

Snapshot of Clinical Supervision in Counseling and Counselor Education: A Five-Year Review*

By: L. DiAnne Borders

Borders, L. D. (2005). Snapshot of clinical supervision in counseling and counselor education: A five-year review. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 24(1-2), 69-113. doi:10.1300/J001v24n01_05

Made available courtesy of Haworth Press (Taylor and Francis):

<http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=journal&issn=0732-5223>

*****Note: Figures may be missing from this format of the document**

Abstract:

Clinical supervision articles in journals published by the American Counseling Association and in two international counseling journals over the last five years include both conceptual pieces and empirical studies. These articles are reviewed and discussed in light of themes, trends, and implications for the practice of clinical supervision as well as supervisor training.

KEYWORDS. Supervision approaches, ethical and legal issues in clinical supervision, multicultural supervision, substance abuse counselors, supervisory relationships, supervisor evaluation, group supervision, supervision research

Article:

Similar to other helping fields, supervised clinical work is a pivotal experience in the development of professional counselors. Indeed, the field has given much attention to developing counseling supervision as a unique profession. Some 20-plus years ago, working groups within the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) created standards for counseling supervisors (Dye & Borders, 1990), a curriculum guide for supervisor training (Borders et al., 1991), and ethical guidelines specific to the practice of supervision (Hart, Borders, Nance, & Paradise, 1995). Working collaboratively with the National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC), the Approved Clinical Supervisor (ACS) credential was created in 1998. One challenge in creating these documents was the expanse of the field. Professional counselors see clients from across the lifespan, and provide services in schools, mental health agencies, college counseling centers, career counseling centers, hospice, cancer patient support services, inpatient and emergency services, rehabilitation settings, substance abuse agencies, older adult services, facilities for at risk youth and domestic violence clients, outdoor/experiential settings, and private practice, among many others. Professional counselors also provide couples and family counseling, play therapy for children, assessments, psycho-educational and therapeutic groups, in-home counseling, and a range of other preventive and remedial services.

Professional counselors are licensed at the master's-level. Their training, accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP), includes a minimum of 100 hours of practicum and 600 hours of internship in a field placement. Of the 600 internship hours, at least 240 must involve direct contact with clients. Weekly individual and group supervision of these experiences is required, including direct observation methods (e.g., live observation, review of audio taped or videotaped sessions). Following graduation from a 48- to 60-hour master's program, 1200 or more post-degree clinical hours are required (the number varies somewhat by state). Increasingly, counselor licensure regulations include requirements related to the practice of post-degree supervision (e.g., direct observation) and the preparation of the supervisor (e.g., specified hours of training specific to counseling supervision; Borders & Cashwell, 1992; Sutton, 1997).

* L. DiAnne Borders, PhD, is Burlington Industries Excellence Professor and Chair, Department of Counseling and Educational Development, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, PO Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170 (E-mail: borders@uncg.edu).

Earlier versions of this article were presented both at the Clinical Supervision Planning Committee meeting in October 2004 and at the First International Interdisciplinary Clinical Supervision Conference in Amherst, NY, June 2005. The author thanks Catharina Chang and Jack Culbreth for their helpful feedback.

Master's-level practitioners also are eligible for the National Certified Counselor (NCC) credential through NBCC, and may work toward several specialty credentials through NBCC (e.g., school counseling, substance abuse counseling).

At the doctoral level, instruction in supervision theory and skills and supervised practice of supervision are required for programs accredited by CACREP. Doctoral graduates may pursue practice in a range of settings, leadership positions within agencies, or academic posts as counselor educators. Doctoral graduates, then, often provide supervision as part of their regular work. In fact, ongoing supervision across one's professional counseling career is encouraged, with the type and frequency of supervision evolving overtime. This brief overview of the profession suggests the broad scope of the field, and thus the challenges in addressing supervision needs of counseling students, licensure applicants, and seasoned practitioners. These challenges and related issues are addressed in the literature reviewed here.

Conducting a review of supervision literature in counseling and counselor education also presents challenges. Counselors publish in a variety of journals, including those specific to the counseling field (e.g., *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *Counselor Education and Supervision*), as well as those based in other related fields (e.g., *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *Addiction: Theory and Research*) and those that are interdisciplinary (e.g., *The Clinical Supervisor*). Similarly, authors from other fields, particularly counseling psychology, sometimes publish in counseling journals. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that articles in counseling-specific journals, regardless of author, reflect the philosophical stance of the counseling field. Thus, for the purposes of this review, I have focused on journals published by the American Counseling Association (ACA), the umbrella organization over divisions with a specialized focus (e.g., school counselors, substance abuse counselors, family counselors). Counseling increasingly has become globalized, both in terms of practice and training (NBCC site). Accordingly, I also have included supervision articles that appeared in two international counseling journals during the last five years, *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling* and *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*; no supervision-related articles were found in the *Canadian Journal of Counselling*. Nevertheless, it should be noted that articles published by counseling professionals in non-ACA journals are not included here. In addition, books (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Borders & Brown, 2005) and book chapters (e.g., Borders, 2001) published by counseling professionals during this time, as well as multimedia materials (e.g., Baltimore & Crutchfield, 2003; Borders & Benschhoff, 1999), also are not reviewed. Following guidelines for this collection, the primary focus here is on articles published within the last five years, roughly late 1999-early 2005. Numbers of supervision articles published in each journal during the review period are provided in Table 1. Numbers by supervision topic and type of article are provided in Table 2.

The counseling supervision literature during the last five years has addressed a variety of topics, using a variety of research methods. Similar to previous decades of supervision literature, recent publications have been more applied than theoretical. Counseling journal editors typically have required researchers to emphasize implications of their findings for practice. This applied emphasis is appropriate to the field, given that the majority of ACA members are master's-level practitioners, and the majority of doctoral-level counseling professionals (those who are publishing) primarily are involved full-time or part-time in the

TABLE 1. Clinical Supervision Publications in Counseling Journals (ACA and International), 1999-2004

<u>Journal</u>	<u>Quantitative Studies</u>	<u>Qualitative Studies</u>	<u>Conceptual</u>	<u>Total # of Supervision Articles</u>
<i>Journal of Counseling and Development (JCD)</i>	4		4	8
<i>Counselor Education and Supervision (CE&S)</i>	16	2	13	31
<i>Counseling and Values (C&V)</i>			2	2
<i>Journal of College Counseling (JCC)</i>			1	1
<i>Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development (JHCED)</i>		1	2	3
<i>Journal of Mental Health Counseling (JMHC)</i>			5	5
<i>Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development (JMCD)</i>	2	1	5	8
<i>Journal of Specialists in Group Work (JSGW)</i>		2		2
<i>Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development (MECD)</i>	1			1
<i>Professional School Counseling (PSC)</i>	2	1	3	6
<i>Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling</i>	1			1
<i>The Family Journal</i>			5	5
<i>Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin (RCB)</i>	2		1	3
<i>British Journal of Guidance Counselling</i>	2	1		3
<i>International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling</i>	1		4	5

Note: There were no supervision publications in *Adultspan*, *Career Development Quarterly (CDQ)*, or *Journal of Employment Counseling* (ACA journals) nor the *Canadian Journal of Counselling* during the review period. "Quantitative" includes experimental studies, descriptive studies, *ex post facto* studies, and surveys.

TABLE 2. Clinical Supervision Publications in Counseling Journals, Categories/Topics by Type of Article, 1999-2004

Topics	Conceptual	Quantitative	Qualitative	Total
Supervisory Relationship	2	5		7
Attachment theory	1	1		2
Counter-transference	2			2
Working alliance		6		6
Multicultural Supervision	8	6	1	15
Age	1	1		2
Gender	1	3	1	5
Language (bilingual)	1			1
Physical disability			1	1
Race/ethnicity	2	2	1	5
Racial identity development			1	1
Religion	1		1	2
Sexual orientation		1	1	2
Socioeconomic status	1		1	2
White supervisors	1			1
Counseling Specialties	6	9	2	17
Career counselors	1	1		2
Family/couple counselors	5			5
Mental health counselors	1			1
Rehabilitation counselors	1	2		3
School counselors	4	5	2	11
Substance abuse counselors		2		2
Supervisors	3	11	1	15
Supervisor competence			1	1
Supervisor feedback and evaluation		3		3
Supervisor self-disclosure		3		3
Supervisor style		7		7
Supervisor training	3	3		6
Supervisees	3	4		7
Anxiety	3	1		4
Case conceptualization		1		1
Satisfaction with supervision		6		6
Self-efficacy	1	3		4
Self-evaluation		1		1
Supervision Approaches/Strategies (Individual supervision)	11		1	12
Developmental Models	5	1		6
Discrimination Model	6	1		7
Group Supervision		2	4	6
Technology in Supervision	1	2		3

TABLE 2 (continued)

Topics	Conceptual	Quantitative	Qualitative	Total
Ethical and Legal Issues	6	1		7
Spirituality in Supervision	3			3
Client Issues	2			2
Eating disorders	1			1
Suicide	1			1
Supervising Counselor Licensure Applicants	2			2

Note. "Quantitative" includes experimental studies, descriptive studies, *ex post facto* studies, and surveys.

teaching and supervision of future practitioners. In addition, counseling interns typically are supervised by both university faculty members (or supervised doctoral students) and on-site master's-level practitioners, who typically have limited to no supervision training. The recent supervision literature, then, also includes a number

of “how to” articles, including applications of theory, descriptions of models or supervision strategies, guidelines for ethical supervision practice, identification of key issues, and discussions of dynamics affecting the supervisor enterprise (e.g., multicultural, group process). To write a review of the counseling supervision literature without including these conceptual pieces would be a disservice to the field. Indeed, these articles represent the field’s commitment to enhancing the practice of clinical supervision not only in program-based (i.e., in-house, at the university) training clinics for counseling students, but also for interns and practitioners in the wide variety of settings where they work. Thus, although the primary focus of this paper is a review of recent empirical publications on supervision within the counseling field, I will begin with an overview of conceptual articles published during the past five years.

THE CONCEPTUAL LITERATURE

Supervision Approaches

A number of conceptual articles involved descriptions of supervision approaches or strategies. Some writers adapted counseling approaches to supervision, such as solution-focused (Presbury, Echterling, &McKee, 1999), strength-based (Edwards &Chen, 1999), and systemic (Montgomery, Hendricks, &Bradley, 2001) perspectives. These articles typically were built on similar works published earlier, and were primarily instructive (i.e., how to). Others drew on diverse psychological theories to explain aspects of supervision, such as attachment (Neswald-McCalip, 2001), goal-setting (Curtis, 2000), and self-efficacy (Barnes, 2004), illustrated by case examples. Barnes’ (2004) discussion of self-efficacy theory is a particularly strong piece, as she explored the theory in some depth and provided a critical review of a relatively large body of empirical literature specific to counselor training and supervision. Cognitive theories were explored by two authors. Granello (2000) described the use of Bloom’s Taxonomy to increase counselors’ cognitive complexity, an outcome goal of most developmental models of supervision (see Blocher, 1983, in particular). Granello included an instructive table of sample skills and questions appropriate to each level of Bloom’s Taxonomy. Fitch and Marshall (2002) provided an overview of cognitive restructuring techniques to address counseling students’ anxiety and self-defeating thoughts.

