

A Study of Hogan's Model of Counselor Development and Supervision

Gregory N. Reising

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

M. Harry Daniels

Southern Illinois University

The construct validity and developmental structure of Hogan's (1964) model of counselor development and supervision were studied using a cross-sectional sample of 141 counseling psychology graduate student trainees, interns, and professional staff in 20 university counseling centers. Counselor Development Questionnaire items were developed into two arrangements—one based on Hogan's concepts as he organized them into levels, and another derived empirically using factor analysis. The two configurations were compared for their ability to predict experience level of participants using discriminant function analysis. Each empirical factor was also examined for relationship with experience by means of one-way analysis of variance with preplanned comparisons. Results indicated that counselor development is best described by a complex rather than a simple model and that it involves factors of Anxiety/Doubt, Independence, Method/Skills Training, Work Validation, Commitment Ambivalence, and Respectful Confrontation. Developmental profiles of these issues are described, and implications for supervision, training programs, and future research are discussed.

The development and supervision of counselors is becoming increasingly recognized as an important and central professional activity. Recently, several authors have drawn from diverse sources in attempts to develop relevant, comprehensive models for use in counselor training (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981; Yogev, 1982). They have uniformly noted the need for research in these efforts. Yet, to date, little research has been conducted to validate generally accepted beliefs about the process of counselor development. Almost all studies of counselor development have isolated one or another aspect of counselor training or supervision, rather than taking a more holistic view (Hansen, Pound, & Petro, 1976; Hansen & Warner, 1971; Matarazzo, 1978). The few empirical studies existing that involved trainees at more than one level of experience do suggest that development changes occur. Some of these

studies, though important, are still limited by sample range restrictions (Gysbers & Johnson, 1965; Nelson, 1978; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Others included subjects with a broad range of experience, but addressed a limited number of developmental issues (Hill, Charles, & Reed, 1981; Kirchner, 1975).

Limiting study to nondevelopmental issues such as comparing training methods, or using subjects with a limited range of experience such as beginning practicum students helps bring research under practical control and strengthens internal validity. These benefits, however, come at the expense of losing a larger perspective on counselor training as a developmental process. Until empirical evidence validates a comprehensive model of counselor development, theoretical ideas and research of limited scope will lack a context within which they can be understood.

Counselor training and supervision as a differential developmental process that arises from changing trainee characteristics and needs has historically been most directly and extensively discussed by Hogan (1964), Mueller and Kell (1972), and Ekstein and Wallerstein (1972). Hogan's (1964) article represents the most comprehensive, yet

Portions of this article were presented at the North Central Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors convention, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 1981.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Gregory N. Reising, Counseling Center, 212 Turner Student Services Building, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

succinct, theoretical model of the process of counselor development and supervision. His work is seminal in that recent authors have adopted or reconceptualized his basic ideas (Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981).

Hogan depicted counselors in training as struggling with different issues at each of four levels of development. In brief, Hogan claimed that trainees move from an anxious, dependent, method-bound, naive stance through an often painful process of skill acquisition and self-discovery. According to Hogan, the struggle eventually leads to more accurate perceptions of clients, supervisors, and oneself, and to responsible independence and creativity in one's counseling work. To facilitate each step of development, Hogan recommended differential supervisory behaviors for each trainee level. These recommended behaviors range from teaching, support, modeling, and awareness training for beginning trainees, to ambivalence clarification, active confrontation, sharing, and eventual peership as trainees advance, individuate, and mature as counselors.

Hogan neatly subsumed such commonly discussed polarities as client versus trainee focus in supervision, autonomous individuation of the trainee versus imitation of the supervisor, teaching versus therapy, didactic versus experiential supervision, and authoritarian versus collegial supervision as differential responses to developmental issues of trainees. Further, Hogan's model has heuristic value in that it structures the entire range of counselor development from novice to master, identifying specific tasks for each developmental stage. The model makes specific recommendations for supervisory behaviors that are related to the trainee's developmental tasks. Finally, Hogan's model is conceptually broad, yet fairly specific and behavioral. Thus, if it can be adequately validated, it represents a promising structure within which to organize more detailed research of limited scope.

