Triadic or Individual?
Developmental Considerations for Clinical Supervision

Kimberly M. Jayne and Katherine E. Purswell

Numerous models for counseling supervision exist, and decision-making criteria are needed for counselor educators to determine the appropriate supervision modality for counselors-in-training. The authors explore existing research on supervision modalities, professional development literature, and use of triadic and individual supervision in light of the overall purposes of supervision.

Supervision is one of the cornerstones of counselor education and is a legal and ethical requirement for counselors-in-training as established by accrediting agencies and state regulatory boards (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2016) requires that each student receive, on average, one hour per week of individual and/or triadic supervision and one-and-a-half hours per week of group supervision during practicum or internship experiences. The current supervision standards originated with the 2001 revision of the CACREP standards for supervision of counselors-in-training, which changed to include triadic supervision, "a tutorial and mentoring relationship between a member of the counseling profession and two counseling students," (CACREP, 2016, p. 44) as an adjunct or alternative to individual supervision. In spite of limited conceptual and empirical evidence for the efficacy of triadic supervision, many CACREP-accredited programs utilize the triadic modality given the time and cost efficiency of supervising two students concurrently (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES], 2011; Lyman, 2010).

In 2011, the ACES Executive Board adopted standards for best practices in clinical supervision that emphasized the need for supervision modalities and interventions to match the individual needs of supervisees. Specifically, the task force members who created the report recommended that supervisors select interventions "based on the assessment of the supervisee's developmental level, confidence, self-efficacy, and learning style; the clinical and supervision contexts; and the needs of the client" (ACES, 2011, p. 5). When utilizing triadic supervision, the supervisor has the responsibility to conduct supervision in a manner that meets the needs of both supervisees in each session. The ACES task force members further advised that time efficiency should not be a primary rationale for utilizing a triadic modality of supervision, and that triadic supervisors strive to effectively match supervisees, so that the development and skill of both supervisees is enhanced (ACES, 2011).

Although supervisors may find guidance from many established models of counseling supervision, no clearly stated decision-making criteria exist for counselor educators and supervisors to determine the appropriateness of triadic or individual supervision for counselors-in-training based on supervisees' developmental needs. The purpose of this article is to provide considerations for decision-making in counselor education regarding the provision of triadic supervision as an alternative or adjunct to individual supervision for counselors-in-training. We will examine this issue in light of the overall purposes and goals of supervision, existing research on the efficacy of various supervision modalities, and research on the professional development of counselors across the lifespan. Throughout these discussions, we will provide recommendations for selecting developmentally appropriate supervision modalities in counselor training and discuss implications for counselor education and research.

Kimberly M. Jayne, Department of Counselor Education, Portland State University and **Katherine E. Purswell**, Department of Counseling and Human Services, University of Scranton. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kimberly M. Jayne, Department of Counselor Education, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751 (e-mail: kimberly.jayne@pdx.edu).

Purpose of Supervision

Supervision is considered essential for counselor development and is utilized to facilitate counselor competence and growth, evaluate and monitor the quality of services provided to clients, and to perform professional gatekeeping (American Counseling Associaiton [ACA] Code of Ethics, 2014; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). Beyond these overarching goals, some specific functions of supervision include: promotion of supervisees' professional development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Dollarhide & Granello, 2012), personal development (Borders, 2009; Scholl, McGowan, & Hansen, 2012), ability to think critically and with complexity (Granello, 2010), and self-exploration of counselors-in-training (Dollarhide & Granello, 2012) protection of client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Dollarhide & Granello, 2012); and enhancement of supervisees' knowledge of counseling theory and techniques.

To accomplish these varied functions of supervision, supervisors are responsible for relating and responding to supervisees in a personalized manner that promotes the development of each supervisee (ACES, 2011; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Borders & Brown, 2005). Skilled supervisors attend to individual variables, cultural factors, and issues of power and privilege that impact the supervisory relationship and the supervision process (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, F.2.b; ACES, 2011; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Dollarhide & Granello, 2012). The interpersonal relationship and working alliance between the supervisor and the supervisee is central to the success and efficacy of supervision across supervision models and modalities because it provides the framework for supervisees' professional and personal development in the counseling profession (ACES, 2011; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2013).