A few authors described a particular technique (e.g., use of transcripts, Arthur & Gfroerer, 2002; bug-in-the-eye approach, Miller, Miller, & Evans, 2002). Sommer and Cox (2003) proposed the use of Greek myths as metaphors for counselor development during supervision. Zorga, Dekleva, and Kobolt (2001) offered suggestions for effective peer supervision groups. Champe and Kleist (2003) provided a review of research on the effectiveness of a supervisory intervention, focusing on live supervision approaches. Such reviews are rare, likely due to the relative lack of studies investigating the effectiveness of supervisory interventions.

Other writers focused on particular counseling specialties. McMahon and Patton (2000) urged clinical supervision for career counselors. Foster and McAdams (1999) presented a model to guide supervision of counseling students who experience client suicide. Specific activities in ongoing supervision (e.g., case review, opportunities to talk to counselors who have had similar experiences) are recommended, and counselor training programs are urged to have specific written procedures in place for responding to such situations. DeLucia-Waack (1999) described a group supervision model, based in parallel process, for female counselors leading eating disorders groups. Counselors’ counter-transference issues related to body image, food, and weight are the focus of supervision. It is expected that the group leaders will discuss personal reactions to group members and group topics, how personal issues affect group process, and the relationship between co-leaders during group supervision sessions. As needed, group leaders are referred to individual counseling to address personal issues that continue to interfere with their work.

Not surprisingly, increased attention to spiritual issues in the counseling field was reflected in recent supervision literature. Bishop, Avila-Juarbe, and Thumme (2003) called for the infusion of spirituality into the supervision process, viewing spirituality as another aspect of client diversity, and outlined potential research questions for exploring this area. Polanski (2003) provided an instructive discussion regarding ways spiritual and religious issues might be addressed in supervision. Polanski used Bernard’s (1997) discrimination model as a framework for describing relevant intervention skills (e.g., assessment of client’s spiritual and religious

beliefs, using words and images consistent with these beliefs), conceptualization skills (e.g., relevance of client's beliefs to presenting issue), and personalization skills (e.g., how the counselor's beliefs may impact the counseling process). Included are issues beyond stated beliefs, including whether religion is a source of strength or guilt, how religious traditions influence one's ideas and images of God (e.g., God as parent), and how oppression of some individuals (e.g., women, gay and lesbian persons) in some religious institutions can play a role in client's issues. Finally, Frame (2001) illustrated the use of a spiritual genogram with supervisees and clients. The genogram portrays religious and spiritual traditions, conversions or other changes in adherence to a faith, closeness and conflicts between family members based in their beliefs, and significant events in the family and religious community (e.g., first communion, death of a well-loved rabbi). Multigenerational patterns and themes are revealed through examination of the genogram, providing self-awareness for supervisees regarding issues that may affect their work with clients, particularly around "trigger families" (i.e., families with issues similar to those of the counselor's family of origin).

Supervision Settings

Suggestions for site supervisors of school counseling interns were addressed in three articles. Noting the lack of supervisor training for most school counselors, Nelson and Johnson (1999) described an integrated approach based in the discrimination model (Bernard, 1997) and the stage outline of Littrell, Lee-Borden, and Lorenz (1979). Sequential stages (orientation, working, transition, and integration stages) across an internship experience are described. Later, Nelson, Johnson, and Thorngren (2000) applied the same approach to supervision of interns in mental health settings. Roberts, Morotti, Herrick, and Tilbury (2001) addressed more practical issues for school counseling site supervisors, including being clear of expectations and evaluating whether these can be met (e.g., intern taping requirements, adequate space for an intern, potential dual relationships). Roberts et al. also highlighted the critical role modeling that site supervisors provide to interns, ways to enhance communication between site supervisors and university faculty members, and the need for supervisor training for site supervisors. Studer (2005) provided an overview of the supervision process, stages, and strategies for site supervisors. She addressed not only clinical supervision but also administrative supervision that allows interns to gain experience in all aspects of a comprehensive, developmental school counseling program.

Magnuson and her colleagues wrote two post-degree supervision "consumers' guides," one for licensure applicants seeking supervision (Magnuson, Norem, & Wilcoxin, 2002) and one for supervisors considering working with them (Magnuson, Norem, & Wilcoxin, 2000). Licensure applicants were encouraged to view themselves as "consumers of supervision" and gather relevant information and recommendations regarding prospective supervisors. The authors suggested topics licensure applicants can cover in interviews as they seek a good supervisor-supervisee fit. Guidelines for the supervisor included a discussion of the differences between university-based supervision and supervision of licensure applicants, an overview of needed documentation (e.g., professional disclosure statements, supervision contract, assessment protocols), and an emphasis on risk management concerns (e.g., vicarious liability, confidentiality).

Pearson (2001) also addressed supervision of pre-licensed counselors. Using a detailed case example, he illustrated the application of the discrimination model (Bernard, 1997) and a developmental model (Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998) in assessing the supervisee, choosing supervision topics, and determining supervisor roles. Relatedly, Pearson (2000) outlined potential challenges in the supervisory relationship (e.g., transference, countertransference, resistance), including ways to recognize and address problematic interactions. More recently, Pearson (2004) outlined strategies to help mental health counseling students prepare for supervision and help them be "proactive participants who impact the quality of their supervision experience" (p. 371).

Supervisor Training

The lack of supervisor training for counselors in the field was of concern to other authors, who proposed ways to address the concern. Britton, Goodman, and Rak (2002) described a one-day workshop they presented to counselors in community mental health agencies. Britton et al. covered the supervisory relationship, models of

supervision, ethics, resistance, and multicultural issues. They also included experiential activities, such as role plays.

Manzanares, O'Halloran, McCartney, Filer, Varhely, and Calhoun (2004) chose a different approach. They created a CD-ROM for their site supervisors. Contents included materials and forms related to the counseling program and internship expectations, as well as brief video clips of faculty members discussing various supervision topics. Evaluations of both approaches by participants were positive.

Getz (1999) described a more involved training process that she has used in academic and practice settings. In particular, Getz outlined seven core competencies, drawn from the ACES curriculum guide for training supervisors (Borders et al., 1991). She also outlined structured procedures the supervisors-in-training use in sessions with their supervisees as well as in supervised supervision sessions, designed to address each competency area.

Ethical and Legal Issues

Ethical and legal issues continue to be of concern to counseling supervisors, and several authors addressed a variety of topics in this area. Herlihy, Gray, and McCollum (2002) described ethical issues particularly salient for school counselors, both in terms of the need for clinical supervision for these practitioners and issues for the school counselor who provides supervision (e.g., competence, confidentiality, dual relationships). Blackwell, Strohmer, Belcas, and Burton (2002) discussed these and other issues (e.g., due process, informed consent) as applied to rehabilitation counselor supervision. Blackwell et al. emphasized the importance of training for supervisors, as outlined in the rehabilitation counselor-clinical supervisor credential, and the need for a supervisor professional disclosure statement (sample included). Cobia and Boes (2000) discussed professional disclosure statements in some detail, emphasizing that use of a strong statement and a formal plan (or individualized learner contract) can minimize the potential for ethical conflicts. These documents clearly set forth the rights and responsibilities of the supervisor and supervisee, supervision approaches, evaluation methods, desired outcomes, potential risks and benefits, and mutually agreed upon goals for the supervision experience. Such documentation also may help the supervisor avoid liability to the supervision. Guest and Dooley (1999) noted that the trend toward credentialing supervisors meant increased accountability for their actions. They applied the elements of malpractice to the supervisory relationship to examine supervisor vulnerability to a malpractice charge from a supervisee. They concluded that all malpractice components—legal duty of care, standard of care, harm, and proximate cause—existed in the supervisory relationship.

Cobia and Pipes (2002) explored the theoretical and empirical bases supporting mandated supervision for practitioners who are under discipline from a regulatory board (e.g., licensure board). They noted that, although there is a consensus that mandated supervision in such cases can be effective, there is no empirical evidence for its success. They found some theoretical support for the practice in developmental models of supervision, interpersonal influence process theories, and social learning theory. Nevertheless, Cobia and Pipes suggested supervisors take on mandated supervision cases with great caution, given the lack of empirical support and potential legal risks.

Muratori (2001) examined another difficulty situation: supervisees who believe they are working with an impaired supervisor. Muratori discussed the range of impairments (e.g., burnout, substance abuse, sexual exploitation) and emphasized that assessing the nature and severity of the impairment is key to determining an appropriate course of action. Applying a developmental perspective, Muratori noted the vulnerability of neophyte counselors, and urged middle-level counselors, “who may be scrutinizing their supervisors through a resistant and somewhat distorted lens” (p. 48), to carefully assess the accuracy of their perceptions. Muratori also provided an ethical decision-making model to help supervisees determine what course of action, if any, will be pursued regarding the impaired supervision.

Multicultural Supervision

Multicultural issues in supervision have received increased attention over the last five years, including a special issue of the *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* (Constantine, 2001), which included two conceptual articles (empirical articles are discussed in the next section). Hird, Cavaliere, Dulko, Felice, and Ho (2001) summarized ongoing discussions between a supervisor (Hird) and his supervisees (coauthors) regarding how multicultural supervision is conceptualized, how cultural differences affect the supervisory relationship, and how supervisors and supervisees might introduce multicultural issues into the relationship. Drawing from their own experiences, the authors illustrated the deleterious effects of *not* discussing multicultural issues directly in supervision. They also emphasized that such conversations should begin early in supervision and described three possible approaches: (1) the use of semi-structured questions to begin the discussion (e.g., What cultural variables construct your cultural identity? How do you feel about your client's race?); (2) a mutual exchange regarding supervisor-supervisee differences and how these may affect their work together, initiated by the supervisor; and (3) a more personal approach in which the supervisor self-discloses his or her own process of becoming multicultural aware.

Also within the special issue, Garrett et al. (2001) presented a paradigm for increasing supervisors' effectiveness in communicating about cultural differences. Drawing on both counseling and anthropology literature, the authors described a VISION model that includes discussion of Values and belief systems, Interpretation of experiences, Structuring the relationship and process, Interactional style preferences, Operational strategies for working toward goals, and Needs, expectations, and desired outcomes. Supervisors are encouraged to use the VISION model to address cultural differences proactively, from the beginning of supervision.

Estrada, Frame, and Williams (2004) echoed these writers' emphasis on early discussions of cultural issues, particularly race and ethnicity. In fact, Estrada et al. argued that supervisors often resist addressing race and ethnicity in their work with supervisees, even when there are racial and ethnic differences among the supervisor, supervisee, and client. The authors described several potential (and observed) errors in cross-cultural supervision, such as failing "to challenge clients' cultural practices, even when these practices limit clients psychologically or result in harm, in a misguided notion that to challenge a client's values is tantamount to imposing one's values on the client" (p.312). To enhance cross-cultural supervision, Estrada et al. suggested using cultural genograms or racial identity assessments to identify supervisor's and supervisee's culturally-based beliefs and assumptions, and an open discussion of the results in an initial supervision session. They also emphasized the importance of learning about clients' racial and ethnic contexts through conversations with colleagues with a similar background, reading professional literature, and experiencing the music and stories of clients of color.

