6-1986

An Empirical Investigation of Stoltenberg's Counselor Complexity Model

George Calvin Zeth Weaver III

University of Tennessee - Knoxville

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by George Calvin Zeth Weaver III entitled "An Empirical Investigation of Stoltenberg's Counselor Complexity Model." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

Mark A. Hector, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Richard L. Nash, Kenneth R. Newton, & William A. Poppen

Accepted for the Council:
Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by George Calvin
Zeth Weaver III entitled "An Empirical Investigation of Stoltenberg's
Counselor Complexity Model." I have examined the final copy of
this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be
accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

Mark A. Hector
Mark A. Hector, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

William A. Poppen

Richard A. Nash

Emmit B. Le

Accepted for the Council:

C.W. Minkel
Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION OF STOLTENBERG'S

COUNSELOR COMPLEXITY MODEL

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

George Calvin Zeth Weaver III

June 1986

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to express my appreciation and thanks to everyone who helped me in this project. I am especially grateful to Dr. Mark A. Hector, my committee chairman, for his time, effort, and guidance in helping develop and carry out this research. I also want to thank my other committee members Dr. Richard L. Nash, Dr. Kenneth R. Newton, and Dr. William A. Poppen. Special thanks also go to Denny Johnston, Dr. C. Edward Watkins, and Dr. Jean P. Wycoff for their help and support during the data collection process. I also want to thank Don Broach, my computer consultant, for making the difficult task of data analysis surprisingly easy. To thank all of my friends who have supported me through this task would be impossible. However, I must express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Amy M. Donahue, Dave Ferguson, Leslie Melton, Betty Noble, Dr. Karen K. Swander, Dr. Robert L. Williams, and Dr. Damaris D. Young. Without the love, support, and patience of these people I would not have been able to complete this task. Lastly, my most important source of support, as usual, came from my family. Words cannot adequately express how much I appreciate the support, love, and patience given to me from my mother and father, Betty and Zeth Weaver, Jr., and my sisters, Sandra Greer and June Medford. Thank you all.

ABSTRACT

Supervision research has begun to focus on developmental models. The main purpose of this study was to test for possible differences in the level of self-actualization of counselor trainees who are at the four levels of counselor development as described by the counselor complexity model (Stoltenberg, 1981). Secondary questions involved the relationships between level of counselor development and the variables of trainees' perceptions of themselves and amount of trainees' counseling experience. Seventy-nine trainees from programs in counseling psychology, clinical psychology, educational psychology, social work, and U.S. Army mental health were used in this study. Trainees' supervisors rated the trainees' level of counselor development on an instrument based on the counselor complexity model (Wiley, 1983). The major findings of this study were that: (a) no relationship was found between level of counselor trainee development and a measure of self-actualization; (b) some evidence was found that a relationship existed between amount of supervised counseling experience and higher levels of counselor development; (c) from the data it was concluded that a relationship existed between amount of unsupervised counseling experience and higher levels of counselor development; (d) a relationship was also found between three measures of trainees' perceptions of themselves--self-awareness, dependency-autonomy, theory/skill acquisition--and

higher levels of counselor development. The results of this study were supportive of the counselor complexity model. Implications were discussed for developmental supervision theory and some suggestions were made for future research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Counselor trainees typically make substantial progress in their development as counselors during the course of training. Knowledge regarding this progress from beginning levels of competence to more advanced levels of competence is limited, however. Understanding how this progress is achieved may be enhanced by using knowledge of developmental supervision theory and self-actualization theory. Counselor trainees' level of self-actualization may be related to their development as counselors.

Statement of Purpose

The main purpose of this study is to test for possible differences in the level of self-actualization of counselor trainees who are at the four levels of counselor development as described by the counselor complexity model (Stoltenberg, 1981). Secondary questions will involve the relationships between the level of counselor development and the variables of counselor trainees' perceptions of themselves and amount of counselor trainees' experience. It is expected that trainees with more experience will be functioning at higher levels of counselor development. From the counselor complexity model it can also be hypothesized that counselor trainees will show increasingly higher levels in perceptions of self-awareness,

1

autonomy, and knowledge of theory and skills as they attain higher levels of counselor development.

This study is original in that no research has focused on counselor trainees' level of self-actualization when trainees are classified according to the counselor complexity model. The results of this study should add to the body of knowledge in counseling supervision research in general and the counselor complexity model in particular.

Theory

In this section, first the counselor complexity model will be discussed, followed by a summary of self-actualization theory. Next, there will be an examination of how an individual moves through the developmental stages in the counselor complexity model and self-actualization theory. Finally, a rationale for the relationship between this model and this theory will be presented.

Counselor Complexity Model

The counselor complexity model is based primarily on Hogan's (1964) supervision model, which identifies four levels of supervisees and suggests general supervisory methods to facilitate counselor development. This model also employs Hunt's (1971) conceptual systems theory to explain different cognitive and personality stages of trainees. The counselor complexity model focuses mainly on describing the developmental process of becoming a "master counselor." As one moves through the different levels of counselor development

toward becoming a master counselor, Stoltenberg (1981) claims ". . . that there are qualitative differences in skill level and knowledge of theories" (p. 59). He presents a model which consists of four levels or stages of counselor development and four corresponding environments for supervision.

At level one of Stoltenberg's model, the trainee has usually had little experience as a counselor. The level one counselor has had an introduction to theories of personality, assessment and diagnosis, as well as other academic subjects which should help increase his or her understanding of human behavior. The trainee has been or is currently being exposed to some type of pre-practicum course to learn the basic fundamental counseling skills (e.g., reflection of feeling, clarification). At this level the trainee has a low level of confidence and tends to be highly dependent upon the supervisor for advice and direction. The supervisee is generally unaware of the impact that he or she has on clients in the counseling relationship. The level one counselor is concerned with rules in counseling, tends to think of clients in terms of counseling categories, and is looking for the "right way" to counsel. This person is quite dependent on the supervisor and looks to the supervisor for instruction in the correct approaches. Stoltenberg describes this stage of development as one of "unilateral dependence." Often the trainee will feel a strong pull to use either the supervisor's counseling approach or the approach of some well-known theorist. The level one counselor may come to supervision with questions already prepared

about specific ways to elicit certain client behaviors or feelings. The individual at level one is trying to define external boundaries and learn where techniques end and his or her own personality begins in the counseling role. At this level the trainee is attempting to learn the general standards of the counseling or mental health profession. The supervisee is grappling with the problem of uniquely expressing himself or herself in the process of counseling. The level one counselor has started to develop a counselor identity.

The primary issue for the level two counselor centers around dependency-autonomy conflicts. The supervisee at this level is trying to define himself or herself as a counselor, yet he or she continues to have relatively high dependency needs. This struggle can be seen as the level two counselor moves back and forth between states of feeling highly confident with newly acquired counseling skills and overwhelmed by the amount of responsibility for which the position calls. Hogan (1964) reports that this state of affairs often leads to fairly frequent changes in the motivation level of the level two counselor. During this stage the trainee's level of self-awareness increases as he or she experiences a wider range of feelings, behaviors, and motivations. Stoltenberg (1981) states that at this level, "The trainee is no longer satisfied to merely imitate the supervisor but prefers instead to begin defining his or her own individual counselor identity and to assume more responsi- bility for outcomes" (p. 62). As the level two counselor continues to define his or her identity, he or she begins to disagree more often with the supervisor about how to work with clients.

The third level of the counselor complexity model can be best described as a state of conditional dependency. After progressing through the dependency-autonomy conflicts and motivational issues at level two, the level three counselor has developed a better defined sense of personal identity as a counselor and more self-confidence as a professional. Hogan (1964) writes that at this level the trainee's motivation has become healthy and stable and he or she can deal more effectively with situational distress. The level three counselor has a higher level of self-awareness, including an understanding of dependency needs and neurotic motivations. At this level the trainee has developed a well differentiated counseling style which expresses his or her individuality. The level three counselor no longer has the need to be a staunch proponent of any particular theoretical orientation or technique. The trainee has developed an increased tolerance for different theoretical perspectives and can now see the value in having differing theoretical viewpoints. The level three counselor has also developed an increased ability to empathize with others.

The fourth level in Stoltenberg's model is the master counselor stage. The level four counselor is capable of independent practice because he or she has an adequate understanding of his or her limitations. Stoltenberg (1981) describes the level four counselor: "The counselor has a personal security based on an awareness of insecurity; is insightful, with full awareness of the limitations of insight; and is able to function adequately, even with some

occasional changes in degrees of motivation" (p. 63). Hogan (1964)
states that the level four counselor recognizes the need to confront
the struggles of life, especially those involving the counseling
profession. Hunt (1971) calls the type of interaction at this level
a state of willful interdependence. The master counselor has
effectively integrated the standards of the professions into his
or her value system.

Self-Actualization Theory

Maslow (1954, 1970) was a pioneer in the development of self-
actualization theory. He set forth a theory of need gratification
which accounts for the whole nature of the person. In contrast
to the emphasis on pathology that characterized most personality
theories in the first half of this century, Maslow, in the humanistic
tradition, centers on the healthy personality.

In his theory of personality, Maslow (1968, 1970) postulates
two distinct types of need, deficiency needs (D-needs) and being
needs (B-needs). The B-needs, the higher of the two, tend to surface
only after the D-needs have been satisfied. According to his theory
of the prepotency of needs, although the B-needs are higher than
the D-needs, if unsatisfied, the D-needs take precedence or are
more immediate than the B-needs. Maslow describes the hierarchical
order of the deficiency needs. For example, basic deficiency needs
such as food, water, oxygen, and sleep take precedence over higher
D-needs such as safety, belongingness, love, and self-esteem.

An individual progresses through the hierarchy of needs only after the most basic needs have been satiated (Maslow, 1968). Maslow (1970) states, "The most basic consequence of satiation of any need is that this need is submerged and a new and higher need emerges" (p. 60). After satiation of a need occurs, the person becomes dissatisfied and bored with previous goals and satisfactions involving that need and the person is then ready to move on to higher level needs.

It is important to be aware that the prepotency of different needs is not a static state (Maslow, 1968). The different levels of needs are in a changing flow of contact and withdrawal in which different needs predominate at different times. This dynamic interaction occurs not only within the D-needs and the B-needs but also between the two realms. Maslow (1968) writes that the distinction between B-needs and D-needs ". . . is a consequence of the clinical perception of qualitative differences between the motivational lives of self-actualizers and of other people" (p. 27). He further states, ". . . the psychological life of the person, in many of its aspects, is lived out differently when he is deficiency-need-gratification-bent and when he is growth-dominated or . . . self-actualizing" (Maslow, 1968, p. 27).

An example of this distinction in people's motivational and psychological lives can be seen between two hypothetical cancer researchers. One researcher may seek to find the cure for cancer because it will assure her of winning the Nobel prize and the adoration

of millions of people. This person's primary motivation is fame and fortune, which Maslow would classify as deficiency-need-gratification-bent, or as a D-need. Another hypothetical cancer researcher may seek to find the cure for cancer because she believes that saving lives is an important and worthwhile activity. This person may have little or no concern for the publicity and monetary rewards that could result from the discovery. Maslow would state that the second cancer researcher is primarily motivated by the higher level B-needs.

Another way of making the distinction between D-needs and B-needs is to note the differences in values between the two realms. In the D-need realm the person values from a means-end, goal-oriented perspective. In this type of valuation utility or usefulness is the criterion. Hartman (1967), a value theorist, labels this standard for valuing as extrinsic. The non-self-actualized person values primarily from this extrinsic value perspective. In contrast, the types of values that one holds when operating in the realm of being needs are quite different. No longer is one concerned with the self-centered ego question, "What good will it do me?" When one operates from the B-need perspective, one views an event as good-in-itself. He or she transcends the ordinary concerns at the D-need level and centers on the experience itself for its intrinsic value (Hartman, 1967). At this level the person is no longer striving to achieve a goal; instead, he or she is beyond striving (Maslow, 1968). He or she appreciates the wonder and beauty of the world

without needing or expecting anything in return. When an individual
is valuing from the intrinsic perspective, then he or she is trans-
cending the basic needs of the human condition and is moving toward
a more self-actualized way of being. The self-actualized person,
then, operates primarily from an intrinsic value perspective.

The self-actualized person is described as operating at a
level of "full humanness" (Maslow, 1971). This higher state of
functioning includes a heightened state of self and other-awareness,
a transcendence of categorical or neurosis-bound thinking and valuing,
higher levels of independence, and a greater sense of identity than
that of the non-self-actualized person. This person is more accepting
of others, is more spontaneous and often lives in the "here and
now." This individual tends to trust his or her perceptions and
feelings more than non-self-actualized people do. Maslow (1968)
also states that self-actualized individuals are capable of empathizing
more with people, have improved personal relationships, have a superior
perception of reality, are more open to experience, and have a more
comprehensive worldview than non-self-actualized people. In short,
the self-actualized person has progressed to a higher level of human
development and is said to be more loving, more noble, and healthier
than non-self-actualized people (Maslow, 1968).

