Effects of Supervisor and Supervisee Theoretical Orientation and Supervisor–Supervisee Matching on Interns' Perceptions of Supervision

Martha W. Putney
Counseling Services, University of South Florida

Everett L. Worthington, Jr., and Michael E. McCullough
Virginia Commonwealth University

Effects of supervisor and supervisee theoretical orientation on supervisees' perceptions of supervisors' models, roles, and foci were studied, as were variables influencing quality of supervision and supervisee autonomy. Interns ($N = 84$) from 32 nationwide training sites were surveyed. Cognitive–behavioral supervisors were perceived to be in a consultant role and to focus on skills and strategies more than were humanistic, psychodynamic, and existential supervisors, who were perceived more as using the relationship model, playing the therapist role, and focusing on conceptualization. Supervisors were not perceived to differ in their use of growth and skill development models, teacher role, and focus on the supervisee. Women were perceived as more effective supervisors than were men. Perceived effectiveness was predicted by theoretical match and similarity. Supervisee autonomy was predicted by theoretical similarity, low supervisor adherence to theory, and unmatched gender.

Of the many published studies of supervision, few have investigated theoretical orientation. Those that have have dealt exclusively with supervisors' orientations (Goodyear, Abadie, & Efros, 1984; Goodyear & Robyak, 1982), especially the theoretical orientation of expert supervisors.

The theoretical orientations of supervisees has been rarely studied because most studies of supervision either investigate beginning level trainees, who have not yet developed a theory of therapy, or they compare beginning and advanced practicum trainees (Worthington, 1987). In fact, only a few studies have dealt exclusively with an advanced supervisee population. In one example, Zucker and Worthington (1986) compared predoctoral interns and postdoctoral applicants for licensure. In another example, Rabinowitz, Heppner, and Roehlke (1986) compared interns to predoctoral trainees with less experience.

Interns are likely to differ from lower level supervisees in several ways. Interns have usually completed all doctoral level coursework, have seen more clients, and have received more supervision than practicum students who have not yet begun internship. Also, developmental theorists and researchers (see Worthington, 1987, for review) suggest that interns have acquired skills that are different from those of lower level trainees. Interns are more likely to have articulated and implemented their own counseling theories than are lower level trainees (Hill, Charles, & Reed, 1981). Therefore, it is important to investigate the relationship between interns' and supervisors' theoretical orientations, and how such a theoretical interface influences supervision.

Although little is known about the variables that influence the effectiveness of supervision and autonomy with intern-level supervisees, several variables have been identified as possible determinants of effectiveness and supervisee autonomy with lower level supervisees. These include: supervisor theory (Friedlander, Keller, Peca-Baker, & Olk, 1986; Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Goodyear et al., 1984; Goodyear & Robyak, 1982; Holloway, Freund, Gardner, Nelson, & Walker, 1989; Liddle & Halpin, 1978; Martin, Goodyear, & Newton, 1987; Miars et al., 1983; Patterson, 1964), supervisee theory (Patterson, 1983), theoretical similarity (Friedlander et al., 1986; Kennard, Stewart, & Gluck, 1987), supervisor experience (Marikis, Russell, & Dell, 1985; Worthington & Stern, 1985), and supervisor and supervisee gender (Maracek & Johnson, 1980; Munson, 1987; Nelson & Holloway, 1990; Worthington & Stern, 1985).

The fundamental assumption on which much of the present investigation is based, stated generically, is that environment–person congruence on essential variables is beneficial to interpersonal influence such as that which occurs during supervision. Stoltenberg (1981) has most forcefully articulated this position in his counselor complexity model, which was expanded by Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987). This model harkens back to Williamson's (1939) trait-and-factor approach to counseling for a major part of its intellectual roots. From another tradition, Brunswick (1943) might be seen as an intellectual ancestor of environment–person matching, and behavioral approaches have always lauded the power of environmental variables, though they have been reluctant until recently to give much credence to the power of person variables.

Obviously, the key to validating a person–environment assumption is finding crucial variables on which to match supervisors and supervisees. Stoltenberg (1981) suggested that counselor developmental level is a crucial variable, and evi-

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Everett L. Worthington, Jr., Department of Psychology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Box 2018, 800 West Franklin Street, Richmond, Virginia 23284-2018.

dence has accumulated to support this contention (see Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987). In the present investigation, developmental level is roughly controlled by examining interns alone (thus limiting differences in developmental level, though not eliminating them). Different literatures support two other important variables on which matching is often recommended: theory of counseling and gender. Some experimental evidence has suggested that matching on these variables is important to effective supervision (see citations in the introductory passages of the present article).

