

A Common Factors View of Counseling Supervision Process

Georgios K. Lampropoulos

ABSTRACT. This paper offers a common factors view of counseling supervision process. This approach is based on (a) a common factors conceptualization of counseling supervision parallel to those which exist in counseling, and (b) an eclectic approach to supervision methods selection similar to those which exist in counseling. Such an approach not only allows a view of supervision in the broader context of change-inducing interactions, but also the incorporation of theoretical and empirical findings from the related fields of counseling and education. *[Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <getinfo@haworthpressinc.com> Website: <<http://www.HaworthPress.com>> © 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]*

KEYWORDS. Common factors, prescriptive matching, supervision process

INTRODUCTION

The common factor approach is a model of counseling integration that has received considerable attention the last two decades (Castonguay & Goldfried, 1994; Lampropoulos, 2000a, 2000b). This approach aims to

Georgios K. Lampropoulos, MA, BA is affiliated with Ball State University.

Address correspondence to: Georgios K. Lampropoulos, Department of Counseling Psychology, TC 622, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306 (E-mail: g_lamp@hotmail.com).

The author is thankful to Sharon Bowman for her comments on an earlier version of this article.

The Clinical Supervisor, Vol. 21(1) 2002
<http://www.haworthpressinc.com/store/product.asp?sku=J001>
© 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

describe important commonalities between different counseling theories and use them to build integrative and parsimonious theories of change. Based on earlier work in the common factors approach to counseling that has identified the most important similarities between therapies (Frank & Frank, 1991; Grencavage & Norcross, 1990), Lampropoulos (2001) recently described a common factors framework in which many change-inducing relationships and interactions operate (i.e., counseling, teaching, mentoring and coaching of any kind, parenting, religion, politics, and sales). Rather than stressing their differences, this approach emphasized the similarities among these human change interactions. These similarities include (a) existence of a need and dependence in a dyadic relationship where there is at least a situational power difference; (b) formation of a relationship (bond, personal skills and qualities), and establishment of a working alliance (contract, goals, tasks); (c) accomplishment of catharsis and relief from distress (empathy, support); (d) instillation of hope and raising of expectations; (e) self-exploration, awareness, and insight; (f) provision of a theoretical explanation (rationale) and ritual for change; (g) problem confrontation (exposure, working through); (h) acquisition and testing of new learning (behavioral-cognitive-experiential-interpersonal, via guidance, identification, modeling, etc.); and (i) control over the problem and mastery of the new experience (through self-attributions of change and self-efficacy enhancement). A detailed description of how these factors apply in counseling, teaching, mentoring of any kind, parenting, acting and directing in theater, religion, politics, and sales is available in Lampropoulos (2001).

A similar specific description of the supervision process will be presented next, where supervision, counseling, and education are broadly defined and discussed as educational and deficiency remediating processes with common structures. This presentation will be based on the aforementioned common factor structure used in Lampropoulos (2001). However, important differences between supervision, counseling, teaching, and consultation exist and have also become the focus of attention (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998) in the search for the identity of supervision as a distinct process. Without intending to downplay the differences, the present paper emphasizes the similarities in order to (a) provide a common conceptualization of the supervision process that fits in a broader framework of human change encounters, and (b) capitalize on and transfer findings from other fields (i.e., education, and counseling) to enhance supervision. Important differences between supervision, counseling, and education (e.g., supervision is evaluative, therapy is not) and various

theories of supervision (e.g., diverse areas of focus) will be appropriately discussed in this approach.

ECLECTIC AND PRESCRIPTIVE APPLICATIONS OF COMMON FACTORS IN SUPERVISION

Based on the common factors view, an eclectic approach to counseling supervision will be also advocated, introducing the eclectic selection and the prescriptive applications of common factors in supervision (similar to the one psychotherapy; Lampropoulos, 2000b). Specifically, a detailed exploration of how common factors in counseling supervision can be eclectically and prescriptively applied to meet the needs of the individual supervisee will be attempted, while supervisor and supervisory relationship variables will also be taken into account. The common factors element of the approach will focus on common pathways, stages and processes that supervisees experience, while the eclectic element will be grounded on early calls for prescriptive models of supervision (i.e., what type of supervision will produce what type of outcome for what type of trainees under what type of circumstances; Holloway & Hosford, 1983).