Movement Through Developmental Stages

One important aspect of developmental theory is the accounting
for and explaining of the process of development or movement through

different stages. This section will focus on how the counselor
complexity model and self-actualization theory address this issue.

Counselor Complexity Model

In developing the Counselor Complexity Model Stoltenberg
was influenced by the work of several theorists. One influence
was the work of Werner (1957) who used a developmental approach
which employs the orthogenetic principle. This principle states
that ". . . wherever development occurs, it proceeds from a state
of increasing differentiation, articulation, and hierarchic integra-
tion" (Werner, 1957, p. 126). Stoltenberg also used the ideas of
Harvey, Hunt, and Schroder (1961) which describe the process of
concept development. Harvey et al. (1961) believed that the structure
of how an individual forms conceptualizations is more important
in understanding that person's level of conceptual development than
the actual content of what the person is thinking about. Higher
levels of conceptual development are characterized by an individual's
ability to conceive of many diverse ways of conceptualizing and
dealing with a specific situation. One who develops in this manner
possesses a worldview which is more relativistic and less stereo-
typical, which allows for greater flexibility in thinking and valuing.
Gardner (1978) describes the process of moving through stages toward
a desired end-state as being triggered by a constant interaction
between the person and the environment. He calls this process
equilibration. Stoltenberg and Pierce (1984) state that

"Development is punctuated by periods of crisis, conflict, or diffi-
culty (disequilibria) which are resolved into a reestablished sense
of balance and proportion. The disequilibrium results from competition
among cognitive structures or concepts that are inconsistent" (pp.
2-3).

According to the counselor complexity model, movement occurs
in a counselor trainee's development when the trainee is in a super-
vision environment which promotes an atmosphere giving him or her
a sense of security and, at the same time, allowing for disequilibria
to occur. Maximum learning and development can happen only if the
supervisor can foster a supervision environment which is congruent
with the supervisee's level of counselor development (Stoltenberg,
1981). If a supervision environment-counselor development level
match does occur, then Stoltenberg theorizes that the supervisee
will be most likely to progress to a high level of counselor develop-
ment. It is important to note that the process of counselor develop-
ment is not static and the supervisor must continually monitor and
alter the supervision environment to meet the developing counselor's
changing needs (Stoltenberg, 1981). Stoltenberg places a great
deal of responsibility on the supervisor for assessing and meeting
the needs of the supervisee. "Since no two trainees are exactly
alike, the supervisor must be able to recognize the idiosyncratic
style of the trainee's counseling approach and also the type of
supervision and clients that will be most appropriate" (Stoltenberg,
1981, p. 64).

Stoltenberg (1981) notes that "Other counselors may, for various reasons, never reach the higher levels" (p. 60). He did not deal directly with why counselor trainees do not progress beyond certain levels of counselor development. Some reasons for why trainees fail to progress to higher levels of development could be poor supervision--failure by the supervisor to match the supervision environment with the counselor trainee's level of development, or the counselor trainee may not possess the intelligence, skills, or overall ability to progress to a higher level of counselor development.

While the counselor complexity model focuses on the development of a specific group, counselor trainees, Maslow's self-actualization theory deals with the development of people in general. The process of movement through stages in self-actualization theory has been discussed earlier in this section. The following segment will expand upon this theme.

Self-Actualization Theory

In Maslow's hierarchical order of needs, a person is motivated by the most basic deficiency needs (physiological needs like food, water, oxygen, sleep) until these needs have been met satisfactorily in the past, and continue to be adequately met in the present. After these lower deficiency needs have been satiated, then an individual progresses up the hierarchy to other deficiency needs (D-needs). In order of precedence these needs are safety, love and belongingness, and self-esteem. Maslow (1970) describes this

process of moving through the hierarchy of needs as one in which
lower level needs submerge and higher level needs emerge to become
the primary source of motivation. One will become fixated or stuck
at a level if one does not get the appropriate need sufficiently
satisfied. The non-self-actualized person is one who has not pro-
gressed beyond D-needs.

If an individual is able to have all D-needs met, then he
or she will be able to progress to the Being needs (B-needs) realm.
The self-actualized person did not become fixated at one of the
lower level needs and instead is motivated by the higher level B-needs
(Maslow, 1968). As has been described earlier, the self-actualized
person transcends deficiency-need motivation and is primarily con-
cerned with becoming fully human in his or her own unique way.
Maslow (1968) describes this type of person as being healthier than
non-self-actualized individuals.

Relationship Between the Counselor Complexity Model and Self-Actualization Theory

This section will address the relationship between Maslow's
(1970) self-actualization theory and the counselor complexity model
(Stoltenberg, 1981). Discussion will focus on the influence of
developmental theory, healthy functioning, and complexity.

Both Maslow (1970) and Stoltenberg (1981) emphasize develop-
mental theory in their writings. In describing self-actualized
persons Maslow (1970) states "From a developmental point of view,

they are more fully evolved because they are not fixated at immature
or incomplete levels of growth" (p. 156). Maslow (1970) believes
that people reach this more advanced level of functioning after
they have had their lower level deficiency needs sufficiently satis-
fied. The self-actualized person is motivated by higher level being
needs (B-needs). Stoltenberg (1981) describes counselor trainee
development as a process, ". . . in a developmental framework that
takes into account the different motivations, needs, and potential
resistances of counselors at different levels or stages of develop-
ment" (p. 59). He believes that changes in needs and motivations
occur as individuals move from lower levels of counselor development
toward the master counselor level. Both theorists describe people
who grow and evolve toward a more advanced level of development.
Maslow's term for this higher level of development is the self-
actualized person, while Stoltenberg labels the highest stage of
development the level four or master counselor.

The concept of healthy functioning is a central theme for
each theorist. Maslow (1970) devoted a chapter to this theme entitled
"Self-Actualizing People: A Study of Psychological Health" (pp.
149-180). In a later work he describes neurosis as being the failure
of personal growth (Maslow, 1971). Maslow presents a strong case
for linking healthy psychological functioning with self-actualization.
He describes the self-actualized person as transcending neurotic
ways of being, and functioning in a spontaneous, healthy fashion.
The self-actualized person is less anxious, more secure, and is

more independent than other people who are at a lower level of func-
tioning (Maslow, 1970). While Stoltenberg (1981) does not use the
phrase psychological health, this theme can be seen throughout the
counselor complexity model. He describes the level one counselor
as being neurosis bound, anxious, and highly dependent on his or
her supervisor. As the counselor trainee progresses through stages
two, three, and four of the counselor complexity model, he or she
develops beyond the neurotic ways of functioning which characterize
the level one counselor. The level two counselor is mainly concerned
with becoming more independent of the supervisor. In describing
the level three counselor, Stoltenberg (1981) states, "The overall
motivation of this individual has become more healthy and stable
. . ." (p. 62). The level four counselor is characterized as reaching
a high level of personal development. "The individual is fully
capable of independent practice, as sufficient self-knowledge and
an integrated counselor identity enables adequate functioning in
nearly all professional situations" (Stoltenberg, 1981, p. 63).
In Maslow's terms, the level four counselor can be described as
having reached a high level of psychological health.

Another theme addressed by both theorists deals with complexity.
Stoltenberg's model describes a four level process in which counselor
trainees develop increasingly more complex ways of viewing clients,
themselves, the world, and the process of counseling. Counselor
trainees at higher levels of counselor development become more flexible,
transcend categorical, concrete ways of thinking, develop a greater

sense of self and other awareness, and have a more complex and accurate worldview than those at lower levels. Maslow (1970) notes these same characteristics in self-actualized people. In viewing the world, the self-actualized person is said to have a more efficient perception of reality which tends to be independent of the self-actualized person's wishes, fears, hopes, anxieties, theories, and beliefs (Maslow, 1970). One characteristic of the self-actualized person is his or her ability to see the world in its complexity (Maslow, 1968). The self-actualized person and the level four counselor in Stoltenberg's model both have the ability to see and understand the world in a complex fashion.

The previous section focused on the relationship between Maslow's (1970) self-actualization theory and the counselor complexity model (Stoltenberg, 1981). The influence of developmental theory in Maslow's theory and Stoltenberg's model was discussed. Healthy psychological functioning is a major theme in Maslow's writing and it is an important factor for determining the counselor trainee's level of development in the counselor complexity model. Both theorists also deal with the issue of complexity. The self-actualized person and the master counselor think, value, and conceptualize in more complex ways than most people in our culture.

Review of the Literature

This section will include a brief review of the literature dealing with developmental supervision and research using Shostrom's

(1974) Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The POI has been the most widely used instrument for assessing individual's level of self-actualization.

Developmental Supervision

An area of emphasis in counselor trainee supervision has been in developmental supervision theory. Recently, several developmental models of supervision have emerged which attempt to synthesize some of the divergent views of theoreticians and researchers in the field (Bernard, 1979; Blocher, 1983; Hart, 1982; Hess, 1980; Littrell, Lee-Bordin, & Lorenz, 1979; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981; Yogev, 1982). These developmental models represent an important advancement in the theoretical thinking involving supervision (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984). This advancement describes counselor trainee development at different stages and offers different types of supervisor behavior for trainees as they progress through higher levels of counselor development. Hess (1980) states that until recently, little research has been conducted on how counselors change as they gain counseling experience.

The empirical research that has been presented to date has been supportive of these developmental models (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Hill, Charles, & Reed, 1981; McNeil, Stoltenberg, & Pierce, 1985; Miars, Tracey, Ray, Cornfield, O'Farrell, & Gelso, 1983; Raphael, 1982; Reising & Daniels, 1983; Stoltenberg, Solomon, & Odgen, 1985; Wiley, 1983; Worthington, 1984). Worthington (1984) states that

Stoltenberg's (1981) counselor complexity model is currently the most heuristic developmental supervision model. Miars et al. (1983) view Stoltenberg's model as ". . . both integrating and advancing the conceptual base for future supervision research and practice . . ." (p. 404).

Several empirical studies have been conducted using the counselor complexity model as a basis for understanding the supervision process. McNeil et al. (1985) examined supervisee's perceptions of their development using the Supervisory Levels Questionnaire (SLQ). They placed supervisees into beginning, intermediate, and advanced groups based on amount of experience. Trainee experience was determined by combining trainees' amount of supervised counseling experience, amount of non-supervised counseling experience, and amount of education. Statistically significant differences in the expected directions were found when the beginning group was compared to the intermediate group, as well as to the advanced group, on all the subscales of the SLQ--self-awareness, dependency-autonomy, theory/skill acquisition. These results are supportive of Stoltenberg's counselor complexity model. Miars et al. (1983) examined the supervision process, as reported by supervisors, across the four experience levels of first practicum, second practicum, advanced practicum, and predoctoral intern. Results indicated that supervisors significantly varied supervision between second practicum and advanced practicum. The authors interpreted these findings as being partially supportive of Stoltenberg's model because changes in supervisors'

styles can imply that there are different levels of counselor development. Reising and Daniels (1983) examined a simple and a complex model of counselor development. They found that counselor development is best described by a complex model which includes factors of anxiety and doubt, independence, method/skills training, work validation, commitment ambivalence, and respectful confrontation. These findings are supportive of a developmental theory of supervision. Stoltenberg et al. (1985) compared supervisee and supervisor initial perceptions of the supervisee's level of counselor development as described by the counselor complexity model and found that supervisee and supervisor ratings of the supervisee's developmental level were positively correlated. Wiley (1983) created the Developmental Level Determination Scale (DLDS) to assess supervisee's developmental level based on the four levels of the counselor complexity model. She found that supervisee level was significantly correlated to amount of supervised counseling experience and not correlated to amount of unsupervised counseling experience.

Several other empirical studies have focused on a general developmental model of supervision. Hill, Charles, and Reed (1981) conducted a longitudinal study over a 3-year period involving 12 doctoral students in a counseling psychology program. An analysis of tape transcripts for each of the three years showed that the counselor trainees increased in amount of minimal encouragers and decreased in their use of questions. These findings were interpreted as supportive of developmental supervision theory. Raphael (1982)

looked at groups of beginning and advanced supervisees and found
that supervisor statements about supervisees in these two groups
differed in six of nine categories. These findings were also supportive
of a developmental supervision model. Heppner and Roehlke (1984)
did a three part study dealing with the interpersonal influence
process between supervisees and supervisors, trainees' perceptions
of supervisor behaviors which had an effect on the effectiveness
of supervisors, and trainees' impressions of critical incidents
that occurred during supervision. They found that interpersonal
influence variables changed across different levels in training,
trainees' perceptions of effective supervisor behavior was different
across levels, and the types of critical incidents that trainees'
reported changed across level in training. Heppner and Roehlke
(1984) concluded that the results of these three studies were supportive
of a developmental model of supervision. Worthington (1984) also
looked at supervisee perceptions of different kinds of supervisor
behavior. This study classified supervisees at five different levels
in training and used 237 counselor trainees from 11 different insti-
tutions. Worthington reported that supervisees' perceptions of
supervisor behavior did change as they gained experience. His findings
were supportive of a developmental model of supervision.

