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Abstract

Large-scale CBT training and implementation programmes, such as the pioneering UK IAPT initiative, aim to develop a workforce of competent therapists who can deliver evidence-based interventions skilfully. Self-awareness of competence enables CBT therapists to accurately evaluate their clinical practice and determine professional development needs. The accuracy of self-assessed competence, however, remains unclear when compared to assessments conducted by markers with expertise in CBT practice and evaluation. This study investigated the relationship between self- and expert-rated competence – assessed via therapy recordings rated on the Cognitive Therapy Scale Revised (CTS-R) – for a large sample of IAPT CBT trainees during training and, for the first time, at post-training follow-up. CBT trainees \((n=150)\) submitted therapy recordings at baseline, mid-training and end-of-training. At 12+ month follow-up, a sub-set of former trainees \((n=30)\) submitted recordings from clinical practice. There were positive relationships \((r=.27-.56)\) between self and expert CTS-R scores at all time points. The proportion of tapes demonstrating significant agreement between self and expert ratings (CTS-R difference <5 points) increased significantly across training and remained stable at follow-up. Findings indicate that accurate self-awareness of competence can be developed during structured CBT training and retained in the workplace. These outcomes are encouraging given the importance of self-awareness to CBT practice and accreditation. Future investigation into the development and maintenance of accurate self-awareness of competence is warranted.
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Key Learning Aims:

- What is the relationship between self-ratings and expert ratings of CBT competence during training and at post-training follow-up?
- Does agreement between self and expert competence ratings improve with CBT training?
- How does agreement between self and expert ratings change across training for more- and less-competent trainees?
- Can accurate self-awareness of competence be retained post-training in the workplace?

Introduction

The Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) initiative in England aims to train over 10,500 CBT therapists by 2025 to address 25% of the national prevalence of anxiety disorders and depression (NHS England, 2016). To meet these ambitious goals and support the expansion of CBT training and provision, effective methods to assess therapists’ competence, or skilfulness at delivering CBT, are required. Expert objective ratings of therapy recordings are the gold-standard competence assessment, but are resource-intensive (Rozek et al., 2018). Interest in varied assessment methods, including therapist self-assessment of competence, has consequently grown (Rozek et al., 2018; Singla et al., 2014). Valid and feasible methods to assess treatment integrity and therapy quality – including competence – are integral for the large-scale implementation of evidence-based therapies such as CBT (Shoenwald et al., 2011). Self-assessment is considered an ‘indirect’ alternative to direct objective assessment, with potential feasibility and cost benefits. Consequently, it may be a resource-efficient method for monitoring therapy fidelity in CBT research and
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practice and/or a useful tool for quality assurance in routine care. Furthermore, different competence assessment methods – including self-report – may be warranted across the wide variety of contexts in which CBT is studied and implemented and thus should be investigated (McLeod et al., 2013).

Self-assessment is also an important element of reflective practice that enables therapists to determine their own strengths and areas for improvement, and therefore to engage effectively with supervision and professional development (Fouad et al., 2009; Kaslow et al., 2009). Consequently, it is considered a core skill for professional accreditation that should be developed during training (BABCP, 2012; Hool, 2010). The acquisition and persistence of accurate CBT self-assessment skills is therefore an important topic for evaluation.

Self-Assessment of Competence in Experienced Therapists

Experienced therapists tend to over-estimate their own ability (Chevron & Rounsaville, 1983; Parker & Waller, 2015; Perlesz, Stolk, & Firestone, 1990; Walfish et al., 2012), particularly the least competent therapists with the lowest objectively-assessed skill (Brosan, Reynolds, & Moore, 2008). The ‘better than average’ bias (Brown, 1986), the tendency to self-rate one’s abilities as greater than those of the average person, may lead to therapists overestimating their competence (Waltman et al., 2016). Therapist drift, the conscious or unconscious failure of experienced clinicians to deliver evidence-based treatment despite available resources (Waller, 2009), may also negatively impact the accuracy of self-assessments (Waltman et al., 2016). The least competent practitioners may demonstrate the greatest overestimation as they lack awareness of their own lack of skill (Dunning, Johnson, Ehrlinger, & Kruger, 2003). Overestimation of competence, particularly by less objectively
competent practitioners, is an important issue since therapists with inaccurately high self-perceptions may feel less motivated to seek out continuing professional development, engage in supervision, or implement feedback to improve their practice (Brosan et al., 2008). Consequently, quality of therapy may drop below acceptable standards and yield potentially negative impacts on clients and service outcomes. Interestingly, more competent therapists conversely exhibit lower self-ratings and even underestimation of competence (McManus et al., 2012), attributed in part to greater self-reflection and awareness of areas requiring further skill development. Professional self-doubt, which may be reflected in lower self-reported CBT competence, has been correspondingly linked to stronger clinical outcomes in psychotherapy than overconfidence (Michenbaum & Lilienfeld, 2018; Nissen-Lie et al., 2017).