Research Questions

This study was designed to address two questions: (a) Is there empirical evidence demonstrating the construct validity of Hogan's developmental model? That is, can

evidence be found that some or all of the issues subsumed under the model are significantly related to experience as Hogan claimed? (b) What is the underlying structure of Hogan's model? Determining that a given phenomenon is *developmental* does not reveal much about the nature of the process. Since development is not a monolithic concept, one must determine what rules or principles describe the behavior of constructs within the model over time in order to adequately delineate it (Blasi, 1980; Flavell & Wohwill, 1969).

Simple Versus Complex Developmental Models

Since little research has been done on counselor development as a stage process, models of stage development were borrowed from other areas of study as a basis for investigation of the structure of Hogan's model. The most promising source was Rest's (1979) treatment of the structure of models in cognitive and moral judgment. Rest compared Piaget's (1960) "simple" stage model of development with a "complex" model of his own definition.

Piaget's simple model posits six underlying assumptions: (a) Each stage is depicted in terms of identical symmetrical curves; (b) the stages are evenly spaced across development; (c) each stage has a period of predominance over other stages that peaks at 100% usage; (d) periods of transition from one stage to the next alternate with periods of consolidation in the next new stage; (e) stage mixture only occurs between two adjacent stages; and (f) the peak of stage usage is also the peak of stage consolidation.

Rest (1979) found the commonly accepted assumptions of the simple model too strict to adequately describe the area's real findings. He therefore proposed a more flexible complex model. Within the framework of the complex model, Rest stated, "The question of developmental assessment would not be 'what stage is a person in?' but rather, 'to what extent and under what circumstances does a person manifest the various types of behaviors, issues or needs depicted by the various stages?'" (Rest, 1979, p. 63). The complex model represents stage development in the following terms: (a) degree of stage membership, (b) probabilistic fluctuation

tuation on the stage dimensions, (c) interaction with the environment and with assessment methods, and (d) membership in several stages or "types" at once.

Despite the acknowledged paucity of research in the area, current authors (cf. Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981) appear to have either uncritically adopted or reconceptualized Hogan's notions in ways that leave the question of structure unanswered. In his theoretical article, Stoltenberg (1981) appeared to accept Hogan's model literally as a simple four-stage model of development in which the various contents within each stage are resolved together before transition to the next stage. Loganbill et al. (1982), in their comprehensive review and conceptual paper, appeared to acknowledge the complexity of counselor development in general terms but did not address the question of what holistic structure counselor development issues might have. Rather than speculating on internal relationships among content issues, they defined a general three-stage model of *stagnation*, *confusion*, and *integration* and applied this model separately to each issue (cf. Mueller, 1982).

It is not surprising that various authors would treat Hogan's model differently. Hogan (1964) himself was unclear about the structure of his model. In his article, he carefully defined a four-stage model, then noted that one might repeat aspects of the process many times. For the purposes of this investigation, we decided that the issues as described within each of Hogan's levels must operate in unison if simple-model criteria are to be satisfied. Hogan's issues describe a complex developmental model if they behave in a more complicated individualistic fashion over time.

Method

Participants

Of 24 university counseling center training directors asked, 20 consented to assist in the identification of participants and data collection. A total of 141 counseling psychology graduate practicum students, interns, and professional staff participated in the study, a 55% sample of the maximum estimated population available in participating centers. The relatively low return rate was attributed by some training directors to the coincidence of data collection with final examinations and semester break.

Instrumentation

The Counselor Development Questionnaire (CDQ), a trainee self-report instrument, was designed to reflect the various issues subsumed in Hogan's model.¹ Of 288 initial items, some were borrowed from other authors (Kirchner, 1975; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979) and others were generated from Hogan's (1964) article. These items were organized into two separate groups, the Trainee (T) Subtest—statements trainees might make about themselves, and the Supervisory Needs (S) Subtest—statements trainees might make about their needs for supervision, each item beginning with the stem "I need a supervisor who . . ."

