

Marie-Eve Martel, M.A., Psy.D.(c), Joel Gagnon, Ph.D.(c), Maxime Bourgault, Psy.D.(c), & Frédérick Dionne, Ph.D.
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (Canada)

INTRODUCTION

- **Therapeutic presence**, the ability for a therapist to be fully involved in an encounter with a client on a multitude of levels, has been well recognized as a fundamental aspect for various types of psychotherapies.
- Although therapeutic presence may seem similar to mindfulness (the terms are often used interchangeably), some authors (i.e. Colosimo & Pos, 2015) make fine **distinctions** between the two concepts, as **therapeutic presence refers to an internal and relational therapeutic stance**, and **mindfulness is considered a technique that can help therapists cultivate the experience of being fully present in therapy**.
- Both therapeutic presence and mindfulness are valued aspects of *Acceptance and Commitment Therapy* (Wilson & Dufrene, 2008).
- Despite the growing amount of research on mindfulness over the past few years, **therapeutic presence seems to have only lately begun to spark interest in scientific research**, and more research is needed to better understand its role in psychotherapy.
- Recently, the *Therapeutic Presence Inventory* (Geller, Greenberg, & Watson, 2010) has been developed to measure therapists' presence in psychotherapy, but a French version of this self-report measure **has yet to be validated**.

Objective:

This study aims to bring preliminary data on the factorial structure of a French translation of the 21-item *Therapeutic Presence Inventory* (TPI).

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS

- **151 French-speaking therapists** in the province of Quebec (Canada) who currently have a clinical practice. Mostly women (70%).
- Participants' mean age was 46.3 years ($SD = 11.32$).
- The majority (44%) practiced CBT, and within this group, the majority (45%) intervened with third-wave interventions.

PROCEDURE

- The reversed parallel method (Vallerand, 1989) was used to translate the questionnaire. Participants were recruited by e-mail via an association for professionals in psychology. Interested individuals accessed the questionnaires on a secure website and following participation, they were entered in a draw for a chance to win one of 6 Mastercard® giftcards of a 25\$ value.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES PERFORMED

- **Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)** was first conducted. Competing **Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA)** models were then investigated.
- The TPI was also correlated with other measures to establish **convergent and divergent validities**.

MEASURES

- Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (Baer et al., 2006)
- Self-Compassion Scale – Short Form (Raes et al., 2011)
- Psychological Distress Index ("Indice de détresse psychologique – Enquête Santé Québec"; Prévile et al., 1992)
- Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985)

