

CHAPTER 18

The Discrimination Model

JANINE M. BERNARD
Fairfield University

The *discrimination model* was conceived as a teaching tool. In the mid-1970s, when I joined the Counselor Education faculty at Purdue University, I was asked to assume primary responsibility for the supervision course. Having recently received my doctorate, I was close enough to the experience of assuming the role of supervisor for the first time to understand my students' need for an aid to organize their initial supervision interventions. My intent was to present them with the simplest of maps to direct their activities as supervisors-in-training. As I attempted to reduce supervision to its simplest components, it seemed to me that supervisors must decide what to address with the trainee and find the most functional style to do so. These two axes became the basis for the discrimination model (Bernard, 1979).

THE SUPERVISOR'S FOCUS IN SUPERVISION

In determining what the supervisor should address within supervision, I went in a slightly different direction from others who had been writing in this area at the time. Rather than viewing the internal reality of the supervisee as the central focus of supervision, I chose to address the supervisee in the activity of conducting a counseling session as the focus. This minor adjustment reverberated to change the experience not only for the supervisee, but for the supervisor. By focusing on the supervisee in action, I had to assume that supervision must relate directly to that activity. Therefore, it was necessary to further analyze the activity of counseling in order to determine categories of counselor input. In other words, if I could identify the component factors that described the activity of counseling, I could help direct the supervisor's attention. (Like Kagan, 1980, I believed that much more happened in counseling than one could attend to; this was so for the supervisor as well as for the counselor. Therefore, the supervisor needed an aid to organize all the data being generated by a counseling session.) At the same time, I realized that the number of factors had to be limited in order to make the map functional. The result was the three focus areas of the model: process skills, conceptualization skills, and personalization skills.

The essence of process skills was the observable activity of the trainee. (Because of the different uses of the term *process*, a better description of this category might be *intervention skills*.) Intervention skills range from the simple to the complex and include all trainee

behaviors that distinguish counseling as a purposeful therapeutic interpersonal activity. From the greeting of a client to attempts to empathize, confront, or interpret behavior, as well as pacing a session and using silence, the skill of the trainee in delivering an intervention is the focus of this category.

A more subtle activity that is occurring during a counseling session is the trainee's use of *conceptualization skills*. Often, the supervisor can only hypothesize about these while observing a session and must interview the trainee to determine the level of conceptualization. This category includes the trainee's ability to make some sense of the information that the client is presenting, to identify themes, and to discriminate what is essential information from what is not. In addition to the assessment aspect of conceptualization, the trainee must choose an appropriate response to the client. The choice of such a response (e.g., to confront a discrepancy in the client's message) is a conceptualization skill; the delivery of the confrontation is an intervention skill. It is at this point, where the trainee and the supervisor appreciate the overlap of skills, that supervision becomes dynamic.

The contribution of the trainee as an individual, including his or her personality, cultural background, sensitivity toward others, and sense of humor, makes up the third category of skills. In order to avoid other psychological constructs, the awkward term *personalization skills* was chosen to describe this dimension of counseling. As with conceptualization, it can be difficult for the supervisor to appreciate all the personalization skills that are being used by the trainee during direct observation of a counseling session. For example, a supervisor of a race different from the trainee and client may not recognize when the trainee is pulling from his or her cultural background to relate to the client. Because personalization skills are the most unique to each trainee, they are the most likely to be misinterpreted by the supervisor, sometimes even after they have been discussed. The personalization skills of the trainee may be the most important to the client, at least initially. As can be derived from their label, these skills may also be viewed as the most personal to the trainee, making the supervisor's scrutiny regarding personalization skills either highly satisfying or uniquely uncomfortable.

Lanning (1986) added a fourth category of skills to the discrimination model, that of *professional behavior*, referring to issues of ethical behavior, professional development, record keeping, and the like. Although this is an important dimension of supervision, I would contend that this category could be collapsed into the original three skill areas. For example, if a trainee forms a dual relationship with a client, is this a deficit of knowledge or personal integrity? In other words, is the problem one of conceptual understanding or personalization? Being late for a counseling session may also be construed as an intervention issue (a nontherapeutic behavior) or a personalization issue (a disrespect for the client).

As the preceding examples illustrate, for every skill there is a potential skill deficit. Therefore, supervisors are often as much aware of the lack of intervention, conceptualization, or personalization skills as of their presence. Furthermore, when skills are lacking, it may become more difficult to identify (through observation) the source of the deficiency. For example, if the supervisor thinks a trainee didn't *do* much in a session, the supervisor must determine whether this was because the trainee didn't know what to do (conceptualization), didn't know how to do what needed to be done (intervention), or didn't feel comfortable enough to do anything (personalization). Simply being aware that inactivity has several potential sources, however, will make the supervisor more astute in how he or she works with the trainee.

THE SUPERVISOR'S ROLE IN SUPERVISION

The insight of the supervisor to assess or identify the areas of focus and/or difficulty for the trainee is only part of the supervisory role. The supervisor must interact with the trainee in ways that are productive to learning and improving clinical skill. The second half of the discrimination model describes three general roles that the supervisor might adopt for the purposes of enhancing the trainee's development, these being teacher, counselor, and consultant.

When the supervisor assumes the teacher role, he or she takes responsibility for determining what is necessary for the trainee to learn in order to become more competent. Thus, a comment such as "I'd like you to consider doing a role play with this client" would be a teacher response. A teacher also evaluates the level of performance. Therefore, a statement such as "That was an excellent session with Mike" would also fall in the teacher category.

When the supervisor assumes the counselor role, he or she is typically addressing the interpersonal or intrapersonal reality of the trainee. By doing so, the supervisor is asking the trainee to reflect on the meaning of an event for him- or herself in much the same way that counselors ask clients to do. Therefore, the supervisor as counselor is more likely to instigate moments for the trainee when things "come together," when thoughts, behavior, and personal reality merge to enhance professional development. Many of the earlier supervision models that addressed "personal growth" relied heavily on the counselor role in supervision.