Five judges familiar with Hogan's model independently classified each item into one of Hogan's first three levels on the basis of item content. Items were retained if four of the five judges agreed on their level classifications. Redundant items were discarded. The revised CDQ item pool contained 81 items in the Trainee Subtest and 76 items in the Supervisory Needs Subtest. The response format was a 5-point Likert scale with strongly agree, agree somewhat, neutral or unsure, disagree somewhat, and strongly disagree as anchors. Also included in the CDQ were demographic items and items measuring years of experience in graduate training and postdegree counseling work. Internal consistency reliability (Chronbach's alpha) of the items classified into each level ranged from .82 to .88.

Procedure

The CDQ and accompanying materials were distributed to participants with the help of participating training directors. Participants completed the CDQ and either returned them to their training directors in sealed envelopes or mailed them directly to the chief investigator in order to preserve confidentiality.

Analyses

Analyses were separate but identical for the Trainee and the Supervisory Needs Subtests. To provide alternative representations of Hogan's model that fit the simple versus complex underlying structure described above, two arrangements of the CDQ items were developed for each subtest. The judges' theoretical item classifications represent the simple stage model alternative, whereas the complex model item arrangement was empirically derived using principal factors factor analysis with varimax rotation. The factor analysis allowed the response pattern itself to suggest an optimal number of constructs, each behaving in an individual manner, and each accounting for a portion of the meaningful variance in the data.

After an initial test of significance in the correlation matrices, Kaiser's criterion, and Cattell's scree test were

¹ The CDQ instrument and accompanying factor analysis statistics may be obtained from Dr. Gregory N. Reising, Coordinator of Clinical Services, Counseling Center, 212 Student Services, 610 E. John, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

used to select an optimal range of numbers of factors to extract. Analyses were completed for this range. Then from this range, the analysis with the largest number of factors extracted which contained at least two items loading .40 or higher on each rotated factor was used (Weiss, 1970; 1971). Factor scores were calculated for each participant on all factors, including the factor loadings of all items in each factor's calculation. Scores were also calculated for each participant on each theoretical scale, using unit weights for all items.

Research Question 1: Construct validity of Hogan's model. Participants were divided into four groups of approximately equal numbers according to experience level. These groups are (a) premasters level; (b) masters level; (c) advanced masters or intern level (masters level plus three years of experience); and (d) PhD level. A one-way analysis of variance with preplanned comparisons (premasters vs. masters; premasters + masters vs. advanced + PhD; advanced vs. PhD) was performed on each theoretical relationship between the degree of endorsement of each scale and experience. These particular preplanned comparisons were selected to allow for both gross and fine discrimination among experience levels, should developmental differences be demonstrated.

Research Question 2: What is the structure of Hogan's model? Parallel discriminant function analyses were performed on the theoretical and on the empirical arrangements of the CDQ items. All factors or scales were included in the analyses. The simple and complex model results were then compared in terms of significance levels and percent of participants correctly classified into experience groups. The item arrangement discriminating best among experience levels reflects the superior underlying structure for Hogan's developmental model.

Results

Factor Analysis

Sixteen factors emerged from the analysis, eight each from the Trainee and from the Supervisory Needs Subtests. Each factor contained at least two items loading .40 or greater with the factor. Forty-eight of the 81 Trainee Subtest items loaded .40 or greater on one factor only; an additional five obtained this loading on two factors. Fifty-three of the 76 Supervisory Needs Subtest items loaded .40 or greater on one factor only; an additional seven obtained this loading on two factors. The factors were interpreted as follows.

The Trainee Factors

T Factor 1, Anxiety/Doubt. Anxiousness and doubt about becoming a counselor. Fear about one's lack of understanding of

clients and about the responsibility of counseling. Lack of confidence in oneself as a counselor. Feelings of panic in counseling sessions. A bipolar factor with 23 items.