THE SUPERVISORY RELATIONSHIP: PRESCRIPTIVE MATCHING AND RELATIONSHIPS OF CHOICE

The formation of a good therapeutic relationship is the most commonly identified common factor in counseling, as well as the factor most strongly related with change (Grencavage & Norcross, 1990). The importance of the therapeutic relationship lies not only in the fact that it can be curative by itself (as it provides a corrective emotional and interpersonal experience), but also because it serves as the vehicle in which change takes place. Regardless of the techniques being used, if a good relationship does not exist (a) counselors may not be able to help their clients to understand and change a problem, (b) parents won't persuade their children to do their homework, (c) salespersons are less likely to convince their customers to buy an expensive product, etc. In the case of supervision, a good relationship will enable the trainee to grow professionally and make the most out of the supervisory experience. At this point, the three components of the relationship (real relationship, working alliance, and transference), as described by Gelso and Carter (1994), will be discussed.

The Real Relationship

A broad conceptualization of the real supervisory relationship (as opposed to the unreal one, distorted by transference), includes the facilitative Rogerian conditions (empathy, warmth, genuineness, unconditional positive regard), as well as variables such as supervisor and supervisee personal skills and qualities, self-disclosure, trust, and social influence. Basic facilitative supervisory conditions are important, particularly for novice trainees (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Being empathic to the difficulties that trainees face in each stage of their development is a quality of the effective supervisor. On the other hand, the issue of unconditional positive regard is thorny, since supervision includes an evaluative aspect. Although the evaluation of the supervisee is necessary (since supervisors are also gatekeepers of the profession), it may be hazardous for the supervisory alliance and process. Indeed, research describes the evaluation process as a catalyst for supervisory alliance ruptures (Burke, Goodyear, & Guzzard, 1998).

Two recommendations that somewhat depart from the traditional practice might partially help supervisors deal with this problem. First, the largest part of the evaluative aspect could take place at the student selection levels. This recommendation is supported by findings that talented and effective therapists are partly born and partly bred (Greenberg, 1998; Orlinsky, Botermans, & Ronnestad, 1998) and that some interpersonal therapist qualities (e.g., empathic ability and warmth) might be difficult to learn (Dobson & Shaw, 1993). These findings are consistent with the modest and complex findings for the effectiveness of counseling training (Stein & Lambert, 1995).

Second, the evaluative aspect of supervision could become subtler, especially for novice counselors. Ronnestad and Skovholt (1993) even suggest that “at the beginning level, the effective supervisor may, to some extent, allow the student to select or distort data” (p. 398). The carefully selected and (assumably talented) trainee counselors should be given the required space and time to find their strengths and develop their abilities and personal style. Although counseling theories and the associated techniques should be taught, a trainee-centered supervisory relationship will allow supervisees to find and become the type of counselor they can be. This type of supervisory relationship will also enable the trainees to attribute their professional development to themselves, which will subsequently enhance their sense of self-efficacy as counselors.

A related issue is supervisor’s directiveness, as well as the more general subject of tailoring the supervisory relationship to the individual

trainee. Prescriptive matching and relationships of choice have recently become an area of focus both in counseling and in supervision (Norcross & Halgin, 1997). It is argued that supervisors should adjust their relationship style according to supervisee characteristics, including developmental and personality factors. At the beginning level, all trainees seem to appreciate an instructional, directive, and skill-building focus (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). However, even in the same beginner stage of supervisee development, the degree of directiveness and structure should also depend on the supervisee's reactance potential (Tracey, Ellickson, & Sherry, 1989). Further, the supervisor should be accepted by the supervisee as a capable and skillful facilitator and teacher (expert power), and preferably be liked as a person (referent power). The ability of the supervisor to influence the supervisee is equally as important as the counselor's ability to influence clients (Dixon & Claiborn, 1987). This influence might occur via the use of different kinds of power in the supervisory relationship: supervisor's expert power, referent power, legitimate power, and reward/coercive power (cited by order of importance and preference). Again, there is some space for the supervisor to eclectically tailor these powers to the individual supervisee.

Moreover, some similarity and matching in the supervisory relationship might also be useful regarding traits on which the participants have little influence. These include the supervisor's and supervisee's gender, race, and theoretical orientation (Ellis & Ladany, 1997; Neufeldt, Beutler, & Banchemo, 1997). For some of these traits a priori matching might be desirable, such as theoretical orientation and related worldviews. Additional important issues to consider regarding matching in the supervisory relationship include (a) the issue of limits in supervisor's flexibility to tailor the relationship to the individual supervisee, and (b) the compatibility of supervisor and supervisee's developmental stages (as a supervisor and a supervisee counselor respectively; for developmental models in supervision see Watkins, 1995a).