International journals also included multicultural supervision articles. Robinson, Bradley, and Hendricks (2000) provided an overview of supervisor cultural awareness and dynamics in the supervision relationship. They provided suggestions for integrating cultural concepts into various theory-based approaches (e.g., psychotherapeutic, behavioral) to supervision. Richards (2000) identified cultural and social issues in Zimbabwe (e.g., colonial history, family hierarchy, spirituality and mysticism) that impact the supervision process. She offered specific suggestions for supervisors working in that country (e.g., use of group supervision rather than individual supervision, recognition of the value of traditional network of helpers).

More recently, Hays and Chang (2003) addressed White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development within supervision, acknowledging that although client populations are becoming increasingly diverse, most counselors are White. Thus, the need to address White privilege within supervision is paramount. Following a review of the literature on the identified constructs, Hays and Chang suggested several approaches for introducing a discussion of White privilege in supervision, including questions to facilitate awareness (e.g., What values and traditions do you associate with your White heritage?), supervisors' open discussion of their own heritage and its influences on their counseling and supervision relationships, expanding discussions to other forms of privilege (e.g., men, heterosexuals), and focusing on group dynamics in group supervision (e.g., Who in the supervision group do you feel most similar to?).

Finally, Fuertes (2004) explored issues salient in supervision of bilingual counseling. First, Fuertes offered explanations and suggestions regarding language, including client and supervisee preferences, dynamics related to “language mixing” and “language switching,” and language-based conceptions of wellness, illness, and coping. He also discussed acculturation levels and acculturation stress, the need for flexibility in theory and technique in counseling and supervision, and the role of counselors and supervisors in advocating for clients’ needs (e.g., housing, health care, immigration issues).

THE EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

The empirical literature on counseling supervision during the five- year span appeared in a number of journals (see Table 1). Not surprisingly, the vast majority of these were published in *Counselor Education and Supervision*, the official journal of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). Both quantitative and, increasingly, qualitative studies were published on an array of topics and issues. In the following section, these research articles have been grouped into categories by the main focus of the research questions; some could have been included in more than one section. Table 2 provides a more comprehensive view, as each study was counted in each category (variable) represented in the study.

School Counseling

During the 1990s, researchers documented the lack of clinical supervision for school counseling practitioners—and their growing need and desire for it (Borders & Usher, 1992; Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994). Unfortunately, more recent studies reveal little change. Page, Pietrzak, and Sutton (2001) conducted a follow-up survey of a national random sample of ASCA members who were practicing school counselors ($n = 267$). Few respondents reported they were currently receiving individual (13%) or group (11%) clinical supervision. Of these, their primary purposes for seeking supervision were improving their school counseling skills (46%) and preparing for licensure (35%). Over half (57%) said they wanted to receive clinical supervision in the future, while 33% reported no need for supervision. Participants also rated the importance of a set of supervision goals. The highest rated goals were “taking appropriate action with client problems,” “developing skills and techniques,” and “improving skills in diagnosis.” These skills-oriented statements, however, accounted for small amounts of the variance in an exploratory factor analysis. Three factors were revealed: Developing Self as a Counselor (44% of the variance), Treatment Planning and Assessment (9.9%), and Developing Skills and Taking Action (6.5%). Page et al. noted the similarity of these factors to the three focus areas in the discrimination model (Bernard, 1997).

School counselors in Australia (“guidance officers”) also receive little supervision, according to McMahon and Patton (2001). In fact, almost half the participants ($n = 227$) in focus groups and a follow-up survey indicated they received supervision twice a year or less. Similar to the United States participants in Page et al.’s (2001) survey, the Australian school counselors expressed strong desires for clinical supervision, and cited a number of supervision benefits such as support, new ideas and strategies, reducing stress and burnout, and personal growth. Participants described in detail their use of informal support networks to meet their supervision needs. McMahon and Patton (2000) reported similar results from focus groups of senior guidance officers (supervisors) and supervised and unsupervised guidance officers (school counselors). All perceived inadequate time was devoted to supervision, and all viewed supervision as important. Reasons for needing supervision identified by the participants included support, accountability, induction of new professionals, isolation, and professional, personal, and skill development. Participants also reported their observations of lack of development without supervision.

School counselors in Israel *do* receive supervision, although they also have expressed a desire to receive more systematic supervision (Shechtman & Wirzberger, 1999). To determine needs and preferred supervisor style, Shechtman and Wirzberger sent questionnaires to Israeli school counselors. Respondents ($n = 202$) were divided into four groups: novices (no more than 2 years experience), less experienced counselors (3-7 years experience), more experienced counselors (8 or more years), and counselor supervisors (those who have completed a 2- year training program in counseling supervision). In line with developmental models of

supervision, the counselor supervisors and more experienced counselors reported fewer needs for supervision overall, and novice and less experienced counselors wanted a more structured teaching style of supervision. Shechtman and Wirzberger also noted the areas for which most of the school counselors wanted supervision: working with teachers, working with parents, innovations in counseling, learning disabilities, suicide prevention, eating disorders, testing in counseling, and coping with conflict and resistance.

Agnew, Vaught, Getz, and Fortune (2000) reported on one Virginia school system's efforts to address the lack of supervision for elementary school counselors through a peer group clinical supervision program. During the first year of the program, a credentialed supervisor (consultant) met monthly with the school counselors to demonstrate and teach various peer group supervision methods (e.g., Interpersonal Process Recall, Kagan, & Kagan, 1997; structured peer group supervision, Borders, 1991). During the second year, the counselors met periodically in peer groups of four, received feedback from the consultant, and modeled their process for each other. The groups continued to meet on their own in the third and subsequent years. During the sixth year, Agnew et al. conducted a qualitative program evaluation, including structured interviews and ratings of program effects, strengths, and weaknesses, as well as archival data (e.g., ratings of job satisfaction and burnout). The researchers reported peer group participants "had high job satisfaction and significantly low burnout levels" (actual data not reported). In addition, almost all participants (97%) reported gains in skills, professionalism, and personal areas (e.g., confidence), although gains in skills were lower than the other areas. Peer support was the most frequently cited strength of the program; weaknesses included not enough time and the need for more supervision training. There was some indication that participants gave each other less confrontive feedback over time.

Although this evaluation report had many limitations, the results reinforce those found in earlier studies (e.g., Crutchfield & Borders, 1997). Clinical supervision for school counselors is a challenge. In contrast to many community mental health agencies, there is not an expectation of clinical supervision—and no clinical supervisors on staff—in school systems. Peer group supervision is one viable approach, and it meets some needs. Notably, however, peer groups do not seem to enhance counseling skills (Agnew et al., 2000; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997). Given that a substantial percentage of counselor education program graduates are school counselors, with consistent documented needs and wishes for clinical supervision, in conjunction with hurdles presented by the school system structure, this is an area needing innovative programs and research that includes outcome variables of interest to school administrators (e.g., students' academic achievement).

Although school counselors in the United States rarely receive supervision, nevertheless training in supervision, they often serve as on-site supervisors for interns. Kahn (1999) investigated how these school counselors allocated their supervision time. Retrospective data were collected from counselors in Pennsylvania ($n = 119$) who had supervised an intern within the last five years. Respondents indicated they spent most of their time supervising the interns' individual and group counseling/crisis intervention (34%) and consultation work (22%). Middle school counselors devoted more supervision time to counseling work than did elementary and high school counselors. Kahn also interviewed 12 counselors who had had supervision training. These counselors reported their supervision training enabled them to prioritize supervision time according to the interns' needs and be more effective.

Counselors in Other Settings

A few studies of counselors in other settings also were reported during the last five years. McMahon (2003) conducted focus groups and surveyed members of a professional career counseling organization in Australia. Fewer than half reported they received clinical supervision, although they cited a variety of benefits of supervision (e.g., support, new ideas and strategies). Participants with backgrounds in counseling, psychology, and social work demonstrated a greater understanding of supervision and were more open to it than were those from human resource development backgrounds.

Schultz, Ososkie, Fried, Nelson, and Bardos (2002) sent questionnaires to rehabilitation counselors employed in the public sector in two western states. Of the 111 respondents, 73% reported no regularly scheduled contact

with their supervisor. About half (53%) reported 30 minutes or less of supervision each week, and respondents often cited staff meetings as supervision time. Shultz et al. concluded that clinical supervision of rehabilitation counselors was irregular, inconsistent, reactive, and crisis-oriented, and noted an “extensive misunderstanding as to what constitutes supervision” (p. 219). The authors noted the need for continued study of clinical supervision and supervisor training to advance the field of rehabilitation counseling.

Thielsen and Leahy (2001) contributed to this effort through a study designed to identify essential knowledge and skills for clinical supervisors in rehabilitation counseling. Randomly selected rehabilitation counselors ($n = 774$) rated 95 knowledge and skill items generated via the Delphi method. Principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded a six-component solution that accounted for 46.3% of the variance. Of the six factors, “rehabilitation counseling knowledge” and “ethical and legal issues” were rated most important. The other four were rated important, but less so: theories and models, intervention techniques and methods, evaluation and assessment, and supervisor relationship. There were some differences by demographic variables. Women rated 5 of the 6 factors as more important than did the men. Respondents with a doctoral degree, training in clinical supervision, and those with counseling specialties other than rehabilitation and social work all rated “theories and models” higher in importance. Thielsen and Leahy also reported a majority of the respondents supported establishing specific training (67.5%) and experience (70.5%) requirements for clinical supervisions in rehabilitation counseling.

Culbreth and Borders (1999) investigated substance abuse counselors’ perceptions of the supervisory relationship. The counselors ($n = 360$) were employed in public mental health centers in North Carolina. Of interest was the impact of a match or mismatch of counselor and supervisor recovery status, a unique dynamic in the substance abuse field. No main effects for counselor or supervisor recovery status were found. There was, however, a significant two-way interaction effect for recovery status (match or mismatch) for all satisfaction and relationship measures. Both recovering and non-recovering counselors reported significantly higher ratings when their recovery status matched that of their supervisor. Culbreth (1999) found similar results in a national survey of substance abuse counselors ($n = 134$). Overall, the counselors reported satisfaction with their supervision, including session mechanics (e.g., frequency), supervisor competence, and the supervisory relationship. Those who considered themselves in recovery wanted significantly more supervision than did non-recovery counselors, and were significantly more likely to prefer a supervisor who also was in recovery.