T Factor 2, Independence. Becoming and struggling to become independent from one's supervisor. Needing to make one's own therapy decisions. A bipolar factor with 7 items.

T Factor 3, Commitment Ambivalence. Doubt about the helpfulness of therapy. Discomfort in therapy and in supervision. Personal doubts about one's own ability to be helpful to clients. Vacillation in professional commitment. Continuing commitment to the profession despite its shortcomings. A unipolar factor with 6 items.

T Factor 4, Method. Need to learn skills and methods. Belief that learning to apply methods consistently will make one ready to take full counseling responsibility. A unipolar factor with 6 items.

T Factor 5, Self-Understanding. Trying to understand one's own feelings better in relation to one's counseling work. Struggle to discriminate between helpful and unhelpful counseling behaviors. Becoming more sensitive to one's impact on one's clients. A unipolar factor with 5 items.

T Factor 6, Work Validation. Need to receive positive and negative feedback and approval of one's counseling work by the supervisor. A unipolar factor with 3 items.

T Factor 7, Criticism Readiness. Valuing and inviting negative feedback and confrontation even when it is threatening. A bipolar factor with 5 items.

T Factor 8, Supervision Comfort. Comfort in supervision. Peerlike supervisory relationships. A bipolar factor with 2 items.

The Supervisory Needs Factors

S Factor 1, Emotional Consultation. Need for assistance in expressing and understanding one's feelings about one's clients and about one's struggle to become a counselor. A unipolar factor with 16 items.

S Factor 2, Skills Training. Need for modeling and performance standards. A unipolar factor with 16 items.

S Factor 3, Mutuality. Need for the su-

supervisor to share personal vulnerabilities and doubts and to show respect and confidence in the trainee. A unipolar factor with 9 items.

S Factor 4, Respectful Confrontation. Need for the supervisor to confront the trainee while staying personal and respecting the trainee's receptiveness and independence. A unipolar factor with 7 items.

S Factor 5, Reciprocal Confrontation. Invites confrontation directed at trainee's own dynamics and behavior. Calls for the supervisor to be willing to argue and struggle with the trainee. A unipolar factor with 6 items.

S Factor 6, Benign Support. Calls for supervisor to exclude trainee's personal life from supervision, and asks supervisor to be ready to intervene in the event of a crisis. A unipolar factor with 4 items.

S Factor 7, Behavioral Monitoring. Need for supervisor to observe therapy sessions. Need for supervisor confrontation. A unipolar factor with 3 items.

S Factor 8, Peer Consultation. Need for the supervisor to reduce teaching and increase sharing activities with the trainee. A unipolar factor with 2 items.

Discriminant Function Analysis

The discriminant function analysis assessed the relationship between each overall item arrangement and experience. Both the theoretical and the empirical (factor) arrangement of the Trainee Subtest were found to discriminate significantly well among levels of experience, Wilks's Lambda (8,3,137) = .560, $p < .0001$; Wilks's Lambda (3,3,137) = .743, $p < .0001$. The empirical arrangement correctly classified 53% of the cases, compared with 43% using the theoretical arrangement. Neither arrangement of the Supervisory Needs Subtest significantly discriminated among experience levels.

Analysis of Variance

Since the empirical arrangement was found superior in the above analysis of the Trainee Subtest, a series of preplanned comparisons in one-way analysis of variance were used to examine each factor's individ-

ual relationship with experience. The empirical arrangement of the Supervisory Needs Subtest was examined in the same manner to determine whether any individual factors had developmental significance.

In the Trainee Subtest, significant homoscedasticity assumption violations were found in the analyses of T Factors 1, 2, and 5. Therefore preplanned comparisons reported for these factors were based on separate variance estimates to compensate for differences in variance among the experience groups. Pooled variance estimates were used in the preplanned comparisons calculations for the remaining factors. Significant preplanned comparisons were found in T Factors 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 (see Table 1). In the Supervisory Needs Subtest, only Factors 2 and 4 obtained significant preplanned comparisons (see Table 2).