Many theories other than person–environment matching have attempted to predict effective supervision. Some theorists suggest that different models of supervision—skill development, personal growth, or relationship—affect supervision differentially (Hart, 1982; Mead, 1990). Role theorists have suggested that supervisory roles such as consultant, therapist, or teacher can also differentially affect counselors (Bernard, 1979). Finally, supervisors focusing on counseling skills, the supervisee as a person, and client conceptualization are thought to influence effectiveness of supervision (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). In each case, model, role, and focus are treated as if they were independent variables affecting the effectiveness of supervision. Goodyear et al., (1984) have suggested that "theoretical orientation is related to a supervisor's manifest behaviors, roles, and attitudes" (p. 234). Whereas Goodyear et al. suggested a correlational relationship between theoretical orientation and supervisory behaviors, roles, and attitudes, in the present study, we investigated theoretical orientation of supervisor, supervisee, and their match (or mismatch) as independent variables that might predict perceptions of supervisors' models, roles, and foci.

The present study examines the extent to which theoretical persuasions of supervisor and supervisee (and their interaction) affect interns' perceptions of their supervisors. Perceptions include the supervisors' adherence to (a) a skill development, personal growth, or relationship *model*, (b) a consultant, therapist, or teacher *role*, and (c) a *focus* on counseling skills, the supervisee as a person, or conceptualization of the client. Obviously, these various models, roles, and foci are not mutually exclusive, but it is likely that supervisors favor models, roles, and foci that are consistent with their theories of counseling and that supervisors likely use these favored models, roles, and foci with greater frequency than those that are inconsistent with their theories of counseling. This would suggest a main effect of supervisor theory on models, roles, and foci of supervision. A person–environment matching hypothesis would suggest that supervisee theoretical orientation and interaction between supervisor and supervisee theoretical orientation would affect perceptions of the supervisor's selection of models, roles, and foci of supervision.

As a second hypothesis, we examined a variety of variables as predictors of supervisees' perceptions of their supervisors' effectiveness. The present study examines 13 variables, including supervisor and supervisee theoretical persuasion, strength of the supervisor's adherence to theory, perceived degree of theoretical match, and amount of supervision experience of the supervisor, which are considered within a stepwise multiple regression to predict perceived supervisor effectiveness. Gender and gender matching were also evalu-

ated as predictors of perceived supervisor effectiveness (Nelson & Holloway, 1990).

For its third hypothesis, the present study seeks to predict correlates of perceived intern autonomy by using the same 13 variables. The assumption is that matching on important variables may free the supervisee at the intern level to act independently. The intern who must function within the supervisor's theoretical framework (not shared by the intern) must depend for more guidance and instruction on the supervisor, hampering intern autonomy. Gender matching is also thought potentially to affect intern autonomy, through creating less heightened awareness of gender tensions than in cross-gender pairings. Other hypotheses relating gender matching and autonomy are available, but the present study focuses on person–environment matching as the organizing theoretical construct.

Method

Participants

Participants were interns ($N = 84$) from 14 American Psychological Association (APA)-approved counseling psychology training sites ($n = 38$) and 17 APA-approved clinical ($n = 46$) psychology training sites throughout the United States. Of the supervisory pairs, 64 were theoretically matched (14 identifying themselves as primarily cognitive–behavioral and 50 identifying themselves as primarily humanistic or psychodynamic), and 20 were theoretically unmatched (10 consisting of cognitive–behavioral supervisors and 10 consisting of humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors). There were 52 male and 32 female supervisors and 36 male and 48 female supervisees. In terms of gender match, there were 40 matched supervisory dyads and 44 unmatched dyads. Of the 40 matched dyads, 22 consisted of male supervisors and supervisees. Of the 44 unmatched dyads, 30 consisted of male supervisors and female supervisees. Participants completed questionnaires based on their perceptions of their supervisors' behaviors and of the supervisory relationship.

Instruments

Personal data sheet. The personal data sheet, which was created for the present study, solicits the supervisee's age, gender, theoretical orientation, and strength of orientation. Supervisees classified their theoretical orientation according to whether it was closer to "Behavioral, Cognitive, or Cognitive–Behavioral," or to "Humanistic, Existential, Psychoanalytic, or Psychodynamic," or neither, and rated their strength of orientation on a scale ranging from *not strongly at all* (1) to *very strongly* (4).

Supervisor data sheet. On the supervisor data sheet, which was also created for the present study, supervisees provided the following information about their supervisors: age; gender; theoretical orientation; strength of orientation, measured on a scale ranging from *not strongly at all* (1) to *very strongly* (4); approximate number of intern-level supervisees supervised; the number of years of postdoctoral therapy experience for supervisors; and whether the supervisor had taken a formal course in supervision. If the supervisee was unsure of how to answer any item, he or she was instructed to ask the supervisor.

Two variables measured theoretical match within supervisory dyads. Perceived theoretical similarity was determined with the item, "How closely matched are you and your supervisor in terms of theory of therapy?" Participants marked responses on a 4-point scale ranging from *not at all matched* (1) to *totally matched* (4). Theoretical match

was computed from participants' ratings of their own and their supervisors' theories of therapy. If both supervisor and supervisee were in the same theoretical group (cognitive–behavioral or humanistic–psychodynamic), they were considered matched. Otherwise, they were considered unmatched.