Finally, the supervisor may take on the role of consultant, allowing the trainee to share the responsibility for his or her learning. When assuming the consultant role, the supervisor becomes a resource for the trainee but encourages the trainee to trust his or her own thoughts, insights, and feelings about the work with the client. The consultant role can be the most difficult to implement because of the autonomy it requires of the trainee. Just as with other types of instruction, it is far easier to tell someone how to do something than to create a context for learning. The consultant role is more about the latter.

There are two ways to view the supervisor roles: Each supervisor statement can be analyzed using the three role definitions, or the roles can be viewed more globally as metaphors for the entire interaction (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). Both approaches are of value, but for different reasons. Starting with role as metaphor, let's assume that Supervisor B is working with Trainee A during her first practicum. It is obvious to Supervisor B that Trainee A is floundering in her sessions, not having grasped the pertinent process variables for helping clients state their issues. Thus, Supervisor B assumes that she will need to use the teacher role primarily with this trainee. The following interaction depicts the beginning of their supervision session:

SUPERVISOR B: Well, how do you think that last session went, A?

TRAINEE A: I was really quite pleased with it. I felt less nervous than I felt last week.

SUPERVISOR B: Yes, you seemed relaxed, and that was good. Were you equally pleased with how you and the client were working together?

TRAINEE A: I'm not sure I know what you mean.

SUPERVISOR B: Um, do you think the client got much out of the session?

TRAINEE A: Yes, I do. She told me in the hallway that she felt a lot better than when she got there.

SUPERVISOR B: Well, I'm glad that she felt better, but I had some questions about the actual process of the session. It seemed to me that you lacked a certain focus on the reasons she came to counseling.

TRAINEE A: So you don't think it was a good session.

SUPERVISOR B: I didn't say that . . .

This example illustrates the reason for considering role both as metaphor *and* as individual response. Supervisor B chooses "teacher" as her metaphor, but she quickly finds herself in a less than productive interaction because she relies too heavily on consultant statements as part of her teaching style. Supervisor B has determined that Trainee A is floundering, yet she asks Trainee A to evaluate her session before Supervisor B gives her any feedback. By attempting to appear egalitarian, Supervisor B sets her trainee up to fail in her response to the question. It would have been more fruitful for Supervisor B to structure the session with teacher responses, such as "I saw you struggle some in this last session. I'd like to use a good part of our session today identifying those moments when you seemed at a loss and seeing if we can come up with some ways for you to handle similar moments in the future. Does that sound as if it would be helpful to you?" By "showing her cards" immediately, Supervisor B would have planted herself squarely in the teacher role; at the same time, she would have protected Trainee A from having to evaluate her session when she clearly did not yet have the insight to do so in a way that would lead to a positive response from her supervisor.

A supervisor's accurate insight into the trainee's work can be compromised, if not undone, by an inexperienced use of roles. For example, the use of the supervisor as counselor role can make the trainee so uncomfortable as to block learning. It is for this reason that all three roles should be considered for each focus area.

Table 18.1 depicts the 3 × 3 matrix of possible choices for a supervisor working with a trainee who will be named Paul. The supervisor has listened to an audiotape of Paul conducting his second counseling session with a woman we will call Tabitha, a 20-year-old African American woman who has sought counseling because she is in an abusive relationship. Paul is Caucasian and in his mid-twenties. In the session, Tabitha starts discussing her sometimes "embarrassment" at being black in light of the constant local incidents of blacks getting in trouble, dropping out of school, and so forth. Paul, obviously at a loss as to how to respond, makes some comment that a lot of whites break the law and drop out of school, too. Tabitha continues to state that she feels "guilty by association." There is also a lot of nervous laughter on Tabitha's part during this segment of the session. Table 18.1 illustrates the range of responses available to the supervisor.

As the reader considers Table 18.1, some supervisor interventions will be evaluated as more relevant and/or more helpful than are others. This, of course, is the purpose of the discrimination model, to encourage supervisors to consider a variety of responses, and to discriminate among them for the maximum development potential for the trainee.

THE MODEL IN USE

Choosing the Supervisor Role

There is a tendency to pair only one of the possible supervisor roles with each of the three supervision foci. Some supervisors adopt a teacher role whenever the trainee seems to be struggling with interventions, a consultant role when conceptualization is the issue, or a counselor role when personalization is the issue. Although these pairings are logical, they limit the supervisor's repertoire and, therefore, his or her impact. As can be seen by review-

Table 18.1 Discrimination Model Example Using the Case of Paul and Tabitha

	Supervisor Role		
Focus of Supervision	<i>Teacher</i>	<i>Counselor</i>	<i>Consultant</i>
Intervention	Supervisor models a different reaction to Tabitha's comment, one that reflects some insight into Tabitha's developmental struggle. Supervisor reviews models of racial identity development with Paul and discusses the implications of Tabitha's statement.	Supervisor reflects on Paul's apparent discomfort when he responds to Tabitha's initial statement and the power of this discomfort to block alternate interventions. Supervisor comments on Paul's discomfort with Tabitha and suggests that this may have caused Paul to forget information he has learned elsewhere. Supervisor suggests that Paul discuss his discomfort, as well as his thoughts about Tabitha's comment, then and now.	Supervisor encourages a conversation with Paul about different intervention possibilities with Tabitha and asks Paul to hypothesize about Tabitha's possible reaction to each. Supervisor asks Paul to write down as many explanations of Tabitha's response as he can produce. The supervisor also suggests that Paul consider Tabitha's response in light of her presenting problem for at least one explanation.
Personalization	Supervisor asks Paul to read Sue and Sue (1990) about the challenges of majority population counselors in assisting minority clients at different racial-identity development stages for the purpose of identifying relevant information for Paul's work with Tabitha.	Supervisor works with Paul to understand the range of his reactions to Tabitha, his feelings about working in context when black-white racial issues are a focus, and in light of Tabitha's presenting problem, his feelings about being both white and male.	Using an interpersonal process recall technique (Kagan, 1976), supervisor helps Paul identify a variety of reactions Paul was having during the targeted segment in his session with Tabitha.