Discussion

Participant response patterns on the empirically derived factors, when taken together, provide an overview of several major features of counselor development. In addition, results strongly support the construct validity of Hogan's model of counselor development, though not necessarily for his supervisory recommendations. Moreover, it was determined that the simple stage model is inadequate to describe the complex structure of issues subsumed within Hogan's model. Counselor development appears to be a complex rather than a simple process.

It appears that anxiety, dependence, and skills focus give way to independence and self-confidence, as trainees grow into professional psychologists. Differences were found to exist among the groups on several of Hogan's issues. Trainees below the advanced masters level reported being more anxious, more dependent, more technique-oriented, and less ready for confrontation than those at the advanced masters level and above. Premasters trainees reported being even more highly anxious than masters level trainees, but did not differ significantly from them on any other dimension. In contrast, several differences were found between the advanced masters and the PhD levels. PhDs were more independent than advanced masters-level trainees, who themselves had

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of Trainee Factor Scores for Experience Groups, with Preplanned Comparison Significance Levels

Group	Factor							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Premasters (A)								
<i>M</i>	.73	-.16	.11	.34	-.25	.00	-.01	-.22
<i>SD</i>	1.23	.73	.84	.85	1.23	.87	.72	.94
Masters (B)								
<i>M</i>	-.01	-.25	-.08	.17	.10	.22	-.14	.00
<i>SD</i>	.77	1.10	.91	.88	.75	.81	.96	.87
(A vs. B)	**							
Advanced masters (C)								
<i>M</i>	-.38	.04	-.16	-.24	.02	.07	.01	.02
<i>SD</i>	.77	.80	.85	.90	.84	.90	.96	.92
PhD (D)								
<i>M</i>	-.19	.55	.29	-.27	.10	-.49	.23	.22
<i>SD</i>	.64	.72	.99	.86	.75	.97	.74	.71
(C vs. D)	**	*	*					
(A + B vs. C + D)		***	***	***	***		*	

Note. 1 = Anxiety/Doubt; 2 = Independence; 3 = Commitment Ambivalence; 4 = Method; 5 = Self-understanding; 6 = Work Validation; 7 = Criticism Readiness; 8 = Supervision Comfort. Within each column, higher numbers reflect more frequent endorsement of items in that factor.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

gained in independence over the less experienced groups. PhDs needed considerably less validation of their work by supervisors than all less experienced counselors. They also reported more commitment ambiv-

alence than did the advanced masters students. This latter finding does not appear to support Hogan's model and is not easily explained.

Although two supervisory needs factors

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Supervisory Needs Factor Scores for Experience Groups, with Preplanned Comparison Significance Levels

Group	Factor							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Premasters (A)								
<i>M</i>	-.09	.20	-.26	-.42	.13	.00	.13	.17
<i>SD</i>	1.00	.74	1.04	.97	.71	.89	.90	.70
Masters (B)								
<i>M</i>	.13	.17	.03	-.08	-.15	.13	.03	.04
<i>SD</i>	1.03	.66	.97	.94	.97	1.08	.69	1.03
(A vs. B)								
Advanced masters (C)								
<i>M</i>	-.07	-.08	.03	.25	-.07	-.16	-.17	-.05
<i>SD</i>	.96	1.02	.96	.81	1.08	.81	1.01	.90
PhD (D)								
<i>M</i>	.02	-.38	.21	.20	.21	.08	.10	.24
<i>SD</i>	.69	1.29	.69	.89	.75	.70	.90	.62
(C vs. D)								
(A + B vs. C + D)			*		**			

Note. 1 = Emotional Consultation; 2 = Skills Training; 3 = Mutuality; 4 = Respectful Confrontation; 5 = Reciprocal Confrontation; 6 = Benign Support; 7 = Behavioral Monitoring; 8 = Peer Consultation. Within each column, higher numbers reflect more frequent endorsement of items in that factor.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

proved significant, the Supervisory Needs Subtest taken as a whole failed to demonstrate developmental significance. Perhaps it is easier for trainees to report their experience of themselves than it is for them to know what their specific needs are for supervision. To participants, many of the supervisory characteristics could have been seen as desirable at all levels of trainee development. Thus, participants may have painted a picture of the globally good supervisor, rather than given a specific accounting of which supervisory characteristics were particularly salient at each level of experience.