The supervisor data sheet also included a 4-point Likert-type item ranging from *do things the supervisor's way* (1) to *do things the supervisee's way* (4), which asked supervisees to rate the degree of autonomy that they believed to be encouraged by their supervisors.

Supervision Questionnaire–Revised (SQ-R). The SQ-R is an adaptation of Worthington and Roehlke's (1979) Supervision Questionnaire, designed to assess perceptions of beginning practicum students of frequencies of 42 supervisor behaviors on a scale ranging from *never or very infrequently descriptive of my supervisor's behavior* (1) to *perfectly descriptive of my supervisor's behavior* (5). Worthington (1984) added 6 additional items, creating the SQ-R. The SQ-R has been found to have 6-week test–retest reliability (Worthington, 1985). For example, test–retest ratings of satisfaction ($r = .70$) and impact of supervision ($r = .87$) were significantly correlated. Ratings of supervisor competence were not significantly correlated ($r = .28$). For individual items, test–retest ratings of 25 of 48 behaviors were correlated at .7 or better ($p < .01$) over the 6-week interval. The construct validity has been supported in a variety of studies (for a review, see Worthington, 1987). Furthermore, even though the questionnaire was developed originally for evaluating beginning practicum students, the SQ-R has demonstrated construct validity when used with all levels of counselors from beginning counselors through postdoctoral licensure applicants.

Zucker (1983/1984) factor analyzed the SQ-R. The three factors (in the order extracted) were named (a) Technical Assistance, which emphasized skill development; (b) Support, which emphasized a focus on the supervisory relationship; and (c) Use of Process, which emphasized using supervision to stimulate the supervisee's personal growth. These factor scores were used to operationalize Hart's (1982) concepts of skill development, relationship, and personal growth models for supervision, respectively.

Supervisor role questionnaire. The supervisor role questionnaire is the adaptation of Bernard's model (1979) used previously by Goodyear et al. (1984). Supervisees rank their supervisor's relative use of the three roles of consultant, counselor, and teacher on a scale ranging from *most frequently used* (1) to *least frequently used* (3).

Supervisor focus questionnaire. The supervisor focus questionnaire is the adaptation of Bernard's (1979) model used previously by Goodyear et al. (1984). Supervisees rank their supervisors' relative emphasis, on a scale ranging from *most heavily emphasized* (1) to *least heavily emphasized* (3), on the three foci of the supervisees' (a) technical skills and strategies, (b) therapeutic use of their own personality styles and personal reactions during counseling, and (c) conceptualization of client dynamics.

Supervisor effectiveness questionnaire. The supervisor effectiveness questionnaire asks supervisees to rate the perceived effectiveness of their supervision in terms of the magnitude of the effect supervision has on improvement in client behavior change, supervisees' confidence as therapists, and supervisees' personal growth from supervision on a scale ranging from *no effect* (1) to *very large effect* (7). These 3 items were previously used by Cross and Brown (1983); they lack reliability and validity data. These items from the supervision effectiveness questionnaire were combined with 3 items from the SQ-R to derive an index of supervision effectiveness.

Procedure

APA provisionally or fully approved internship training sites ($N = 51$) were randomly selected from among those listed in the thirteenth edition (1984–1985) of the Association of Psychology Internship Centers' (APIC) *Directory of Internship Programs in Professional Psychology* (Association of Psychology Internship Centers Executive Committee, 1984). Of the sites, 26 were in medical school settings that accept mostly interns from clinical psychology programs, and 25 sites were university counseling centers, training mostly (but not necessarily only) interns from counseling psychology graduate programs. Of the 51 sites, 31 sites participated. Training directors who participated (14 counseling and 17 clinical programs) received surveys to distribute to all of their interns. Interns' packets of questionnaires were coded, and training directors supplied names of interns associated with each code number. Two weeks after surveys were distributed, the senior author sent a letter to interns who had not returned their surveys reminding them to complete their surveys. No additional follow-up attempts were initiated. Of the 31 internship sites participating, 84 of 151 (56%) surveys that were originally sent to training directors were completed and returned.

Design

To test the first hypothesis, three 2 (supervisor theory) × 2 (supervisee theory) multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted. The three analyses used as dependent variables related measures of each supervisee's perception of the supervisor's use of (a) model, (b) role, and (c) focus, respectively. The second and third hypotheses were tested using stepwise multiple regression.

Results

Effects of Theoretical Orientation

Means and standard deviations for major variables are given in Table 1. In general, supervisor theory but not supervisee theory or theoretical similarity was related to supervisees' perceptions of the models, roles, and foci of their supervisors. Although theoretical similarity between supervisors and supervisees was not related to perceptions of how supervisors conducted supervision, it was strongly related to both perceived effectiveness of supervision and perceptions of intern autonomy. Gender was found to relate to perceived supervisor effectiveness and gender matching was found to relate to interns' perceptions of their autonomy.