The Working Alliance (Contract, Goals, Tasks)

The transtheoretical concept of working alliance as we know it today (i.e., bond, goals and tasks) in counseling was introduced in supervision by Bordin (1983). Although the present author prefers to include the concept of (counseling or supervisory) contract in the working alliance and group the concept of bond with the real relationship (for reasons of conceptual clarity), it is important to keep in mind that these are artificial distinctions with the heuristic value of describing the counseling and

supervision process and operationalizing research. In fact, all these concepts are closely related and continuously interact with each other (see also Constantino, Castonguay, & Schut, 2001).

A supervision contract between the two participants to supervise and be supervised respectively should be "signed," also taking into account a mutual liking, respect, bond and relationship. This contract should be as detailed and clear as possible from the beginning. It should be shaped by mutual input from the two parties, with the supervisor as an expert holding the final responsibility for the process and outcome of supervision.

Goals include (a) the assessment of supervisees' strengths and weakness, as well as their specific needs and preferences, and (b) the determination of specific skills to be learned and mastered, as well as the areas of focus regarding theoretical orientation and client populations. Prescriptive matching here will be based on supervisees' specific needs, preferences, and developmental stages.

Tasks used to reach these goals in supervision are also important. Process tasks include the provision of structure, guidance, instruction, feedback and evaluation on behalf of the supervisor, as well as self-evaluation, rehearsal and application of new knowledge and skills, corrective action, and exploration of alternatives on behalf of the supervisee. A great variety of supervisory formats, methods, and techniques exist that allow a greater selection and flexibility. Self-reports, process notes, audiotape, videotape, Interpersonal Process Recall, reflecting teams, and various forms of live observation and group supervision are some of the most common methods (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Prescriptive matching regarding tasks will be mainly operationalized on the level of supervisees' differences in learning or cognitive style (e.g., analytical vs. intuitive) as well as personality differences (e.g., low supervisee conscientiousness dictates more structure).

Possible ruptures in the supervisory alliance or relationship at any of their components should be identified by the supervisor and be repaired as soon as possible, since they will definitely damage the supervision process and outcome (as it happens in counseling). The first study of ruptures and repairs in supervisory alliances is available in Burke et al. (1998).

Transference and Countertransference

A certain degree of distortion and bias in supervision should be expected, due to the phenomena of transference and countertransference (for a discussion see Bernard & Goodyear, 1998, pp. 81-87). This situation

may become even more complicated as a result of parallel process, in which the supervisee is simultaneously counselor and supervisee.

The separation-individuation process in supervision (Watkins, 1990) as well as supervisees' attachment styles have been also discussed in the literature. Watkins (1995b) reviewed pathological attachment styles in supervision (i.e., anxious attachment, compulsive self-reliance, compulsive caregiver) and provided examples and explanations of how and why supervision fails in those cases. Although he acknowledged that these types of supervisees are not very common in graduate programs, he recommended that they should be referred for therapy and not dealt with in supervision. However, it might be worth trying to accommodate the supervisory relationship to deal with supervisees' attachment patterns (as Dolan, Arnkoff, and Glass, 1993, have suggested for the therapeutic relationship) for those supervisees with only some elements of pathological attachment styles. Even in the thorny issue of trainee's attachment style, an effort to tailor the supervisory relationship to trainee needs and styles might prove to be a sufficient supervisory accommodation that will allow further optimal learning in supervision.

SUPPORT AND RELIEF FROM TENSION, ANXIETY, AND DISTRESS

Supervisees' anxiety and insecurity about their skills, their performance, their evaluation, and their future as counselors are the most common and important issues, particularly at earlier levels of their development. These findings are confirmed by research (e.g., Duryee, Brymer, & Gold, 1996) and are part of the first stages of various developmental models of supervision. The supervisee's tension has many causes and sources at that point, one of them being lack of knowledge about counseling in general. High levels of anxiety will definitely impede the supervisee's learning and performance (for a review of relevant data and the role of anxiety in supervision see Bernard and Goodyear, 1998, pp. 75-84). In general, the supervisor is responsible for creating a safe, supportive environment as a prerequisite for further development. By conveying empathy, warmth, support, and tolerance for some mistakes and permissiveness necessary to try different things, the supervisor will provide a secure base for the supervisee's learning. A mutual understanding and acceptance that (a) some mistakes will happen, (b) some counseling failures will occur, and (c) the supervisee will not learn everything at once

is important because it recognizes the limits of the trainee and takes much of the pressure away.