Research on developmental supervision theory and the counselor
complexity model is still limited, however, the empirical studies
that have been conducted have been generally supportive of these
models. The counselor complexity model has received some validation

from the studies that have been conducted and it seems that this
model merits more study.

Personal Orientation Inventory

Shostrom's (1974) Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) has
been widely used in assessing individual's level of self-actualization
(Knapp, 1976). The POI's two main personal orientation scales are
designed to measure a person's inner-directedness (Id) and time
competence (Tc). The inner-directedness scale assesses whether
one's reaction tends to be self-oriented or other-oriented. Self-
oriented people often follow internalized principles and motivations
while other-oriented individuals are primarily influenced by peer
groups or other types of external forces. The time competence scale
attempts to measure how often the person lives in the present.
The time incompetent person tends to be overly concerned with past
or future oriented events. Results of the research done in this
area have been generally supportive of self-actualization theory
(Knapp, 1976). Hyman (1979) states, "The evidence thus lends consider-
able support to use of the Id and Tc scales as measures of two related
but distinct aspects of self-actualization" (p. 182).

One segment of research has focused on the relationship between
level of counselor self-actualization and effectiveness of the coun-
selor. Selfridge and Vander Kolk (1976) found a strong relationship
between level of self-actualization, as measured by the POI's inner-
directed and time competence scales, and counselor effectiveness
as perceived by clients. Other studies have associated effective

counselors with high levels of self-actualization as measured by the POI (Faillace, 1977; Foulds, 1969; Graff and Bradshaw, 1970). Brekke (1978) concludes from the results of his research that clients' perceptions of counselor empathy tends to be more related to counselor's level of self-actualization rather than to counselor's reflection of feeling skill. Omizo, Rivers, and Michael (1980) found that level of self-actualization may be a good predictor of ability in facilitative communication among counselor trainees.

Some studies have examined the impact of counseling practicum (e.g., Master's practicum I), counseling training--such as training for alcoholism counselors, and counselor training programs (e.g., Master's degree in Counselor Education) on trainee's level of self-actualization as measured by the POI (Bonk, Knapp, & Michael, 1968; Melchers, 1972; Osborne & Steeves, 1982; Schwab & Harris, 1981; Phillips, 1974). All of these studies found statistically significant differences in a positive direction on the inner-directedness and/or the time competence scales following the practicum or training.

Several studies have examined the effect of training on the level of self-actualization of counselors and others in the helping professions. Payne's (1981) study of drug abuse counselors revealed that the POI's inner-directedness scale was significantly correlated with accurate prognostic statements by counselors. Weinrach and Knapp (1976) report that high school counselors with higher POI scores were rated as more effective by their students. The time competence scale was significantly correlated with a measure of

effectiveness in this study. Murphy (1980) also found a significant correlation between the time competence scale and a measure of adjustment among Catholic priests. Wehler and Hoffman (1978) indicated that after a 9 month training period, alcoholism counselors showed statistically significant increases in inner-directedness and time competence. Narr (1974) in a study of senior undergraduate students, found that students participating in a counseling skills course scored statistically significant increases in 11 of the 12 POI scales. The inner-directedness scale was significant at the .01 level and the time competence scale was significant at the .05 level. The results of these studies can be interpreted as offering support for the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between amount of counselor training and counselor trainee's level of self-actualization as measured by the POI.

While many studies have offered support for the idea that level of self-actualization increases as a result of practicum or training experiences, or level of self-actualization is associated with counselor effectiveness, not all research has been supportive of these findings. Rowe and Winborn (1973) in a replication study of Fould's (1969) work, found that only one of the POI's 12 scales had a statistically significant relationship to counselor level of inter-personal functioning. Brown (1975), Phillips (1975), Rodriguez (1977), and Thames and Hill (1980) also obtained results which were not supportive of a relationship between the POI and counseling behaviors. No statistically significant relationships

were found in these studies between the POI's inner-directedness or time competence scales and measures of counselor facilitativeness, counselor skill, or counselor effectiveness. Langelier (1976) found no statistically significant changes in level of self-actualization as a result of counseling practicum. These studies are examples of investigations that have not been supportive of the relationship between self-actualization theory and counselor development.

From this review of literature dealing with self-actualization theory and research, and counselor development, several conclusions can be reached. First, although the counselor complexity model's developmental approach has considerable intuitive appeal, the empirical data on this model are limited. More research is needed to determine the validity of the counselor complexity model. Second, some controversy exists regarding the relationship between level of self-actualization as measured by the POI and counselor trainee development. The review of literature revealed a number of empirical studies supportive of this relationship. To help clarify this question about the relationship between levels of self-actualization and counselor trainee development, more empirical investigation is needed.

Hypotheses

Based on Stoltenberg's (1981) counselor complexity model, Maslow's (1970) theory of self-actualization, and the research supporting these works, the following hypotheses are posed:

1. There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on POI time competence scores.

2.   There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on POI inner-directedness scores.

3.   There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on amount of supervised counseling experience.

4.   There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on amount of unsupervised counseling experience.

5.   There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ self-awareness scores.

6.   There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ dependency-autonomy scores.

7.   There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ theory/skills acquisition scores.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

Participants

Participants in this study included 79 supervisees and 44 supervisors. Useable data were collected from 15 counseling psychology students at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UTK), 9 educational psychology students at UTK, 1 counselor education student at UTK, 5 community agency students at UTK, 5 clinical psychology students at UTK, 6 counseling psychology students at North Texas State University, 28 social work students at UTK, and 10 U.S. Army mental health workers at Ft. Knox, Kentucky. Fifty-three supervisees were female and 26 were male. The average age of supervisees was 30.87 years with a range of 22 to 60 years. Twenty-seven of the supervisors were female and 17 were male. Supervisors ranged in age from 26 to 63 years, with the average age being 41.0 years.

Sample Size

Power analysis (Cohen, 1977) was used to determine the number of subjects needed for this study. Power is defined as the probability of finding a treatment effect. Cohen (1977) states that three factors affect power. These factors are sample size, level of significance or alpha level, and effect size (ES). ES is the

amount of the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. If these factors are taken into account before data are collected, then the statistical power of the data analysis will be increased (Cohen, 1977).

To help simplify the process of determining appropriate sample size, Cohen (1977) provides guidelines for choosing effect size and power. He suggests a value of .10 for small ES, .25 for medium ES, and .40 for large ES. ES for this study was determined by calculating the ES from two similar studies (Wiley, 1983; McNeil et al., 1985), and it was decided to employ a medium ES (.25). Power was set at .80 and level of significance was set at .05 (Cohen, 1977). With these three factors as guidelines, Cohen's (1977) sample size tables for analysis of variance with four groups suggest a minimum of 58 subjects.

<center>Procedure</center>

Subjects, who consisted of supervisors and supervisees, were contacted by the experimenter by (1) asking for volunteers in students' classes, (2) writing letters to potential participants, (3) making telephone calls and writing letters to administrators at distant institutions, and (4) making telephone calls to prospective subjects in local settings. After subjects agreed to participate, supervisors followed one set of procedures and supervisees followed another set of procedures.

All supervisors were given a supervisor folder to complete. Each folder contained materials in the following order: (1) supervisor

instruction sheet, (2) statement of informed consent, (3) supervisor demographic form, (4) supervisor card #1, (5) supervisor question-naire(s)--the Developmental Level Determination Scale (Wiley, 1983)--(6) supervisor card #2. The supervisor instruction sheet provided a step-by-step explanation of how to complete the materials in this study. The statement of informed consent briefly described the study and contained a statement of permission. Demographic data were collected on the supervisors by using the supervisor demographic form. Completion of this form required about 5 minutes. Supervisor card #1 contained instructions for determining the names and code numbers of the supervisees in this study. In order to maintain anonymity of the supervisees, this card was destroyed after the supervisor had completed all materials. One Developmental Level Determination Scale was completed by the supervisor for each supervisee participating in the study. It took the supervisor approximately 10 minutes to complete the Developmental Level Determination Scale for each supervisee. Supervisor card #2 contained the code numbers of the supervisor and the participating supervisees. A sample set of supervisor materials is included in Appendices E through H.

All supervisees received similar folders. Each folder contained instructions, an informed consent form, a demographic data form, the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1974), and the Supervisory Levels Questionnaire (SLQ) (McNeil, Stoltenberg, & Pierce, 1985). The instruction sheet described the procedures for completing all materials. The supervisee informed consent form explained the

study and contained a statement of permission. Demographic data were collected by means of the supervisee demographic data form. All items on the POI have two possible answers, and it took trainees approximately 30 minutes to complete this instrument. The SLQ contained items on a 7 point Likert scale and required about 10 minutes to complete. The order of the materials was the same for everyone except for the POI and SLQ. The order of these two instruments was alternated to guard against possible ordering effects. Half of the randomly selected participants completed the POI first and half completed the SLQ first. A sample set of supervisee materials is included in Appendices A through D.

All data were collected during the Spring and Summer terms of 1985. Each subject was given the opportunity to ask for the results of the study and this information was provided upon request.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted with nine supervisees and four supervisors from the Educational and Counseling Psychology department's Master's Practicum II at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Feedback from the participants indicated that the procedures and instruments in this study were clear and understandable. Therefore, no changes were made in the pilot study procedures when the main study was conducted.

Variables

The independent variable in this study was level of counselor development. Counselor development consisted of four different levels and these levels were determined from scores on the Developmental Level Determination Scale (DLDS). The DLDS was completed by the supervisor.

There were seven dependent variables in this study. These variables included two POI scores (inner-directedness and time competence), three SLQ scores (self-awareness, dependency-autonomy, and theory/skill acquisition), number of weeks of supervised counseling experience, and number of weeks of unsupervised counseling experience.

Statistical Analysis

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if any statistical differences existed between the means of the four groups on the seven dependent variables. The level of significance was set at .05. If the one-way MANOVA was found to be significant, then one-way ANOVA's were used to determine which of the seven hypotheses were significant (Larrabee, 1982; Leary & Altmaier, 1980; Olsen, 1979). Post-hoc Duncan's Multiple Range tests were conducted on hypotheses with significant differences to determine how the four groups differed. The statistical analysis was done at The University of Tennessee Computer Center on an IBM

360/65 computer using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS,
1982).

Instrumentation

Four instruments were used in this study--the Developmental
Level Determination Scale (DLDS) (Wiley, 1983), the Supervisory
Levels Questionnaire (SLQ) (McNeil, Stoltenberg, & Pierce, 1985),
the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1974), and a
general information questionnaire.

The DLDS was used to assess the level of counselor development
and was completed by the trainee's supervisor. This instrument
consisted of 21 Likert scale items derived from Stoltenberg's counselor
complexity model. The twenty-first item was not scored. Items
were on a seven point scale ranging from absolutely untrue to abso-
lutely true. The test-retest reliability of the DLDS scale over
a 2 week period is .76 (Wiley, 1983). Four expert raters and four
experienced supervisors were used to establish the construct validity
of the DLDS. Each rater possessed a thorough understanding of the
counselor complexity model. The four experienced supervisors were
counseling psychologists who had at least 3 years of experience
as a supervisor. Each of the 20 scored items on the DLDS was designed
to represent one of the four counselor development levels. Wiley
constructed these items based on the counselor complexity model.
Construct validity was determined by having the raters identify
each of the 20 items as being in one of the four levels of the counselor

complexity model. "Correctly" identified items were those items

chosen by raters which matched the DLDS' four levels of counselor

development. Fourteen of the 20 items of the DLDS were correctly

identified by three-fourths of the expert raters. Twelve of the

DLDS items were correctly identified by all of the experienced raters.

Four items were correctly identified by three-fourths of the experi-

enced raters and four items were correctly identified by half of

the experienced raters. These results are supportive of the DLDS'

construct validity. Wiley (1983) concluded that the DLDS is suffi-

ciently reliable for research purposes and has reasonable construct

validity.

Scoring of the DLDS consisted of adding the scores for the

five items on each of the four levels. The highest score determined

the supervisee's predominant level of counselor development. In

Wiley's (1983) study 8 out of 107 subjects were tied on their level

of development scores. She conducted statistical tests on 18 variables

to determine if subjects with tie scores were different from subjects

with non-tied level scores. Wiley found no significant differences

between the two groups of any of the variables. A random procedure

was used to break ties in her study, and a similar procedure was

followed in this study. In the unlikely event that someone tied

on three of the scales, the middle level would have been used as

the subject's counselor development level.