Model. A 2 (supervisor theory) × 2 (supervisee theory) MANOVA was performed with supervisory models (skill development, relationship, personal growth) as dependent variables. There was a significant multivariate main effect for supervisor theory on type of supervisory model, multivariate $F(3, 78) = 6.03$, $p < .001$. Post hoc univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) revealed that humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors were perceived to emphasize the supervisory relationship significantly more than were cognitive–behavioral supervisors, $F(1, 80) = 4.98$, $p < .05$. There were no differences for skill development and personal growth models. There were no multivariate differences in type of supervisory model with regard to supervisee theory. No significant multivariate interaction effects were found.

Role. A 2 × 2 MANOVA was performed with perceived roles (consultant, counselor, teacher) as dependent variables. There was a significant multivariate effect for supervisor theory, multivariate $F(3, 76) = 2.78$, $p < .05$. Post hoc ANOVAs revealed that cognitive–behavioral supervisors were perceived to assume the consultant role significantly more

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Three Supervisory Models, Roles, and Foci for Supervisors and Supervisees of Similar and Different Theoretical Orientation

| | Supervisor CB | | | | Supervisor HP | | | |
| | Supervisee CB ($n = 14$) | | Supervisee HB ($n = 10$) | | Supervisee CB ($n = 10$) | | Supervisee HB ($n = 50$) | |
Dependent variable	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Supervisory model*								
Relationship[a]*	38.00	9.57	38.50	7.26	40.70	6.80	42.62	7.88
Skill development[b]	65.64	16.05	64.60	11.13	70.00	10.82	67.62	10.38
Personal growth[c]	74.21	18.49	72.80	12.34	74.20	15.26	70.88	16.72
Supervisory role*								
Consultant[d]*	1.79	1.12	1.30	0.48	1.40	0.70	1.80	1.31
Therapist[d]*	2.86	1.65	2.90	0.32	2.40	0.97	2.54	1.22
Teacher[d]*	2.36	1.98	1.80	0.63	2.00	0.47	2.06	1.22
Supervisory focus*								
Skills/strategies[d]*	1.50	0.76	1.70	0.82	2.50	0.53	2.34	1.22
Personhood[d]	2.21	0.80	1.70	0.82	1.80	0.92	2.20	1.31
Conceptualization[d]*	2.14	0.77	2.40	0.70	1.50	0.53	1.78	1.25

Note. CB = cognitive–behavioral orientation (including cognitive, behavioral, and cognitive–behavioral); HP = humanistic–psychodynamic orientation (including humanistic, existential, psychoanalytic, and psychodynamic).

[a] Range 14–70; higher scores indicate more frequent use. [b] Range 21–105; higher scores indicate more frequent use. [c] Range 20–100; higher scores indicate more frequent use. [d] Range 1–3; higher scores indicate *less* frequent use.

* Main effects for supervisor theory were significant at $p < .05$ or better, multivariate or univariate. No main effects were significant at $p < .05$ for supervisee theory, and no interactions were significant.

than were humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors, $F(1, 78) = 3.95$, $p < .05$, whereas humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors were perceived to assume the therapist role significantly more than were cognitive–behavioral supervisors, $F(1, 78) = 8.26$, $p < .01$. No differences existed between the two groups with respect to their perceived assumption of the teacher role. There were no multivariate differences in supervisory roles with regard to supervisee theory, nor were there multivariate interaction effects.

Focus. A 2×2 MANOVA was performed with perceived supervisor foci (skills/strategies, personality, conceptualization) as dependent variables. There was a significant main effect for supervisor theory, multivariate $F(3, 76) = 8.00$, $p < .0001$. ANOVAs revealed that cognitive–behavioral supervisors were perceived to focus on supervisees' mastery of skills and strategies more than were humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors, $F(1, 79) = 13.78$, $p < .0001$, and humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors were perceived to focus on supervisees' conceptualization of client dynamics more than did cognitive–behavioral supervisors, $F(1, 79) = 14.52$, $p < .0001$. There were no differences between the groups with respect to their perceived focus on the therapeutic use of the supervisee's personality and personal reactions. There were no multivariate differences with regard to supervisee theory, nor were there multivariate interaction effects.