Supervisor Training

The effectiveness of supervisor training programs were investigated in two studies. Baker, Exum, and Tyler (2002) used Watkins’ (1994) supervisor complexity model as the framework in a study of a doctoral-level academic course. Twelve students who had completed a supervision theory and research class and who were currently enrolled in a supervision practicum made up the experimental group. Seven doctoral students not yet enrolled in either course made up the control group. All students completed a scale designed to measure Watkins’ supervisor development model at the beginning, middle, and end of the semester. In addition, students participated in retrospective interviews at mid-semester and one month after the end of the course. The interviews also involved questions based in Watkins’ model. Dependent t tests indicated the experimental groups’ developmental scores significantly increased from the beginning to mid-semester and from mid-semester to the end of the course. Independent t tests indicated the experimental and control groups were not significantly different at the beginning of the course, but were different at mid-semester and the end, with the experimental group being higher each time. Ratings of the students’ interview responses were less clear, as the judges could not always agree on the developmental stages represented in the comments. There was the most agreement of growth of one stage in the students’ cognitive/skills focus over the semester. There seemed to be little observable growth in more affective areas such as dealing with supervisee feelings and confronting supervisees. These results are in line with those reported by Borders and Fong (1994), who found their supervisors-in-training were particularly challenged by situations requiring interventions related to relationship dynamics and were reluctant to address counselor’s personal concerns. Also, given the calls for including both didactic and experiential (i.e., supervised supervision) activities in supervisor training programs (e.g., Borders et al., 1991), it is interesting to note that the two groups of students scored similarly on the objective

developmental measure at the beginning of the semester, even though the experimental group had completed the didactic portion of their training and the control group had not. It appears that *supervised supervision* experiences have a unique influence on supervisor development and, perhaps, their effectiveness.

McMahon and Simons (2004) provided an intensive four-day supervision training workshop for 15 practicing counselors (experimental group) in a variety of work settings throughout Queensland, Australia. Learning objectives were based on the competency areas identified in the ACES curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors (Borders et al., 1991), and included both didactic and experiential components. There also was a control group, made up of 42 counselors who had indicated an interest in the training but could not attend. The researchers constructed a measure based on the learning objectives and covering theoretical and conceptual knowledge, practical skills and abilities, and confidence and self-awareness. The measure was administered to both groups before the training, to the experimental group at the end of training, and to both groups six months later. There were no differences between the two groups on the pretest, and the control group's scores had not changed six months later. In contrast, there was a significant increase in the experimental group's scores from pretest to posttest, and then a slight (non-significant) decline at the six months follow-up. Nevertheless, the experimental group had significantly higher scores than the control group did at the six month point.

It is challenging to conduct research on supervisor training programs, whether in academic or field settings. It is particularly difficult to obtain a sample size large enough for anything than fairly basic research designs. Clearly, Baker et al. (2002) and McMahon and Simons (2004) faced these and other limitations. In both studies, supervisor gains were assessed with self-report measures with limited psychometric support, rather than actual behaviors. Few measures specific to supervisor performance exist, however, and the use of a control group in each study is notable.

Wheeler and King (2000) surveyed counseling supervisors in Britain about supervision of supervision. They were prompted by an ethical requirement for supervisors to arrange for supervision for their work (British Association for Counselling, 1996). Of the 70 respondents to the survey, 90% reported they had supervision of their supervision; about half (55.7%) had the same supervisor for supervision as for their counseling. Half (51%) also indicated they currently were providing supervision for other supervisors, and this group rated supervision of supervision significantly higher in importance than did respondents not currently engaged in providing such supervision. Respondents also listed issues they had discussed with their supervisor of supervision during the last year as well as what issues their supervisees (supervisors) had raised. In both instances, ethical issues were the most frequently discussed topic, followed by boundary issues and competence of supervisees.

Supervisor Competence

Only one study related to supervisor competence was located. Magnuson, Wilcoxon, and Norem (2000) set out to characterize ineffective supervision in a qualitative study of 11 counselors and counselor educators. Interview data yielded six nearly unanimous overarching principles of "lousy supervision": unbalanced (e.g., too focused on details rather than the large picture), developmentally inappropriate, intolerant of differences (e.g., not flexible), untrained (e.g., not able to manage boundaries or difficult issues), professionally apathetic, and providing a poor model of professional and personal attributes (e.g., does not mentor, behaves unethically). The researchers also delineated three general spheres of lousy supervision: organizational/administrative (e.g., fails to clarify expectations, not prepared), technical/cognitive (e.g., perceived as unskilled or unreliable, provides vague feedback), and relational/affective (e.g., intrusive, insensitive, avoids relational issues). In short, ineffective supervisors were characterized as unskilled and/or not invested. The need for supervision training seems a clear implication of this study.

Supervisory Relationship

Over the last five years, researchers have investigated various aspects of the supervisory relationship and its impact. Most operationalized the supervisory relationship in terms of the working alliance (Bordin, 1983). Some used an adapted measure of scales designed to measure the counseling working alliance, while others

used a measure developed specific to the supervisory relationship (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). (One additional study of the working alliance [Gatmon et al., 2001] is reviewed in the multicultural supervision section.)

In one of the few theory-based studies (across all studies reviewed here), White and Queener (2003) investigated the relevance of attachment theory in explaining the working alliance. They included one additional variable, social provisions (i.e., quality of one's support network), in their quest to identify individual well-being characteristics of the supervisee and supervisor relevant to the supervisory relationship. They gathered data from 67 dyads, supervisees in practica or internship (mostly female master's students) and their supervisors (mostly female, onsite supervisors). Preliminary analyses indicated that gender, theoretical orientation, and number of supervision sessions were not related to any of the criterion variables. Supervisees' attachments and social provisions predicted neither their own perceptions of the working alliance nor their supervisors' perceptions. In contrast, supervisors' attachments (but not their social provisions) predicted both the supervisees' and supervisors' perceptions of the working alliance. When either supervisees or supervisors reported a more favorable supervisory working alliance, the supervisors were more comfortable with closeness in relationships and depending on others when in need, two aspects of more secure attachment.

Ladany and his colleagues published a series of studies of the supervisory relationship, beginning with his dissertation (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999). Ladany et al.'s (1999) study was based in Bordin's (1983) theory of the working alliance, specifically testing whether changes in supervisees' perceptions of the working alliance would predict their self-efficacy as counselors. They recruited a national sample of counseling and psychology interns ($n = 107$, mostly White female doctoral students) who reported perceptions of their work with their supervisors (mostly males) near the beginning and the end of the semester. Preliminary analyses revealed that months of supervised counseling experience did not correlate significantly with any of the predictor or criterion variables. Self-efficacy increased significantly over time. In terms of the theoretical research question, a multivariate multiple regression analysis was significant. Follow-up analyses, however, indicated that changes in the supervisees' perceptions of the working alliance were not related to reported changes in their self-efficacy. In addition, only one working alliance factor, emotional bond, predicted supervisees' satisfaction with supervision. When supervisees perceived the emotional bond became stronger over time, they also reported increases in satisfaction (e.g., more positive perceptions of supervisor's personal qualities and performance, their own supervisory behavior, and their comfort in expressing ideas in supervision). Ladany et al. speculated that their measure of the working alliance may have been inappropriate, since it was an adaptation of a scale designed to measure the therapeutic working alliance and did not include items related to evaluation.

In several follow-up studies, Ladany and colleagues explored the role of self-disclosure in the supervisory relationship. First, Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) gathered supervisees' reports of supervisor self-disclosures, including frequency and content of these disclosures. Supervisees ($n = 105$, mostly White females in counseling and psychology programs) both described actual supervisor self-disclosures and completed an index of frequency of types of disclosures (e.g., favorable or unfavorable, intimate or non-intimate). Supervisees reported an average of 5.46 supervisor self-disclosures, most often in the categories of personal issues (73%), neutral counseling experiences (55%) (e.g., how supervisor handled a suicidal client), and counseling struggles (51%). Least reported self-disclosures included experiences as a supervisor (8%) (mostly negative), didactic mentoring (12%), supervisory relationship (12%), and dynamics of the training site (13%). Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman expressed some concern over the high frequency of supervisor disclosures regarding their own personal issues and the few didactic or mentoring statements. In further planned analyses, the researchers found some relationships among supervisor styles, working alliance, and content and frequency of self-disclosures. For example, supervisees reported that supervisors with a more attractive (i.e., collegial) style made more disclosures overall, more task-oriented supervisors made fewer disclosures of personal issues, and more interpersonally-sensitive supervisors were less likely to reveal neutral counseling experiences. Supervisees who reported more supervisor disclosures also rated the supervisory working alliance higher, on all

three subscales (goals, tasks, emotional bond). More self-disclosures of counseling struggles were related to a stronger emotional bond.

Ladany and Melincoff (1999) provided an interesting contrast in their study of supervisor reports of nondisclosures. Ninety supervisors (mostly White females, doctoral level) in a variety of settings (e.g., mental health agencies, schools, private practice, prisons) described actual nondisclosures ($n = 519$) and explained their reasons ($n = 711$) for not disclosing. Categories of the most frequently listed nondisclosures were negative reactions to a supervisee's counseling and professional performance (74%), supervisor personal issues (67%), and negative reactions to a supervisee's behavior in supervision (56%). The least cited categories included positive reactions of a supervisee's counseling and professional performance (11%), supervisor attraction to a supervisee (10%), reactions to a supervisee's clients (4%), and supervisor's experiences with other trainees (4%). Thus, based on their self-reports, supervisors were more likely to share positive reactions and not share negative evaluations with their supervisees. The most cited reasons for nondisclosure were not relevant (77%), supervisor's own issue (71%), and anticipated negative reactions from supervisee (64%). There were several significant relationships between type of nondisclosure and reason for not disclosing. When supervisors did not disclose negative reactions to a supervisee, they were more likely to cite reasons that the supervisee "will discover when developmentally ready" and "addressed indirectly." When personal issues were not disclosed, supervisors were more likely to explain with "not relevant." Interestingly, supervisors in this study reported they typically did not disclose personal issues (67%) while supervisees in Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) cited personal issues as the most frequent self-disclosure of their supervisors (74%).

In a third study, Ladany, Walker, and Melincoff (2001) gathered supervisors' ($n = 137$) self-reports of self-disclosure frequency, supervisory style, and working alliance with respect to their work with a current supervisee. Supervisor style significantly predicted the working alliance. Follow-up analyses revealed that the attractive style predicted all three components of the working alliance, agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and emotional bond. Interpersonally-sensitive and task-oriented styles predicted agreement on tasks only. In addition, supervisor style significantly predicted frequency of supervisor self-disclosure; supervisors who reported greater use of attractive and interpersonally sensitive styles also reported more frequent self-disclosures. Ladany et al. (2001) encouraged supervisors to be flexible, since each style seemed to contribute in a unique way to the working alliance.

In two other studies, the role of gender within the supervision relationship was explored. Although these two studies could have been discussed in the multicultural and diversity issues section, the research questions were so specific to the supervisory relationship that I have elected to include them here.

Wester, Vogel, and Archer (2004) focused on male supervisees and the impact of their socialized restricted emotionality (RE) within the supervision relationship. The researchers theorized that supervisor gender and supervisee defensive style were important moderators in supervision. They used a supervisory working alliance scale (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990) as a measure of the "turning-against-object" defensive style, and a counseling self-efficacy scale (Larson et al., 1992) as a measure of the "turning-against-self" defensive style. Psychology interns ($n = 103$) reported lower restrictive emotionality scores than published scores for men in the general population but higher than published scores for practicing counselors. A series of ANOVAs indicated that male supervisees with higher RE scores had significantly lower self-efficacy scores, but RE scores had no effect on working alliance scores. Supervisor gender had a main effect on working alliance scores, with male-male dyads reporting poorer perceptions of the supervisory relationship.