While poor self-awareness in experienced clinicians is concerning and may indicate that self-report is an inadequate method of assessing competence in routine practice, many studies are cross-sectional and have not accounted for the quality and duration of prior training or on-going supervision. Training that involves regular comparison between self and expert ratings of competence—an established element of IAPT CBT training—may support accurate self-awareness (Kaslow et al., 2009; Waltman et al., 2016). Therefore, investigation of self-assessments in CBT trainee cohorts during and after training is indicated.

**Self-Assessment of Competence in CBT Trainees**

Training courses play an important role in developing therapists’ self-awareness of competence. Learning theory suggests that therapists’ self-representations of their own skill change with increasing levels of feedback and experience (Lyon, Stirman, Kerns, & Brun, 2011). Self-representations are further suggested to become more
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accurate through comparison with expert evaluations (Kaslow et al., 2009; Waltman et al., 2016). Relevant studies, however, have not reached consensus regarding the relationship between CBT trainees’ self- versus expert evaluations.

Comparison of trainees’ self-ratings and expert ratings of competence for a single session during training (Rozek et al., 2018) and towards the beginning and end of training (Mathieson et al., 2009) indicated trends towards agreement, with varying significance. Limited longitudinal evidence indicates that while there is considerable variability in the strength of the relationship between self and expert ratings, agreement tends to improve across training (Loades & Myles, 2016; McManus et al., 2012). A small study found evidence of trainee overestimation compared to objective markers (Rozek et al., 2018), while larger studies indicated underestimation – particularly by more-competent trainees – (McManus et al., 2012), or switching over time (Loades & Myles, 2016). Methodological issues, including relatively small sample sizes ($n= 5-64$) and the use of different measures for self and expert ratings and/or of unvalidated competency rating scales may have contributed to inconsistency in findings. The relationship between self and expert ratings of CBT competence across training requires methodologically-sound clarification.

Self-Assessment of Competence Beyond Training

Self-awareness of competence during the transition from training into the post-training workplace has never been directly investigated, and is important given the proposed role of self-awareness in promoting evidence-based practice. IAPT CBT trainees appear to maintain expert-rated competence 12+ months after training (Liness et al., 2018). If consensus between self- and expert-rated competence is attained by the end of training, this may persist into the workplace. Alternatively, previous reports of therapist drift (Waller, 2009) and overestimation of competence in experienced
therapists may indicate that agreement decreases over time. Given the inconsistent findings during training and absence of research into the post-training transition, longitudinal evaluation of the relationship between self-assessed and expert-assessed competence is warranted.

**Aims & Hypotheses**

This study aimed to clarify the relationship between self and expert assessments of CBT competence during training using a large longitudinal sample of IAPT trainees, and to directly assess agreement following transition into the workplace. Self and expert competence ratings for audiotaped sessions were compared at baseline, mid-training, end-of-training, and at 12+ month follow-up. Trainees who did not obtain competence by the end-of-training tape were provided with additional support targeting therapeutic skills and self-reflection, allowing for preliminary investigation into whether this group at risk of inaccurate self-assessments could achieve self-awareness of competence with further input. Hypotheses were:

1) self and expert competence ratings would demonstrate significant positive associations at all time points

2) the proportion of tapes on which self and expert competence ratings agree would increase significantly across training to reach good agreement by final submissions

3) good agreement between self and expert competence ratings would be retained at follow-up.

Exploratory analyses were conducted to assess change in agreement for competent and non-competent trainees (those who attained versus did not attain competence by the end of training) across the course.
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Method

Participants

Participants were 150 therapists who completed a one-year Post-Graduate Diploma in CBT between 2009-2014 and submitted a baseline therapy recording for training. Missing self or marker rating data were excluded for 12 of the 162 eligible trainees. Median age was 32.00 (IQR=7) years. The trainee sample was 77% (n=116) female and 23% (n=34) male. Ethnicities were 83% (n=125) white, 8% (n=12) Asian, 6% (n=9) black, and 3% (n=4) mixed ethnicity. Professions were Psychological Wellbeing Practitioner = 33% (n=50), clinical psychologist = 33% (n=49), counselling psychologist = 12% (n=18), counsellor/psychotherapist = 12% (n=17), mental health nurse = 5% (n=8), occupational therapist = 3% (n=5), and other = 2% (n=3).