In contrast to the DLDS, McNeil, Stoltenberg, and Pierce's

SLQ was completed by the supervisee. The SLQ was designed to measure

trainee's self-perceptions of their counseling and supervision behaviors. The SLQ is comprised of 24 self-report items. Items are on a seven point Likert scale with never and always at opposite ends of the scales. McNeil, Stoltenberg, and Pierce (1985) report that the SLQ items are based on the counselor complexity model. Construct validity of the SLQ was established by having four expert judges classify the items into three subscales with eight items each. The three subscales of the SLQ are self-awareness, dependency-autonomy, and theory/skills acquisition. The judges were chosen because they were known to have a detailed understanding of the counselor complexity model. McNeil, Stoltenberg, and Pierce (1985) report that items were independently classified by the judges. When there was disagreement regarding which subscale an item should be in, the three judges discussed the item and the item was only included in the instrument if it was agreed upon by all three judges. No data regarding the construct validity of the SLQ were reported. Reliability data for the SLQ consisted of Cronbach's alpha coefficients. Reported Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the three subscales were-- self-awareness .55, dependency-autonomy .76, and theory/skills acquisition .67 (McNeil, Stoltenberg, and Pierce, 1985). The SLQ yielded scores for each of the three subscales, with higher scores reflecting a greater frequency of behaviors as described by the items making up that factor.

Shostrom's (1974) POI was used to assess trainee's level of self-actualization. The POI is comprised of 150 two-choice

items and was completed by the supervisees. Items were scored for
two main personal orientation scales--inner-directedness and time
competence. The inner-directed scale is designed to measure whether
a person's reaction tends to be self-oriented or other-oriented.
Self-oriented people often follow internalized principles and motiva-
tions while other-oriented individuals are primarily influenced
by peer groups or some other type of outside force. The time competence
scale attempts to measure how often the person lives in the present
as opposed to being overly concerned with past or future oriented
events.

While the validity data on the POI is quite extensive, only
a brief summary of this information will be presented in this review.
Knapp's (1976) Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory reviews
approxximately 400 studies, and it is the most comprehensive report
of validity data for the POI. This detailed review offers support
for the validity of the POI. Hyman's (1979) review focuses on the
construct validity of the POI's two major scales, inner-direction
(Id) and time competence (Tc). From this review of over 30 studies
dealing with the construct validity of the POI's two main scales,
she concludes that "Evidence relevant to both variables supports
their validity as measures of qualities associated by Maslow with
self-actualization" (Hyman, 1979, p. 182). Damm (1969, 1972) states
that the best overall measure of self-actualization on the POI is
either the raw score from the inner-directedness scale or a combina-
tion of the raw scores from the inner-directedness scale and the

time competence scale. Tosi and Lindamood's (1975) review of the POI states, "Evidence for the POI's predictive validity on criteria related to self-actualization also supports its construct validity" (p. 223). Oakland, Freed, Lovekin, Davis, and Camilleri's (1978) critique of the POI is much less supportive of the POI. Their investigation of the POI's validity data revealed mixed results. In summary, it appears that the majority of studies conducted have been supportive of the POI's validity.

Reliability data for the POI have also been within acceptable limits. Shostrom (1974) reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .93 for the inner-directedness scale and .91 for the time competence scale for a group of 75 adults in a sensitivity training course and a group of 15 school psychologists. The length of time between the first test and the retest for these two groups was 11 and 15 weeks. Klavetter and Mogar (1967) obtained test-retest reliability data on the POI from 48 college students by administering the POI twice, 1 week apart. The test-retest reliability coefficient for the inner-directedness scale was .77 and the time competence scale was .71. Ilardi and May (1968) reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .55 for the time competence scale and .71 for the inner-directedness scale in their study involving 46 Nursing students. Wise and Davis (1975) administered the POI twice with a 2 week interval to 172 university students. They reported test-retest reliability coefficients of .88 for inner-directedness and .75 for time competence. These studies all provide support for the reliability of the POI.

General information questionnaires were completed by supervisors and supervisees. The supervisee general information questionnaire has questions regarding trainees' age, sex, weeks of supervised counseling experience, weeks of unsupervised counseling experience, type of training program, current training status, number of clients seen per week, number of hours per week spent in individual supervision, number of weeks of supervision received from trainees' current supervisor, and how many weeks the trainee has known his or her supervisor. The supervisor demographic form has questions regarding supervisors' sex, age, amount of experience as a supervisor, academic degree, current position, and the number of clients the supervisor sees per week.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

A one-way MANOVA was performed in which the counselor development level served as the independent variable with four levels. There were seven dependent variables. An overall one-way MANOVA using the Pillai-Bartlett trace statistic (Olsen, 1976) was found to be significant (F (21, 213) = 1.66, p < .05). One-way ANOVA's were then performed to determine which of the dependent variables yielded significant results. Post-hoc Duncan's Multiple Range tests were carried out on the dependent variables that had previously shown significant differences.

The seven main hypotheses proposed in this research project corresponded to the seven dependent variables tested in the MANOVA and subsequent ANOVA's and Duncan's Multiple Range tests. Table 1 provides a summary of the means and standard deviations of the four levels of counselor development on the seven dependent variables. Significant differences were found on the Supervisory Levels Questionnaire (SLQ) self-awareness scores (F (3, 75) = 2.77, p < .05) and unsupervised counseling experience (F (3, 75) = 4.57, p < .05) (Table 2). After analyzing the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range test, differences were found between level four counselors and level one counselors on SLQ self-awareness scores. Also, the SLQ means of all four groups were in the predicted order of magnitude

37

Table 1. Means and (Standard Deviations) for the Four Levels of Counselor Development.

Dependent Variable	Level I n=6	Level II n=24	Level III n=20	Level IV n=29
POI Time competence	16.00(3.63)	16.29(2.71)	17.70(3.51)	17.90(3.20)
POI Inner-directedness	86.50(19.84)	87.88(11.83)	91.45(11.69)	92.41(11.38)
Supervised counseling experience	55.67(43.09)	38.62(36.24)	50.10(33.41)	78.79(74.48)
Unsupervised counseling experience	100.00(154.92)	84.38(131.22)	53.75(98.10)	222.41(238.42)
SLQ Self-awareness	36.67(6.06)	39.17(4.42)	40.35(5.43)	41.90(4.08)
SLQ Dependency-autonomy	41.50(9.29)	40.38(5.28)	41.65(5.87)	44.45(4.15)
SLQ Theory/skill acquisition	38.67(2.94)	37.96(4.28)	40.30(4.57)	40.66(2.89)

POI = Personal Orientation Inventory, SLQ = Supervisory Levels Questionnaire.

Table 2. Summary Table for Analysis of Variance for the 7 Dependent Variables.

Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square Between	Mean Square Within	F	P
POI-Time competence	47.49	3	15.83	10.08	1.57	0.2021
POI-Inner-directedness	383.66	3	127.89	152.16	0.84	0.4784
Supervised counseling experience	22813.85	3	7604.62	2880.55	2.64	0.0547
Unsupervised counseling experience	419127.31	3	139709.10	30540.54	4.57	0.0055*
SLQ-Self-awareness	183.97	3	61.32	22.13	2.77	0.0466*
SLQ-Dependency-autonomy	235.03	3	78.34	29.48	2.66	0.0535
SLQ-Theory/Skill acquisition	111.99	3	37.33	14.60	2.56	0.0605

POI = Personal Orientation Inventory, SLQ = Supervisory Levels Questionnaire, * = Significant at .05 alpha level.

for this variable. From the results of the Duncan's Multiple Range
test, it was also concluded that level four counselors have signifi-
cantly more weeks of unsupervised counseling experience than level
three counselors. Level one, level two, and level four counselors
did not have significant differences in number of weeks of unsuper-
vised counseling experience. No significant differences were found
on POI inner-directedness scores, POI time competence scores, SLQ
dependency-autonomy scores, SLQ theory/skill acquisition scores,
and weeks of supervised counseling experience (Table 2).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The findings of this investigation are discussed in this
chapter. First, the general limitations of the study will be pre-
sented. Next will be a discussion of the results of the seven main
hypotheses that were tested. Several supplementary analyses of
the data will also be presented. The chapter will close with a
brief statement about the implications of the study and suggestions
for future research.

General Limitations

The design of the study is classified as descriptive. There-
fore, cause-and-effect conclusions cannot be drawn from the results
(Huck, Cormier, & Bounds, 1974). One possible source of variance
in this research comes from the many different supervisors who
participated in the study. One supervisor's level four rated counselor
may be another's level three rated counselor. Supervisors were
required to have a minimum of 1 hour of individual supervision for
at least 5 weeks with the supervisee they were rating. The descriptive
nature of this study, however, did not allow for control over super-
visor variance in ratings.

Another problem of this study was the lack of equal distribution
of counselors across the four counselor development levels. While

levels two (n=24), three (n=20), and four (n=29) were relatively
equal in number, level one was quite low (n=6). Although these
numbers were sufficient to allow for use of the one-way MANOVA,
the generalizability of these findings is limited by the small number
of level one counselors.

One other limitation of this study is the low reliability
scores for the three SLQ subscales. Cronbach's alpha coefficients
for the three subscales were--self-awareness .55, dependency-autonomy
.76, and theory/skills acquisition .67 (McNeil, Stoltenberg, & Pierce,
1985). These coefficients are not indicative of a highly reliable
instrument.

Discussion

Hypothesis One

There will be significant differences between counselors
at the four counselor development levels on POI time competence
scores.

The one-way ANOVA did not show any significant differences
between counselors at the four levels of counselor development on
the POI's time competence scale. It appears that level of counselor
development is not related to whether an individual lives more in
the present, or is more concerned with past or future events. While
the results did not yield statistically significant differences,
it is interesting to note that the POI time competence mean scores
for the four levels of counselor development were in the predicted
order.

Hypothesis Two

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on POI inner-directedness scores.

Again, the one-way ANOVA did not show any significant differences between counselors at the four levels of counselor development on the POI's inner-directedness scale. These findings seem to indicate that a person's tendency to follow internalized principles and motivations or a tendency to look outside himself or herself for direction is not related to his or her level of counselor development. Although statistical differences did not exist between the POI inner-directedness mean scores for the four levels of counselor development, the mean scores for the four groups were once again in the predicted order.

Hypothesis Three

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on amount of supervised counseling experience.

The one-way ANOVA did not yield statistically significant results; however, the p value was quite close to the .05 level of significance (p = .0547). These results, strictly considered, do not lend support for the hypothesis that amount of supervised counseling experience is related to level of counselor development. This nonsignificant result is inconsistent with Wiley's (1983) study which used the DLDS to determine level of counselor development.

She found that supervisee level of development was significantly
correlated to amount of supervised counseling experience for counsel-
ing psychology trainees. In the present study the level four counselor
mean number of weeks was at least 23 weeks greater than any other
counselor level. However, the mean number of weeks was not statis-
tically different due to the relatively large variances within the
groups on this variable.

Hypothesis Four

There will be significant differences between counselors
at the four counselor development levels on amount of unsupervised
counseling experience.

The results of the one-way ANOVA did support this hypothesis.
The post-hoc Duncan's Multiple Range test showed that level four
counselors have significantly more weeks of unsupervised counseling
experience than level three counselors, level one counselors, and
level two counselors. The mean number of weeks for level four
counselors was 221.41, level three counselors averaged 53.75 weeks,
while the level two counselor mean was 84.38 and the level one
counselor mean was 100.00. These results are also inconsistent
with Wiley's (1983) study which showed no significant differences
between the four levels of counselor development on amount of unsuper-
vised counseling experience. From the results of the present study
it appears that amount of unsupervised counseling experience is
partially related to level of counselor development.

Hypothesis Five

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ self-awareness scores.

After analyzing the results of the one-way ANOVA on the SLQ self-awareness scores, it was determined that statistical differences did exist. The Duncan's Multiple Range test was then conducted and differences were found between level four counselors ($\bar{X}$ = 41.90) and level one counselors ($\bar{X}$ = 36.67) on SLQ self-awareness scores. The mean score for level three counselors was 40.35 and the mean score for level two counselors was 39.17. It seems that level of self-awareness tends to increase as counselors move from lower levels of counselor development to higher levels. These findings are consistent with the results of McNeil et al. (1985) in their study of the SLQ with counseling and clinical psychology students.

Hypothesis Six

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ dependency-autonomy scores.

The one-way ANOVA did not show statistically significant differences. This hypothesis was not supported. However, the p value was close to the .05 level of significance (p = .0535). From the results of this data it appears that no relationship exists between level of counselor development and SLQ dependency-autonomy scores. These findings are not consistent with the work of McNeil

et al. (1985) who found a statistically significant relationship between higher SLQ dependency-autonomy scores and more counseling experience for counseling and clinical psychology students.