Finally, Granello (2003) investigated the impact of gender and age on the interactions of supervisor and supervisee. She analyzed transcripts of supervision sessions for 42 interns and their onsite supervisors, using a revised form of the Blumberg Interaction Analysis System (BIA). For gender, there was a main effect only for supervisee gender (no interaction effect or main effect for supervisor gender) on four BIA categories. Supervisors of both genders were more likely to accept or build on the suggestions and ideas of female supervisees, an unexpected finding. Supervisors of both genders also asked for more opinions, analysis, and

evaluations from male supervisees. Male supervisees gave more suggestions and female supervisees gave more praise, support, and agreement comments to their supervisors. In a second MANOVA, gender and age had a significant interaction effect for two BIA categories. Although male supervisees scored higher than female supervisees in both categories, males who were older than their supervisors were asked for their opinions and gave their opinions more often than supervisees (male or female) in other age configurations. These differences were particularly apparent in comparing the scores of older male and older female supervisees. Granello discussed the symbiotic nature of the supervisory relationship as revealed by the different patterns of interactions of supervisors with male versus female supervisees, and the status apparently afforded to older male supervisees.

Supervisor Style

Supervisor style continues to be a popular variable in research, often in terms of the role of style in the supervisory relationship, as previously discussed (e.g., Culbreth & Borders, 1999; Ladany, Walker et al., 2001; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999). Four other studies explored other aspects of supervisor style. Most relied on Friedlander and Ward's (1984) conceptualization and measure, which delineates three fairly distinct styles: attractive, interpersonally-sensitive, and task-oriented.

Ladany, Marotta, and Muse-Burke (2001) investigated supervisees' ($n = 100$, mostly White females) preference for supervisor style based on their counseling experience, familiarity with specific client symptoms and diagnoses, and complexity of their case conceptualizations of these clients. A series of multivariate multiple regression analyses revealed that supervisee general experience (i.e., months of counseling experience, months of supervised counseling experience, and total number of clients seen) vs. specific experience (i.e., number of clients seen with the specified diagnoses) predicted the complexity of the supervisees' case conceptualizations. Those with more experience wrote more integrated and complex case conceptualizations (for both diagnoses). No measures of supervisee experience predicted supervisor style preference for the specified client, and complexity of case conceptualizations also did not predict style preference. Most supervisees preferred a mixture of styles for the specified client, suggesting the need for supervisors to be flexible in their approach. Having used multiple measures relevant to counselor developmental level (i.e., experience and cognitive complexity), Ladany et al. concluded, "It is likely that the relationship between trainee developmental level and supervisor approach is more complex than anticipated" (p. 216).

Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) hypothesized that supervisor story would predict master's-level interns' satisfaction with supervision and their perceived self-efficacy. Interns ($n = 82$, mostly White females) from six different training programs participated. The two multiple regression analyses were significant. However, the interpersonally sensitive style was the only significant predictor of satisfaction, and the task-oriented style was the only significant predictor of perceived self-efficacy. Satisfaction with supervision and perceived self-efficacy were not significantly correlated. Like Ladany, Marotta et al. (2001), Fernando and Hulse-Killacky concluded that supervisors need to be proficient in all three styles and be flexible in their use.

Steward, Breland, and Neil (2001) explored the influence of novice supervisees' preferences for supervisor style on their self-evaluations. The supervisees ($n = 36$, mostly White females) completed a non-standardized counselor competence rating scale at the end of the semester. Their supervisors also evaluated them using the same scale. Supervisory styles did not significantly predict supervisees' self-evaluations nor their supervisors' evaluations of them. Supervisor style was a significant predictor of the accuracy of supervisees' self-evaluations (i.e., how close their evaluations were to their supervisors' evaluations). The attractiveness style explained 37% of the variance in the difference between supervisees' and supervisors' evaluations. The more attractive the supervisor, the greater was the difference in the evaluations. The authors provided several, somewhat contradictory, possible explanations for these results, and concluded their results underscore the need for supervisor support and challenge. In addition, supervisees' and supervisor's evaluations were significantly correlated, with supervisees tending to give themselves lower scores than their supervisors gave them.

Hart and Nance (2003) tested a different model, based in Adaptive Counseling and Therapy, which involves four styles: telling, teaching, supporting, and delegating. Supervisees ($n = 168$) and their supervisors ($n = 90$) (both groups, mostly White females) rank ordered 150 word descriptions of the styles twice. As a pretest, they rank ordered their preferences. As a post-test, they rank ordered based on the supervisors' actual behaviors across ten weeks of individual supervision sessions. Not surprisingly, more directive styles were negatively correlated with less directive styles. Supervisees' and supervisors' rankings were somewhat consistent at pretest and post-test, with "supportive teacher" ranked high and "consultant/integrative" ranked low each time.

Supervisor Feedback and Evaluation

Despite the critical role of supervisor feedback in counselor development there have been few studies specific to this part of the process. Two were located during the five-year span of this review, both by Larson and her colleagues.

Larson, Day, Springer, Clark, and Vogel (2003) described the development of an observational feedback rating scale. They described optimal supervisory feedback as specific, constructive, and with a balance of positive and negative comments, and devised a 4-point rating scale to measure the presence of each of these four dimensions (1 = absent, 4 = present to a large degree). Transcripts of two supervisor-supervisee dyads in a university counseling center were rated. Of the 31 hours of tape, 199 feedback statements were identified. Interestingly, low numbers of both positive ($M = 2.08$, $SD = .83$) and negative ($M = 1.32$, $SD = .54$) statements were reported. The supervisor statements more often evidenced constructive ($M = 2.91$, $SD = .96$) and specific ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .86$) feedback. Larson et al. reported initial estimates of construct validity and concurrent validity, and found that undergraduates could rate the statements reliably. These results suggest that the supervisors used fewer than 7 feedback statements during each supervision hour, a result that echoes earlier findings by Friedlander, Siegel, and Brenock (1989), who also found feedback was given rarely.

Daniels and Larson (2001) conducted an experimental study to test the impact of performance feedback (positive or negative) on counseling students' self-efficacy and anxiety. Participants ($n = 45$, mostly White females) completed a self-efficacy pretest, conducted a 10-minute mock counseling session, estimated his or her own performance, completed an anxiety pretest, and then received either positive or negative feedback (bogus, somewhat exaggerated, randomly assigned) that rated the counseling students' performance in comparison to others. Repeated measures ANOVAs revealed an interaction effect between feedback and self-efficacy. Positive feedback significantly increased self-efficacy scores and decreased anxiety, while negative feedback had the opposite effects. Given the difficulty of finding measurable effects with only one, brief treatment in research, these results are impressive. Daniels and Larson concluded that the optimal feedback for novice counselors enhances the positives and provides specific suggestions for improvement.

Supervision Interventions

As in previous decades of supervision research, there were few investigations of specific interventions in individual supervision; only two were located in counseling journals over the last five years. Neswald, McCalip, Sather, Strati, and Dineen (2003) reported on their own experiences in a "creative supervision group." An open-ended, evolving qualitative approach is described, with an emphasis on process observations. The group leader and group members reported that the creative approaches used contributed to a more collaborative atmosphere.

Clingerman and Bernard (2004) explored the use of student-initiated e-mail as a supplemental supervisory tool, with a particular focus on whether e-mail enhanced supervisees' growth in personalization (self-awareness). E-mails of 19 master's level practicum students (mostly White females in school counseling) were coded in terms of their reference to interventions, conceptualization, personality, professional behavior/practicum site, and professional behavior/practicum class. E-mails were divided into time periods representing the beginning, middle, and final weeks of the semester. There was a significant decrease in the number of e-mails across the time periods. Personalization messages were significantly greater than other message types during each time period. Clingerman and Bernard concluded that their results supported other claims that e-mail encourages greater intimacy than face-to-face interactions.

Group Supervision

Holloway and Johnston (1985) described group supervision research as “widely practiced but poorly understood” (p. 332). Four studies around group supervision helped address this gap in the literature.

Christensen and Kline (2000) set out to address the lack of research regarding the process of group supervision. They collected various data (e.g., direct observations, researcher’s journal, interviews, focus group) for six doctoral students in group supervision of their work with process groups for first-semester master’s students. Using grounded theory procedures, four primary constructs were identified: influence of supervisee anxiety (e.g., hesitant to participate, fear of evaluation), the group supervision process (e.g., development of trust, increase in peer feedback), multiphasic learning process (e.g., involvement in group, making sense of learning and applying it), and multiphasic learning outcomes (e.g., personal awareness, group work concepts, group skills).

Later, Christensen and Kline (2001) explored their “process-sensitive peer group supervision” model, in which peers provide feedback based in the three focus areas of Bernard’s (1997) discrimination model (i.e., techniques and interventions, conceptualization, personalization). Six master’s level interns responded to open-ended questions regarding their experiences in the group at three points across the semester. Data analyses, following grounded theory procedures, yielded two primary themes: peer engagement and supervisor involvement. The most significant aspect of peer engagement was peer feedback, and the supervisees seemed to prefer a more facilitative (vs. directive) role for the supervisor. Three developmental phases also were identified: passive involvement (dependence), learning responsibility (independence), and personal involvement (interdependence and intimacy). Christensen and Kline concluded their results supported previous findings regarding the strengths of peer group supervision (with a supervisor facilitator).

In a third qualitative study, Starling and Baker (2000) explored the efficacy of a structured peer group model, as described by Borders (1991). They conducted intensive interviews of four master’s level practicum students at the middle and end of the semester. The interviews included questions about their goals, self-assessed competence, and influence of peers in the group. Four themes emerged from grounded theory-based analyses. Supervisees reported a decrease in confusion and anxiety, greater clarity about their goals, and increased confidence, and emphasized the value of feedback from their peers. Starling and Baker concluded the structured peer group model was an effective approach, and that their results supported previous writings regarding the benefits of group supervision.

Ray and Altekruze (2000) conducted an experimental investigation comparing the effectiveness of large group supervision (8 students), small group supervision (4 students), and combined large group and individual supervision. Of particular interest was whether group supervision alone was as effective as combined group and individual supervision. Master’s level practicum students ($n = 64$) were randomly assigned to one of the three treatment groups. They submitted videotaped counseling sessions near the beginning and at the end of the semester. These tapes were rated using a measure of counselor influence by the clients, supervisors, and trained raters. In addition, the students completed pre and post-test measures of counselor development, and stated their preference for each supervision experience. Across groups, there were significant increases in counselor influence ratings for the supervisors’ ratings only. Client ratings had a ceiling effect. An ANCOVA indicated no significant differences in post-test ratings, regardless of source, among the three treatment groups. Across groups, there was a significant increase in supervisees’ self-reports of development. An ANCOVA revealed significant differences on one of three development subscales. Students in large group supervision reported greater gains in a sense of autonomy than did students in the other two treatment groups. Finally, students reported a strong preference for individual supervision, regardless of treatment group. Ray and Altekruze acknowledged the limitation of using the counselor influence measure as an indicator of counselor effectiveness, but concluded their results raised some questions regarding the best way to provide supervision (i.e., Is individual supervision necessary?).