Effectiveness

A stepwise multiple regression equation using 13 variables to predict perceived supervisor effectiveness was tested. The 13 variables were the following: supervisor theory and strength of adherence, supervisee theory and strength of adherence,

theoretical match, perceived theoretical similarity, supervisor gender, supervisee gender, gender match, and four measures of supervisor experience (supervision coursework, total number of supervisees, number of interns supervised, and number of years of postdoctoral therapy experience). Stepwise multiple regression was selected because little theory specifically addresses the order of these 13 variables, which were used to predict perceived supervisor effectiveness (and in a later analysis, perceived supervisee autonomy). Three variables predicted perceived supervisor effectiveness: greater perceived theoretical similarity, $F(1, 68) = 30.30$, $p < .0001$; greater degree of theoretical match, $F(1, 68) = 7.50$, $p < .01$; and supervisor gender (female supervisors were perceived as more effective than male supervisors), $F(1, 68) = 4.02$, $p < .05$. This three-variable model is significantly predictive of effectiveness, $F(3, 72) = 15.38$, $p < .0001$.

Autonomy

Of the same 13 predictor variables, three variables predicted supervisee autonomy: lack of a gender match, $F(1, 68) = 7.51$, $p < .01$; perceived similarity of theoretical orientation, $F(1, 68) = 5.21$, $p < .05$; and less supervisor strength of adherence to theory, $F(1, 68) = 8.46$, $p < .01$. This three-variable model is significantly predictive of supervisee autonomy, $F(3, 72) = 7.65$, $p < .01$.

Discussion

Limitations

The present study must be interpreted cautiously because of methodological weaknesses. All ratings were made by in-

terns and thus reflect intern perceptions of supervision, which may not be shared by supervisors. Since it has been shown repeatedly that supervisors and supervisees differ in their perceptions of supervision (Ellis, Dell, & Good, 1988; Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Krause & Allen, 1988; Wiley & Ray, 1986; Worthington & Stern, 1985), it is a particularly salient limitation that only one member of the supervisory dyad was surveyed in this investigation. Furthermore, many of the measuring instruments, while having been used in previous published research, have little psychometric support. Third, supervisors and supervisees were placed in broad theoretical categories. Cognitive, behavioral, and cognitive–behavioral therapies share a problem-solving focus but differ on important methods and philosophies. Similarly, humanistic, existential, psychoanalytic, and psychodynamic therapies share a general emphasis on emotional and unconscious issues but differ on important methods and philosophies. Forcing supervisees to identify theoretical orientations with only two broad categories obscures all but macroscopic distinctions. Even with these limitations, though, some suggestive findings emerged from the present study.

Implications for a Matching Model of Supervision

Generally, the supervisor's theoretical orientation but not the supervisee's theoretical orientation affected the supervisee's perceptions of the supervisor's model, role, and focus. This suggests that the conduct of a supervision session may generally be determined by the supervisor's method. The absence of significant interactions between supervisor and supervisee theory suggests that supervisors' styles (model, role, and focus) are relatively fixed (Holloway, 1984; Holloway et al., 1989). Furthermore, supervisors may not easily modify their supervisory styles to match perceived needs of their supervisees.

On the other hand, neither supervisors' nor supervisees' theories predicted perceived supervisor effectiveness. Perceived theoretical matching predicted perceived effectiveness. This may suggest that matching (or not) may occur on two levels, each with its own effect. On one level, the supervisor's method of conducting supervision appears to be theoretically driven. Yet, within any theory-driven method, the supervisor will be perceived as more or less effective to the degree that he or she (a) works within the content of the supervisee's theory and (b) uses a method and content that matches the supervisee's. The positive influence of theoretical similarity of supervisor and supervisee on supervisee satisfaction has been identified elsewhere (Kennard et al., 1987).

Three variables were predictive of perceived supervisee autonomy. Supervisory dyads in which supervisor and supervisee were of different genders and of similar theoretical orientation, and in which supervisors were weakly adherent to their theoretical orientations, encouraged supervisee autonomy. This expands the findings of Nelson and Holloway (1990), who found that both male and female supervisors encouraged males supervisees' autonomy but often discouraged female supervisees' autonomy.

Thus, supervisors may rarely match their methods to their supervisees, yet such matching is predictive of perceived ef-

fectiveness of supervision and autonomy of intern supervisees. Taken together, these results suggest that for effective supervision, internship sites pay special attention to assigning interns to supervisors who already share a theoretical similarity to the intern.

Effects of Supervisor Theory on Perceptions of Supervisor Model, Role, and Focus

Concerning supervisory model, supervisees perceived their humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors to act more in line with Hart's (1982) relationship model, which stresses the relationship between supervisor and supervisee, than did their cognitive–behavioral supervisors. Goodyear and Bradley (1983) and Doehrman (1976) report that relationship concerns are central to the approaches of supervisors with theoretical orientations similar to those of supervisors in the humanistic–psychodynamic group. There were no differences in the extent to which each group of supervisees perceived their supervisors to use Hart's (1982) skill development model or personal growth model. Hart (1982) suggests that the skill development model is a viable approach for beginning supervisees. Supervisors may perceive intern-level supervisees as having surpassed the need for a skill development approach, regardless of the supervisor's theoretical orientation (Guest & Beutler, 1988; Tracey, Ellickson, & Sherry, 1989). This supposition is consistent with many developmental theorists (Littrell, Lee-Borden, & Lorenz, 1979; Sansbury, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981). However, several theorists (Hess, 1986; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982) suggest that skills development remains an important feature of supervision across levels of supervisee experience (though at increasingly higher levels of abstraction). Furthermore, supervisors of both theoretical persuasions were not perceived as using a personal growth model differently.