Hypothesis Seven

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ theory/skill acquisition scores.

Analysis of the one-way ANOVA revealed that the p value (p = .0605) was close to the established level of significance but it did not meet this standard. These lack of significant differences were inconsistent with results obtained by McNeil et al. (1985) using the SLQ. They found that increased SLQ theory/skill acquisition scores were related to greater levels of counselor experience.

This analysis of the seven hypotheses revealed that only two hypotheses were supported by the data. From these findings it can be suggested that increased amounts of unsupervised counseling experience and higher level of SLQ self-awareness scores are related to higher levels of counselor development.

The results of both hypotheses dealing with self-actualization as measured by the POI showed a slight increase in mean scores in the predicted direction across the four levels of counselor development, however, these increases were not at all close to being statistically significant. These findings lead to several possible tentative conclusions. It may be the case that level of self-actualization does not influence one's level of counselor development. It may

also be that the POI is not the best instrument for measuring level of self-actualization with a more psychologically sophisticated population as used in this study (Tosi & Lindamood, 1975).

Supplementary Analyses

While the results of the two hypotheses dealing with the POI were not close to being statistically significant, the other three non-significant hypotheses were all within roughly one one-hundredth of a p value point of being significant. Due to the imprecise nature of the instruments used and the arbitrary selection of the .05 level of significance, it was decided that a supplementary analysis would be conducted on these three hypotheses.

The supplementary analysis consisted of changing the level of significance on the one-way ANOVA and the post-hoc Duncan's Multiple Range test from .05 to .10. This level of significance was used because the computer program for Duncan's Multiple Range test can only be changed in increments of .05 (SAS, 1982): The results of this supplemental analysis involving hypotheses three, six, and seven will be discussed.

Hypothesis Three

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on amount of supervised counseling experience.

With the change in significance level, the results of the one-way ANOVA were supportive of this hypothesis. The post-hoc

Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that there were significant differences between the means of level four counselors ($\overline{X}$ = .78.79) and the means of level two counselors ($\overline{X}$ = 38.63) on amount of supervised counseling experience. Level four, level one ($\overline{X}$ = 55.67), and level three counselors ($\overline{X}$ = 50.10) were not found to have statistically significant differences in amount of supervised counseling experience. The results of this hypothesis test provide partial support for the counselor complexity model. These findings are more consistent with Wiley's (1983) results and they offer empirical support for the idea that amount of supervised counseling experience has some relationship with level of counselor development.

Hypothesis Six

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ dependency-autonomy scores.

After the alpha level was changed, the results of the one-way ANOVA provided support for this hypothesis. The Duncan's Multiple Range test showed that level four counselors mean scores ($\overline{X}$ = 44.45) were significantly different from level two counselors mean scores ($\overline{X}$ = 40.38) on the SLQ scale. Level four, level three ($\overline{X}$ = 41.65), and level one ($\overline{X}$ = 41.50) counselors' scores were not statistically different. These results are partially supportive of the counselor complexity model and they are similar to the findings reported by McNeil et al. (1985) in their study of the SLQ.

Hypothesis Seven

There will be significant differences between counselors at the four counselor development levels on SLQ theory/skills acquisition scores.

With the changed alpha level the results of the one-way ANOVA were supportive of this hypothesis. Results of the Duncan's Multiple Range test pointed out significant differences between level four counselors ($\overline{X}$ = 40.65) and level two counselors ($\overline{X}$ = 37.96) on SLQ theory/skill acquisition mean scores. No statistically significant differences were found between level four, level three ($\overline{X}$ = 40.30), and level one counselors ($\overline{X}$ = 38.67) mean scores. These findings are partially supportive of the counselor complexity model. The results are also more consistent with McNeil et al.'s (1985) research.

From the original data analysis and the supplemental data analysis, some general statements can be made about this study. If a case can be made for increasing the alpha level in this study to approximately .06, then five of the seven hypotheses were supported by the data. These hypotheses included all three SLQ scales and both supervised and unsupervised counseling experience. Perhaps the most revealing finding from the study is that SLQ subscales and counseling experience were found to be consistent with the counselor complexity model while the two POI scales did not yield results which were supportive of this model. While there appears to be a sound theoretical basis to link the counselor complexity model with self-actualization theory, the empirical results of this study

do not provide support for this conclusion. From these results it can be suggested that level of counselor development has little relationship with an individual's movement toward self-actualization.

One additional supplemental data analysis was conducted. Instead of analyzing the data by the four counselor development levels, subjects were grouped by counselor level in training. In previous studies supervisees were grouped by level in training (Friedlander & Snyder, 1983; Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Miars et al., 1983; Reising & Daniels, 1983; Zahner & McDavis, 1980). In the present research, level in training was divided into first year Master's students, second year Master's students, first year doctoral students, second year doctoral students, and doctoral interns. Using this method of grouping subjects, the number of subjects in each group was as follows: first year Master's (n = 36), second year Master's (n = 16), first year doctoral (n = 13), second year doctoral (n = 7), and doctoral interns (n = 7). The seven hypotheses will be reviewed after analyzing the data based on counselor's level in training (see Appendices I and J for summary of results).

Hypothesis One

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on POI time competence scores.

The one-way ANOVA did not show any significant differences between mean scores of counselors at the five levels in training on the POI's time competence scale. This hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis Two

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on POI inner-directedness scores.

The results of the one-way ANOVA did support this hypothesis ($p = .0132$). The post-hoc Duncan's Multiple Range test showed that mean scores of doctoral interns ($\overline{X} = 99.00$) and first year doctoral students ($\overline{X} = 99.38$) were significantly higher on the POI inner-directedness scale than mean scores of second year doctoral students ($\overline{X} = 88.00$), first year Master's students ($\overline{X} = 87.50$), and second year Master's students ($\overline{X} = 87.44$). From these results it can be suggested that doctoral interns' and first year doctoral students' POI mean scores are related to being inner-directed, and therefore more self-actualized than second year doctoral students' mean scores, first year Master's students' mean scores, and second year Master's students' mean scores on the POI. It was unexpected to find that second year doctoral students mean scores were more similar to first and second year Master's students' mean scores, while doctoral interns' and first year doctoral students' average scores were significantly higher than the other three groups.

Hypothesis Three

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on amount of supervised counseling experience.

Although the one-way ANOVA was significant at the .0001 level, these results were expected because the method for establishing groups was based upon level in training.

Hypothesis Four

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on amount of unsupervised counseling experience.

The results of the one-way ANOVA were supportive of the hypothesis. The Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that doctoral interns ($\overline{X}$ = 296.43) had significantly more weeks of unsupervised counseling experience than did second year Master's students ($\overline{X}$ = 109.38), first year Master's students ($\overline{X}$ = 92.36), or second year doctoral students ($\overline{X}$ = 14.29). First year doctoral students ($\overline{X}$ = 223.08) had significantly more mean weeks of unsupervised counseling experience than second year doctoral students. It is interesting to note that although doctoral interns had more unsupervised counseling experience (approximately 296 weeks), second year doctoral students had the least amount of unsupervised counseling experience (approximately 14 weeks). This finding is surprising and no apparent reason can be found to explain these differences.

Hypothesis Five

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on SLQ self-awareness scores.

An examination of the results of the one-way ANOVA revealed that the data did not support this hypothesis.

Hypothesis Six

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on SLQ dependency-autonomy scores.

The one-way ANOVA results were not significant at the .05 alpha level. However, if the .10 alpha level were used, then this hypothesis would be supported by the data (p = .0710). The Duncan's Multiple Range test indicated that doctoral interns ($\overline{X}$ = 45.57), first year doctoral students ($\overline{X}$ = 43.61), second year Master's students ($\overline{X}$ = 41.83), and first year Master's students ($\overline{X}$ = 41.83) had significantly higher SLQ dependency-autonomy scores than did second year doctoral students ($\overline{X}$ = 37.57). These findings are unexpected and are similar to findings in hypothesis five which deals with unsupervised counseling experience. Stoltenberg (1981) hypothesizes that counselor trainees may temporarily regress in level of counselor development when they are placed in a new and threatening environment, however, this regression would seem to be more likely to occur during the potentially threatening internship experience instead of during second year doctoral practicum. It may be that something was occurring to second year doctoral students in this study which was related to their increased dependency scores.

Hypothesis Seven

There will be significant differences between counselors at the five levels in training on SLQ theory/skills acquisition scores.

This hypothesis was not supported by the results of the one-way ANOVA.

From the analysis of the data using level in training as the determinant for groups, some general statements can be made.

Although the POI time competence hypothesis was unsupported, the POI inner-directedness hypothesis was supported. Further analysis showed that doctoral interns and first year doctoral students had higher mean scores on the POI inner-directedness scale than trainees at the other three levels in training. The results of hypothesis three were expected due to the way trainees were classified according to level in training. Analysis of hypothesis four showed that doctoral interns had significantly more mean weeks of unsupervised counseling experience than did first and second year Master's students and second year doctoral students. From the analysis it was also found that first year doctoral students had significantly more mean weeks of unsupervised counseling experience than did second year doctoral students. Only one of the three hypotheses involving the SLQ was supported, and this hypothesis would not have been supported at the .05 alpha level, only the .10 level. Post-hoc analyses showed that second year doctoral students scored significantly lower on mean SLQ dependency-autonomy scores than the other four groups. This finding was unexpected.

Implications

The main purpose of this study was to test for differences in level of self-actualization, as measured by the POI, of counselor trainees at four levels of counselor development determined by the counselor complexity model. No significant differences were found between the four levels of counselor development on two POI scales

measuring self-actualization. From these findings it appears that
there is no substantial relationship between level of counselor
development and level of self-actualization.

Another central question in this study dealt with the relation-
ship between level of counselor trainee development and amount of
previous counseling experience. Hypotheses pertaining to the amount
of supervised and non-supervised counseling experience and level
of counselor development were supported by the data. In general,
a relationship does seem to exist between the amount of supervised
and non-supervised counseling experience and trainees' level of
counselor development. Higher levels of counselor development appear
to be related to more counseling experience.

The last major question in this research focused on the rela-
tionship between trainees' level of counselor development and their
perceptions of themselves, as measured by the SLQ. It was found
that higher levels of counselor development were associated with
increased mean scores in counselor trainee self-awareness, dependency-
autonomy, and theory/skill acquisition. These findings provide
support for the counselor complexity model.

While counselor trainees' level of self-actualization does
not appear to be related to level of counselor development, supple-
mental analyses based on trainees' level in training did reveal
differences between counselor training groups on mean POI inner-
directedness scores. Doctoral interns and first year doctoral students
had significantly higher mean scores than did second year doctoral

students, first year Master's students, and second year Master's
students. From these results it can be suggested that higher levels
in counselor training seem to be related to higher levels of self-
actualization, except for second year doctoral students. It is
puzzling that the second year doctoral students' mean inner-directedness
score was more similar to Master's students' mean scores. An examina-
tion of the raw data revealed no obvious explanation for this
unexpected finding.

Other supplemental analyses of the data, based on trainees'
level in training, revealed the following results. No significant
results were found between mean scores for the five levels in training
on the POI time competence scale, the SLQ self-awareness scale,
and the SLQ theory/skills acquisition scale. However, significant
differences between the level in training means were found on super-
vised counseling experience, non-supervised counseling experience,
and the SLQ dependency-autonomy scale. It was expected that dif-
ferences would be found between groups on amount of supervised counsel-
ing experience because this factor was used to determine the five
different groups. The analyses of data based on level in training
yielded findings which can be interpreted to suggest that higher
levels in training are related to increased amounts of non-supervised
counseling experience. Also, a relationship seems to exist between
levels in training and scores by trainees on the SLQ dependency-
autonomy scale. Higher levels in training were associated with
higher mean dependency-autonomy scores on the SLQ. It can be

suggested from these findings that supervisees at higher levels in training are more autonomous.

Two methods were used to classify counselor trainees in this study. The primary method used supervisors to rate the level of counselor development of their supervisees by means of the DLDS. Wiley's (1983) research has been the only other study dealing with level of counselor development to use this method of classification. The second method of classification employed in this study was based on supervisees' level in training. The majority of research dealing with supervision has used supervisees' level in training as the criteria for forming groups (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Miars et al., 1983; Worthington, 1984).

The two methods of classifying supervisees each have advantages and disadvantages. The level in training classification allows for clearly defined categories and it is easy to use. The DLDS rating of trainee level of counselor development by the supervisor allows for a more personal and individualized assessment of the trainee by someone who is assumed to have a good understanding of supervision theory and practice. The main disadvantage of the level in training classification is that it fails to consider other factors (e.g., personal maturity, age, previous counseling experience) which may have influenced trainees' level of counselor development. The primary disadvantage of using supervisor ratings of trainees is related to using an instrument (DLDS) to classify levels of counselor development. Any such instrument has attending validity and reliability questions.