The Factors

The factor score scaling procedure reduces the data to standard scores, such that groups can only be compared relative to each other. Absolute levels of factor characteristics cannot be inferred from this method of analysis. The following is a discussion of the significant individual factors as they behave over the course of counselor development and as they may relate to each other. By examining the experience-related growth and decay of the reported importance of these factors, it is possible to develop an image of counselor development.

Anxiety/Doubt (T Factor 1). The results dramatically show experience-related differences on this factor. Beginning trainees start out at a relatively high level, with considerable reduction in anxiety and doubt during the first year or two of doctoral training. Indeed, T Factor 1 is the only factor which achieved a significant difference between the premasters and masters level.

Independence and Work Validation (T Factors 2 and 6). These two factors may be better understood if they are considered together. Premasters students begin highly dependent (T Factor 2), with no decrease in dependence at the masters level. Hogan accounts for this continued dependency when he describes the willing dependence of the trainee in early training and the dependence that results from the struggle for insight in Level 2. After the masters level there is a dramatic and steady decrease in dependence when, as Hogan would describe it, trainees' struggles with the need for in-

dependence result in the achievement of true autonomy.

Another aspect of Hogan's notion of autonomy, the need for the supervisor's validation, operates differently from dependence and was empirically separated from T Factor 2 into T Factor 6. At the advanced masters level, need for validation of one's work continues, but independence has increased over its previous level. It is as if the relevant question for trainees at that point changed from "Will my supervisor support and understand me?" to "Will my supervisor respect my work?" At the PhD level, however, a dramatic decrease in the need for feedback and validation was found. Not surprisingly, this decrease coincides with the passage into professional adulthood, where feedback will be less frequent and more collegial. The question then may become "Will I be able to find or make a place for myself as a professional?" At this level, counselors may be both relatively highly independent and self-validating.

Commitment Ambivalence (T Factor 3). Factor 3 is the most problematic factor to emerge from the T items. It might also be the most interesting. T Factor 3 reflects discomfort in supervision and counseling sessions; doubts about the helpfulness of counseling; and doubts about one's own therapeutic skill, given the persisting interference of the trainee's own personal problems. It also, however, reflects continuing commitment to the counseling profession despite these shortcomings.

Apparently, personal doubt and difficulty with the ambiguity and imperfection of the counseling profession persist and even increase in PhD-level professionals over advanced masters-level trainees. Presumably, however, more mature counselors are not incapacitated by these problems as trainees might be. While still feeling uncertain about themselves and their profession, PhD-level counselors may be more able to live with these doubts because of their deepened self-awareness and appropriately adjusted expectations about the profession. Perhaps the apparent incongruity of commitment in the face of doubt heralds entry into Hogan's Level 4 (not studied here), where Hogan writes about one's security and insight being deepened by an intimate un-

derstanding of one's limitations in these areas.

Method (T Factor 4). Trainees were found to decline from a relatively higher initial level of focus on methods, with a major decrease occurring between the masters and advanced masters levels. This shift occurs at a time when Hogan recommends that supervisors reduce teaching activities and deal more directly with trainees' ambivalent struggle for awareness and independence (Level 2).

Skills Training (S Factor 2). S Factor 2, like T Factor 4, obtained a significant reduction after the masters level. In addition, an increase in the standard deviation of the more experienced groups appears to support Kirchner's (1975) finding that some PhDs desired further skills training while others did not.

Respectful Confrontation (S Factor 4). In S Factor 4, the two least experienced groups scored significantly lower than the other more experienced groups. A significant increase in this factor after the masters level supports from the trainee perspective the increase in readiness for a more personal, confrontive relationship with the supervisor that Hogan notes in his Level 3.