Multicultural Supervision

Of the four studies reviewed here, two appeared in a special issue of the *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development* (Constantine, 2001). "Multicultural" was defined quite broadly in two of the studies. All involved supervisor-supervisee discussions specific to multicultural variables and the critical influence of these discussions on the supervisory relationship.

Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, and Pope-Davis (2004) collected critical incidents in multicultural supervision, defined broadly to include race, ethnicity, sex, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and physical disabilities. Although most of their supervisees ($n = 17$ master's students) and supervisors ($n = 11$ doctoral students) were White females, each dyad differed on at least one of the identified multicultural dimensions. At the end of the semester, participants described one or more critical incidents in which multicultural issues occurred during supervision, including if and how the incident was resolved, and rated the experience as positive, negative, helpful, challenging, supportive, offensive, harmful, or threatening (1-5 Likert scale). Finally, participants described how the critical incident(s) influenced their multicultural competence. Content coding yielded 10 types of critical incident situations, including interpersonal discomfort, contact with cultural differences, supervisor corrected behavior, theoretical discussions, and self-disclosure. In addition, seven influence categories were identified, with awareness (i.e., gain in personal awareness, insight) reflected in 50% of the responses. Toporek et al. also provided a matrix of influences with corresponding critical incident situations and multicultural variables. For example, "recognition of need for more training" arose out of one situation, as did "encouragement from supervisor," regarding only the cultural variable of ethnicity, while "awareness" was generated by a number of situations, regarding a variety of cultural variables. The researchers noted that perceptions and impact of the critical incidents were unique to each dyad, but also concluded that the supervisory relationship "may be a pivotal component of multicultural supervision that moderates how all other experiences are perceived" (p. 80). In response to a request to provide suggestions for improving multicultural supervision, supervisor participants recommended addressing these issues in the initial supervision session, and expressed a need for positive demonstrations of supervisors dealing with multicultural issues.

Gatmon et al. (2001) explored the influence of discussions of cultural variables during supervision on satisfaction and the working alliance. Psychology interns ($n = 289$, mostly White, heterosexual females) reported whether discussions of ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation occurred during supervision, who initiated these discussions, and rated (7-point Likert scale) perceived levels of frequency, depth, safety, and satisfaction with the discussions. There were more matches in the three cultural variables than differences among the dyads. Overall, the interns reported low frequencies of discussions of cultural variables, especially for sexual orientation. Discussions of ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation were significantly more likely (Chi-square analysis) when there were dyad match differences on these variables. A MANOVA was used to assess differences in working alliance between dyads that did discuss similarities and differences and those who did not. Only ethnicity was significant; supervisees who reported discussions of ethnic similarities had higher scores on the bond subscale of the working alliance measure. Tests for group differences in satisfaction (ANOVAs) were significant for gender and sexual orientation, but not ethnicity. Supervisees who reported discussions of similarities and differences in gender and sexual orientation reported higher levels of satisfaction. Supervisors initiated about half of the discussions regarding ethnicity and gender, but only one-third for sexual orientation, a finding that contrasts with suggestions of the supervisors in Toporek et al. (2004) and others (e.g., Hird et al., 2001) that these issues be put on the table in the first session. Gatmon et al. concluded, "it is not the cultural match between supervisor and supervisee itself that is important but the presence and quality of the discussion of difference and similarity" (p. 110).

Duan and Roehlke (2001) focused on cross-racial supervision dyads in university counseling centers. Psychology interns ($n = 60$, 40 men) and their supervisors ($n = 58$, 30 men) were recruited; one person in each dyad was Caucasian. Duan and Roehlke developed a survey of scaled items and open-ended questions regarding perceptions of supervisor-supervisee conflicts, supervisor's behaviors, attitudes, and characteristics. Although both groups reported high satisfaction, there were a number of significant differences in the groups' perceptions. For example, compared to the supervisees, supervisors reported more incidences of addressing

multicultural issues, asking supervisees for help in understanding their culture, and acknowledging the power differential, and significantly higher levels of like and respect for their supervisees. Supervisees reported more comfort with self-disclosure than their supervisors perceived. Stepwise multiple regression revealed supervisees' comfort level with self-disclosure and their perceptions of supervisors' positive attitudes toward them significantly predicted supervisees' satisfaction (72% of the variance). For supervisors' satisfaction, three predictors were significant (61% of the variance): their positive attitudes toward supervisees, perceptions of supervisees' comfort with self-disclosure, and the degree to which they believed their supervisees viewed them as expert, trustworthy, and helpful. Much in line with previously discussed studies, Duan and Roehlke encouraged early attention to multicultural issues, with supervisors taking responsibility for initiating these discussions, and urged supervisors to check their self-perceptions of how frequently they address these issues during supervision. Notably, this is the only study reviewed here in which the participants were primarily male, although it is not clear to what extent this influenced the results.

Gainor and Constantine (2002) compared the effects of Web-based peer group and an in-person peer group on supervisees' multicultural competence. School counseling interns ($n = 45$, mostly White females) were randomly assigned to the two groups, both of which followed Constantine's (1997) multicultural supervision framework in weekly group meetings. They completed a multicultural case conceptualization ability exercise before and after the group experience, and a satisfaction questionnaire at post-test. A MANCOVA revealed significant differences on the multicultural case conceptualization measures between the two groups; the in-person peer group had higher etiology and treatment scores. In addition, the in-person group reported significantly greater satisfaction with their group experience than the Web-based group. In contrast to Clingerman and Bernard (2004; reported earlier), Gainor and Constantine concluded that their Web-based format may provide limited perceptual relationship cues and intimacy, particularly around multicultural topics, and suggested Web-based groups be used ideally in conjunction with face-to-face supervision.

Ethical Behavior

Erwin (2000) explored counseling supervisors' levels of moral sensitivity, one's realization that behaviors may affect others negatively or violate a moral principle. He randomly selected from members of ACA who self-identified as counseling supervisors. Participants ($n = 147$, mostly White, with master's degrees) were asked to identify key supervision and counseling issues in two case vignettes, one in which the counselor broke confidentiality and one in which the counselor had a dual role with a client. Their responses were rated for degree of moral sensitivity on a 1 to 5 scale, with scores of 1, 2, and 3 indicating low sensitivity. The supervisors scored significantly higher in moral sensitivity (t test) on the breach of confidentiality case than on the dual relationship case. Nevertheless, 35% scored low on the confidentiality case and 67% scored low on the dual relationship case.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This review of five years of counseling supervision journal publications provides a snapshot of the models, issues, and dynamics of particular relevance to the field of counseling and counselor education. The number of articles published during this time period, many more than I expected, denotes the continued emphasis on this topic in the counseling field. Most articles, conceptual and empirical, had an applied focus, such as descriptions of supervision strategies, issues specific to various counseling specialties, challenges of conducting on-site supervision, and dialogues concerning multicultural issues. In empirical studies, supervisors were studied more often than supervisees. Familiar variables (e.g., supervisory style) and new ones (e.g., supervisor self-disclosure, technology) were investigated. A number of these studies provided critical directions for supervisor training. Themes, conclusions, and implications are discussed in this section.

1. There is continued evidence of and concern for lack of clinical supervision for counseling practitioners, particularly those in the schools. In addition, there continues to be "extensive misunderstanding" (Schultz et al., 2002, p.219) of what clinical supervision is, often being confused with staff meetings and administrative oversight. These misunderstandings may be rooted in the lack of supervisor training for master's-level counselors, who typically are the primary supervisors for counseling interns, pre-licensed counselors, and

counseling staff members. In several studies reviewed here, those with supervision training better understood their role and function and valued supervision more highly, including supervision of their own work. The need for increased supervisor training, then, is abundantly clear. Innovative approaches are needed to reach practitioners in a variety of field settings, as supervision training students during their master's program can have limited impact. Master's students do not yet have the experience and professional maturity needed to understand the complex levels and nuances of counseling supervision. In fact, at graduation they may be at a developmental level where they question the value of supervision for themselves (Borders & Brown, 2005).

2. The absolute critical role of the supervisory relationship resonates throughout the literature reviewed here, as does the responsibility of the *supervisor* for creating a safe, trusting, challenging, and open environment. This is stated in particularly strong terms by multicultural supervision writers and researchers, who emphasized repeatedly the supervisor's responsibility for introducing cultural variables into the supervisory dialogue, in initial sessions and beyond. Clearly, supervisors need to check out their own self-perceptions of their behavior, as these may be inaccurate, particularly in terms of how often they initiate multicultural discussions (Duan & Roehlke, 2001) as well as what topics they disclose during supervision (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999; Ladany & Melincoff, 1999). In addition, there is some indication that supervisor's characteristics, such as attachment style, have more bearing on relationship dynamics than do supervisees' characteristics (White & Queener, 2003). Again, the responsibility of the supervisor for self-scrutiny regarding supervisory attitudes and behaviors is clear. The relationship can be enhanced by supervisor self-disclosures, particularly disclosures of their own counseling struggles (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999).

3. Despite the critical role of the supervisory relationship, there is some evidence that supervisors avoid difficult relationship issues, or at least find them challenging. Both supervisees (Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999) and supervisors (Ladany & Melincoff, 1999) reported that supervisors infrequently disclosed about the supervisory relationship. Lack of attention to relation issues also was a defining characteristic of "lousy supervision" (Magnuson et al., 2000). It may be that supervisors want to avoid negative reactions from their supervisees, or are unsure of how to handle these reactions. In addition, some supervisors seem to struggle with boundary issues with their supervisees (Wheeler & King, 2000). It appears that greater attention to relationship dynamics in supervisor training is warranted.

4. Multicultural supervision received increased attention, was defined broadly by several authors, and moved to a focus on the supervisor-supervisee dialogue about cultural issues. These issues seem to be discussed more frequently when there are supervisor-supervisee mismatches on cultural variables (Gatmon et al., 2001). Cultural issues are just as prevalent and relevant in matched dyads, however, including White-White dyads, where White privilege may be a powerful if invisible influence (Hays & Chang, 2003). In fact, Gatmon et al. (2001) concluded that the cultural match is much less important than "the presence and quality of the discussion of difference and similarity" (p. 110). Indeed, when cultural issues are discussed supervisees report greater gains in personal awareness and insight (Toporek et al., 2004), stronger emotional bonds with their supervisors, and higher levels of satisfaction (Gatmon et al., 2001). Yet, supervisors may discuss these issues less frequently than they believe they do (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). Sexual orientation may be overlooked more often than other cultural issues (Gatmon et al., 2001). Supervisees want to discuss multicultural issues related to their counseling and supervision interactions, apparently more frequently and with greater comfort than their supervisors realize (Duan & Roehlke, 2001). Although several authors provided strategies for addressing multicultural issues, particularly in initial sessions (Estrada et al., 2004; Garret et al., 2001; Hays & Chang, 2003; Hird et al., 2001), supervisors may need specific training—and modeling—of effective approaches and productive interactions around this topic (Toporek et al., 2004).

