001$ (Page 115; Line 10).	This was changed.	p. 135, line 5
	78	R. Null hypotheses should not be mentioned at this level (Page 115; Line 11).	The sentence was deleted	p.135, line 6
	79	R. Typo – fro instead of for (Page 115; Line 13):	Changed	p. 135, line 7
	80	R. Start the y axis score at 0. Anything above this as in this analysis over-emphasises effect and is very misleading. It is not clear how it adds anything to the statistical outcome This goes for all graphs (Page 116; Fig. 3).	All the graphs were deleted as they did not add anything to the statistics.	
	81	R. Clearly state whether the categorical variables were coded as 0 and 1. If not (sadly), the analysis must be re-run (Page 120; Line 11) (see p 47, Line 18).	The categorical variables were re-coded to 0 and 1	p. 139, line 20-21

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revisi on Numb er	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
discussion	82	R. Discussion should start with summary of findings (Suggestion reduce summary of findings at end of results section, move them from results section and then put them at beginning of discussion to orientate the reader).	A summary of findings was added to the beginning of the discussion, whilst the conclusion at the end of the result section was deleted.	p. 144
	83	R. Discussion could consider the exclusion of potential participants on the basis of a university address (p82) 'Exclusion' criteria - participants who were employed in academia - should have been considered in the discussion as this may be considered a biased/flawed recruitment strategy since many counselling psychology academics also have a practice of some sort.	Again, as noted in the methodology correction part, this was added as a limitation of the methodology in the discussion.	p. 179, line 7-12
	84	R. Discuss that could not make gender comparisons due to unequal groups of males and females(71% female, 29% male – ratio of 2.5:1 for females to males) even though gender seen as a relevant factor (P97)		p. 108, line 20
	85	R. Clarify if a score on an instrument indicates low/medium/high possession of a particular property (e.g., p102)	This was clarified	p. 115, line 7
	86	5. R. No need to repeat statistical findings in discussion (p123)	All statistical findings in the discussion were deleted	p. 144 onwards
	87	R. No need to repeat/restate hypotheses – just to progress from whether they were supported or not (pp132,135, 137, 138, 140, 142,147)	Restated hypotheses in the discussion section were deleted	p. 144 onwards

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	87	R. Diagrammatic representation revisited in the discussion rather than introduced. Also, figure should be numbered in correspondence with the chapter number within which they are embedded	Diagrammatic representation of the model was introduced at the end of the result section and numbered according to chapter. All the other tables and figures were also changed to be numbered according to their chapters (see throughout thesis for examples).	p. 143
	88	R. Conclusion section (p150) is very sparse and needs elaborating. At the moment it is just a very brief selective summary with a model that is not even considered - simply alluded to.	The conclusion section was elaborated on	p. 167-170
	89	R. The discussion compares current findings with published findings but does not consider the findings in light of psychological theories. Similarly, the section on 'theoretical implications' (pp152-153) does not use mainstream psychology to anchor or contextualise the current findings.	The findings were anchored in mainstream psychology such as psychological theories (see throughout introduction and discussion). This was also done in the theoretical implications section.	e.g., p. 171-172
	90	R. New material needs to be explored in the introduction before it is reviewed in the discussion [e.g. page 126 [Motta (1997)' (154); 'Motta and colleagues (1997)' (154]	Motta and colleagues' (1997) ideas were discussed in the introduction, before being referred to again in the discussion.	p. 19, line 10 p. 173, line 7 onwards

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	91	R. No consideration of the role of supervision, yet three relevant questions are asked about supervision and more participants received supervision than received therapy (93% v 83% respectively) only discussed as two sentences one on p156 and the other on p157	A more through discussion on the role of supervision was added	p. 175, line 16 onwards
	92	R Explain why the thesis suffers from similar pitfalls that had been criticised by the researcher in other previous research (e.g., S & F's 'non-standardised measures', p28; lack of generalisation across larger sample sizes, p55)	An explanation for this was added in the limitations part	p. 183, line 1 onwards
	93	R. 41.33% return rate for the questionnaires is poor, even if it is normal for this population. A lot more needs to be said about the potential implications, including sample bias. Bryman (2004) says that less than 50% return is not acceptable (Page 97; Line 14) Much more needs to be made of the implications of the low response rate (Page 158; Line 18).	More was written about the implication of sample bias and low response rate.	p. 179-180