The remaining factors. No significant relationship to experience was found for T Factors 5, 7, and 8 (Self-Understanding, Criticism Readiness, and Supervision Comfort), nor for S Factors 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 (Emotional Consultation, Mutuality, Reciprocal Consultation, Benign Support, Behavioral Monitoring, and Peer Consultation). Although several of these factors obtained apparent trends consistent with Hogan's model, strengthening of the factors and further exploration is necessary to determine any real developmental significance.

Empirical versus theoretical arrangement. Results of the discriminant function analyses revealed that the empirical arrangement of the Trainee Subtest discriminated better among the experience groups than did the theoretical arrangement. A comparison of the results of these two arrangements suggests that the theoretical scales principally reflect the powerful empirical factors of Method, Anxiety/Doubt, and Independence. These factors are unquestionably central to Hogan's model.

However, a much more complete and articulate accounting of counselor development issues is available in the complex configuration of the data.

Although the discriminant function analysis revealed no significant difference in the discriminant power of the two item arrangements of the Supervisory Needs Subtest, an examination of the data suggests that the two experience-related supervisory factors account for the pattern in the theoretical scales as well. The empirical factors appear preferable in that they are more specific, more explanatory.

Implications

Several implications may be drawn from this study. Three particularly salient topics for comment are the differential training of counselors, the design of developmentally appropriate training programs, and the need for additional research in the area of counselor development and supervision.

Differential supervision. This study challenges monolithic notions supervisors may have about counselors in training. Underlying any supervisory style that remains relatively invariant from trainee to trainee is an incorrect assumption that all trainees are in need of the same things. Such an assumption is belied by even a simple stage model of counselor development. However, supervisors may need to go beyond the simple developmental model and examine how the complex model's individual issues are organized within each trainee. Trainees may not exhibit simple stage-to-stage transitions but rather a gradual process of resolution of some issues while others emerge and become salient.

Training programs. If developmental characteristics can be adequately assessed in trainees, programs for training and supervision may be appropriately redesigned to address each trainee's specific needs. Some prepracticum training programs, for example, focus almost exclusively on skill development. A common complaint from trainees in these programs is that the richness of human experience is restricted by such an approach. Other programs have a more varied structure. Their trainees may grumble (as method-bound trainees might) that they are not learning enough specifics.

Individual student differences in developmental readiness may be reflected in such complaints and perhaps they should be accommodated.

Attention to individual differences in developmental profile may help supervisors and faculty to reconceptualize the problems some trainees encounter in their programs. While enduring characteristics certainly do affect trainees' counseling potential, the view that all trainees lack potential who cannot adjust to the program is shortsighted. Some trainee problems may be reframed as problems in the fit between trainee profile and program structure. Stoltenberg (1981) made recommendations for building developmentally appropriate training programs using the theories of Hogan (1964) and Hunt (1971).

Future research. Although we have begun to empirically articulate the structure of counselor development in this study, our work is only a beginning. Several unanswered questions emerge as we view the results and begin to scrutinize counselor development issues more clearly. Longitudinal study is certainly needed to clarify and extend knowledge in the area. Recent refinements in the methodology of stage model research (eg. Davison, 1977; Davison, Robbins, & Swanson, 1978) may also prove valuable. A particularly interesting possibility is the study of typologies of trainees to assess whether different developmental tendencies obtain for subgroups of trainees with differing enduring personal characteristics or cultural backgrounds.

A most critical need for future research centers upon outcome studies of supervisory behaviors over a variety of trainee profiles, and upon the role of the overall training environment in counselor development. Included in such study could be requirements, roles, passages, rewards, personal styles of interaction among students and faculty, and research in a variety of training settings. What are commonly known as trainee characteristics may well be discovered to describe person-environment complexes and not trainees alone. In this light, all parts of the training system may be seen to share responsibility for success and failure in the training of counselors.