ing Table 18.1, the *focus* of the supervision interaction is the entry point only. For example, consider the intervention/counselor combination given in Table 18.1. One could argue that if the trainee is uncomfortable with a particular client, causing him to falter in his interventions, that the focus should be personalization rather than intervention. Yet, by entering the supervision interaction through a focus on intervention, the supervisor (a) pinpoints the consequence of the trainee's discomfort with this client; (b) directs the trainee toward the ultimate solution (i.e., when the trainee is able to use different types of interventions with this client he may feel more confident and, thus, less uncomfortable); and (c) diminishes the possibility of the trainee becoming overly defensive. If, instead, the supervisor focuses on personalization from the role of counselor, the supervision session will no doubt evolve in a different manner with different results for the trainee.

This example brings us to another important point, the rarity of a supervision issue being planted in one focus area only. Discomfort within the trainee when assuming the responsibility of conducting therapy will limit his or her willingness to attempt new interventions. Unclear conceptualization will frustrate the trainee, thus blending personalization and conceptualization. Inability to think on his or her feet will make it difficult to intervene competently. At the same time, it is important for the supervisor to help the trainee identify the primary focus that seems to be causing difficulty. For example, one trainee I worked with recently was aware only of his panic in his early counseling sessions. As we worked together, however, it became obvious to me that he was entering each counseling session unprepared conceptually. Because each session had been so uncomfortable for him, he had avoided doing his "homework" between sessions. Once supervision helped him to conceptualize better (using both teacher and consultant roles), his panic subsided.

Finally, the supervisor should be sensitive to an overuse of any of the supervisor roles or a particular area of focus. Some supervisors are "natural" teachers and prefer to give their supervisees as much feedback as they can during supervision. Others are frustrated therapists who can cause the reaction I once heard: "Would you please tell my supervisor to stop *counseling* me!" Other supervisors seem to get stuck on one focus, seeing everything as a conceptualization issue or a personalization issue. Supervisors can check their focus easily by reviewing their notes after observing or listening to a counseling session or their supervision notes after meeting with a trainee. If all of a supervisor's notes fall into the same category and this is replicated across trainees, it may say as much about the supervisor as about any individual trainee.

The Importance of Technology

The assumptions of the discrimination model reflect educational practices as much as therapeutic practices. Therefore, early on, it became clear that the model depended on direct samples of the trainee's work (Bernard, 1981). In other words, it is virtually impossible to use self-report as the basis for this supervision model. Just as teachers benefit from watching themselves teach, and dancers learn from seeing themselves dance, counselors can continue to benefit from reviewing accurate samples of their work. For the supervisor, it is imperative to observe directly or, at the very least, listen to audiotapes of the trainee's work, unless the exclusive focus of supervision is the internal reality of the trainee. What is presented in self-report is a metaphor of the session rather than the session itself. A metaphor can be highly significant for supervision, but in the final analysis, it is still a metaphor.

The need for technology is especially acute in regard to the intervention and personalization foci. How many times during a case conference has a supervisor heard a trainee

explain a successful implementation of an intervention only to have a videotape or audiotape show a different reality? Without direct access to the trainee's work, the supervisor is not in a position to correct a faulty intervention or to offer suggestions for making an intervention more fruitful. As for personalization, by definition this focus centers on the trainee's blind spots. Occasionally, these will be evident during self-report, but often a trainee will distance him- or herself from those moments of countertransference or personal discomfort. The time between the counseling session and the supervision session allows for such denial. The supervisor will be much more helpful to the trainee if he or she can, at some level, *experience* the personalization issue with the trainee. A simple audiorecording makes this much more likely to occur.

Another important reason for obtaining direct samples of a trainee's work has to do with what was mentioned earlier regarding the supervisor's hypothesis about the conceptualization or personalization of the trainee. The supervisor accumulates hunches about what the trainee is thinking and feeling during a counseling session. Checking out these assumptions is an important part of supervision. When the supervisor's hunches are different from the trainee's self-report, this is important feedback either for the supervisor or for the trainee. In other words, either the supervisor is misreading the situation or the trainee's internal reality is different from what is observable in the counseling session. Either way, this situation provides important data for supervision, data that would not be available if observation or taping of the session were not done.

Thus far, I have focused on all the precautionary reasons to use technology in supervision, but there are many positive reasons to do so also. It is a delight to see or hear a trainee experience a moment of immediacy with a client or resist being "hooked" by a client's irrational blaming or deliver an intervention with near perfect timing, resulting in a therapeutic experience for the client. Sharing these moments with trainees can add tremendous dimension to the supervisory relationship. In addition, with appropriate releases, these samples of work well done and/or struggles resolved can provide invaluable learning experiences for future trainees.

Expansions of the Discrimination Model

Stenack and Dye (1982) conducted research to determine if a clear distinction existed among the three supervision roles proposed by the discrimination model. They were able to identify five supervisor activities for each of the roles (p. 302):

Supervisor as Teacher

1. Evaluate observed counseling session interactions.
2. Identify appropriate interventions.
3. Teach, demonstrate, or model intervention techniques.
4. Explain the rationale behind specific strategies and/or interventions.
5. Interpret significant events in the counseling sessions.

Supervisor as Counselor

1. Explore trainee feelings during counseling session or supervision session.
2. Explore trainee feelings concerning specific technique and/or interventions.