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	94	R. In connection with above, revisit discussion of sample size (Page 137 & p162; Line 4). It is not sufficient to simply state that increasing the sample size might bring a significant effect; it is more complex than that. The outcome may have been non-significant because there was too much variation given the sample size. If that variation remained as the sample got bigger, it would make no difference to the significance. The effect of outliers is reduced in larger samples, but it is rather more complicated than simply increasing it. Also, a discussion about increasing sample size would also have considered how likely it was in the profession to find roughly equal sized groups of those who had not had therapy given the nature of the profession. Unlikely to find an ecologically meaningful sample to represent what are really likely to be real unequal proportions	<p>The discussion on sample size from page 137 was deleted, as it did no longer seem relevant to the new argument I was making.</p> <p>Also, the discussion on the small sample size in the statistical limitation was altered, to also acknowledge that the n-significant results may have been due to too much variation given the sample size, or alternatively that there was no relationship between current emotional woundedness and VPTG.</p> <p>Please note however, that a discussion on groups having had therapy or not was not included in the above part, as there were no difficulties, or n-significant findings related to that calculation.</p>	<p>p. 158 line 4 onwards</p> <p>p. 185, line 9 onwards</p>
	95	R. It is not good to use phrases like 'as stated in the introduction' (Page 123; Line 16).	'as stated in the introduction' was deleted	p. 144, line 18

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	96	R. Be more precise about DSM (Page 123; Line 21)	DSM- IV was referenced. It had previously been defined in the document (p. 67, line 16).	p. 144,
	97	R. Replace ‘insignificant’ with n-significant’, not ‘’. This happens elsewhere; run an ‘edit/replace’ check (Page 138; Line 2).	All ‘insignificant’ words were replaced with n-significant throughout the thesis (making use of the find and replace edit).	e.g., p. 156, line 10
	98	R. Clarify explanation of Levene’s test - it simply guides us to choosing the correct line to read in the t-test; it does not explain the outcome (unless it would have been significant had 19. variances been equal; in which case, make that more specific) (Page 138; Line 3).	This part was deleted, because the Levene’s test was irrelevant to the findings.	p. 158, line 4 onwards
	99	R. Typo: ‘centred’, not ‘cantered’ (Page 139; Line 9).	The spelling was changed	p. 159, line 3
	100	R. Clarify the type of t-test (Page 140; Line 18	An “independent” t-test was added	p. 160, line 8
Reflexivity	101	The student’s motivation for the research was not considered. More depth on what the student has learnt (e.g., the struggle that the student refers to) would have been relevant. How the student’s practice has been affected by these findings and how will disseminate the research.		p. 190-193

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	102	The work of Scragg, Bor and Watts (1999) on personality traits of potential counselling psychologists seems relevant to this study especially in light of the discussion on p139.	The findings from this study was referred to in the introduction and the discussion	p. 80., line 3 p.159, line 15
	103	When a concept is mentioned for the first time, it should be referenced. Also, references should be included for any controversial/not very well established assertions (e.g., pp66-67). Follow APA reference style e.g., 'Moby Thesaurus II; Grady Ward, 2007' (p65). Only last name of author and publication year need to be included. Also, this reference is not listed in the reference list. It is also not clear why a thesaurus as opposed to a psychological source was used to provide a definition pivotal to the research.	This was done. Also, a thesaurus was used as a source to provide the definition of emotional woundendess, because no psychological source was found that could be quoted. Reference was listed in reference section	p. 70-71 p.69, line 11
	104	Examples of some authors in the text but not listed in references section: 'Linley et al (2005)' (p55) 'Sedwick (1984)' (p133); 'Kadambi and Truscott's (2004)' (p135) 'Tedeschi and Calhoun, 2006' (p138); 'Calhoun & Tedeschi, 1998'(p142); 'Zoellner and Maercker, 2004'; 'Pargament et al. (1998; 2000)' (p145) ; 'Koenig et al.(2001)' (p145); 'Weis et al., 2004' (p148); 'Motta (1997)' (154); 'Motta and colleagues (1997)' (154); Linley and Joseph, 2007 (p160)	The above authors were listed in the reference section. In addition, other authors not listed in the references section were also listed.	p. 194-214
	105	R. Use UK language and spelling throughout thesis	American spelling throughout thesis was changed to UK spelling	