Although these are important for all trainees, prescriptive applications of support should also be made based on a variety of criteria. First, the degree of supervisees' anxiety (regardless of their developmental level) should dictate the amount of support. Second, the supervisee's experience should also indicate the level of support and permissiveness. Third, personality characteristics such as introversion vs. extroversion have been proven important matching dimensions in supervision (Ronnestad, 1976). Fourth, situational factors in supervision, such as case severity (i.e., client's suicidal attempt) and threats to the supervisee's self esteem may also dictate the level of support. Fifth, Dixon, and Claiborn (1987) suggested that an overall supervisee perception of problem severity (which refers to the supervisee's general perceived difficulty to change and develop as a counselor) is important to determine the level of support. Sixth, the supervisee's need for challenge vs. support is another important consideration in prescriptive supervision (for the necessity of challenge in supervision for learning purposes see Blocher, 1983). In general, there is an optimal level of anxiety that facilitates learning without debilitating the supervisee. The effective supervisors will find this level for each supervisee and match their supervision to it.

These are some of the eclectic and prescriptive dimensions in deciding when, why, how much and for how long to provide support in supervision. Another important consideration is the how. For example, live observations (particularly some forms of walk-in live observations) might be avoided initially for highly anxious supervisees. Instead, process notes and tapes might be used. A selective discussion of the first cases of the supervisees might be allowed to some degree, while the supervisor should focus more (or at least equally) on the supervisees' strengths and success, rather than on their mistakes and failure. Finally, another important consideration is the interaction between the supervisee's anxiety as a counselor and the neophyte supervisor's anxiety as a supervisor. This is mostly applicable in situations where a doctoral student is the supervisor of a less experienced graduate student (which is a common practice in doctoral programs in applied psychology). When anxiety levels are high in both supervision participants (i.e., both the trainee counselor and the trainee supervisor are in early stages of their development in these roles), this combination may sometimes result in fear of experimentation and exploration, a limited practice of what is known and safe, and stagnation (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). When an a priori optimal match (i.e., between an anxious/beginner trainee and a more experienced/less anxious supervisor) is

not possible, corrective action should be taken by the supervisor or the trainee supervisor's supervisor.

INSTILLATION OF HOPE AND RAISING OF EXPECTATIONS

Frank and Frank (1991) have highlighted the role of demoralization and the importance of remoralization and positive expectations in counseling. Generally studied in the context of the placebo effect, the role of hope and high morale in change can not be overstated. Remoralization has the powerful effect of decreasing symptoms and increasing client's active involvement for change. Recently, Watkins (1996) discussed the issue of demoralization in supervision. He eloquently described how novice counselors may feel overwhelmed and helpless when facing issues of identity development as counselor, along with concerns about their own self-efficacy as well as the effectiveness of therapy in general. The discrepancy between what they already know and what they are expected to learn in order to perform at a professional level can be so enormous that it makes them feel hopeless and powerless.

To combat demoralization, Watkins (1996) emphasized the importance of structure, guidance and the interpersonal aspects of the supervisory relationship (e.g., encouragement, tolerance), while he also discussed the value of creating wonder, awe and curiosity about counseling to the supervisee. To these useful suggestions, a few other recommendations could be added. First, setting subgoals and goals of increasing difficulty in the course of supervision might help to reduce the supervisee's hopelessness. Similarly, the supervisors may eclectically adapt their standards and expectations for the individual supervisee to match their level of development and reduce demoralization. Second, supervisors' self-disclosure about their own development might also put concerns into (developmental) perspective for the supervisee, and published personal and professional journeys of master counselors can be equally inspirational and remoralizing. These can serve as a form of social comparison and social support that can convince trainees that they are not the first to experience developmental concerns, and that they can also succeed. In addition, the practice of group supervision can function as another form of peer support and social comparison that will help supervisees adjust their expectations to realistic levels. The main effect of remoralization is the active involvement of supervisees in their professional development.

Again, the importance of individual and developmental differences should also be taken into account in tailoring the supervisory processes to the supervisee. In line with this, Dixon and Claiborn (1987) acknowledged that supervisees differ on their pessimistic vs. optimistic expectations about (a) their ability for change in general, and (b) their ability to change the way they counsel. In the context of a social influence and problem-solving theory of supervision, they suggested the generation of realistic alternatives, and the encouragement of trainees' creativity (which are in themselves highly individualized forms of eclectic supervision).

SELF-EXPLORATION, AWARENESS, AND INSIGHT

This is a process common in supervision, and a crucial stage for supervisee professional development. Supervisees will attempt to explore and learn about their abilities, strengths and weaknesses, personal issues, therapeutic styles, and outcomes. In addition, they will focus on the what, why and how of counseling process, under the guidance of their supervisor. However, self-exploration in supervision refers (and should be restricted) to the part that relates to the trainee's professional development (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993), and should not be confused with personal therapy of the trainee.