As stated earlier, the level of counselor development classifi-cation yielded significant results ($\propto$ = .06) on five of the seven hypotheses. The five hypotheses which were supported by the data dealt with amount of supervised counseling experience, amount of non-supervised counseling experience, supervisees' SLQ self-awareness scores, dependency-autonomy scores, and theory/skill acquisition scores.

Analysis of the data based on the level in training classifica-tion when reanalyzed at the .01 alpha level yielded results which were supportive of four of the seven hypotheses. These four hypotheses focused on SLQ dependency-autonomy scores, POI inner-directedness scores, amount of non-supervised counseling experience, and amount of supervised counseling experience. Due to the nature of this classification system, it was expected that the hypothesis dealing with amount of supervised counseling experience would be supported. If the hypothesis dealing with supervised counseling experience is excluded, then the level in training classification produced significant results on three of the six hypotheses.

Another way of looking at the two ways of classification is to examine how often the level means of each hypothesis test were in the predicted order for each factor (e.g., DLDS level one mean was the lowest of the four means on hypothesis one, level two mean was the second lowest, etc.). The DLDS was comprised of four levels while the level in training classification had five levels. An overall examination of the data showed that the DLDS correctly

predicted 19 of the 28 (4 levels x 7 hypotheses) possible level
placements. The level in training classification correctly predicted
order by level (e.g., first year Master's mean score was the lowest
of the five means scores for POI inner-directedness scores) for
6 of the 30 levels (5 levels x 6 hypotheses--the supervised counseling
hypothesis was excluded due to the nature of the classification
system).

A consistent finding in this study is that for the level
of counselor development classification, level four mean scores
were consistently the highest scores on the seven dependent variables.
It was hypothesized that level four mean scores would be the highest,
so this portion of the study supported the counselor complexity
model. There were inconsistencies, however, in the mean scores
of the other three counselor development levels. On three of the
hypotheses which had significant differences--SLQ dependency-autonomy,
SLQ theory/skill acquisition, and supervised counseling experience--the
level four mean scores were significantly different, in the predicted
direction, from the level two mean scores. However, the level four
mean scores were not significantly different from level three and
level one mean scores. These findings were unexpected. For the
SLQ self-awareness hypothesis, all of the mean scores were in the
predicted order with only the level four mean being significantly
different from the level one mean score. On the non-supervised
counseling experience hypothesis, level four mean scores were signifi-
cantly different in the predicted direction from the other three

mean scores. It was surprising to find that the level one mean
score was higher on this variable than the level two and level three
mean scores. This pattern of inconsistency among the mean scores
of the three lower levels of the counselor complexity model is puzzling.

Several reasons can be proposed regarding the inconsistent
order in the mean scores of the three lower levels of counselor
development. The first reason can be attributed to the possible
inadequacy of the measuring instruments. Both the DLDS and the
SLQ are new instruments and although some reliability and validity
evidence is available on them, they need further testing and more
refinement. The second reason which may have affected the results
was the surprisingly low number (N=6) of level one counselors.
Although this number was large enough to allow for the MANOVA pro-
cedure, this group may not have been representative of level one
counselors. In future studies similar to this one, researchers
should take steps to insure that a representative number of level
one counselors is included in the sample.

The third reason for the inconsistent findings may be found
in Stoltenberg's (1981) description of the level two counselor.
He states that the primary issue for the level two counselor centers
around dependency-autonomy conflicts. It may be the case that level
two counselors' dependency-autonomy conflicts lead to lower self-report
scores on instruments measuring dependency-autonomy and theory/skill
acquisition. The dependency-autonomy conflicts may have a negative
impact on level two counselors' sense of security as counselors,

which can be reflected in lower scores on self-report instruments
which assess factors dealing with counseling skills. While the
POI, where no differences were found, is also a self-report instrument,
it tends to assess broader topics dealing with self-actualization.
The SLQ, on the other hand, deals specifically with how the supervisee
thinks, feels, and behaves as a counselor. On two of the three
SLQ scales, the level four mean score was significantly different
in the predicted direction than the mean score for level two counselors.
These two scales were dependency-autonomy and theory/skill acquisition.
The third SLQ scale, self-awareness, showed significant differences
between level four mean scores and level one mean scores. It may
be that the dependency-autonomy conflicts experienced by the level
two counselor do not have a negative effect on self-awareness.
This general interpretation is not consistent with McNeil et al.
(1985) who found that higher level trainees had significantly greater
scores on all three SLQ scales than trainees at lower levels. However,
in McNeil et al.'s study supervisees were placed into groups based
on amount of experience. It could be that supervisor ratings (DLDS)
are a more accurate way to rate actual trainee development than
the classification based on experience. If the classification by
supervisor is more accurate than the classification by experience
method, then the supervisor rating may be more sensitive to the
dependency-autonomy struggles experienced by the level two counselor.
This difference could account for the lower mean scores for the
level two counselor.

From the results of the primary and the supplemental data analyses, several trends emerged. Both methods of classification yielded results which supported a relationship between higher levels of counselor development or level in training, and higher mean scores for supervised counseling experience, non-supervised counseling experience, and the SLQ dependency-autonomy scale. It appears that these three variables are related to higher levels of counselor development and counselor level in training. In the future, supervisors and researchers may want to consider these three variables closely when trying to determine counselor trainee level of counselor development. Based on the counselor development level classification, higher mean scores on the SLQ self-awareness scale and the SLQ theory/skill acquisition scale are related to higher levels of counselor development. The level in training classification produced results which supported a relationship between higher levels in training and higher mean POI inner-directedness scores. In summary, there is some evidence to suggest that supervisors are more effective at classifying trainees level of counselor development as described by Stoltenberg's counselor complexity model than the more widely used level in training classification.

Future Research

Some suggestions for future research in counseling supervision will be presented in this section. Due to the descriptive design of this study, no cause-and-effect conclusions can be reached.

This study failed to show any significant relationship between level of self-actualization and level of counselor development. Repeating this study with another measure of self-actualization may be worthwhile. It is possible that the POI is not an effective instrument for measuring self-actualization in counselor trainees.

From the results of the data analyses involving the supervisor rating of trainees' level of counselor development classification and the level in training classification, it can be concluded that the former classification system merits further study. This classification yielded statistically significant results on five of the seven hypotheses dealing with counselor development as described by Stoltenberg's counselor development model. In future studies supervisors' ratings of trainees should be taken into consideration when determining how trainees are classified into groups. It may be worthwhile to use both methods of classification when conducting studies. Other supervision studies dealing with different variables could use this dual classification approach.

If supervision researchers did follow the aforementioned suggestions, several other steps should be taken. First, more refinement of the DLDS (Wiley, 1983) would be needed and other instruments should be developed to assess supervisees' level of counselor development. Also, it would be helpful if supervision researchers could establish a standard level in training criteria which could be followed by people conducting research in this area. Currently, many different

levels in training have been used to classify counselor trainees
and this lack of uniformity makes generalizations across studies
difficult.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

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

Blocher, D.H. (1983). Toward a cognitive developmental approach to counseling supervision. The Counseling Psychologist, 11(1), 27-34.

Bonk, E.C., Knapp, R.R., & Michael, W.B. (1978). Personality growth among counselor trainees as measured by the personal orientation dimension. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 38, 519-521.

Brekke, D.M. (1978). Relationships among level of self-actualization, reflection of feeling skill, and counselor functioning. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 3363A. (University Microfilms No. 7823479)

Brown, R.W. (1975). A counseling practicum training program: The relationship between self-actualization and counseling skill. Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 7643A-7644A. (University Microfilms No. 75-13, 300)

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analyses for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press.

Damm, V.J. (1969). Overall measure of self-actualization derived from the personal orientation inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 29, 977-981.

Damm, V.J. (1972). Overall measures of self-actualization derived from the personal orientation inventory: A replication and refinement study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 32(2), 485-489.

Faillace, J.J. (1977). A measure of self-actualization as a predictor of counselor effectiveness with coached clients. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 5600A-5601A. (University Microfilms No. 77-1572)

Foulds, M.L. (1969). Self-actualization and level of interpersonal functioning. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 9, 87-92.

Friedlander, M.L., & Snyder, J. (1983). Trainees' expectations for the supervisory process: Testing a developmental model. Counselor Education and Supervision, 22(2), 342-348.

Knapp, R.R. (1976). Handbook for the personal orientation inventory. San Diego: Edits.

Langelier, R. (1976). The psychology of self-actualization involving the communication of therapeutic counseling skills between beginning and experienced counselors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 4693B-4694B. (University Microfilms No. 76-5249)

Larrabee, M.J. (1982). Reexamination of a plea for multivariate analyses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29(2), 180-188.

Leary, M.R., & Altmaier, E.M. (1980). Type I error in counseling research: A plea for multivariate analyses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27(6), 611-615.

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

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

Maslow, A.H. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harpers.

Maslow, A.H. (1968). Towards a psychology of being. New York: Van Nostrand.

Maslow, A.H. (1970). Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Maslow, A.H. (1971). The farther reaches of human nature. New York: Viking Press.

McNeil, B.W., Stoltenberg, C.D., & Pierce, R.A. (1985). Supervisees' perceptions of their development: A test of the counselor complexity model. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32(4), 630-633.

Melchers, E.E. (1972). The value of the personal orientation inventory in predicting counselor effectiveness and the value of counseling practicum in promoting self-actualization. Dissertation Abstracts Internatioinal, 32, 3696A-3697A. (University Microfilms No. 72-3283)

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

Murphy, T.J. (1980). The relationship between self-actualization and adjustment among American Catholic priests. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 457-461.

Narr, R. (1974). Personality changes and innovations in teaching counseling skills to undergraduates. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, & Practice, 2, 52-57.

Oakland, J.A., Freed, F., Lovekin, A., Davis, J.P., & Camilleri, R. (1978). A critique of Shostrom's personal orientation inventory. Journal of Humanistic Psychoogy, 18(2), 75-85.

Olson, C.L. (1976). On choosing a test statistic in multivariate analysis of variance. Psychological Bulletin, 83(4), 579-586.

Omizo, M.M., Rivera, E., & Michael, W.B. (1980). Self-actualization measures as predictors of ability in facilitative communication among counselor trainees. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 451-456.

Osborne, J.W., & Steeves, L. (1982). Counseling practicum as a facilitator of self-actualization. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 28(3), 248-256.

Payne, T.J. (1981). Counselors' levels of self-actualization and prognoses for their clients: Further support for the POI. Journal of Drug Education, 11(4), 369-375.

Phillips, J.M. (1974). A study of a counseling practicum in facilitating the self-actualization process. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 2310A-2311A. (University Microfilms No. 74-23, 455)

Phillips, S.D. (1975). Self/ideal value congruence and its relationship to self-actualization and counseling effectiveness among selected counselor trainees. Dissertation Abstracts International, 34, 1987A-1988A. (University Microfilms No. 74-23, 455)

Raphael, R.D. (1982). Supervisee experience: The effect on supervisor verbal responses. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

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.

Rodriguez, A.M. (1977). The relationship between a measure of self-actualization and the facilitative conditions offered in counseling. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37, 4872A. (University Microfilms No. 77-1526)

Rowe, W., & Windborn, B.B. (1973). Self-actualization and counselor interpersonal functioning: A replication. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 13, 79-84.

SAS User's Guide: Basics, 1982. SAS Institute Incorporated, Cary, N.C.

Schwab, R., & Harris, T.L. (1981). Personal growth of counselor trainees. Counselor Education and Supervision, 20(3), 219-222.

Selfridge, F.F., & Vander Kolk, C. (1976). Correlates of counselor self-actualization and client-perceived facilitativeness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 15(3), 189-194.

Shostrom, E. (1974). Manual for the personal orientation inventory. San Diego: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.

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

Stoltenberg, C.D., & Pierce, R.A. (1984). Another look at developmental models for counselor training. Paper presented at the American College Personnel Association, Baltimore, M.D.

Stoltenberg, C.D., Solomon, G.S., & Odgen, L. (1985). Comaring supervisee and supervisor initial perceptions of supervision: Do they agree? Manuscript submitted for publication.

Thames, T.B., & Hill, C.E. (1980). The relationship of counselor self-actualization to counselor facilitativeness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 20(1), 45-49.

Tosi, D., & Lindamood, G. (1975). The measurement of self-actualization: A critical review of the personal orientation inventory. Journal of Personality Assessment, 39(3), 215-223.

Wehler, R., & Hoffman, H. (1978). Personal orientation inventory scores of female alcoholism counselors before and after training. Psychological Reports, 43, 500-502.

Weinrach, S.G., & Knapp, R.R. (1976). Level of school counselor actualizing and student perception of guidance services: Further validation of the personal orientation inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 36, 501-504.