Measures

Therapeutic competence was assessed with the UK Cognitive Therapy Scale – Revised (CTS-R; Blackburn et al., 2001). The CTS-R comprises 12 items assessing general therapeutic and CBT-specific competencies, with a total score range of 0-72 and competence threshold ≥36. Internal consistency is high (α range=.75-.97; Blackburn et al., 2001). In the present sample, inter-rater reliability was excellent for expert markers: ICC (114, 113) =.95 (Linness et al., 2019). Expert markers were course staff with extensive experience practicing and supervising CBT and scoring the competence measure. They were trained in rating the CTS-R when they started the course via workshops and co-rating therapy tapes with other course staff. Subsequently, they were subject to regular accuracy monitoring via second marking of randomly-selected tapes.

Procedure
Data were collected during training for coursework submissions and were included in a larger observational study evaluating IAPT CBT training (Liness et al., 2019). A one-day workshop in rating the CTS-R was provided to trainees prior to the baseline submission. Weekly supervision including live review of clips of trainees’ therapy was also an integral part of training. Trainees submitted audio-recorded sessions with CTS-R self-ratings for the course at the beginning of training (baseline), after 5-6 months of training (mid-training), and after 9-10 months of training (end-of-training). Expert markers scored recordings on the CTS-R upon submission by students. All students receive detailed feedback for skill development on all submissions. Recordings comprised an adult anxiety or depression mid-treatment session that was requested to be representative of trainees’ usual practice. All trainees submitted recordings of both anxiety and depression treatment since competence was required across disorders. For further details about the training course, please refer to (Liness et al., 2019).

Trainees were expected to obtain competence by the end of the course. Those who had not achieved competence by this timepoint (‘non-competent’) received additional support comprising three clinical skills tutorials and practice-based feedback. These trainees then provided a resubmission tape and CTS-R rating.

Former trainees who were still working in trusts that had granted ethics approval for research were contacted at least twelve months post-training regarding participation in a larger follow-up study (Liness et al., 2018). Self-rating data at follow-up were available for 30 therapists who were included in the present study. Therapists were requested to submit a recording and CTS-R self-rating of a mid-treatment CBT session representative of their usual practice, which was then expert-scored on the CTS-R. There were no significant differences between therapists who participated at follow-up and those who did not in self or expert-assessed baseline CTS-R or self-assessed end-of-training CTS-R, p<.05. A significant
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difference emerged between mean expert-assessed end-of-training CTS-R for follow-up participants ($M=39.47$, $SD=3.13$) and non-participants ($M=37.37$, $SD=3.79$), $t(148)=-2.81$, $p=.006$, indicating possible self-selection bias for high performing former trainees providing follow-up ratings and tapes.

Results

Descriptive Statistics for Self and Expert Competence Ratings

Table 1 reports trainees’ mean self and expert CTS-R ratings at each time point. Mean self and expert ratings were both below the CTS-R competence threshold ($\geq 36$) at baseline and mid-training, crossed the competence threshold by the end of training, and remained above the threshold at follow-up.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

Association between Self and Expert Ratings

**Overall Findings During Training.** Pearson’s correlations revealed significant positive relationships between self and expert CTS-R ratings for trainees’ baseline [$r(148)=.29$, $p<.001$], mid-training [$r(148)=.50$, $p<.001$] and final submissions [$r(148)=.27$, $p<.001$]. To give a true picture of the relationship between self and expert ratings upon course completion, non-competent trainees’ resubmission scores were entered as their final submissions.

**Competent and Non-Competent Trainees.** Of 150 trainees, 113 obtained competence by end-of-training (‘competent’) and 37 did not (‘non-competent’). Competent and non-competent trainees were not found to differ in distribution of professions [Fisher’s...

---

1 The Benjamini-Hochberg Procedure (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995) was used to correct for multiple comparisons across all hypothesis tests, with false discovery rate $Q=.05$. 

11
exact test = 9.50, \( p = .11 \)], therefore comparisons of self and expert ratings were conducted on the basis of competence only and not professional group.