3. Facilitate trainee self-exploration of confidence and/or worries in the counseling session.
4. Help trainee define personal competencies and areas for growth.
5. Provide opportunities for trainees to process their own affect or defenses.

Supervisor as Consultant

1. Provide alternative interventions and/or conceptualizations for trainee use.
2. Encourage trainee brainstorming of strategies and/or interventions.
3. Encourage trainee discussion of client problems, motivation, etc.
4. Solicit and attempt to satisfy trainee needs during the session.
5. Allow trainee to structure the supervision session.

Neufeldt, Iversen, and Juntunen (1995) have developed a manual for training supervisors using the Stenack and Dye (1982) outline as their initial focus. Each supervision behavior is explained in detail, and a supervision vignette is included to demonstrate the behavior. Neufeldt et al. refer to the Stenack and Dye behaviors as “beginning supervision strategies.” They follow these with “advanced supervision strategies” that, they assert, combine two or more of the three supervisor roles. The eleven advanced strategies delineated by Neufeldt et al. (p. 48) are as follows:

1. Encourage trainee’s exploration of change theory.
2. Help trainee conceptualize a case (including developing valid information, setting the problem, and developing a change strategy).
3. Explore trainee’s feelings to facilitate understanding of the client.
4. Facilitate trainee’s identification and use of cues in client’s and trainee’s behavior.
5. Explore trainee’s intentions in a session.
6. Help trainee assess compatibility between in-session behavior and theory of change.
7. Present a developmental challenge.
8. Explore trainee-client boundary issues.
9. Use parallel process to model appropriate strategies for dealing with clients.
10. Reframe trainee ideas and behaviors in a positive manner and build on them.
11. Help trainee process feelings of distress aroused by the client’s experience.

As with the beginning supervision strategies, the authors offer an explanation and brief supervision vignette to demonstrate each advanced strategy.

In order to understand how Neufeldt et al. (1995) view each of the advanced strategies as combining supervisor roles, let us look more closely at the first strategy: “Encourage trainee’s exploration of change theory.” Neufeldt et al. (pp. 57–58) include the following behaviors to complete this strategy:

- Supervisor asks trainee how he or she thinks people change (consultant).
- Supervisor labels the answer as trainee’s espoused theory of human change (teacher).
- Supervisor investigates the trainee’s experiences of change in his or her life (counselor).

From this analysis, supervisor facilitates the trainee's understanding of his or her practical theory of change and so labels it (teacher).

Supervisor asks trainee to look at ways in which espoused theory and practical theory overlap and ways in which they differ (consultant).

This analysis of advanced strategies that combine roles is helpful to the practicing supervisor, who must learn to weave roles skillfully in order to accomplish more complex learning tasks. The Neufeldt et al. (1995) text is a significant contribution to this end.

Combining the Discrimination Model With Developmental Models of Supervision

The discrimination model provides a matrix of choices for the supervisor. Developmental models (e.g., Johnson & Moses, 1988; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987) have addressed the more specific needs of trainees at different points in their development. Referring to developmental models, therefore, can assist the supervisor in using the discrimination model matrix more deliberately.

Loganbill et al. (1982) described the developmental process as moving the trainee from *stagnation* (naively unaware or being "stuck") through *confusion* (erratic cognitive and behavioral fluctuations, disorganization, and dependency on the supervisor) in order to ultimately have the trainee experience *integration* (emotional and cognitive comfort with a significant new learning). The eight critical issues used by Loganbill et al. (1982) to evaluate the trainee (as stuck, in confusion, or integrated) were adapted from Chickering's (1969) developmental tasks of youth and included competence, emotional awareness, self-directedness, conceptual integration, respect for individual differences, purpose and direction, personal motivation, and professional ethics. This path from stagnation to integration is revisited over and over again as new interventions are learned, new frameworks are considered, and new insights are attained.

We have sufficient evidence that novice trainees prefer a relatively high level of structure from their supervisors (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Reising & Daniels, 1983; Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Crethar, 1994; Worthington, 1987; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Referring back to Loganbill et al. (1982), therefore, it seems that while in the throes of confusion, the trainee may not be able to take advantage of supervision that is highly consultative or may be more agitated by the supervisor as counselor than assisted if this supervisor role exacerbates the trainee's sense of groundlessness. Rather, the structure that is usually associated with the teacher role may be the most efficient to guide the trainee when confusion is at its peak (whereas the consultant or counselor roles may be more helpful when the trainee is in a state of stagnation). Furthermore, because a trainee will be in different states around different issues (e.g., at integration around personal motivation, at confusion around respect for individual differences, and at stagnation regarding competence for advanced techniques), the supervisor will need to be able to comfortably adopt different roles as different trainee states are identified.

Johnson and Moses (1988) took the Loganbill et al. (1982) model and integrated it with discrimination model concepts. For each of the critical issues in supervision as described by Loganbill et al. (e.g., respect for individual differences), Johnson and Moses asserted that there was a behavioral aspect (intervention), a cognitive aspect (conceptualization), and an affective aspect (personalization). For example, a female trainee might intellectually understand the "cycle of violence" and may be skillful in demonstrating

counseling approaches used with victims of abuse but may still find herself experiencing annoyance with the client for allowing herself to be victimized, which may block her from communicating the appropriate amount of support for the client. In this case, the supervisor would need to address the trainee's annoyance, perhaps initially moving her from stagnation to confusion, and with additional work, to integration. A balance of support and challenge offered by the supervisor is needed to keep the trainee moving in a positive direction. The many options within the roles of teacher, counselor, and consultant are adequate for this purpose, according to Johnson and Moses (1988).