Werner, H. (1957). The concept of development from a comparative and organismic point of view. In D. Harris (Ed.), The concept of development. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wiley, M.O. (1983). Person-environment congruency in counseling supervision by training level and its relationship to reported satisfaction and learning. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1982). Educational Resources Information Center, 18, ED 227 377.

Wise, G.W., & Davis, J.E. (1975). The personal orientation inventory: Internal consistency, stability, and sex differences. Psychological Reports, 36, 847-855.

Worthington, E.L., Jr. (1984). Empirical investigation of supervision of counselors as they gain experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31(1), 63-75.

Yogev, S. (1982). An eclectic model of supervision: A developmental sequence for beginning psychotherapy students. Professional Psychology, 13, 236-243.

Zahner, C.J., & McDavis, R.J. (1979). Moral development of professional and paraprofessional counselors and trainees. Counselor Education and Supervision, 19(4), 243-251.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SUPERVISEE INSTRUCTIONS

SUPERVISEE INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my dissertation research. Enclosed in this folder are materials and forms; please fill them out in the order that you find them in the folder. Please complete this form within one week if possible. If you have any problems or questions about the two questionnaires, the values inventory, or meeting the time schedule, please leave a message for me at 615-974-4466.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING STEPS IN THE ORDER PRESENTED:

1. Read and sign the Informed Consent form.

2. Complete the Supervisee Demographic form.

3. Complete the Supervisee Questionnaire and the Personal Orientation Inventory. Please complete these two instruments in the order that you find them in your folder.

4. After you have signed the Informed Consent form and completed the Supervisee Demographic form, the Supervisee Questionnaire, and the Personal Orientation Inventory, please hand in your folder to Mrs. Poor, secretary, in Community Mental Health.

5. Notify your supervisor that you have turned in all materials. Thanks again for your time and effort.

Toby Weaver

APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT (SUPERVISEE)

INFORMED CONSENT (SUPERVISEE)

Your participation in a research study is requested. This study deals with counseling/psychotherapy supervision. The purpose of the study is to determine certain characteristics of counseling/ psychotherapy trainees as reported by the trainees and their supervisors. You will be asked to complete one values inventory and two questionnaires. It has taken other people between 50 and 60 minutes to complete these three instruments. Your current supervisor will also be asked to complete two questionnaires. One of these questionnaires will be about you as a trainee. Neither you nor your supervisor will be informed of the other's responses in this study. Results from all instruments will be protected and kept confidential. If you would like to obtain the general results of this study, please indicate so by writing your mailing address beneath your printed name at the bottom of this form. Thank you for your participation.

Statement of Permission

I understand that this research is being conducted by Toby Weaver, a doctoral student in the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I have read the above description and understand that it is a truthful representation of this project. I consent to participation in this project with the understanding that my consent may be withdrawn

76

at any time without penalty. I further understand that my participation in this research is on a voluntary basis. If I have questions regarding participation, I can contact the experimenter at the address listed below.

Date_____   _____
                                              Signature

                                   _____
                                             Printed Name

Toby Weaver
Department of Educational and
  Counseling Psychology
108 Claxton Education Building
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
Phone: (615) 974-5131

APPENDIX C

SUPERVISEE DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

SUPERVISEE CODE NUMBER _____

SUPERVISEE DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

Please answer the following demographic questions.

1. Supervisee Sex: ___Male ___Female

2. Supervisee Age: ___Years

3. Your most recent degree received _____
   (degree)   (date)

4. Academic program where you are currently enrolled: (check one
   in each column)

   ___Master's program   ___Counseling Psychology
   ___Doctoral program   ___Clinical Psychology
   ___Other   ___Educational Psychology
      (please explain_____   ___Social Work
   _____)   ___Counselor Education
                                ___Other (please explain_____
                                _____)

5. Current training status:

   ___Master's Practicum I   ___Doctoral Practicum I
   ___Master's Practicum II   ___Doctoral Practicum II
   ___Master's Practicum III   ___Doctoral Practicum III
   ___Master's Practicum IV   ___Doctoral Practicum IV
   ___Master's Practicum V   ___Doctoral Practicum V
   ___Master's Practicum VI   ___Doctoral Practicum VI
   ___Master's Internship   ___Doctoral Internship
                                ___Other (please explain_____
                                _____)

6. University where your degree will be granted and date expected:

   _____
   (university)   (date degree expected)

7. Does your department consider you a part-time or a full time
   student?

        Circle one: Full-time   Part-time

8. This is my ___ semester or ___ quarter of <u>supervised</u> counseling experience. (credit and/or non-credit)

   (If on semester system only indicate number of semester, e.g., second)
   (If on quarter system only indicate number of quarter, e.g., fourth)

9. Other than supervised counseling experience, I have had ___ years experience working as a counselor.

10. Number of clients I currently see per week (both supervised and unsupervised) ___

11. Number of hours spent per week in individual supervision with my supervisor ___

12. How many weeks of supervision have you received from your current supervisor ___

13. How many weeks have you <u>known</u> your current supervisor ___

APPENDIX D

SUPERVISORY LEVELS QUESTIONNAIRE

SUPERVISEE QUESTIONNAIRE

In terms of your own <u>current</u> behavior, please circle the items below according to the following scale:

    1: NEVER
    2: RARELY
    3: SOMETIMES
    4: HALF THE TIME
    5: OFTEN
    6: MOST OF THE TIME
    7: ALWAYS

1. Within supervisory and counseling/therapy relationships, I am sensitive to my <u>own</u> dynamics.

NEVER						ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. I feel genuinely relaxed and comfortable in my counseling/therapy sessions.

NEVER						ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. I find myself using the same specific techniques in most of my therapy sessions.

NEVER						ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. I am able to critique counseling tapes and gain insights with minimum help from my supervisor.

NEVER						ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. I am able to be spontaneous in counseling/therapy, yet my behavior is relevant.

NEVER						ALWAYS
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. I lack self confidence in establishing counseling relationships with diverse client types.

   NEVER   ALWAYS
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. I find it difficult to express my thoughts and feelings clearly in counseling/therapy.

   NEVER   ALWAYS
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. My verbal behavior in counseling/therapy is pretty much the same with most clients.

   NEVER   ALWAYS
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. I am able to apply a consistent personalized rationale of human behavior in working with my clients.

   NEVER   ALWAYS
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. I believe I exhibit a consistent professional objectivity, and ability to work within my role as a counselor without undue overinvolvement with, or excessive distance from, my clients.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

11. I tend to get confused when things don't go according to plan and lack confidence in my ability to handle the unexpected.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

12. I find myself intellectualizing about my client's problems without being in touch with their feeling states.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

13. The overall quality of my work fluctuates; on some days I do well, on other days, I do poorly.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

14. I depend upon my supervisor considerably in figuring out how
    to deal with my clients.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

15. I find myself working with my clients as I think my supervisor,
    or some other counselor/therapist I know would.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

16. During counseling/therapy sessions, I am able to focus completely
    upon my client.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

17. I feel comfortable in confronting my clients.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

18. Much of the time in counseling/therapy, I find myself thinking
    about my next response, instead of fitting my intervention into
    the overall picture.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

19. I am comfortable with client silence.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

20. My motivation fluctuates from day to day.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

21. I feel most comfortable when my supervisor takes control of
    what we do in supervision.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

22. At times, I wish my supervisor could be in the counsel/therapy
    session to lend a hand.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

23. I find myself focusing less on learning new techniques and approaches to counseling/therapy and thinking more about my general professional development.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
      1   2   3   4   5   6   7

24. During counseling/therapy sessions, I find it difficult to concentrate because of my concern with my own performance.

    NEVER   ALWAYS
      1   2   3   4   5   6   7

McNeill, Stoltenberg, and Pierce, 1985.

APPENDIX E

SUPERVISOR INSTRUCTIONS

SUPERVISOR INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my dissertation research. Enclosed in this folder are materials and forms; please fill them out in the order that you find them in your folder. Please complete these materials within one week, if possible. If you have any problems or questions about completing the materials or meeting the time schedule, please leave a message for me at 974-4466 or 974-5131.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING STEPS IN THE ORDER PRESENTED:

1. Read and sign the Informed Consent form.
2. Complete the Supervisor Demographic form.
3. Please find Supervisor card #1 and list on this card the names of each of the supervisees you will be evaluating.
4. Copy the code number from your first Supervisee folder next to the name of the first supervisee that you listed on Supervisor card #1. Continue this process until all of the names on Supervisor card #1 have a code number.
5. Distribute Supervisee folders to each of your supervisees, using Supervisor card #1 as a guide (e.g., the first supervisee listed on your card will be given the first coded Supervisee folder).
6. Complete one Supervisor Questionnaire for each of your supervisees--using Supervisor card #1 to identify each supervisee. Write in the supervisee code number (found on Supervisor card #1) in the upper right hand corner of the Supervisor Questionnaire in the space after Supervisee Code Number.
7. Please find Supervisor card #1 and list the Supervisee code numbers (numbers only) from Supervisor card #1 on to Supervisor card #2.
8. Return your folder with all materials EXCEPT SUPERVISOR CARD #1 to Pat Hatfield, secretary, in the Educational and Counseling Psychology department.
9. Keep Supervisor card #1 and check with each of the students listed on this card to be sure they have turned in their materials after one week. After you have confirmed that all of your supervisees have turned in their materials, please DESTROY SUPERVISOR CARD #1.

Thanks again for your time and effort.

Toby Weaver

APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT (SUPERVISOR)

INFORMED CONSENT (SUPERVISOR)

Your participation in a research study is requested. This study deals with counseling/psychotherapy supervision. The purpose of the study is to determine certain characteristics of counseling/psychotherapy trainees as reported by the trainees and their supervisors. You will be asked to complete one demographic questionnaire about yourself and one questionnaire about each of your current supervisees who is willing to participate in this study. The demographic questionnaire will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete and the questionnaire involving supervisees has taken other supervisors about 10 minutes for each supervisee they are rating. Supervisees will be asked to complete three instruments. Neither you nor your supervisee(s) will be informed of the others' responses in this study. Results from all instruments will be protected and kept confidential. If you would like to obtain the general results of this study, please indicate so in writing beneath your printed name at the bottom of this form. Thank you for your participation.

Statement of Permission

I understand that this research is being conducted by Toby Weaver, a doctoral student in the Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I have read the above description and understand that it is a truthful representation of this project. I consent to participation in this project with the understanding that my consent may be withdrawn at any time without penalty. I further understand that my participation in this research is on a voluntary basis. If I have questions regarding participation, I can contact the experimenter at the address listed below.

Date_____   _____
                                                Signature

Toby Weaver   _____
Department of Educational and   Printed Name
  Counseling Psychology
108 Claxton Education Building
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996
Phone: (615) 974-5131

APPENDIX G

SUPERVISOR DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

SUPERVISOR DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

Please answer the following questions.

1. Supervisor Sex: ___Male   ___Female

2. Supervisor Age: ___

3. Total number of semesters and/or quarters you have been a counseling supervisor:

    ___semesters

    ___quarters

4. Most recent degree: ___

                 Date: ___

5. Your current position: (check one)

    ___a. Full-time Counseling Center staff

    ___b. Part-time Counseling Center staff and part-time academic (departmental) staff

    ___c. Full-time academic (departmental) staff

    ___d. Other (please explain) _____

6. Current number of clients you see individually each week _____.

7. Please indicate your primary area of affiliation (e.g., Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology, Social Work)

    _____

APPENDIX H

DEVELOPMENTAL LEVEL DETERMINATION SCALE

SUPERVISOR CODE NUMBER_____   SUPERVISEE CODE NUMBER_____

SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

The following items are to be rated on a scale from 1 to 7 in
response to the stem "My supervisee . . . ." Please respond
keeping ONLY the supervisee identified by the code number above
in mind.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Absolutely untrue	Usually or for the most part untrue	More untrue than true	A mix of both or can't decide	More true than untrue	Usually or for the most part true	Absolutely true

MY SUPERVISEE :

___1. has a consistent and firm sense of confidence about his/her
counseling skills even when challenged by clients, supervisors
and colleagues.

___2. usually has a firm sense of confidence about his/her counseling
skills, although he/she is shaken when challenged by clients,
supervisors, and/or colleagues.

___3. is inconsistently aware of his/her strengths, weaknesses,
motivations, neurotic needs, etc. and their impact on clients.

___4. nearly always looks to others for ideas about how he/she
should behave as a counselor.

___5. is consistently aware of his/her strengths, weaknesses, motiva-
tions, neurotic needs, etc. and is able to use them as resources
during counseling sessions.