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
	106	R. Avoid rhetorical sentences (p66 – a whole paragraph of only rhetorical questions; pp155-156) .	Rhetorical sentences were changed.	e.g., p.70, line 5 p.173, line 16
	107	R. Contents – typo- has referred to acknowledgements on p179, when page is actually 169 as next page is 170. Also acknowledgements should be towards beginning of thesis.	Acknowledgements were moved to the start of the document	
	108	R. Contents listings and headings in body of text are different in some places e.g., sub-heading is listed as 'Summary of findings' in contents listings, yet in the thesis it is referred to as ' <i>Conclusion on findings</i> ' (p150).	Content listing was changed	p. 2-7
	109	R. Examples of misspelling / incorrect /colloquial usage of basic terms used in counselling psychology e.g., 'validational properties' (validity?), p88 'charted', 'psychoteheraputically' (p106); 'non' (p108); 'insignificant' (p109; p115; P121, p138, p147); 'Lickert' (p101; 103); 'planned prior' (107, also 'a priory tests', p162 – do you mean ' <i>a priori</i> '?; 'significantly' (p112); ' <i>in tune</i> with the set hypothesis' (p115); 'The null hypothesis was thus <i>discarded</i> ' (p115); 'psychologsits' (p118); 'psychologists's' (p131); 'The psychologist's self is' (p156) The typical phrase is 'use of self' 'non-experiential' (non-experimental'?) – p158	Misspelling, grammar mistakes and incorrect usage of terms were corrected: 'charted', - changed to 'chartered' validational properties' – changed to 'validity' 'psychoteheraputically'- changed to 'psychotherapeutically' 'non'-changed to 'none' (p 127, line 16) 'insignificant' - was	p. 93, line 19 p.100, line 8 p.125, line 6 p.126, line 16

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
			<p>replaced throughout the document by the word 'n-significant'</p> <p>'Lickert'- changed to 'Likert'</p> <p>'a priory'; -changed to 'a priori'</p> <p>'significantly' ;' this word was no longer included in the part, after the text had been re-written when the multiple regression was re-run .</p> <p><i>in tune</i> with the set hypothesis' was replaced with 'in line with'</p> <p>'The null hypothesis was thus <i>discarded</i>' ; All mentioning of the null hypothesis was deleted, as not required.</p> <p>'psychologsits'; the inferential statistics text had already been changed due to the re-running of the analyses, and did therefore no longer include this misspelling</p>	<p>p. 113, line 5</p> <p>p.185, line 3</p> <p>p.135, line 3</p>

Part of doctorate where the amendment is needed	Revision Number	Required revision from examiners	Any comment from me, if needed.	Page and line in doctorate where the revision can be found
			<p>‘psychologists’s’ was corrected- psychologists’</p> <p>‘The psychologist’s self is’ The typical phrase is ‘use of self’ – replaced by use of self</p> <p>‘non-experiential’- was replaced by non-experimental’</p>	<p>p.152, line 1</p> <p>p. 175, line 11</p> <p>p. 181, line 4</p>
	110	R. Incorrect use of coordinating conjunctions (e.g., ‘and’ and ‘but’) – student has placed them at the beginning of sentences when in fact their grammatical function is to connect sentences (p144). One line sentences ‘hanging’ without being incorporated into paragraphs.	The word ‘And’ at the start of the sentence was deleted	p. 163, line 9
	111	R. Thesis should be written in the past tense and in third person (e.g., p155) (p 172)	This was changed throughout thesis	e.g., p. 174, line 15
	112	R. If referring to a volume of research or authors [E.g., ‘many reviews’ (e.g., p12)] then include illustrations (references) to support this assertion.	References were included.	p. 15, line 4
	113	Ecological validity could also be considered.	Ecological validity was considered	p. 180, line 19 onwards