Cognitive–behavioral supervisors were perceived to assume Bernard's (1979) consultant role more than were humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors, and humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors were perceived to assume the therapist role more than were cognitive–behavioral supervisors. However, there were no differences between the two groups in perceived assumption of the teacher role.

The consultant role rests on the assumption that supervisees should express their supervisory needs (Bernard, 1979). This implies that the consultant takes the supervisee's reporting of needs at face value, rather than relying on more indirect means of determining supervisee needs. Supervisors with cognitive and behavioral orientations might have been likely to ask about their supervisee's needs and deal directly with the needs, reflecting a problem-solving focus. Such a focus on observable behavior and/or reported cognitions would likely lead cognitive–behavioral supervisors to choose a role that allows them to use this focus in supervision. In contrast, humanistic and psychodynamic supervisors may have been more likely to attribute behavior to unrecognized psychodynamic forces (Bordin, 1983; Doehrman, 1976), focusing on personal aspects of their supervisees. Friedlander and Ward (1984) also found psychodynamic supervisors to be more

interpersonally sensitive and less task oriented than cognitive-behavioral supervisors.

Similar to the skill development model, the teacher role may be seldom used with advanced supervisees. As interns, the supervisees in this sample may have been seen by their supervisors as having advanced beyond the need to be taught basic skills and knowledge. Although this hypothesis is supported by developmental theorists (Blount, 1982; Littrell et al., 1979; Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981) and has been supported in several empirical investigations (Reising & Daniels, 1983; Zucker & Worthington, 1986), the evidence is not unequivocal (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Worthington, 1984). A particularly strong suggestion that supervision—even with advanced supervisees—involves the teaching role comes from the extensive analyses of the videotapes of Goodyear's (1982) *Psychotherapy Supervision by Major Theorists*. Friedlander and Ward (1984), Goodyear et al. (1984), and Holloway et al. (1989) have shown that teaching is a primary component in the videotapes of experts demonstrating their theoretical approach to supervision. The generality of the findings of such research is limited, especially given the strong demands of a demonstration videotape to be an exemplar of each theorist's system.

With regard to supervisory focus, if one assumes that supervisors supervise the way they do therapy, then cognitive-behavioral supervisors would be expected to concern themselves more with changing their supervisee's use of skills and strategies. Likewise, humanistic–psychodynamic supervisors should tend to focus on helping their supervisees to assess their clients' dynamics. Goodyear and Bradley (1983) and Guest and Beutler (1988) supported the finding that there were no perceived differences in supervisors' focus on the person of the supervisee.

Relations of Theoretical Matching and Gender to Perceived Effectiveness

Results supported the hypothesis that both perceived theoretical similarity and theoretical match would predict effectiveness. If supervision effectiveness is the extent to which supervision increases the supervisee's ability to be a competent therapist, similar theoretical orientation will give both members of the dyad similar criteria for therapist competence; thus, the supervisor will help the supervisee meet the supervisee's criteria for competence. Supervisees will feel more competent as they meet the criteria they have set for measuring competence and will therefore rate their supervision as being more effective. Though Kennard et al. (1987) report similar findings, Handley (1982) found results to the contrary.

Although female supervisors were perceived to be more effective than male supervisors in the present study, other studies (Kennard et al., 1987; Worthington & Stern, 1985) have found opposite results. The discrepancy may be related to the large proportion of women in the present study's theoretically matched humanistic–psychodynamic supervisory dyads. In humanistic–psychodynamic supervision, a relationship-oriented approach is more frequently used. Women appear to be more relationship oriented than are men (Maracek & Johnson, 1980; Walker & Stake, 1978), although

Nelson and Holloway (1990) found the power inherent in the supervisory situation to overshadow such gender differences.

Relations of Theoretical Similarity and Gender Matching to Perceived Supervisee Autonomy

Because perceived theoretical similarity between supervisor and supervisee was predictive of perceived supervisee autonomy, it may be true that supervisors allow supervisees more freedom when the supervisee's theory corresponds closely to the supervisor's theory. At least, supervisees may not attend as closely to perceived restrictions on their counseling behavior because conflict over theoretical perspective is not present.

When supervisors are perceived to adhere strongly to their own theoretical persuasion, interns perceive themselves to have less autonomy than with weakly adherent supervisors. Supervisors who are strongly adherent to their theories may be more invested in their approach as compared to other theories and thus may be more inclined to believe that theirs is the "best" way for their supervisees to do things (see Leddick & Dye, 1987). Such restriction, whether veridical, may be assumed by supervisees.