___6. usually lacks confidence in present counseling skills and
is overwhelmed by own weaknesses.

___7. clearly understands a broad range of limitations of counseling,
including the limits of counseling as a treatment per se,
and has essentially completed integrating this knowledge
into a firm sense of professional identity.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Absolutely untrue	Usually or for the most part untrue	More untrue than true	A mix of both or can't decide	More true than untrue	Usually or for the most part true	Absolutely true

___8. is clearly aware of a broad range of limitations of counseling, including the limits of counseling as a treatment per se, and is struggling to integrate this with his/her sense of self as a professional.

___9. has very little awareness of his/her strengths, weaknesses, motivations, neurotic needs, etc., and their impact on clients.

___10. is developing an inner sense of self as a counselor but frequently looks to others for ideas about how he/she should behave as a counselor.

___11. is prone to readily identify with a theoretical school or individual practitioner without thorough consideration.

___12. has essentially completed his/her sense of self as a counselor and integrated it with his/her sense of self as a person.

___13. sees counseling as a very powerful instrument but is becoming vaguely aware and uneasy about a few limitations of counseling, such as the inappropriateness of counseling for some clients and/or problems.

___14. has a well developed sense of self as counselor, but is only beginning to integrate it with his/her sense of self as a person.

___15. is consistently aware of his/her strengths, weaknesses, motivations, neurotic needs, etc. and their impact on clients, but is only beginning to develop the capacity to use them as resources during the counseling session.

___16. tends to regard counseling as all-powerful.

___17. views clients from a variety of rather thoroughly examined perspectives and is testing out the goodness of fit of an internalized theoretical framework.

___18. is committed to a theoretical framework or composite which is internalized, integrated with his/her counseling behavior, and can be articulated.

___19. characteristically fluctuates between feeling confident and feeling very inadequate about present counseling skills.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Absolutely untrue	Usually or for the most part untrue	More untrue than true	A mix of both or can't decide	More true than untrue	Usually or for the most part true	Absolutely true

___20. is beginning to view clients from a variety of perspectives and is becoming aware of a need to develop an internalized theoretical framework.

___21. is enjoyable to work with.

Wiley, 1982.

APPENDIX I

MEANS AND (STANDARD DEVIATIONS) FOR THE

FIVE LEVELS OF COUNSELOR EXPERIENCE

Table 3. Means and (Standard Deviations) for the Five Levels of Counselor Experience.

Dependent Variable	Level by Experience				
	I n=36	II n=16	III n=13	IV n=7	V n=7
POI Time competence	16.64(3.20)	18.06(3.71)	18.15(1.95)	15.71(3.90)	18.00(2.77)
POI Inner-directedness	87.50(13.62)	87.44(9.52)	98.38(7.37)	88.00(11.82)	99.00(10.23)
Supervised counseling experience	29.42(27.80)	64.06(78.85)	79.69(56.84)	80.43(23.85)	123.57(33.26)
Unsupervised counseling experience	92.36(148.18)	109.37(139.31)	223.08(235.07)	14.29(37.80)	296.43(294.54)
SLQ Self-awareness	39.97(5.01)	40.94(4.99)	40.54(3.28)	37.57(6.40)	42.57(4.43)
SLQ Dependency-autonomy	41.83(4.52)	42.82(7.08)	43.62(5.58)	37.57(6.70)	45.57(3.41)
SLQ Theory/skill acquisition	39.25(4.22)	40.25(4.46)	40.54(2.44)	37.71(4.46)	40.00(2.77)

POI = Personal Orientation Inventory, SLQ = Supervisory Levels Questionnaire, Level I = First year Master's, Level II = Second year Master's, Level III = First year Doctoral, Level IV = Second year Doctoral, Level V = Doctoral Intern.

97

APPENDIX J

SUMMARY TABLE FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

FOR THE 7 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

BASED ON LEVELS IN TRAINING

Table 4. Summary Table for Analysis of Variance for the 7 Dependent Variables Based on Levels in Training.

Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square Between	Mean Square Within	F	P
POI Time competence	54.98	4	13.74	10.11	1.36	0.2564
POI Inner-directedness	1829.76	4	457.44	134.68	3.40	0.0132*
Supervised counseling experience	69721.48	4	17430.37	2285.59	7.63	0.0001***
Unsupervised counseling experience	457865.60	4	114466.40	30429.76	3.76	0.0077**
SLQ Self-awareness	99.30	4	24.83	23.58	1.05	0.3859
SLQ Dependency-autonomy	265.93	4	66.48	29.46	2.26	0.0710
SLQ Theory/Skill acquisition	48.63	4	12.16	15.65	0.78	0.5439

POI = Personal Orientation Inventory, SLQ = Supervisory Levels Questionnaire, * = Significant at .05 alpha level, ** = Significant at .01 alpha level, *** = Significant at .0001 alpha level.

APPENDIX K

SUMMARY TABLE FOR RAW SCORES ON RANKING BY EXPERIENCE, COUNSELOR

DEVELOPMENT LEVEL, POI INNER-DIRECTEDNESS (Id) AND TIME

COMPETENCE SCORES (Tc), SUPERVISORY LEVELS

QUESTIONNAIRE SELF-AWARENESS (SA),

DEPENDENCY-AUTONOMY (DA), AND

THEORY/SKILL ACQUISITION (TS),

WEEKS OF SUPERVISED COUNSELING

EXPERIENCE (SEX), AND WEEKS OF

NON-SUPERVISED COUNSELING

EXPERIENCE (NSEX)

Table 5. Summary Table for Raw Scores.

Subject	Exper. Level	Co. Dev. Level	Id	Tc	SA	DA	TS	SEX	NSEX
1	1	2	100	21	45	45	47	20	100
2	1	3	102	18	48	50	48	20	100
3	1	4	74	17	39	36	36	20	200
4	2	1	104	19	44	49	39	30	200
5	1	2	66	14	38	33	36	20	25
6	1	3	87	21	28	37	33	10	50
7	1	2	97	18	40	43	37	10	250
8	2	2	90	20	32	39	31	10	150
9	2	2	94	21	39	34	39	30	100
10	1	2	97	17	46	47	44	10	0
11	1	4	87	15	43	43	36	20	50
12	1	2	75	14	44	45	38	10	125
13	1	2	97	16	41	41	33	10	0
14	2	3	81	20	41	43	42	50	0
15	1	3	91	22	46	42	40	20	0
16	1	3	97	15	40	41	41	20	0
17	2	3	86	19	38	38	42	20	0
18	5	4	86	13	43	42	39	110	375
19	5	3	96	18	38	43	35	120	0
20	5	4	108	21	45	49	41	80	100
21	5	4	89	18	47	48	43	175	600
22	5	4	111	20	46	48	43	100	750
23	5	1	94	16	35	41	39	120	0
24	3	2	113	19	44	45	43	60	300
25	3	3	99	18	42	42	42	60	100
26	3	2	100	13	39	42	37	50	0
27	3	2	104	17	39	41	39	40	0
28	3	4	104	20	40	45	40	50	100
29	1	3	102	17	44	47	45	40	0
30	1	2	81	15	36	36	31	30	0
31	1	3	88	18	43	43	40	30	250
32	1	4	84	17	41	39	42	30	50
33	2	4	78	12	35	43	39	50	0
34	2	3	92	20	41	42	34	60	0
35	2	2	89	20	43	46	40	50	0
36	2	4	82	15	50	50	48	50	0
37	1	2	83	14	36	36	33	30	0
38	1	3	101	19	45	47	43	40	0
39	1	2	68	15	35	40	37	30	50
40	1	3	92	17	39	42	41	30	175
41	2	2	77	13	33	26	34	80	0
42	2	3	90	22	46	52	41	80	50
43	1	4	106	18	38	45	44	30	0

101

Table 5. (Continued)

Subject	Exper. Level	Co. Dev. Level	Id	Tc	SA	DA	TS	SEX	NSEX
44	1	2	82	16	37	41	36	30	100
45	2	4	87	16	46	49	44	50	150
46	1	4	65	9	37	40	40	30	0
47	1	2	88	17	45	46	45	30	550
48	1	4	96	22	46	47	39	30	75
49	1	4	92	21	39	42	39	10	600
50	2	4	90	19	40	41	39	50	0
51	1	4	102	17	45	45	43	30	50
52	1	2	91	15	43	45	38	20	0
53	1	2	73	14	32	33	34	30	0
54	1	4	92	15	44	41	40	30	0
55	2	3	68	10	44	38	46	50	350
56	1	4	77	18	45	47	41	30	350
57	3	2	92	17	45	42	42	6	0
58	4	3	91	14	28	26	33	65	0
59	4	2	88	15	37	38	38	66	100
60	4	3	105	20	42	43	39	67	0
61	1	1	90	16	34	37	39	24	0
62	4	4	95	22	46	46	36	65	0
63	1	3	115	22	37	46	42	20	0
64	1	1	48	9	29	33	33	20	0
65	3	4	103	20	42	47	46	150	550
66	3	4	88	17	41	47	40	200	400
67	3	4	103	20	43	45	40	100	250
68	1	2	73	11	37	39	42	80	0
69	2	4	85	21	45	53	43	15	300
70	5	4	109	20	44	48	40	160	250
71	3	4	96	20	38	46	39	150	750
72	2	4	106	22	38	42	43	350	350
73	1	2	91	19	34	46	37	175	175
74	3	1	86	18	44	56	41	100	300
75	4	3	69	11	34	32	33	130	0
76	4	3	77	13	43	39	46	80	0
77	4	4	91	15	33	39	39	90	0
78	3	1	97	18	34	33	41	40	0
79	3	4	94	19	36	36	37	30	150

Note: Abbreviations for each of the above columns are as follows: Exper. Level = Experience Level (First year Master's = 1, Second year Master's = 2, First year Doctoral = 3, Second year Doctoral = 4, Doctoral Intern =5), Co. Dev. Level = Counselor Development Level (based on the four levels of the counselor complexity model), Id = POI Inner-directedness scale, Tc = POI Time competence scale, SA = SLQ Self-awareness scale, DA = SLQ Dependency-autonomy scale, TS = SLQ Theory/skill acquisition scale, SEX = Supervised counseling experience, NSEX = Nonsupervised counseling experience.

APPENDIX L

SUMMARY OF RAW SCORES BY
TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM

Table 6. Summary of Raw Scores by Type of Training Program.

Program	N	Id	Tc	SA	DA	TS	SEX	NSEX
Clinical Psychology	5	85.60	15.20	36.00	35.80	39.20	74.00	30.00
Community Agency	5	75.00	15.40	38.80	38.80	39.20	18.00	50.00
Counseling Psychology	21	97.67	18.14	39.33	41.62	38.71	63.24	129.76
Counselor Education	1	74.00	17.00	39.00	36.00	36.00	20.00	20.00
Educational Psychology	9	94.78	17.78	43.22	44.33	40.00	21.11	66.67
Social Work	28	86.29	16.11	41.00	42.46	38.86	37.14	100.00
U.S. Army	10	94.00	18.80	40.60	46.90	41.10	148.00	332.50

Id = POI Inner-directedness, Tc = POI Time competence, SA = SLQ Self-awareness, DA = SLQ Dependency-autonomy, TS = SLQ theory/ skill acquisition, SEX = Supervised counseling experience, NSEX = Nonsupervised counseling experience.

APPENDIX M

SUMMARY OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

GROUPED BY LEVELS

Table 7. Summary of Training Programs Grouped by Levels.

Program	DLDS				Experience				
	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	V
Clinical Psychology	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	3
Community Agency	1	3	1	0	4	1	0	0	0
Counseling Psychology	2	7	6	6	3	2	6	4	6
Counselor Education	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Educational Psychology	1	3	4	1	7	2	0	0	0
Social Work	0	9	7	12	19	9	0	0	0
U.S. Army	1	2	0	7	2	2	5	0	1

DLDS = Developmental Level Determination Scale, I = Level one counselor, II = Level two counselor, III = Level three counselor, IV = Level four counselor, Experience = Classification determined by year in program, I = First year Master's, II = Second year Master's, III = First year Doctoral, IV = Second year Doctoral, V = Doctoral Intern.

VITA

George Calvin Zeth Weaver III, "Toby," was born in Easton, Maryland on January 12, 1956. He is the son of G. C. Zeth Weaver, Jr. and M. E. Betty Weaver. He has two sisters, Sandra W. Greer and June W. Medford. Toby attended public schools in Greensboro and Denton, Maryland. He graduated from North Caroline High School in 1974. Toby obtained his Bachelor of Arts degree with a major in Philosophy from Salisbury State College in Maryland, graduating cum laude in May, 1978. He entered graduate studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in September 1978. Toby worked as a Financial Aid counselor at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, from 1979 to 1981. Requirements for the Master of Science degree were completed in Educational and Counseling Psychology at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in August, 1983. Toby completed a year long clinical/counseling psychology internship at Duke University's Counseling and Psychological Services in July, 1984. He was awarded the Doctor of Philosophy degree in June, 1986. Toby is currently employed at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, as Coordinator of a federal program working with disadvantaged students.