Less is known about the ongoing supervision needs of more seasoned therapists and the development of supervisors (Worthington, 1987). We know that the consultation role is more useful for counselors once they have more of the basic skills integrated into their style. We do not, however, know about differential applications of the consultation role based on the sophistication of the supervisee. We also have no empirical data regarding the interplay of the counselor and consultant roles in working with seasoned supervisees. Nevertheless, an appreciation of developmental differences, at least throughout training programs and for entry-level practitioners, is an important dimension for using the discrimination model beneficially.

Training Supervisors to Use the Discrimination Model

The discrimination model has been used most regularly to introduce novice supervisors to the process of supervision. Because of its atheoretical nature, the model translates well to different therapeutic modalities. Furthermore, the delineation of supervisor foci and roles is helpful to novice supervisors who desire anchors for their initial attempts to supervise. As was noted by Borders and Fong (1994), supervisor development has some parallels to therapist development, with the novice supervisor responding well to structure. The discrimination model provides some of that structure.

In addition to its utility for novice supervisors, the model has been beneficial for the present cohort of seasoned supervisors. When I first presented the model to experienced supervisors, I was apprehensive about its utility for that group. As is generally known within the mental health professions, however, the more experienced the supervisor, the more likely that the supervisor learned his or her craft through apprenticeship. Therefore, thinking of supervision in other than a therapeutic modality seems to be invigorating and useful to seasoned practitioners. In addition, because many seasoned supervisors still rely on self-report, the exercise of using technology, including the taping of supervision sessions for analysis, proves to be provoking.

Using the model to train supervisors, novice or experienced, is explained in detail elsewhere (Bernard, 1981; Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). Therefore, I will not repeat the entire process here. I would, however, like to emphasize some of the more critical activities for supervisor learning.

Give Ample Time to Focus. It is easy to view the three focus categories as self-evident and move on to supervisor role. In doing so, however, supervisors-in-training forgo an opportunity to appreciate the richness of the therapeutic process, as well as their limits in perceiving all that is relevant for trainee learning within each counseling session. For all training groups I have conducted, the entire group watches 20 to 30 minutes of a therapy session, and the participants are asked to take notes as if the therapist were their supervisee and they would be responsible for conducting a supervision session after viewing

the therapy session. Once everyone has a set of notes, the three focus areas are introduced and are placed on a chalkboard or overhead projector with each category heading a column. Then participants are asked to share their observations about the supervisee's performance. It is important for the trainer to take an almost alter-ego style in labeling each feedback item. The following is an example of a conversation with participants from a recent workshop conducted by the author:

P1: I thought she [therapist in the tape] was distant, aloof. I wanted her to *do something*.

B: You've stated this as both a lack of skill, not doing anything, and as a personal issue, being distant and aloof. Do you have a hypothesis about which might be the bigger issue?

P1: I assume it's the personal issue. I didn't see any evidence that she had any warmth for the client.

P2: I disagree. I thought she started the session with a lot of warmth, but when the client started to "yes, but" her, she seemed to pull back. I think she got overwhelmed and just didn't know what to do.

B: So you agree that there was a personal element, that is, being overwhelmed, but you think the cause was her inability to find her way out of a difficult interaction, which would be more of a conceptual issue.

P2: Right.

Two things are going on during this activity. First, supervisors are learning that their first comments often dilute the focus area of concern with another focus area. For example, the first participant says that the therapist isn't doing anything (which could be easily corrected), although her real concern is that the therapist is aloof (perhaps more difficult to alter). As the trainer asks the participants questions to help them clarify their comments, everyone is hearing how misleading feedback can be if the foci are blurred (which is different from when the supervisor chooses one focus area as a beginning point, knowing that he or she wants to address another as well). Second, participants start to realize that what they saw, heard, and focused on when observing a given therapy session can be different from what other supervisors saw, heard, and focused on. Experienced supervisors can have "overdeveloped" antennae, meaning that they become quick at making certain hypotheses, even if by doing so they ignore other important data.

Use Multiple Examples. Because the training activity just described can produce a great deal of discussion and insight into the supervision process, it is tempting to accept a thorough analysis of the focus aspect of the discrimination model relative to one counseling session (and one supervisee) as sufficient. This is usually a mistake. No matter how animated or fruitful the discussion, participants will learn more about themselves if they apply the model to more than one supervisee, especially if the supervisees are distinct on at least one focus category. It is when the activity of using the model is repeated that participants start to appreciate their own personal patterns, sometimes irrespective of the supervisee. Furthermore, it is possible that during an initial activity, a participant found him- or herself to be in agreement with most of what others in the training group had to say; a second round, however, might find his or her perspective quite unique.

Be Literal. As participants describe what they see or hear or react to in a trainee's counseling session, hold them to what they say, not to what they mean. If a participant says, "I didn't like how he leaned forward during the session," help him or her realize that this

is an observation that addresses the intervention used. If the discussion eventually evolves to the realization that the participant thought the trainee was being seductive, allow the group an opportunity to appreciate the potential consequences (positive and negative) of delivering personalization feedback through intervention language.

Allow for Practice of the Roles. Addressing focus allows participants an opportunity to gain insight with relatively low risk. Asking them to demonstrate supervisor role behavior may be perceived as a bit more threatening. Accepting participants' descriptions of their supervision roles, however, would parallel the limits of self-report supervision. Participants are more likely to know their preferred role as metaphor than they are to have an accurate sense of the roles that are used if their supervisory interventions are analyzed statement by statement. The latter, therefore, offers supervisors an opportunity to move beyond stagnation or confusion to a higher developmental level.

The roles also are far simpler conceptually than they are behaviorally. Activities that ask participants to change role on cue or that ask participants to conduct a simulated supervision session with the use of two of the three roles exclusively can be challenging. Furthermore, if the same supervisee (i.e., two participants simulating the same supervisee who was seen on tape earlier in the training) is supervised by two supervisors using different predominant roles, tapes of these simulations can offer excellent samples of the role's power to influence the direction of learning.