Perhaps the unexpected finding that supervisory dyads that were unmatched for gender allowed more supervisee autonomy can be attributed to sex role stereotyping. Brodsky (1980) states that supervisors' sex role stereotypes influence supervision. Socialization may encourage supervisors to allow supervisees of the other sex to conduct therapy as the supervisees see fit, since allowing greater autonomy probably decreases the likelihood of there being conflict in the relationship. The finding that unmatched gender pairs were related to more perceived supervisee autonomy is consonant with findings of Robyak, Goodyear, Prange, and Donham (1986). They found that male and female supervisors used different power bases in supervision with female supervisees. The present findings are not in complete accord with Nelson and Holloway (1990). They found differential treatment of men and women in the supervisee roles. Generally, women were reinforced less frequently for high-power messages than were males, regardless of the gender of the supervisor. In the present study, male supervisor–female supervisee pairs ($n = 30$) and other gender unmatched pairs ($n = 14$) were perceived to foster supervisee autonomy more than were gender-matched pairs (male, $n = 22$; female, $n = 18$). Differences in methodology may account for the differences in findings between the two studies. Nelson and Holloway (1990) analyzed supervision discourse, whereas, the present study measured supervisees' perceptions. It is conceivable that differences in supervisees' perceptions could exist despite the existence of differences in behavior of supervisors. The issue of gender in supervision is extremely complicated, with a need to account for at least four major variables that may interact: (a) gender, (b) sex role beliefs and behaviors of supervisor and supervisee, (c) gender match, and (d) theoretical match.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future investigations of the influence of theoretical matching on supervision would benefit from direct behavioral meas-

ures, comparisons of different training sites, and the use of an open-ended format for assessing theoretical orientation, in order to access information about more of the specific theories in use. Future research should examine both supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions of supervision. Furthermore, it remains to be investigated how supervisor and supervisee theory and theoretical similarity influence supervision process (e.g., using sequential analysis), as well as supervision outcome (e.g., by examining counselor behavior in subsequent counseling sessions).

References

Association of Psychology Internship Centers Executive Committee. (1984). *Directory of internship programs in professional psychology* (13th ed.). Washington, DC: Association of Psychology Internship Centers.

Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 19,* 60–68.

Blount, C. M. (1982, August). *A developmental model of supervision: Implications for practice and research.* Paper presented at the 90th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working-alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 35–42.

Brodsky, A. M. (1980). Sex role issues in the supervision of therapy. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), *Psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 509–522). New York: Wiley.

Brunswick, E. (1943). Organismic achievement and environmental probability. *Psychological Review, 50,* 255–272.

Cross, D. G., & Brown, D. (1983). Counselor supervision as a function of trainee experience: Analysis of specific behaviors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 4,* 333–341.

Doehrman, M. (1976). Parallel process in supervision and psychotherapy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 48,* 9–104.

Ellis, M. V., Dell, D. M., & Good, G. E. (1988). Counselor trainees' perceptions of supervisor roles: Two studies testing the dimensionality of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35,* 315–324.

Friedlander, M. L., Keller, K. E., Peca-Baker, T. A., & Olk, M. E. (1986). Effects of role conflict on counselor trainees' self-statements, anxiety level, and performance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33,* 73–77.

Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, G. W. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31,* 541–557.

Goodyear, R. K. (1982). *Psychotherapy supervision by major theorists* [Videotape series]. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University Instructional Media Center.

Goodyear, R. K., Abadie, P. D., & Efros, F. (1984). Supervisory theory into practice: Differential perception of supervision by Ekstein, Ellis, Polster, and Rogers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31,* 228–237.

Goodyear, R. K., & Bradley, F. O. (1983). Theories of counselor supervision: Points of convergence and divergence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 59–67.

Goodyear, R. K., & Robyak, J. E. (1982). Supervisor's theory and experience in supervisory focus. *Psychological Reports, 51,* 978.

Guest, P. D., & Beutler, L. E. (1988). Impact of supervision on therapist orientation and values. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56,* 653–658.

Handley, P. (1982). Relationship between supervisors' and trainees' cognitive styles and the supervision process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29,* 508–515.

Hart, G. M. (1982). *The process of clinical supervision.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1984). Differences among supervisees at different levels of training: Implications for a developmental model of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31,* 76–90.

Hess, A. K. (1986). Growth in supervision: Stages of supervisee and supervisor development. *The Clinical Supervisor, 4,* 51–67.

Hill, C. E., Charles, D., & Reed, K. G. (1981). A longitudinal analysis of changes in counseling skills during doctoral training in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28,* 428–436.

Holloway, E. L. (1984). Outcome evaluation in supervision research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*(1), 167–174.

Holloway, E. L., Freund, R. D., Gardner, S. L., Nelson, M. L., & Walker, B. R. (1989). Relation of power and involvement to theoretical orientation in supervision: An analysis of discourse. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36,* 88–102.