Balancing gatekeeping, supervisee development, client welfare, and the supervisee-supervisor relationship are not simple tasks even in the most ideal circumstances. The complex demands of supervision are potentially multiplied in a triadic format due to the division of time and attention between two supervisees and responsibility to a greater number of clients. Supervisors may also be challenged as they aim to develop a strong working alliance with each supervisee and to manage group and power dynamics within the supervision triad (Borders et al., 2012). These issues may be compounded when peer supervisees have substantial developmental differences or are poorly matched (Hein & Lawson, 2008).

Research on Supervision Modalities

Researchers have obtained mixed results on the efficacy of individual, triadic, and group supervision for counselor development (Averitt, 1988; Bland, 2012; Lanning 1971; Newgent, Davis, & Farley, 2004; Nguyen, 2003; Ray & Altekruse, 2000). Although significant differences between the three modalities have not been established, some evidence supports the effectiveness of individual over triadic supervision (Newgent et al., 2004) and that triadic and individual supervision are not equivalent in terms of the supervisor-supervisee working alliance (Bakes, 2005). Qualitative research indicates that supervisors and supervisees value the contribution peers make to the process, including peer feedback and vicarious learning (Lawson, Hein, & Stuart, 2009; Stinchfield, Hill, & Kleist, 2007). Triadic supervision may increase demands on supervisors and present challenging dynamics related to managing feedback (Derrick, 2010; Stinchfield et al., 2007). Furthermore, supervisees in triadic supervision who also received some amount of individual supervision, often benefited from the additional supervision sessions (Derrick, 2010; Lawson et al., 2009; Stinchfield et al., 2007).

Effectiveness Research

Lyman (2010) surveyed 276 counselor educators to explore their rationale and frequency of use of triadic supervision in CACREP-accredited programs. The author found that, of the 63.5% of counselor educators who used triadic supervision in their programs, 74.3% used it solely with master's students and 20.5% used it with both master's and doctoral students. Of those surveyed, 82.1% perceived triadic to be as effective or more effective than individual supervision with master's students and 90% perceived it to be as effective or more effective than individual supervision with doctoral students. Overall, the majority of counselor educators surveyed utilized triadic supervision and considered it an effective supervision modality.

With regard to group supervision, researchers found no significant differences between the effectiveness of group and individual supervision for counselor development (Averitt, 1988; Lanning 1971; Ray & Altekruse, 2000). Nguyen (2003) compared the efficacy of two triadic supervision formats and individual supervision and found no significant differences in effectiveness between either triadic modalities or individual supervision. In contrast, Newgent and colleagues (2004) found that supervisees considered individual supervision more effective and better at meeting their needs than triadic supervision.

In an investigation of the working alliance in triadic and individual supervision, Bakes (2005) found that supervisors and supervisees perceived the working

alliance differently in each modality and that the two modalities were not equivalent. However, when examining the impact of supervision modality on working alliance and counselor self-efficacy, Bland (2012) found no difference between individual and triadic supervision. Limitations across studies included absence of control groups, concurrent student participation in multiple supervision modalities, inadequate instruments to measure the desired constructs, and small sample sizes.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative researchers explored perceptions of supervision and found triadic supervision increased the demands on supervisors who had to manage sometimes challenging dynamics between clinically inexperienced peers who likely had different personalities and could be at different developmental levels (Borders et al., 2012; Hein & Lawson, 2008). Supervisors found it challenging to concurrently meet the needs of both students when the students had very different capabilities and learning needs. They also found supervisors were sometimes able to fulfill a less directive and more facilitative role due to additional peer interaction in triadic supervision. Thus, triadic supervision had the advantage of capitalizing on peer interactions, but could also pose substantial challenges regarding the supervisor's ability to facilitate student growth when peers were not well-matched.

Time Management in Supervision. In their examination of supervisees' experiences in triadic supervision, Lawson et al. (2009) found that the triadic structure affords less time and attention for each supervisee. Similarly, in an exploration of supervisors' and supervisees' experiences in triadic supervision, Derrick (2010) found the triadic modality required increased structure, organization, and time in order to effectively meet supervisees' needs. Whereas triadic supervision provided more opportunities for vicarious learning, peer feedback, and support, supervisors found it challenging to adequately meet both students' needs, to adequately monitor client welfare, and to manage the dynamics of providing feedback to one student in front of another student who may be at a different ability or insight level dynamics or managing student feedback to one another (Borders et al., 2012; Derrick, 2010).