Preparing the Trainee for the Model

"What is it that my supervisor is looking for?" For new trainees or counselors working with a new supervisor, this is a legitimate question. Trainees have typically invested a great deal of psychic energy, as well as significant time and money, in pursuing training in psychotherapy of one sort or another. By the time a clinical supervisor enters the picture, the desire for a successful experience is high.

By describing the categories of intervention skills, conceptualization skills, and personalization skills, the supervisor can move the trainee into the context of the supervisory experience. Not only does this exercise give the supervisor and trainee a common language, it allows the trainee to hear feedback with a more discriminating ear as supervision progresses (Bernard, 1994a). In addition, by framing some social habits as personalization skills, the trainee may more easily grasp their effect on the counseling process.

Whatever the model used by the supervisor, evaluation should be consistent. Therefore, the supervisor also prepares the trainee for working with the discrimination model by describing evaluation criteria based on the focus areas of the model. Table 18.2 illustrates one such evaluation instrument that has been used to evaluate trainees at the culmination of their first practicum. By viewing such a list of skill attainment at the beginning of and throughout supervision, the trainee becomes a full partner in the use of the model.

As important as it is to explain the focus areas to the trainee, it has also proved useful to describe the roles available to the supervisor when conducting supervision. This can encourage dialogue between supervisor and trainee about how counselors learn, as well as providing trainees a vehicle for communication when supervision does not seem to be meeting their needs. For example, it might be beneficial for the trainee to hear something like the following: "There are a few different ways that I can assist you in becoming more expert. When I take a teacher role, I'll be attempting to assist you directly. You'll probably feel pretty comfortable at these times because I'll be doing a good deal of the work. When

Table 18.2 Evaluation Instrument Consistent With Discrimination Model

Supervisee's Name: _____ Date: _____

1 = needs improvement 2 = adequate 3 = good 4 = excellent

Intervention skills:

Ability to "manipulate" the process toward some desired outcome. For example, if your client has been evasive, ability to intervene to help your client be more concrete.	1	2	3	4
Ability to be in control of the session.	1	2	3	4
Ability to be flexible regarding skills.	1	2	3	4
Ability to be creative regarding skills.	1	2	3	4

Conceptualization skills:

Ability to be able to follow the client's issues as presented during the session.	1	2	3	4
Ability to be able to see the relevance of "sub-themes" to the client's issues.	1	2	3	4
Ability to be able to identify a direction to pursue in the session based on a sound rationale.	1	2	3	4
Ability to have an appreciation for your personal assumptions about the client's issues (espoused theory).	1	2	3	4
Ability to be able to evaluate your interventions for change (practical theory) based on your espoused theory.	1	2	3	4
Ability to identify interventions that complement your conceptualization of the client.	1	2	3	4
Ability to reevaluate your conceptualization of the client on an ongoing and more sophisticated level as you work with the client.	1	2	3	4

Personalization skills:

Ability to recognize your personal assets and liabilities, accenting the former and restraining the latter.	1	2	3	4
Ability to be in touch with your feelings in your sessions and throughout supervision, allowing you to become a better counselor as you mature as a professional.	1	2	3	4
Ability to demonstrate interpersonal and intrapersonal depth and flexibility.	1	2	3	4
Ability to work successfully with persons different from yourself.	1	2	3	4

Professional behavior:

Readiness for supervision and an ability to use feedback constructively.	1	2	3	4
Ability to exhibit professional behavior that reflects the ethical codes of the counseling profession.	1	2	3	4
Ability to exhibit behavior reflective of the responsibility and maturity expected of a professional.	1	2	3	4
Ability to exhibit an appropriate understanding of boundaries.	1	2	3	4

Additional comments:

Supervisor

Supervisee

Date

I believe it's important for you to risk your own strategy, I will probably assume a consultant role. Those times will challenge you more and you'll probably feel on less sure ground."

Conversations about roles can originate from the trainee as well. If trainees are aware of the options, they can communicate a readiness for a role: "I feel as if I've been getting in my own way in my session with Julie. I wonder if you could help me figure out what's going on" (a request for the counselor role). Finally, when the roles have been introduced to the trainee, the supervisor can give process feedback that relates to the roles: "You know, George, I've felt for a couple of weeks now that it's important for you to take more responsibility for planning your counseling sessions. But every time I assume a consultant role, you barrage me with questions, which more or less invites me back into a teacher role. Have you been aware of that pattern?"

In short, working conjointly within the context of the discrimination model communicates a respect for the trainee as a partner in his or her own learning. At the same time, it holds the trainee accountable by making both the process and the goals of supervision less mysterious (Ladany & Friedlander, 1995).

SPECIFIC ISSUES IN USING THE DISCRIMINATION MODEL

Theoretical Issues

The discrimination model was conceived to be atheoretical. Regardless of how trainees envision the helping process, they must deal with the issues of their conceptual grasp of the process, their mastery of intervention skills, and the interpersonal and intrapersonal dynamics that occur during the counseling session. In fact, the model has been used successfully with trainees working within a systemic framework, supervisees within a cognitive behavioral training setting, and trainees with a psychodynamic orientation, to name just a few.

It is its atheoretical nature that distinguishes the discrimination model as a model of supervision from an induction into a particular school of thought regarding the helping process. Bernard and Goodyear (1992) described the latter as *psychotherapy-based supervision*. Psychotherapy-based supervision will rely on the same principles for the supervision process as for the therapy process. The classic example of psychotherapy-based supervision is psychodynamic theory in which part of training includes the process of undergoing psychoanalysis and clinical supervision revolves significantly around transference and countertransference issues. By contrast, the discrimination model operates parallel to the theory of psychotherapy being conducted, not within it. There are advantages and disadvantages to this approach.