A variety of techniques and strategies can be used to increase supervisees' understanding of different levels of their functioning as a counselor. For example, behavioral techniques such as self-monitoring and self-observing can be used to increase knowledge of how the trainee behaves in therapy. The use of self-assessment forms designed to examine the interaction between therapist-client from audiotaped sessions, called *interactograms*, can be used for this purpose (Lieberman & Cobb, 1987). From a cognitive theory perspective, the supervisor can use Socratic questioning and cognitive exploration to help trainees discover any faulty assumptions about counseling, or any irrational beliefs and expectations about their role and performance in both counseling and supervision. Emotional awareness in the counseling and the supervisory relationship, and understanding of personal motivation are also important supervision foci (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982). These concerns are usually emphasized in psychodynamic models of supervision, but have crucial impact on trainees' development and clients' welfare (therapeutic outcomes). From a psychodynamic perspective, the supervisor may facilitate trainees' awareness of transference, countertransference, and resistance issues in the counseling and supervi-

sory relationship. However, the focus and the purpose of the supervisor should be different from those of a counselor, and deeper unresolved personal issues of the trainee should be dealt with outside supervision (i.e., in personal therapy). In general, some form of feedback from the supervisor is necessary for the supervisee's awareness. What may change are the forms of the feedback (directive, interpretive, facilitative), and the foci of the feedback (cognitive, behavioral, emotional, or interpersonal professional functioning). In this decision process, individual differences and needs of the supervisee should be taken under consideration (i.e., eclectic use of feedback).

Lastly, some comments on Kagan's Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) method in supervision (Kagan & Kagan, 1997) and its possible adaptation for eclectic use in the exploration phase of supervision seem appropriate. Developed in the person-centered tradition and with a strong experiential component, IPR is a powerful tool to help supervisees increase their awareness and understanding of all aspects of their behavior in session. In the original model, the role of the supervisor-inquirer is assumed to be basically that of a trusted facilitator who avoids any interpretive, instructional, and directive (to the content) intervention. According to the person-centered experiential theory (Rice, 1980), supervisees will increase their awareness through a self-exploratory, meaning-creating, and self-actualizing humanistic process, having to face only their unconscious defenses (and not the supervisor's interference/evaluation). Nevertheless, a version where the supervisor has a more active and directive role and uses some interpretation and advice might be more beneficial and can be eclectically used with supervisees who (a) are extremely and repeatedly defensive, (b) have an increased need/preference for structure and advice, and (c) show a limited ability to benefit from self-discovery and self-reflecting experiences (as facilitated by the original IPR method). Regardless of what version of IPR is being used, it should be noted that the evaluative aspect should be avoided as much as possible, while a good supervisory relationship is a prerequisite for its effective use.

A THEORETICAL RATIONALE AND A RITUAL FOR SUPERVISION

This common factor refers to the existence of a training philosophy (theory) and methodology that all supervision models have. Frank and Frank (1991) have also eloquently described the importance of this factor in counseling and change. A theoretical rationale is necessary to describe and ex-

plain development and change, and guide both the supervisor and the supervisee. A practical ritual is useful in applying the supervision theory and specifying what needs to be done in terms of supervision techniques. A presentation of different theoretical rationales (models) for supervision is available in a comprehensive handbook edited by Watkins (1997). A good description of major supervision rituals and methods are available in Bernard and Goodyear (1998). The position of the present paper is that (a) important similarities between these theoretical models of supervision exist and similar techniques and strategies are used by these models to address basic (common) supervisees' needs; (b) supervision methods and techniques should be used eclectically to accommodate the individual differences of supervisees (see throughout the paper); and (c) supervision theories can be integrated in a harmonious whole and used in different points of supervision, wherever their strengths lie (see section on theoretical integration below).