RESULTS

➤ **Table 1: Factor loadings**

Items	Means (SD)	Factor loadings
1. J'étais conscient du flux de ma propre expérience interne. <i>(I was aware of the flow of my own internal experience).</i>	4.73 (.95)	.62
*2. Je me sentais fatigué ou ennuyé. <i>(I felt tired or bored).</i>	5.54 (1.1)	.79
*3. J'ai trouvé difficile d'écouter mon client. <i>(I found it hard to listen to my client).</i>	5.99 (.87)	.83
4. J'ai senti que l'interaction entre mon client et moi était fluide et rythmique. <i>(I felt that the interaction between my client and I was fluent and rhythmic).</i>	4.95 (.77)	.60
*5. Le temps semblait s'étirer. <i>(The time seemed to stretch).</i>	5.91 (.99)	.48
*6. J'ai trouvé difficile de me concentrer. <i>(I found it hard to concentrate.)</i>	5.84 (.92)	.73
7. À certains moments, j'étais tellement immergé dans l'expérience de mon client que j'ai perdu la notion du temps et de l'espace. <i>(At times, I felt so submerged in my client's experience that I lost track of time and space).</i>	2.45 (1.38)	-
8. J'ai été capable de mettre de côté mes propres exigences et soucis pour être avec mon client. <i>(I was able to put aside my own expectations and worries in order to be with my client).</i>	5.34 (1.02)	.45
*9. Je me sentais distant et déconnecté de mon client. <i>(I felt distant and disconnected from my client).</i>	6.33 (.71)	.56
10. J'ai ressenti une profonde reconnaissance et du respect pour mon client en tant que personne. <i>(I felt profound recognition and respect for my client as a person).</i>	5.48 (1.06)	.58
11. Je me sentais attentif et à l'écoute des nuances et des subtilités de l'expérience de mon client. <i>(I felt attentive and in tune with the tone and subtleties of my client's experience).</i>	5.28 (.77)	.77
12. J'étais complètement dans l'instant présent dans la séance. <i>(I was completely in the present moment during the session).</i>	5.12 (.91)	.66
*13. Je me sentais impatient et critique. <i>(I felt impatient and critical).</i>	6.11 (.89)	.53
14. Mes réponses étaient guidées par les sentiments, les mots, les images et les intuitions qui émergeaient lors de mon expérience avec mon client. <i>(My responses were guided by feelings, words, images and intuitions that emerged during my experience with my client).</i>	4.89 (1.1)	.57
*15. Il me tardait que la séance se termine. <i>(I couldn't wait for the session to finish).</i>	6.23 (.82)	.67
*16. Il y avait des moments où ma manière d'agir avec mon client était différente de ce que je ressentais à l'intérieur. <i>(There were moments when the way I acted with my client was different than what I felt inside).</i>	5.82 (.93)	.27
17. Je me sentais complètement immergé dans l'expérience de mon client tout en demeurant centré en moi-même. <i>(I felt completely submerged in my client's experience while remaining centered on myself).</i>	4.44 (1.22)	.76
*18. Parfois mes pensées s'éloignaient de ce qui se passait dans le moment présent. <i>(Sometimes my thoughts would drift away from what was happening in the present moment).</i>	5.54 (.80)	.49
19. Je me sentais en synchronicité avec mon client au point de pouvoir sentir ce qu'il vivait. <i>(I felt synchronised with my client to the point where I could feel what he was living).</i>	4.24 (1.22)	.62
20. Je me sentais sincèrement intéressé par l'expérience de mon client. <i>(I felt sincerely interested by my client's experience).</i>	5.66 (.82)	.54
*21. Je sentais une distance ou une barrière émotionnelle entre mon client et moi-même. <i>(I felt a distance or an emotional barrier between my client and myself).</i>	5.88 (.85)	.43

Note. EFA based on the correlation matrix; Rotation method = Promax; Parallel Analysis = 2 factors.
Item 7 was removed from the analyses based on negative correlations with its subscale.
* Items must be reversed before calculating a total score.

- The scale showed good internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .88 for the total scale, and .85 for each subscale).

RESULTS

➤ **Table 2: Model fit indices of the confirmatory factor analysis**

	χ^2	df	Δdf	CFI	TLI	SRMR	RMSEA [90% CI]
One factor	401.33	170		.725	.693	.098	.095 [.083-.107]
Two factors	225.49	169		.933	.925	.074	.047 [.030-.062]
One factor with method effects ^a	155.69	125	44	.964	.945	.055	.040 [.015-.059]
One factor with method effect ^b	160.87	125	44	.957	.935	.060	.044 [.021-.061]
One factor with method effect ^c	194.32	160	9	.959	.952	.059	.038 [.014-.054]
One factor with method effect ^d	206.59	160	9	.945	.934	.066	.044 [.025-.060]

Note. CFI = Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; 90% CI = 90% Confidence Interval for RMSEA.

* $p < .05$

^a Covariances among the errors of the positively worded items (items 1, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20).

^b Covariances among the errors of the negatively worded items (items 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 13, 15, 16, 18, 21).

^c Latent method factor among the positively worded items.

^d Latent method factor among the negatively worded items.

➤ **Table 3: Convergent and divergent validities**

	Therapeutic Presence (TPI)
Mindfulness	.60**
Self-Compassion	.55**
Psychological Distress	-.39**
Life Satisfaction	.22**

Note. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

DISCUSSION

- Results from EFA showed two factors as opposed to the one factor found in the original version. Competing CFA models revealed the presence of **potential method effects** arising from the wording of the items.
- Correlations with other measures indicate that the French TPI has **good convergent and divergent validities**.
- Caution should be used when using the French TPI as two separated subscales. **We recommend to use the total score of the French TPI** as a measure of therapeutic presence.

LIMITATIONS

- The small sample size may have affected the results of the CFAs in favour of the more parsimonious model. **Further research with larger samples is needed** before drawing any conclusions on the presence of method effects as well as the factor structure of the French TPI. **Future research could also incorporate behavioural observations**.
- **This study contributes to the study of therapeutic presence in a French-speaking population by offering a tool for research and clinical purposes.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- We would like to thank l'Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières for their financial support.