5. Almost all the empirical results covered in this review were based on White female participants. Often, the percentages of Whites and females were as high as 70% and 80%. Unfortunately, these figures reflect the reality of the counseling student population, and present quite a challenge to multicultural supervision researchers. Nevertheless, these researchers designed studies that provided insightful and instructive results, as previously discussed.

6. What is the role of feedback in supervision? What *is* feedback in supervision? The few analyses of session dialogues to date (Friedlander et al., 1989; Larson et al., 2003) have yielded relatively few statements that can be categorized specifically as feedback, yet supervisees require feedback to be able to make changes, add new

skills, expand their client conceptualizations, and develop greater self-awareness. Supervisors seem reluctant to give negative feedback and prefer indirect over direct methods of providing this feedback (Ladany & Melincoff, 1999). Indeed, blunt negative statements decreased supervisees' self-efficacy and increased their anxiety in one study (Daniels & Larson, 2001), and ineffective feedback (vague, too focused on details) was a component of lousy supervision (Magnuson et al., 2000). Nevertheless, Larson et al. (2003) also reported low frequencies of positive feedback. Additional studies of effective feedback—direct and indirect—are needed to enhance our knowledge—and supervisor training—in this area.

7. Other supervisor training needs beyond relationship dynamics, discussions of cultural issues, and effective feedback also were indicated. In particular, supervisors reported that ethical issues were particularly challenging (Thielson & Leahy, 2001; Wheeler & King, 2000). In addition, beginning supervisors (at least those who are doctoral students) struggle with the appropriate way to deal with supervisee affect (Baker et al., 2002), perhaps because of their heightened awareness regarding ethical issues in taking on a counselor role with their supervisees (Borders & Fong, 1994). Importantly, this review provided additional empirical evidence that *supervised supervision* experiences are requisite to supervisor development (Baker et al., 2002). As previously outlined (e.g., Borders et al., 1991), supervisor training programs should include experiential components—ongoing practice with feedback—as well as didactic instruction.

8. In terms of counseling specialties, school counseling supervision received the most attention. This seems appropriate given that school counseling is one of the foundations of the counseling field and represents a significant proportion of counseling graduates. In addition, the school setting presents unique challenges, even hurdles, to efforts to provide clinical supervision, which several authors tried to address. Nevertheless, there are many counselors in a number of other settings, and the limited literature indicates these have their own challenges and dynamics. Hopefully, researchers will continue to explore these.

9. The viability of group supervision was supported consistently in the four studies published during the last five years, although perhaps it is best used in combination with individual supervision (Ray & Altekruze, 2000). In three qualitative studies, the key role of peer feedback was highlighted. Interestingly, although all three used the term “peer group supervision,” all employed group supervisors. Results seem to support the presence of a facilitative (vs. directive) role for a group supervisor who sets appropriate structure, helps create a safe and trusting environment, encourages peer involvement, and helps generalize learnings and the application of them (cf. Starling & Baker, 2000; Christensen & Kline, 2001). Although peer feedback is valuable in unique and important ways, skills outcomes are enhanced when a supervisor is present (Agnew et al., 2000; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997).

10. Developmental models were a major focus of supervision research in the 1980s and 1990s. Here, these models were mentioned often as a guiding framework for a supervision approach and in interpreting research results. Within this five year span, however, only two empirical investigations of developmental models were located. Measuring “developmental level,” a term with a more conceptual than experience basis (e.g., Blocher, 1983), continued to be a challenge. Shechtman and Wirzberger (1999) categorized their counselors by years of experience alone, while Ladany, Marotta et al. (2001) used various measures of counseling experience and a measure of cognitive complexity. Both studies added support to the general tenets of developmental models, although both also indicated matching developmental level with supervisor approach was more complex than perhaps originally described. Researchers in both studies concluded the need for supervisor flexibility, since various styles and approaches are needed, even with the same supervisee.

11. Similarly, Bernard's (1997) discrimination model was frequently used as a framework for describing supervisory approaches to issues as varied as goal-setting (Curtis, 2000) and addressing spirituality (Polanski, 2003). The model was the basis for two studies, one of Israeli school counselors (Shechtman & Wirzberger, 1999) and one of e-mail communications from supervisees (Clingerman & Bernard, 2004). Clearly, the discrimination model continues to be a viable and instructive framework across the spectrum of counseling supervision.

12. Use of technology in supervision was investigated in two studies, with somewhat contradictory results regarding attention to relationship and self-awareness components via technology. Clingerman and Bernard (2004) concluded that e-mail communications encourage greater intimacy than face-to-face supervision, while Gainor and Constantine (2002) reported their Web-based group format limited intimacy, likely due to the lack of perceptual relationship cues. Differences in the supervision formats may have contributed to the different

conclusions. Clingerman and Bernard's supervisees were e-mailing their small-group practicum supervisors, who responded to their messages, so they had both e-mail and face-to-face interactions with their supervisors. Gainor and Constantine compared in-person only and Web-based only group supervision formats. As technology evolves and becomes more accessible to supervisors in a variety of settings, studies of more interactive formats will be of interest, particularly since these formats may expand the availability of supervision in some geographical areas (e.g., rural) and other isolated settings.

13. The empirical research on clinical supervision during this time period included both quantitative and, increasingly, qualitative studies. Often, the samples were small and were based in one program, which limits generalizability (cf. Borders & Fong, 1994). Of the quantitative, only five employed an experimental design. The rest were primarily descriptive, *ex postfacto* studies, often described as "exploratory," or surveys. The qualitative studies, again often exploratory in nature, varied greatly in their rigor. Lack of attention to potential (or obvious) researcher bias and adherence to a systematic qualitative approach characterized a few of the studies. Nevertheless, a qualitative approach seemed quite appropriate for identified research questions in several studies, particularly those of group supervision, "lousy supervision," and multicultural supervision. Given the lack of standardized measures specific to the supervision enterprise, qualitative approaches may be preferred to, or be seen as a valuable adjunct to, use of researcher-developed scales and surveys that have little to no psychometric support. Indeed, several researchers used a mixed methods approach quite effectively (e.g., Gatmon et al., 2001; Ladany & Lehrman-Waterman, 1999).

14. How should the supervisory relationship be conceptualized and operationalized? In this review, the working alliance was the most frequently chosen theoretical framework. However, both adaptations of therapeutic working alliance scales and the supervision-based scale by Efstation et al. (1990) have been criticized by researchers (although they often continue to use the same measures in subsequent studies). White and Queener (2003) noted that the Efstation et al. scale does not correspond exactly with Bordin's (1983) theory, so that it may not be accurate to operationalize working alliance by using this scale. Ladany et al. (1999) noted that therapeutic working alliance scales do not include items related to evaluation, a key component of the supervisor's responsibility and the power dynamics in supervision.

Perhaps a larger question, implied by these researchers, is whether working alliance is an appropriate conceptualization of the supervisory relationship. Reliance on the working alliance theory may be another example of adopting counseling-based theories as the basis for studying supervision, a practice that is problematic since the two enterprises differ in key ways (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Borders & Brown, 2005; Dye & Borders, 1990). To date, the supervisory relationship has not received the same scrutiny as the counseling relationship has enjoyed for some decades, so that the components specific to supervision interactions are still largely unknown. That said, the working alliance has been useful in highlighting the importance of the emotional bond factor in the supervisor-supervisee relationship.

CONCLUSION

Clinical supervision literature in counseling and counselor education continues to cover a broad range of issues, settings, and dynamics. Literature published during the last five years has been instructive, particularly regarding supervisor-supervisee dialogues regarding multicultural issues and the critical role of the supervisory relationship. In addition, the need for supervisor training, including supervised practice, has been further supported. A number of avenues for continued development and research regarding supervision practice have been identified, although several will be challenging to address. Hopefully, over the next five years, counseling researchers will find creative approaches to further enhance supervision practice and refine supervisor training.

REFERENCES

- Agnew, T., Vaught, C. C., Getz, H. G., & Fortune, J. (2000). Peer group clinical supervision program fosters confidence and professionalism. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 6-12.
- Arthur, G. L., & Gfroerer, K. P. (2002). Training and supervision through the written word: A description and intern feedback. *The Family Journal, 10*, 213-219.
- Baker, S. B., Exum, H. A., & Tyler, R. E. (2002). The developmental process of clinical supervisors in training: An investigation of the supervisor complexity model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*, 15-30.

- Baltimore, M. L., & Crutchfield, L. B. (2003). *Clinical supervisor training: An interactive CD-ROM training program for the helping professions*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Barnes, K. L. (2004). Applying self-efficacy theory to counselor training and supervision: A comparison of two approaches. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 56-69.
- Bernard, J. M. (1997). The discrimination model. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 310-327). New York: Wiley.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bishop, R. D., Avila-Juarbe, E., & Thumme, B. (2003). Recognizing spirituality as an important factor in counselor supervision. *Counseling and Values, 48*, 34-46.
- Blackwell, T. L., Strohmer, D. C., Belcas, E. M., & Burton, K. A. (2002). Ethics in rehabilitation counselor supervision. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 45*, 240-247.
- Bloch, D. H. (1983). Toward a cognitive developmental approach to counseling supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 27-34.
- Borders, L. D. (1991). A systematic approach to peer group supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 248-252.
- Borders, L. D. (2001). Counseling supervision: A deliberate educational process. In D. C. Locke, J. E. Myers, & E. L. Herr (Eds.), *The handbook of counseling* (pp. 417-432). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Borders, L. D., & Benschoff, J. M. (1999). *Learning to think like a supervisor* [instructional videotape]. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Borders, L. D., Bernard, J. M., Dye, H. A., Fong, M. L., Henderson, P., & Nance, D. W. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: Rationale, development and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31*, 58-82.
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Borders, L. D., & Cashwell, C. S. (1992). Supervision regulations in counselor licensure legislation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31*, 208-218.
- Borders, L. D., & Fong, M. L. (1994). Cognitions of supervisors-in-training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 280-293.
- Borders, L. D., & Usher, C. H. (1992). Post-degree supervision: Existing and preferred practices. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 594-599.
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 35-42.
- British Association for Counselling. (1996). *Code of ethics and practice for supervisors of counsellors*. Rugby: Author.
- Britton, P. J., Goodman, J. M., & Rak, C. F. (2002). Presenting workshops on supervision: A didactic-experiential format. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*, 31-39.
- Champe, J., & Kleist, D. M. (2003). Live supervision: A review of the research. *The Family Journal, 11*, 268-275.
- Christensen, T. M., & Kline, W. B. (2000). A qualitative investigation of the process of group supervision with group counselors. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 25*, 376-393.
- Christensen, T. M., & Kline, W. B. (2001). The qualitative exploration of process-sensitive peer group supervision. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 26*, 81-99.
- Clingerman, T. L., & Bernard, J. M. (2004). An investigation of the use of e-mail as a supplemental modality for clinical supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 82-95.
- Cobia, D. C., & Boes, S. R. (2000). Professional disclosure statements and formal plans for supervision: Two strategies for minimizing the risk of ethical conflicts in post-master's supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78*, 293-296.
- Cobia, D. C., & Pipes, R. B. (2002). Mandated supervision: An intervention for disciplined professionals. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*, 140-144.
- Constantine, M. G. (2001). Introduction to the special issue: Perspectives on multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 98-101.