EXPOSURE AND CONFRONTATION OF PROBLEMS

After identifying the supervisee's problems and weaknesses as a counselor, there is an effort to (a) confront and dismiss them, and (b) replace them with more effective counseling behaviors and skills. Although all theories of counseling seem to incorporate some form of exposure to problems, confrontation has been mostly emphasized in cognitive-behavioral orientation. From a cognitive perspective, restructuring of the supervisee's maladaptive cognitions and irrational beliefs about counseling is one way to confront problems. From a behavioral perspective, negative reinforcement of all problematic behaviors in the trainee's repertoire can be useful, while positive reinforcement of effective behaviors to replace them is also helpful. Hosford and Barmann (1983) have described the use of desensitization and relaxation procedures in social learning (behavioral) supervision, where they focus on identifying and remediating the anxiety-provoking situations that impede the supervisee's performance in therapy. Alternatively, exposure in mock sessions, supervisor-assisted exposure (co-therapy), or even sudden and full exposure to real anxiety provoking sessions (flooding) can be used from a behavioral perspective. Finally, by defining the lack of specific therapeutic skills and knowledge as a problem (deficiency), any kind of learning experience in supervision can be considered as problem confrontation. Thus, all behavioral, experiential, and cognitive instruction techniques can be used for that purpose (see also next factor).

ACQUISITION AND TESTING OF NEW LEARNING

The process of learning new counseling skills and behaviors might be behavioral, cognitive, experiential, or interpersonal in nature and content. Supervisees learn through direct instructional techniques, through modeling and imitation of other counselors' behavior, through gradual step by step learning of the desired behavior (shaping), through the supervisory relationship, through identification with the supervisor, and through personal experience. A variety of client variables that have been considered in counseling as important for matching counselor's interventions can also be considered here as well. These may include the supervisee's cognitive complexity, psychological-mindedness, dependency, need for structure, coping style, perceptual style, developmental level, neuroticism, extroversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, reactance, and self-efficacy.

Indeed, examples from differential research findings from the field of supervision include (a) preference for more structure by trainees low in conceptual level (vs. less structure for trainees high in conceptual level; Holloway & Wampold, 1986); (b) preference for low structure by trainees high in reactance to authority (Tracey et al., 1989); and (c) preference for more critical feedback by trainees high in conceptual level (Winter & Holloway, 1991). However, research seems to be limited to the study of supervisees' preferences (as opposed to the study of real differential supervision effectiveness of these matches).

Another major area of matching attention is supervisees' learning styles (Ing, 1990) and cognitive styles (Lochner & Melchert, 1997). Matching the supervisee's cognitive and learning styles with different supervisory styles (Friedlander & Ward, 1984) and different supervision methods seems promising (see also Ellis & Ladany, 1997). In this process, aptitude by treatment interaction research (ATI) findings from the fields of education (Snow, 1989) and counseling (Beutler, 1991) can be useful to guide future research in supervision.

MASTERY OF THE NEW KNOWLEDGE

Behavioral and social learning theories and techniques are usually emphasized in this important process that will complete the development of the supervisee's professional identity. Prolonged and repeated exposure to the new knowledge and therapeutic skills, and rehearsal in supervision and in session, will enhance the supervisee's self-efficacy as a counselor.

Further, supervisees' self-attributions of professional development (facilitated by the supervisor) will result in establishment of trainees' professional identity and mastery of their new counseling skills.

Dixon and Kruzeck (1989) found differences between supervisors and supervisees in the attributions of the supervisees' behavior in therapy (internal and dispositional for supervisors and external and situational for supervisees). The effective supervisor should try to make these differences (as well as similar differences caused by the actor-observer bias phenomenon) work for the supervisee's benefit. Supervisors could eclectically use attributions in supervision according to the supervisees' individual level of anxiety, self-awareness, and self-efficacy. For example, (a) too much anxiety dictates enhancement of external attributions, (b) little self-awareness dictates enhancement of internal attributions, and (c) low counseling self-efficacy dictates enhancement of internal attributions.

SUPERVISION THEORIES AND THE COMMON FACTORS VIEW

Counseling-based theories of supervision tend to focus on some functions and stages in supervision, while they may neglect others. For example, psychodynamic, person-centered, and working alliance models tend to emphasize the supervisory relationship and the facilitative conditions in the development of the trainee counselor. In contrast, behavioral, cognitive, and social learning theories of supervision capitalize more on the use of specific techniques, and are directive, behavior focused, and instructional. A relevant account of convergence and divergence between theories of counselor supervision can be found in Goodyear and Bradley (1983); descriptions of counseling theory-based supervision models are available in Watkins (1997). As happens in counseling (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1984) different theoretical models of supervision have strengths, weaknesses, and unique areas of foci, which call for the integration of these supervision approaches.