Competent trainees’ self-ratings positively correlated with expert ratings at baseline \([r(111) = .39, p < .001]\), mid- \([r(111) = .60, p < .001]\), and end-of-training \([r(111) = .27, p = .004]\). Conversely, non-competent trainees’ self-ratings did not correlate with corresponding expert ratings at baseline \([r(35) = .10, p = .56]\), mid- \([r(35) = .25, p = .13]\), or end-of-training \([r(35) = -.24, p = .14]\), but correlated positively for resubmission tapes \([r(35) = .40, p = .005]\).

**Follow-Up.** Follow-up participants’ self and expert ratings were positively associated \([r(28) = .56, p < .001]\). Follow-up analyses were not conducted separately for competent and non-competent trainees, as only 3 previously non-competent trainees returned for follow-up.

**Significant Agreement between Self and Expert Ratings**

Following Loades and Myles (2016) criterion to assess CTS-R agreement between self and expert ratings, a difference of >5 points in either direction indicated significant trainee under- or overestimation while a difference within 5 points indicated significant agreement. This criterion was derived based on the psychometric properties of the CTS-R described by Gordon (2007). Figure 1 presents patterns of agreement for the whole sample at each time point.

**INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE**

Figure 1. *Patterns of Agreement between Self and Expert CTS-R Scores*

**Overall Findings During Training.** As shown in Figure 1, the majority of tapes at all time points demonstrated agreement between self and expert CTS-R scores. McNemar’s tests (agreement vs disagreement) found that agreement increased significantly between baseline (61%) and mid-training (80%) \([\chi^2(1) = .84, p < .001]\), and slightly but not significantly between mid-training (80%) and final submissions (87%) \([\chi^2(1) = .36, p = .15]\). Visual inspection of the patterns of disagreement indicate relatively even distribution between
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under- and overestimation at baseline (respectively 20% vs 19%), marked tendency towards
underestimation mid-training (18% vs 2%), and some tendency towards underestimation on
final submissions (10% vs 4%).

Competent and Non-Competent Trainees. Figure 2 presents patterns of agreement
across training for competent and non-competent trainees. The majority of submissions
demonstrated agreement between self and expert CTS-R scores across all time points for both
competent and non-competent trainees, though patterns of agreement varied considerably for
these groups.

Agreement increased significantly for competent trainees between baseline (63%) and
mid-training (80%) \[\chi^2(1)=1.93, p=.003\], and slightly but not significantly between mid-
training (80%) and end-of-training (87%) \[\chi^2(1)=.003, p=.28\]. At all time points, competent
trainees demonstrated greater frequencies of underestimation than overestimation. Notably,
there was no overestimation at mid-training.

There was a non-significant increase from baseline (54%) to mid-training (78%) for
non-competent trainees \[\chi^2(1)=.29, p=.06\], and a non-significant decrease by end-of-training
(60%) \[\chi^2(1)=.38, p=.12\]. Agreement increased significantly by the resubmission tape (86%)
\[\chi^2(1)=.001, p=.02\]. Patterns of disagreement indicated a substantial tendency towards
overestimation at baseline, followed by a small tendency towards underestimation mid-
training. At end-of-training, all disagreements indicated overestimation; however, a small
tendency towards underestimation was found on the resubmission tape.

INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE

Figure 2. Patterns of Agreement for Competent and Non-Competent Trainees

Follow-Up. A large majority (83%) of tapes demonstrated agreement between self
and expert CTS-R scores at follow-up. McNemar’s test found no significant change in
agreement between final submissions and follow-up for the 30 follow-up participants,
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$[X^2(1)=1.20, p=.10]$. The distribution of agreement was identical for final submissions and follow-up – comprising 83% agreement, 10% underestimation, and 7% overestimation. These findings provide preliminary evidence that agreement between self and expert ratings is retained at follow-up.

**Discussion**

This study aimed to clarify the relationship between self and expert assessments of CBT competence across training and following transition into the workplace. Recordings of CBT treatment sessions were scored by IAPT trainees and expert markers on the validated CTS-R (Blackburn et al., 2001) at the beginning, middle and end of the course, and at post-training follow-up. As predicted, self and expert ratings demonstrated positive relationships and the proportion of tapes achieving agreement increased across training. Patterns of agreement between self and expert ratings emerged in the expected directions for trainees who were competent versus non-competent at the end-of-training, though there was unexpected variability across training for non-competent trainees. At post-training follow-up, former trainees’ self- and expert-rated competence agreed as anticipated.