By providing a language for supervision that is different from psychotherapy, the two are less likely to be fused and the trainee is less apt to perceive him- or herself as a client. Furthermore, because the discrimination model attempts to be "evenhanded," regarding the contribution of interventions, conceptualization, and personal attributes to the outcome of the therapeutic process, it may serve to balance a theoretical orientation that seems to weigh these areas differentially. This may be important if the trainee is weakest in an area that receives the least scrutiny within a theoretical orientation (which, due to self-selection, is quite likely). As one trainer stated about her theory of choice: "In the normal course of therapy, I'd give the 'person of the therapist' credit for only about 10% of the outcome.

But if that 10% isn't there, the other 90% doesn't have a chance." Such a declaration serves as an argument for a supervision model that is distinct from the therapy model.

Although there is much to be said for a distinction between therapy and supervision, there are also disadvantages to an atheoretical supervision model. There is much in the literature to suggest that trainees are theoretically unsophisticated and require theoretically consistent supervision to attain entry-level competence (e.g., Freeman, 1992). Persons holding this view tend to regard supervision as an ideal opportunity for modeling therapeutic conditions and have an inherent assumption of the isomorphic properties of supervision.

Cultural Issues

Only in recent years have the helping professions given serious attention to multicultural supervision. As a result, the professional literature in this area is limited and empirical studies are only beginning to appear (Leong & Wagner, 1994). When it was initially developed, the discrimination model was no exception to the overall insensitivity to cultural variables within supervision.

Just as the model can be said to be atheoretical, it is also acultural. This does not imply that using the model denies the importance of culture, but that cultural awareness must be infused into its use. Although all three focus areas are affected by cultural factors, a discussion of the personalization skills category can be used as an example of the importance of culture when using the model.

As has been expressed by many authors (e.g., McGoldrick, Pearce, & Giordano, 1982), what is often attributed to personality is, instead, an expression of cultural background. Tone of voice, gregariousness, sense of humor, and nonverbal behavior are all highly culturally determined. Clinical supervisors, therefore, must be cognizant of this as they evaluate personalization skills. Additionally, behaviors cannot be evaluated out of context. The supervisor must take into account the multicultural reality of the counselor-client interaction, as well as the counselor-supervisor interaction. The supervisor must also evaluate the cultural "fit" between him- or herself and the client (i.e., the fit may be better between trainee and client than either of these to the supervisor). Only after such an analysis can the supervisor begin to consider personalization skills. Even then, the wise clinical supervisor will take a posture of respectful inquiry rather than an evaluative posture regarding this category, especially if the trainee and/or trainee and client represent cultural groups far removed from the bulk of the supervisor's experience.

It should be noted that for this discussion, culture does not include only race and ethnic background, but also gender, economic background, and so forth. In fact, training workshops have often found gender to be a highly salient factor when supervisors watch trainee tapes. A male trainee can be seen as "sexist and insensitive" by female supervisors, while being perceived as "vulnerable" by the male supervisors. Although both perspectives have some validity, it is important for supervisors to realize the extent to which their first impressions are moderated by gender.

Recent research has shed some additional light on the role that culture plays within supervision, information that can be applied to the use of the discrimination model. Hilton, Russell, and Salmi (1995) studied the relationship between supervisor and supervisee when these persons represented different races and found that being accepted and feeling psychologically safe are necessary ingredients for productive supervision. Perhaps surprisingly, when the independent variable of race was considered, it did not emerge as a main effect. A pilot study conducted by Fukuyama (1994) revealed that for doctoral internship students, a sensitivity to race and culture was highly significant for a successful supervisory experience.

These two studies are particularly interesting when the developmental supervision literature is reviewed. Several foremost studies in the developmental supervision literature (Heppner & Roehlke, 1984; Rabinowitz, Heppner, & Roehlke, 1986) suggest a developmental progression in supervision. This progression begins with the novice supervisee's need for structure and support and ends with the advanced supervisee's readiness to discuss personal issues and how these relate to the process of counseling. It may be fruitful to consider a similar developmental process operating within multicultural supervision as an explanation for differing results between studies such as Hilton et al. (1995) and Fukuyama (1994). The fact that Hilton et al. found a main effect for level of support but no main effect for race and no interaction effects may be explained by the fact that the supervisees used in the study were novices. The ability of Fukuyama's subjects to address the effect of race and cultural dynamics as operating within their supervisory context may be a function of their advanced developmental stage as doctoral internship students (Bernard, 1994b). Therefore, as the supervisor chooses both focus area and role, he or she is well advised to do so within a developmental context that takes into account development across several variables, including culture. Too much challenge, for example, through a focus on personalization regarding cultural issues, may flood the novice trainee into cultural denial rather than produce the desired effect of increasing cultural awareness.

Research Outcomes

Although models may appear sound intuitively, they are greatly enhanced by empirical evidence of their viability. The discrimination model has received some support, either through explicit study of the model or research efforts that used the model to frame hypotheses (e.g., Ellis & Dell, 1986; Ellis, Dell, & Good, 1988; Glidden & Tracey, 1989; Goodyear, Abadie, & Efros, 1984; Goodyear & Robyak, 1982; Putney, Worthington, & McCullough, 1992; Stenack & Dye, 1982, 1983; Yager, Wilson, Brewer, & Kinnetz, 1989).

Some key findings regarding the utility of the discrimination model are worth noting. Stenack and Dye (1983) found that the supervisor role directly influenced supervisee focus during supervision sessions. Specifically, the teacher role shifted trainees from feelings to actions; the counselor role caused a reduction in thoughts and an increase in the focus on feelings; and the consultant role increased a focus on thoughts and decreased focus on feelings and actions. These findings suggest that the supervisor role may have predominance within a supervision session, regardless of focus. For example, if the supervisor chooses the consultant role, he or she will invite a cognitive evaluation of interventions, conceptualizations, or personalization (depending on focus). As Stenack and Dye (1983) note, therefore, the supervisor should be trained to evaluate the trainee's needs and choose a role that will most effectively address those needs.