In brief, one way of integrating different theories of supervision into the aforementioned common factors structure can be schematically outlined as follows: future therapists are carefully selected and evaluated on the basis of their interpersonal skills primarily before they enter supervision (that is, a great deal of evaluation moves to the selection level). In supervision, a facilitative supervisory relationship (person-centered, humanistic models) is formed, with an emphasis on the supervisory work-

ing alliance (working alliance model). Supervision-related anxiety is reduced through ego supportive/facilitative (psychodynamic/ humanistic models) interventions, and remoralization takes place through restructuring (cognitive model). In the exploration stage, insight-oriented strategies (e.g., IPR) are utilized to help trainees identify what kind of therapist they can be (experiential school). Trainees' awareness and understanding can also be increased through exploration of their counseling transference and attachment patterns and motives assisted by supervisor's interpretations (psychodynamic school). Behavior focused exploration (i.e., self-monitoring and self-observing) can increase behavioral awareness, and assessment of irrational beliefs about therapy and supervision can enhance understanding (cognitive school). At the confrontation level, different kinds of exposure (behavioral school) and cognitive restructuring (cognitive school) can be used to address problematic counseling behaviors. In the learning and rehearsal stages, new counseling techniques and skills can be acquired and replace old inappropriate/inadequate professional functioning (through instruction, modeling, guidance, rehearsal; behavioral tradition). Mastery of the new professional identity will come as a result of the supervisee's internal attributions of improvement and increases in counseling self-efficacy (social cognitive theory).

Last, the present common factors view bodes well with the stages of supervisee development proposed by the various developmental models of supervision (Watkins, 1995a). It is also compatible with the social role supervision models (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998) that support the variety of roles supervisors assume at different points in supervision, with different supervisees, for different supervision functions and foci (i.e., the eclectic and prescriptive dimension).

CONCLUSIONS

This paper attempted to provide an eclectic common factors view of the counseling supervision process. This approach is based on a general common factor framework in which many change-inducing relationships and interactions operate (e.g., counseling, teaching, supervision, religion, politics, and sales). Instead of stressing differences, this approach capitalizes on the similarities between these human change interactions, as well as different supervision models. In addition, specific factors related to supervisor-supervisee variables (i.e., personality characteristics, preferences, styles, needs, and stages of professional development) with eclectic and prescriptive implications have been discussed in their appro-

priate position under each of these common factors. Theories, models, and empirical findings from the field of supervision were discussed and integrated according to this structure, and selected promising directions based on the closely related fields of counseling and teaching were introduced. Due to space limitations, only a few selected examples of such eclectic applications were presented. This approach hopefully adds to the literature of supervision by providing an alternative conceptualization of the supervision process, and by proposing practice applications accordingly. As counseling supervision is still in the early stages of its growth, more research and theory development is needed (Ellis & Ladany, 1997).

REFERENCES

- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Beutler, L. E. (1991). Have all won and must all have prizes? Revisiting Luborsky et al.'s verdict. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59*, 226-232.
- Blocher, D. (1983). Toward a cognitive-developmental approach to counseling supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*, 27-34.
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*, 35-42.
- Burke, W. R., Goodyear, R. K., & Guzzard, C. R. (1998). Weakenings and repairs in supervisory alliances. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 52*, 450-462.
- Castonguay, L. G., & Goldfried, M. R. (1994). Psychotherapy integration: An idea whose time has come. *Applied and Preventative Psychology, 3*, 159-172.
- Constantino, M. J., Castonguay, L. G., & Schut, A. J. (2001). The working alliance: A flagship for the "scientist-practitioner" model in psychotherapy. In G. S. Tyron (Ed.), *Counseling based on process research: Applying what we know* (pp. 81-131). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dixon, D. N., & Claiborn, C. D. (1987). A social influence approach to counselor supervision. In J. E. Maddux, C. D. Stoltenberg, & R. Rosenwein (Eds.), *Social process in clinical counseling psychology*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Dixon, D. N., & Kruczek, T. (1989, August). *Attributions of counseling by counselor trainees and supervisors*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Dobson, K. S., & Shaw, B. F. (1993). The training of cognitive therapists: What have we learned from treatment manuals? *Psychotherapy, 30*, 573-577.
- Dolan, R. T., Arnkoff, D. B., & Glass, C. R. (1993). Client attachment style and the psychotherapist's interpersonal stance. *Psychotherapy, 30*, 408-412.
- Duryee, J., Brymer, M., & Gold, K. (1996). The supervisory needs of neophyte psychotherapy trainees. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 52*, 663-671.