**Agreement Across Training for the Overall Cohort**

Self and expert CTS-R scores were positively associated across the course, providing evidence of agreement during training. However, the strength of associations varied, which may have been in part due to competent and non-competent trainees having different profiles of agreement between self and expert ratings of their tapes (see below for discussion). At all time points, the majority of tapes (61%-87%) demonstrated agreement between self and expert ratings. The proportion of significant agreement (CTS-R difference <5; Loades & Myles, 2016) was lowest at baseline, which may be unsurprising as this is when trainees are learning both about the rating system and about CBT itself and thus there is greater
opportunity to misunderstand both. Agreement increased significantly between baseline and mid-training, and non-significantly between mid-training and final submissions. These findings indicate that as trainees’ CBT experience and use of rating scales increased, trainee self-ratings of competence began to converge more with expert raters who were highly experienced in both CBT and in the rating system. Improved agreement between self-rated and expert-rated competence is encouraging given the importance of accurate self-assessments for informing clinical practice and calibrating professional development in the post-training workplace.

These findings have important implications regarding the use of self-evaluation as a resource-efficient CBT competence assessment method – particularly in training. The changing proportion of agreement across training supports previous assertions that self-evaluation is not an appropriate stand-alone competence assessment for trainees (Rozek et al., 2018). Rather, self-assessment appears to be more appropriate as a self-reflective learning tool (Waltman et al., 2016), with trainees’ understanding of their own skill becoming more accurate with repeated comparison to expert ratings and with increasing experience. The results also provide further support for the regular use of live therapy clips in supervision, as trainee self-report may not be sufficiently accurate to inform supervision during training.

Furthermore, these findings indicate that CTS-R rater training – which was delivered to trainees at the beginning of the course – is insufficient for the development of accurate self-assessment in the absence of further CBT training and experience. While CTS-R rater training appears important for reliability (Gordon, 2007; Reichelt, James & Blackburn, 2003), it may be that CBT experience itself is necessary for raters to understand and evaluate the underlying construct of how competent CBT is delivered. This has important potential implications beyond self-assessment, as novice raters or those with limited CBT training/experience may be unsuitable to conduct objective assessor ratings using the CTS-R.
These findings converge with preliminary evidence of poorer reliability in novices’ judgements of competency on other measures compared to experts’ despite rater training (Schmidt et al., 2018), and is an important topic for further enquiry.

Patterns of variability for the minority of tapes that disagreed – namely trainees’ tendency to underestimate rather than overestimate their competence from the mid-training point – were consistent with those found in smaller longitudinal training studies (Loades & Myles, 2016; McManus et al., 2012). Mid-training underestimation of self-rated competence was consistent with Lyon et al.’s (2011) learning theory account of skill development. This suggests that skill and self-representations decrease as the implementation of new skills and standards interferes with skill perception, but subsequently increase with awareness of surpassing baseline competence after further training (Lyon et al., 2011). This overall tendency towards underestimation rather than trainee overconfidence for tapes that disagreed may be encouraging in light of evidence suggesting that professional self-doubt is linked with stronger clinical outcome (Michenbaum & Lilienfeld, 2018; Nissen-Lie et al., 2017). While investigating the link between self-assessed competence on the CTS-R and clinical outcome was not within the scope of this study, this is a relevant area for future research given these findings from the literature.

Agreement Across Training for Competent and Non-Competent Trainees

Competent trainees’ ($n = 113$) self-ratings demonstrated positive relationships with expert ratings at all time points, with the proportion of agreement increasing across training. Additionally, tapes that disagreed tended to demonstrate underestimation - consistent with McManus et al. (2012). Competent trainees may have used defensive pessimism to manage anxiety, a strategy often attributed to high performers (Norem & Cantor, 1986), and been more aware of areas requiring improvement (McManus et al., 2012). This self-
underestimation in competent trainees may reflect professional self-doubt, a construct that has been linked with good clinical outcome in other therapeutic modalities (Michenbaum & Lilienfeld, 2018; Nissen-Lie et al., 2017).