In regard to the research reported here, several improvements for future study seem

warranted. As in all factor analysis studies, the pattern of results certainly reflects item selection and analysis decisions as well as the phenomena under study. The relatively weaker factors of the CDQ could be strengthened with item additions and deletions and reinvestigated for developmental significance. Longitudinal replication could answer internal validity concerns over differential mortality in training programs as it confounds with the measure of developmental change. A method of investigation different from participant report may be needed to adequately examine the relationship between trainee developmental profile and needed supervisory behaviors. Finally, the CDQ could be further refined and validated as an assessment instrument.

This study has found construct validity evidence for Hogan's (1964) model of counselor development. It has further examined the underlying structure of Hogan's issues and determined that counselor development is best described by a complex rather than a simple developmental model. The model as articulated here suggests that supervisors, training programs, and researchers should examine in detail how developmental issues constellate in ways that may appear individualistic, but are nonetheless understandable in terms of a comprehensive model of counselor development.

References

- Blasi, A. Issues in defining stages and types. In J. Loevinger (Ed.), *Ego development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Davison, M. L. On a metric, unidimensional unfolding model for attitudinal and developmental data. *Psychometrica*, 1977, 42, 523-548.
- Davison, M. L., Robbins, S., & Swanson, D. B. Stage structure in objective moral judgments. *Developmental Psychology*, 1978, 14, 137-146.
- Ekstein, R., & Wallerstein, R. S. *The teaching and learning of psychotherapy* (2nd ed.). New York: International Universities Press, 1972.
- Flavell, J. H., & Wohwill, J. F. Formal and functional aspects of cognitive development. In D. Elkind & J. H. Flavell (Eds.), *Studies in cognitive development: Essays in honor of Jean Piaget*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Johnson, J. A. Expectations of a practicum supervisor's role. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1965, 4, 68-74.
- Hansen, J. C., Pound, R., & Petro, C. Review of research on practicum supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1976, 16, 107-116.

- Hansen, J. C., & Warner, R. W., Jr. Review of research on practicum supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 1971, 10, 261-272.
- Hill, C. E., Charles, D., & Reed, K. G. A longitudinal analysis of changes in counseling skills during doctoral training in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1981, 28, 428-436.
- Hogan, R. A. Issues and approaches in supervision. *Psychotherapy, Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1964, 1, 139-141.
- Hunt, D. E. *Matching models in education: The coordination of teaching methods with student characteristics*. Toronto, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.
- Kirchner, K. R. Expectations about individual counseling supervision (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri—Columbia, 1974). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 1975, 36(1), 445-B. (University Microfilms No. 75-16,012)
- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 1982, 10(1), 3-42.
- Matarazzo, R. G. Research on the teaching and learning of psychotherapeutic skills. In S. Garfield & A. Bergin (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Mueller, W. J. Issues in the application of "Supervision: A conceptual model" to dynamically oriented supervision: A reaction paper. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 1982, 10(1), 43-46.
- Mueller, W. J., & Kell, B. L. *Coping with conflict: Supervising counselors and psychotherapists*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.
- Nelson, G. L. Psychotherapy supervision from the trainee's point of view: A survey of preferences. *Professional Psychology*, 1978, 9, 539-550.
- Piaget, J. The general problem of the psycho-biological development of the child. In J. M. Tanner & B. Inhelder (Eds.), *Discussions on child development* (Vol. 4). New York: International Universities Press, 1960.
- Rest, J. R. *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979.
- Stoltenberg, C. Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1981, 28, 59-65.
- Weiss, D. J. Factor analysis and counseling research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1970, 17, 477-485.
- Weiss, D. J. Further considerations in applications of factor analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1971, 18, 85-92.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Roehlke, H. J. Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1979, 26, 64-73.
- Yogev, S. An eclectic model of supervision: A developmental sequence for beginning psychotherapy students. *Professional Psychology*, 1982, 13, 236-243.

Received August 4, 1982

Revision received November 2, 1982 ■