Researchers found that students benefited from individual supervision as a supplement to triadic supervision to share personal information with their supervisors, to discuss their experiences in triadic supervision, and to address client concerns (Derrick, 2010; Stinchfield et al., 2007). Others also recommended supervisors augment triadic with individual supervision to provide appropriate time and attention for each student (Lawson et al., 2009). Stinchfield et al. (2007) noted that supervisees reported positive experiences within a triadic model designed to provide equal time and attention for each supervisee and to engage supervisees in active and reflective roles. However, students with less developed counseling skills or competency concerns may need increased individual attention (Lawson et al., 2009). If triadic supervision is used, the length and frequency can be increased (Lawson et al., 2009).

Supervisee Compatibility. Researchers found that both supervisees and supervisors recognized that compatibility and appropriate matching of peer supervisees was critical for students' growth; and that developmental differences between peer supervisees contributed to disparities in the time and attention provided to each supervisee and the perceived power differential between peers (Borders et al., 2012; Derrick, 2010). Lawson et al. (2009) also emphasized the importance of effectively matching supervisees, attending to compatibility between supervision peers, and encouraging collaboration between all members of the supervisory triad (Hein & Lawson, 2008; Lawson et al., 2009). Lawson et al. (2009) concluded that

> a relatively high level of compatibility between supervision peers is necessary to achieve fundamental elements of supervision, which, in turn, contribute to an effective supervision process. In contrast, a low level of compatibility can result in varying degrees of impairment to both the process and outcome of triadic supervision. (pp. 454-455)

Poor compatibility between peer supervisees undermines safety and trust and contributes to restricted feedback processes as well as decreased openness, self-disclosure, learning, and support. Specific training and skill development is necessary for supervisors to effectively facilitate triadic supervision (Borders et al., 2012; Hein & Lawson, 2008).

In a complementary study, Hein, Lawson, and Rodriguez (2011) identified several factors that contribute to supervisee-peer compatibility, including: multicultural dimensions (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity), personality characteristics, previous counseling experience, cumulative life experiences, developmental level, counseling skills, conceptualization skills, maturity, motivation and willingness to learn, ability to engage in self-reflection, ability to provide feedback, receptivity to feedback, willingness to self-disclose, and affective expression. Researchers concluded that supervisees valued having a voice in the matching process (Derrick, 2010; Stinchfield et al., 2007) and recognized that incompatibility impacted their sense of safety and the overall productivity of triadic supervision (Derrick, 2010).

Overall, the qualitative and quantitative results of research on the various supervision modalities have been mixed. A high percentage of counselor educators utilize triadic supervision and believe it is helpful (Lyman, 2010), yet qualitative research highlights many disadvantages to triadic supervision, such as limited time and focus (Derrick, 2010) as well as challenges with supervisee incompatibility (Hein & Lawson, 2008; Lawson et al., 2009). Although triadic supervision has some benefits, they seem to only be present when supervisees are well-matched. Without clear, consistent research outcomes, counselor educators and supervisors must rely on existing research and theory to inform decision-making practices regarding supervision modality.

Counselor Development

Counselor development is among the important factors for supervisors to consider when determining the most appropriate supervision modality for counselors-in-training (ACES, 2011; Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). Assessing each student's developmental level is critical for providing effective supervision and meeting students and clients' needs. Though there are many individual differences across the spectrum of professional development, several well-researched and established developmental models may be utilized to inform counselor educators' decision-making practices regarding the application of supervision modalities and interventions in CACREP-accredited counseling programs.

Skovholt and Ronnestad's (2003) lifespan developmental model, Stoltenberg and McNeil's (2010) integrated developmental model, and King and Kitchener's (2004) reflective judgment model provide potential frameworks for understanding counselor development. Each of these models provides insight into supervisory needs of beginning students entering formal training, advanced students in practicum and internship, and new professionals following completion of a master's degree through licensure and/or doctoral education. Table 1 includes a summary of key dimensions from each developmental model and potential benefits and limitations of utilizing triadic supervision at each phase of counselor development.

Beginning Students

Beginning level students typically include pre-practicum and beginning practicum students. These students tend to be highly anxious and eager to learn, and they may benefit most from individual supervision.