Non-competent trainees ($n = 37$) demonstrated greater variability in agreement. While non-competent trainees tended towards overestimation at baseline and end-of-training, there was a drop in confidence mid-training that mirrored the pattern demonstrated by the overall cohort. Agreement only improved significantly by the resubmission tape, following additional support by course staff, and there was a significant positive relationship between self and expert ratings at this time point only. Additional support to develop competence may have promoted appropriate self-reflection about therapy skills; however, it was not feasible to evaluate whether this support was responsible for improved agreement beyond the effects of greater practice. Further investigation into effective extra support for non-competent trainees is recommended given this preliminary indication that it may be useful in fostering accurate self-awareness. In particular, future research should investigate whether non-competent trainees struggled on specific items of the CTS-R in order to inform targets for additional support.

**Agreement at Post-Training Follow-Up**

This was the first study that directly assessed agreement between former trainees’ self-ratings and expert ratings of competence following transition into the workplace. Self and expert ratings were positive associated, with the majority demonstrating agreement (83%). Furthermore, there was no significant change in the proportion of significant agreement between end-of-training and follow-up for therapists that participated. Former trainees’ maintenance of accurate self-ratings is encouraging given the international scaling
up of CBT training and provision, and given the relevance of self-appraisals to professional accreditation and therapy delivery.

The structure of IAPT CBT training and clinical services may have assisted maintenance of accurate self-ratings of competence. Trainees work three days in IAPT services during the course and the majority remain in IAPT services upon course completion (Liness et al., 2019); therefore, strong ties are established between the course and services. While the amount of supervision decreases post-training, the majority of IAPT CBT therapists report regular individual supervision (Liness, Lea, Nestler, Parker & Clark, 2017). Continuity between training and clinical practice and ongoing supervision are important for therapists to maintain clinical skills (Brooker et al., 2003; Mannix et al., 2006; Rakovshik et al., 2016) and may similarly assist therapists to retain accurate self-assessment of competency in CBT. However, results at follow-up may have been affected by self-selection bias; therapists who participated in the follow-up demonstrated greater expert-assessed end-of-training competence and relatively few previously non-competent trainees contributed tapes or self-assessment ratings. Similar difficulties with recruitment for follow-up studies are noted across the training and workplace literature (Brosan et al. 2007; Miller et al., 2004; Stirman et al. 2015). Furthermore, the relatively brief one year follow-up period may have been insufficient for the development of therapist drift in experienced clinicians (Waller, 2009) and future research should investigate longer follow-up. Given that accurate self-appraisals of competence are proposed to play an important role in post-training CBT clinical practice (Fouad et al., 2009) and may provide a resource efficient adjunctive method to assess therapy quality (Shoenwald et al., 2011), future studies with larger follow-up samples and longer follow-up periods are recommended to investigate factors that contribute to ongoing accuracy.
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Limitations

This study has several limitations linked to its naturalistic, observational design. Sessions were self-selected by trainees and markers were not blinded to time point. It was not feasible to include a control group for training overall or for additional support. Future studies would benefit from a larger follow-up sample to investigate the relationship between self-assessed competence post-training and other practice-related factors and clinical outcomes. Also, while the CTS-R provided a validated and consistent method to compare self and expert competence ratings, estimates of its inter-rater reliability vary considerably across the literature (Blackburn et al., 2001; Gordon, 2007; James et al., 2001; Kazantzis et al., 2018; Reichelt et al., 2003). Trained raters, however, appear to achieve stronger reliability (Gordon, 2007; Reichelt et al., 2003) and excellent reliability was obtained by the trained and experienced raters in the present sample (Liness et al., 2019). The CTS-R also provides a specific rating of competence for a single session at a given time-point, and the addition of a global self and supervisor ratings of therapist competence across a full caseload may also be informative in future studies.

Conclusions

Training courses are responsible for developing an increasingly large workforce of therapists able to effectively deliver interventions and monitor their own abilities and professional needs. The present findings suggest that self-awareness of competence can be developed during training – even for struggling trainees. Agreement appears to be maintained at post-training follow-up. These findings add to evidence (Liness et al., 2018) that structured training with strong links to clinical services, as provided by the IAPT training and service delivery model, is beneficial for clinicians’ long-term development and outcomes.
Key Practice Points

1) Accurate self-awareness of competence can be developed across long-term CBT training.

2) Self-evaluations are not recommended as a formal assessment method for CBT trainees. They may, however, be a helpful learning tool.

3) Additional support for less-competent trainees may help to develop accurate self-awareness of competence in this group.

4) Good agreement between self and expert judgments of competence can be maintained in the post-training workplace. Continuity between training and clinical services provided by the IAPT programme may have been helpful.
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