Kennard, B. D., Stewart, S. M., & Gluck, M. R. (1987). The supervision relationship: Variables contributing to positive versus negative experiences. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18,* 172–175.

Krause, A. A., & Allen, G. J. (1988). Perceptions of counselor supervision: An examination of Stoltenberg's model from the perspectives of supervisor and supervisee. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35,* 77–80.

Leddick, G. R., & Dye, H. A. (1987). Effective supervision as portrayed by trainee expectations and preferences. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27,* 139–154.

Liddle, H. A., & Halpin, R. J. (1978). Family therapy training and supervision literature: A comparative review. *Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 4,* 77–98.

Littrell, J. M., Lee-Borden, N., & Lorenz, J. A. (1979). A developmental framework for counseling supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 19,* 129–136.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(1), 3–42.

Maracek, J., & Johnson, M. (1980). Gender and the process of therapy. In A. M. Brodsky & R. T. Hare-Mustin (Eds.), *Women and psychotherapy: An assessment of research and practice* (pp. 67–93). New York: Guilford Press.

Marikis, D. A., Russell, R. K., & Dell, D. M. (1985). Effects of supervisor experience level on planning and in-session supervisor verbal behavior. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32,* 410–416.

Martin, J. S., Goodyear, R. K., & Newton, F. B. (1987). Clinical supervision: An intensive case study. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18,* 236–243.

Mead, D. E. (1990). *Effective supervision: A task-oriented model for the mental health professions.* New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Miars, R. D., Tracey, T. J., Ray, P. B., Cornfeld, J. L., O'Farrell, M., & Gelso, C. J. (1983). Variation in supervision process across trainee experience levels. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30,* 403–412.

Munson, C. E. (1987). Sex roles and power relationships in supervision. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18,* 236–243.

Nelson, M. L., & Holloway, E. L. (1990). Relation of gender to power and involvement in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37,* 473–481.

Patterson, C. H. (1964). Supervising students in the counseling practicum. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 11,* 47–53.

Patterson, C. H. (1983). A client-centered approach to supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 21–25.

Rabinowitz, F. E., Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1986). Descriptive study of process and outcome variables of supervision over time. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33,* 292–300.

Reising, G. N., & Daniels, M. H. (1983). A study of Hogan's model

of counselor development and supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 235–244.

Robyak, J. E., Goodyear, R. K., Prange, M. E., & Donham, G. (1986). Effects of gender, supervision, and presenting problems on practicum students' preference for interpersonal power bases. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 159–163.

Sansbury, D. L. (1982). Developmental supervision from a skills perspective. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(1), 53–57.

Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 59–65.

Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists: A developmental approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tracey, T. J., Ellickson, J. L., & Sherry, P. (1989). Reactance in relation to different supervisory environments and counselor development. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 336–344.

Walker, E. F., & Stake, J. E. (1978). Changes in preference for male and female counselors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 1153–1154.

Wiley, M. O., & Ray, P. B. (1986). Counseling supervision by developmental level. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 439–445.

Williamson, E. G. (1939). *How to counsel students: A manual of techniques for clinical counselors.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1984). Empirical investigation of supervision

of counselors as they gain experience. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 63–75.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1985). *Six-week test–retest reliability of the SQ-R.* Unpublished manuscript, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1987). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience: A review. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 189–208.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26*, 64–73.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Stern, A. (1985). Effects of supervisor and supervisee degree level and gender on the supervisory relationship. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*, 252–262.

Zucker, P. J. (1984). An examination of advanced counseling and psychotherapy supervision (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1983). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 45*, 1035B.

Zucker, P. J., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1986). Supervision of interns and postdoctoral applicants for licensure in university counseling centers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 87–89.

MEMBERS OF UNDERREPRESENTED GROUPS: REVIEWERS FOR JOURNAL MANUSCRIPTS WANTED

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts for APA journals, the APA Publications and Communications Board would like to invite your participation. Manuscript reviewers are vital to the publication process. As a reviewer, you would gain valuable experience in publishing. The P&C Board is particularly interested in encouraging members of underrepresented groups to participate more in this process.

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts, please write to Leslie Cameron at the address below. Please note the following important points:

• To be selected as a reviewer, you must have published articles in peer-reviewed journals. The experience of publishing provides a reviewer with the basis for preparing a thorough, objective review.

• To select the appropriate reviewers for each manuscript, the editor needs detailed information. Please include with your letter your vita. In your letter, please identify which APA journal you are interested in and describe your area of expertise. Be as specific as possible. For example, "social psychology" is not sufficient—you would need to specify "social cognition" or "attitude change" as well.

• Reviewing a manuscript takes time. If you are selected to review a manuscript, be prepared to invest the necessary time to evaluate the manuscript thoroughly.

Write to Leslie Cameron, Journals Office, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242.