- Crutchfield, L. B., & Borders, L. D. (1997). Impact of two clinical peer supervision models on practicing school counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 75*, 219-230.
- Culbreth, J. R. (1999). Clinical supervision of substance abuse counselors: Current and preferred practices. *Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling, 20*, 15-25.
- Culbreth, J. R., & Borders, L. D. (1999). Perceptions of the supervisory relationship: Recovering and nonrecovering substance abuse counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 330-338.
- Curtis, R. C. (2000). Using goal-setting strategies to enrich the practicum and internship experiences of beginning counselors. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 38*, 194-205.
- Daniels, J. A., & Larson, L. M. (2001). The impact of performance feedback on counseling self-efficacy and counselor anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 120-130.
- DeLucia-Waack, J. L. (1999). Supervision for counselors working with eating disorders groups: Countertransference issues related to body image, food, and weight. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 379-388.
- Duan, C., & Roehlke, H. (2001). A descriptive "snapshot" of cross-racial supervision in university counseling center internships. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 131-146.
- Dye, H. A., & Borders, L. D. (1990). Counseling supervisors: Standards for preparation and practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 27-32.
- Edwards, J. K., & Chen, M-W. (1999). Strength-based supervision: Frameworks, current practice, and future directions. *The Family Journal, 1*, 349-357.
- Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 322-329.
- Erwin, W. J. (2000). Supervisor moral sensitivity. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 115-127.
- Estrada, D., Frame, M. W., & Williams, C. B. (2004). Cross-cultural supervision: Guiding the conversation toward race and ethnicity. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 307-319.
- Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's-level counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 293-304.
- Fitch, T. J., & Marshall, J. L. (2002). Using cognitive interventions with counseling practicum students during group supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 335-342.
- Foster, V. A., & McAdams, C. R., III. (1999). The impact of client suicide in counselor training: Implications for counselor education and supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 22-33.
- Frame, M. W. (2001). The spiritual genogram in training and supervision. *The Family Journal, 9*, 109-115.
- Friedlander, M. L., Siegel, S. M., & Brenock, K. (1989). Parallel process in counseling and supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 149-157.
- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 541-557.
- Fuertes, J. N. (2004). Supervision in bilingual counseling: Service delivery, training, and research considerations. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 84-94.
- Gainor, K. A., & Constantine, M. G. (2002). Multicultural group supervision: A comparison of in-person versus web-based formats. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 104-112.
- Garrett, M. T., Borders, L. D., Crutchfield, L. B., Torres-Rivera, E., Brotherton, D., & Curtis, R. (2001). Multicultural supervision: A paradigm of cultural responsiveness for supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 147-158.
- Gatmon, D., Jackson, D., Koshkarian, L., Martos-Perry, N., Molina, A., Patel, N., & Rodolfa, E. (2001). Exploring ethnic, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision: Do they really matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 102-111.
- Getz, H. G. (1999). Assessment of clinical supervisor competencies. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 491-497.
- Granello, D. H. (2000). Encouraging the cognitive development of supervisees: Using Bloom's taxonomy in supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 31-46.
- Granello, D. H. (2003). Influence strategies in the supervisory dyad: An investigation into the effects of gender and age. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*, 189-202.

- Guest, C. L., Jr., &Dooley, K. (1999). Supervisor malpractice: Liability to the supervisee in clinical supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 269-279.
- Hart, G., Borders, L. D., Nance, D., &Paradise, L. (1995). Ethical guidelines for counseling supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 270-276.
- Hart, G. M., &Nance, D. (2003). Styles of counselor supervision as perceived by supervisors and supervisees. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 146-158.
- Hays, D. G., &Chang, C. Y. (2003). White privilege, oppression, and racial identity development: Implications for supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 134-144.
- Herlihy, B., Gray, N., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 55-60.
- Hird, J. S., Cavalieri, C. E., Dulko, J. P., Felice, A. A. D., & Ho, T. A. (2001). Visions and realities: Supervisee perspectives of multicultural supervision. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 114-130.
- Holloway, E. L., &Johnston, R. (1985). Group supervision: Widely practiced but poorly understood. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 24*, 332-340.
- Kagan (Klein), H., &Kagan, N. I. (1997). Interpersonal process recall: Influencing human interaction. In C. E. Watkins Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 296-309). New York: Wiley.
- Kahn, B. B. (1999). Priorities and practices in field supervision of school counseling students. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 128-136.
- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., &Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 447-455.
- Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 143-160.
- Ladany, N., Marotta, S., & Muse-Burke, J. L. (2001). Counselor experience related to complexity of case conceptualization and supervision preference. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 203-219.
- Ladany, N., & Melincoff, D. S. (1999). The nature of counselor supervisor nondisclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 161-176.
- Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory style: Its relation to the supervisory working alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 263-275.
- Larson, L. M., Day, S. X., Springer, S. H., Clark, M. P., &Vogel, D. L. (2003). Developing a supervisor feedback rating scale: A brief report. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 35*, 230-238.
- Larson, L. M., Suzuki, L. A., Gillespie, K. N., Potenza, M. T., Bechtel, M. A., & Toulouse, A. L. (1992). Development and validation of the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 105-120.
- Littrell, J. M., Lee-Borden, N., &Lorenz, J. A. (1979). A developmental framework for counseling supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 19*, 119-136.
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Wilcoxon, A. (2000). Clinical supervision of prelicensed counselors: Recommendations for consideration and practice. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 22*, 176-188.
- Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Wilcoxon, S. A. (2002). Clinical supervision for licensure: A consumer's guide. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 41*, 52-60.
- Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, S. A., & Norem, K. (2000). A profile of lousy supervision: Experienced counselors' perspectives. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 189-202.
- Manzanares, M. G., O'Halloran, T. M., McCartney, T. J., Filer, R. D., Varhely, S. C., & Calhoun, K. (2004). CD-ROM technology for education and support of site supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 220-231.
- McMahon, M. (2003). Supervision and career counsellors: A little-explored practice with an uncertain future. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 31*, 177-187.
- McMahon, M., &Patton, W. (2000). Career counsellors, support and lifelong learning: A case for clinical supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 22*, 157-169.
- McMahon, M., &Patton, W. (2000). Conversations on clinical supervision: Benefits perceived by school counsellors. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 28*, 339-351.

- McMahon, M., & Patton, W. (2001). Clinical supervision: The perception and experiences of school counselors in Australia. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 23*, 201-214.
- McMahon, M., & Simons, R. (2004). Supervision training for professional counselors: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 301-309.
- Miller, K. L., Miller, S. M., & Evans, W. J. (2002). Computer-assisted live supervision in college counseling centers. *Journal of College Counseling, 5*, 187-192.
- Montgomery, M. J., Hendricks, C. B., & Bradley, L. J. (2001). Using system perspectives in supervision. *The Family Journal, 9*, 305-313.
- Muratori, M. C. (2001). Examining supervisory impairment from the counselor trainee's perspective. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 41-56.
- Nelson, M. D., & Johnson, P. (1999). School counselors as supervisors: An integrated approach for supervising school counseling interns. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 89-100.
- Nelson, M. D., Johnson, P., & Thorngren, J. M. (2000). An integrated approach for supervising mental health counseling interns. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 22*, 45-58.
- Neswald-McCalip, R. (2001). Development of the secure counselor: Case examples supporting Pistole & Watkins's (1995) discussion of attachment theory in counseling supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 18-27.
- Neswald-McCalip, R., Sather, J., Strati, J. V., & Dineen, J. (2003). Exploring the process of creative supervision: Initial findings regarding the regenerative model. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 42*, 223-237.
- Page, B. J., Pietrzak, D. R., & Sutton, J. M., Jr. (2001). National survey of school counselor supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 142-150.
- Pearson, Q. M. (2001). A case in clinical supervision: A framework for putting theory into practice. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 23*, 174-183.
- Pearson, Q. M. (2004). Getting the most out of clinical supervision: Strategies for mental health counseling students. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 26*, 361-373.
- Polanski, P. J. (2003). Spirituality in supervision. *Counseling and Values, 47*, 131-141.
- Presbury, J., Echterling, L. G., & McKee, J. E. (1999). Supervision for inner vision: Solution-focused strategies. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 146-155.
- Ray, D., & Altekruze, M. (2000). Effectiveness of group supervision versus combined group and individual supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 19-30.
- Richards, K. (2000). Counsellor supervision in Zimbabwe: A new direction. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 22*, 143-155.
- Roberts, E. B., & Borders, L. D. (1994). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. *The School Counselor, 41*, 149-157.
- Roberts, W. B., Morotti, A. A., Herrick, C., & Tilbury, R. (2001). Site supervisors of professional school counseling interns: Suggested guidelines. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 208-215.
- Robinson, B., Bradley, L. J., & Hendricks, C. B. (2000). Multicultural counselling supervision: A four-step model toward competency. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 22*, 131-141.
- Schultz, J. C., Ososkie, J. N., Fried, J. H., Nelson, R. E., & Bardos, A. N. (2002). Clinical supervision in public rehabilitation counseling settings. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 45*, 213-222.
- Shechtman, Z., & Wirzberger, A. (1999). Needs and preferred style of supervision among Israeli school counselors at different stages of professional development. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 456-464.
- Sommer, C. A., & Cox, J. A. (2003). Using Greek mythology as a metaphor to enhance supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*, 326-335.
- Starling, P. V., & Baker, S. B. (2000). Structured peer group practicum supervision: Supervisees' perceptions of supervision theory. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 162-176.
- Steward, R. J., Breland, A., & Neil, D. M. (2001). Novice supervisees' self-evaluations and their perceptions of supervisory style. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 131-141.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W., & Delworth, U. (1998). *IDM supervision: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Studer, J. R. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 8*, 353-359.
- Sutton, J. M. (1997, January). *A descriptive study of the supervision of counselors as mandated by state statute and rule*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of State Counseling Boards, Hot Springs, AZ.
- Sutton, J. M., &Page, B. J. (1994). Post-degree clinical supervision of school counselors. *School Counselor, 42*, 32-39.
- Thielsen, V. A., &Leahy, M. J. (2001). Essential knowledge and skills for effective clinical supervision in rehabilitation counseling. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 44*, 196-208.
- Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 67-83.
- Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1994). The supervision of psychotherapy supervisor trainees. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 48*, 417-431.
- Wester, S. R., Vogel, D. L., &Archer, J., Jr. (2004). Male restricted emotionality and counseling supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 82*, 91-98.
- Wheeler, S., & King, D. (2000). Do counselling supervisors want or need to have their supervision supervised? An exploratory study. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 28*, 279-290.
- White, V. E., & Queener, J. (2003). Supervisor and supervisee attachments and social provisions related to the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*, 203-218.
- Zorga, S., Dekleva, B., & Kobolt, A. (2001). The process of internal evaluation as a tool for improving peer supervision. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 23*, 151-162.