- Ellis, M. V., & Ladany, N. (1997). Inferences concerning supervisees and clients in clinical supervision: An integrative review. In C. E. Watkins, (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp.447-507). New York: Wiley.
- Frank, J. D., & Frank, J. B. (1991). *Persuasion and healing* (3rd ed.). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, G. W. (1984). Development and validation of the supervisory styles inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 541-557.
- Gelso, C. J., & Carter, J. A. (1994). Components of the psychotherapy relationship: Their interaction and unfolding during treatment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 296-306.
- Goodyear, R. K., & Bradley, F. O. (1983). Theories of counselor supervision: Points of convergence and divergence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*, 59-62.
- Greenberg, L. S (1998, June). *Psychotherapeutic talent: Born and bred*. Paper presented at the 1998 International Meeting of Society for Psychotherapy Research, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Grencavage, L. M., & Norcross, J. C. (1990). Where are the commonalities among the therapeutic common factors? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 21*, 372-378.
- Holloway, E. L., & Hosford, R. E. (1983). Toward developing a prescriptive technology of counselor supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*, 73-77.
- Holloway, E. L., & Neufeldt, S. A. (1995). Supervision: Its contributions to treatment efficacy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 207-213.
- Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1986). Relation between conceptual level and counseling-related tasks: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 310-319.
- Hosford, R. E., & Barmann, B. (1983). A social learning approach to counselor supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*, 51-58.
- Ing, C. (1990). The application of learning style in research in the supervisory process. *Child and Youth Services, 13*, 143-155.
- Kagan, H., & Kagan, N. I. (1997). Interpersonal Process Recall: Influencing human interaction. In C. E. Watkins (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 296-309). New York: Wiley.
- Lampropoulos, G. K. (2000a). Definitional and research issues in the common factors approach to psychotherapy integration: Misconceptions, clarifications, and proposals. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 10*, 415-438.
- Lampropoulos, G. K. (2000b). Evolving psychotherapy integration: Eclectic selection and prescriptive applications of common factors in therapy. *Psychotherapy, 37*, 285-297.
- Lampropoulos, G. K. (2001). Common processes of change in psychotherapy and seven other social interactions. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 29*, 21-33.
- Lieberman, S., & Cobb, J. P. (1987). The grammar of psychotherapy: Interactograms. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 151*, 594-601.
- Lochner, B. T., & Melchert, T. P. (1997). Relationship of cognitive style and theoretical orientation to psychology interns' preferences in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 256-260.
- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*, 3-42.

- Neufeldt, S. A., Beutler, L. E., & Banchemo, R. (1997). Research on supervisor variables in psychotherapy supervision. In C. E. Watkins (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 508-524). New York: Wiley.
- Norcross, J. C., & Halgin, R. P. (1997). Integrative approaches to psychotherapy supervision. In C. E. Watkins (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 203-222). New York: Wiley.
- Orlinsky, D. E., Botermans, J. F., & Ronnestad, M. H. (1998, June). *Psychotherapeutic talent is the skill that therapists have already when they start training: An empirical analysis*. Paper presented at the 1998 Meeting of Society for Psychotherapy Research, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Prochaska, J. O. & Diclemente, C.C. (1984). *The transtheoretical approach: Crossing the traditional boundaries of therapy*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Rice, L. (1980). A client-centered approach to supervision of psychotherapy. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 136-147). NY: Wiley.
- Ronnestad, M. H. (1976). Counselor personality and supervisory styles. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 17, 56-60.
- Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 71, 396-405.
- Snow, R. E. (1989). Aptitude-treatment interaction as a framework for research on individual differences in learning. In P. L. Ackerman, R. J. Sternberg et al. (Eds.), *Learning and individual differences: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 13-59). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Stein, D. M., & Lambert, J. J. (1995). Graduate training in psychotherapy: Are therapy outcomes enhanced? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 63, 182-196.
- Tracey, T. J., Ellickson, J. L., & Sherry, P. (1989). Reactance in relation to different supervisory environments and counselor development. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 36, 336-344.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1990). The separation-individuation process in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy*, 27, 202-209.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1995a). Psychotherapy supervisor and supervisee: Developmental models and research nine years later. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 15, 647-680.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1995b). Pathological attachment styles in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy*, 32, 333-340.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1996). On demoralization and awe in psychotherapy supervision. *Clinical Supervisor*, 14, 139-148.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (Ed.). (1997). *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision*. New York: Wiley.
- Winter, M., & Holloway, E. L. (1991). Relation of trainee experience, conceptual level, and supervisor approach to selection of audiotaped counseling passages. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 9, 87-103.

RECEIVED: 03/19/01

REVISED: 01/07/02

ACCEPTED: 02/11/02

ON THE WEB



For additional information about The Haworth Press and our products, please check out our web site at:

<http://www.HaworthPress.com>