Second, the role of consultant has been found to be less distinctive than that of teacher or counselor in several studies (Ellis & Dell, 1986; Glidden & Tracey, 1989; Goodyear et al., 1984; Stenack & Dye, 1982). One hypothesis is that this role does not enjoy the same clarity of definition as both the teacher and counselor roles (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). A second possibility may have to do with the samples used for several of these studies. Often, the supervisors are doctoral students working with master's level students during their first practicum. Referring again to developmental concepts, it is likely that the supervisees in these studies were not ready to take advantage of the consultant role, thus making these reactions less rewarding and thus appearing "fuzzier." Finally, it must be questioned whether the consultant role was more vulnerable than the other roles to the time constraints involved in these studies.

CONCLUSION

The discrimination model was developed to be technically eclectic and to be used differentially to specific situations. Its strength is the flexibility it allows the supervisor; a potential weakness is that it is not driven by any theoretical approach and, therefore, allows for less modeling as part of supervision. In recent years, the model has been expanded to include professional issues (Lanning, 1986; Lanning & Freeman, 1994; Lanning, Whiston, & Carey, 1994), to address developmental concepts (Johnson & Moses, 1988), and to propose supervisor interventions that blend roles (Neufeldt et al., 1995). Cultural, as well as individual and developmental, variables need to be considered for implementation of the model. Finally, additional research will assist supervisors in refining their use of the model.

REFERENCES

- Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 19*, 60–68.
- Bernard, J. M. (1981). Inservice training for clinical supervisors. *Professional Psychology, 12*, 740–748.
- Bernard, J. M. (1994a). Receiving and using supervision. In H. Hackney & L. S. Cormier (Eds.), *Counseling strategies and interventions* (4th ed., pp. 169–189). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bernard, J. M. (1994b). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong and Wagner, Cook, and Fukuyama. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 159–171.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1992). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Borders, L. D., & Fong, M. L. (1994). Cognitions of supervisors-in-training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 280–294.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ellis, M. V., & Dell, D. M. (1986). Dimensionality of supervisor roles: Supervisors' perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 282–291.
- Ellis, M. V., Dell, D. M., & Good, G. E. (1988). Counselor trainees' perceptions of supervisor roles: Two studies testing the dimensionality of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 315–324.
- Freeman, S. C. (1992). C. H. Patterson on client-centered supervision: An interview. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31*, 219–226.
- Fukuyama, M. A. (1994). Critical incidents in multicultural counseling supervision: A phenomenological approach to supervision research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 142–151.
- Glidden, C. E., & Tracey, T. J. (1989, August). *The structure of perceived differences in supervision across developmental levels*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans.
- Goodyear, R. K., Abadie, P. D., & Efron, F. (1984). Supervisory theory into practice: Differential perception of supervision by Ekstein, Ellis, Polster, and Rogers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 228–237.
- Goodyear, R. K., & Robyak, J. E. (1982). Supervisors' theory and experience level in supervisory focus. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 978.
- Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1984). Differences among supervisees at different levels of training: Implications for a developmental model of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*, 76–90.
- Hilton, D. B., Russell, R. K., & Salmi, S. W. (1995). The effects of supervisor's race and level of support on perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 559–563.
- Johnson, E., & Moses, N. C. (1988, August). *The dynamic developmental model of supervision*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta.

- Kagan, N. (1976). *Influencing human interaction*. Mason, MI: Mason Media; or Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Kagan, N. (1980). Influencing human interaction—eighteen years with IPR. In A. K. Hess (Ed.), *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 262–286). New York: Wiley.
- Ladany, N., & Friedlander, M. L. (1995). The relationship between the supervisor working alliance and trainees' experience of role conflict and role ambiguity. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 220–231.
- Lanning, W. (1986). Development of the supervisor emphasis rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 25*, 191–196.
- Lanning, W., & Freeman, B. (1994). The Supervisor Emphasis Rating Form-Revised. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 294–304.
- Lanning, W., Whiston, S., & Carey, J. C. (1994). Factor structure of the supervisor emphasis rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 41–51.
- Leong, F. T. L., & Wagner, N. M. (1994). Cross-cultural counseling supervision: What do we know? What do we need to know? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 34*, 117–131.
- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*, 3–42.
- McGoldrick, M., Pearce, J. K., & Giordano, J. (Eds.). (1982). *Ethnicity and family therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Neufeldt, S. A., Iversen, J. N., & Juntunen, C. L. (1995). *Supervision strategies for the first practicum*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association Press.
- Putney, M. W., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & McCullough, M. E. (1992). Effects of supervisor and supervisee theoretical orientation and supervisor-supervisee matching on interns' perception of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 258–265.
- Rabinowitz, F. E., Heppner, P. P., & Roehlke, H. J. (1986). Descriptive study of process and outcome variables of supervision over time. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*, 292–300.
- Reising, G. N., & Daniels, M. H. (1983). A study of Hogan's model of counselor development and supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 235–244.
- Stenack, R. J., & Dye, H. A. (1982). Behavioral descriptions of counseling supervision roles. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 22*, 295–304.
- Stenack, R. J., & Dye, H. A. (1983). Practicum supervision roles: Effects on supervisee statements. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 23*, 157–168.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists: A developmental approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W., & Crethar, H. C. (1994). Changes in supervision as counselors and therapists gain experience. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 25*, 416–449.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1987). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience: A review. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 189–208.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26*, 64–73.
- Yager, G. G., Wilson, F. R., Brewer, D., & Kinnetz, P. (1989, March). *The development and validation of an instrument to measure counseling supervisor focus and style*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.