Overview of beginning students. When seeking answers to complex problems that cannot be resolved through reasoning alone, King and Kitchener (2004) found individuals at the earliest level of reflective judgment view knowledge as concrete and absolute and reference authority figures to justify their beliefs and conclude that one view is right and all others are wrong (Table 1). Brabeck and Welfel (1985) found that master's level counseling trainees displayed the second level of reflective judgment, quasi-reflective judgment, in which they valued various perspectives, but were unable to differentially evaluate the quality of evidence to arrive at a current best answer. However, when faced with new, complex challenges, including clinical challenges, the students sometimes reverted to earlier levels of reflective judgment. This potential regression is consistent with research indicating beginning students often experience high levels of anxiety (Ronnestad & Skovolt, 2013). Because counseling represents the challenge of an ill-structured problem, which they approach with a high degree of self-focus and limited self-awareness (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010), beginning students tend to be highly dependent on external sources for direction and evaluation (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Dollarhide & Granello, 2012). They also tend to seek counseling approaches and methods that can be learned quickly and applied universally (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003) and seek the "right" or "best" approach to use with clients (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). This tendency toward concreteness and reliance on external authority to find "the" answer is only exacerbated by "high standards of performance, unrealistic expectations, the achievement orientation of academia, [and] fear of being unsuited for counseling/therapy work" (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003, p. 32-33).

Beginning students are often highly dependent on supervisors and sensitive to critical feedback (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). They may experience supervision as threatening and actively work to hide their anxiety and self-doubt (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003). Because of their fears, beginning students also tend to present only positive aspects of their clinical work and avoid sharing difficulties openly in supervision. To address these issues, supervisors may need to provide higher levels of structure and direction in supervision to help reduce their anxiety and address their need for concrete skills. However, beginning students also need opportunities to struggle with the complexity and ambiguity of the counseling process, to explore multiple perspectives, and to practice self-reflection (King & Kitchener, 2004; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010).

Recommendations for beginning students. We recommend individual supervision for beginning level

students. When individual supervision is not possible on a weekly basis, it should be provided as an adjunct to triadic supervision at regular intervals. For beginning students, the presence of a peer in supervision may serve to increase performance anxiety and decrease self-disclosure. Supervisors may experience difficulty providing sufficient time to two supervisees with high needs for structure and to adequately monitor client welfare.

Despite these recommendations, individual student characteristics should be kept in mind when making the decision between supervision modalities. For example, peer presence in triadic supervision can normalize anxiety and provide an additional source of support and feedback for some students (Table 1). Further, the triadic modality can provide students with alternate perspectives and decrease self-focus, helping move them out of the pre-reflective stages of reflective judgment. We believe the negative aspects of triadic supervision outweigh the positive aspects and that many of the helpful components of triadic supervision can be achieved outside of the supervision modality through group supervision or peer observation and consultation.

Advanced Students

Advanced students typically include mid- to late-practicum and early- to mid-internship students. These students are developing confidence and independence, and may still depend on their supervisors for support and assistance. We recommend individual supervision or a combination of individual and triadic supervision for advanced students.

Overview of beginning students. Counselor educators and supervisors intend that by the end of practicum and the beginning of internship counseling students are moving into the advanced student role. Toward the end of their formal training, advanced students often feel pressure to excel in their work and have internalized high standards for professional functioning (Table 1; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003). As a result, they tend to be cautious and to feel overly responsible in their professional roles. Advanced students may still feel insecure and vulnerable and actively seek validation and feedback from supervisors and peers. They function more independently but often experience a conflict between their growing sense of autonomy and their dependency on supervisors or instructors (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). During the quasi-reflective thinking stage that generally characterizes master's students and that may particularly characterize master's students once they have some counseling experience (Brabeck & Welfel, 1985), students have a growing awareness that

uncertainty is part of the knowing process and view knowledge as constructed, contextual, and subjective (King & Kitchner, 2004). Although evidence is used to justify beliefs, evidence is considered selectively to support established beliefs and the connection between evidence and specific beliefs is often tenuous.

Skovholt and Ronnestad (2003) emphasized that during the advanced student phase, "experiences in supervision have particular significance" (p. 15) and "can be a powerful source of influence" (p. 15). Advanced students are more likely to readily engage in a process of critical evaluation and assessment and tend to be more aware of the interplay between their personal and professional growth. These students may seek feedback from their supervisors in order to clarify their perspectives on conceptual, theoretical, and methodological issues but feel more freedom to reject supervisory feedback. Thus, tension, conflict, and resistance generally peak in supervision during this phase (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). According to Skovholt and Ronnestad (2003), the advanced student "has actively assimilated information from many sources but has still not had enough time to accommodate and find his or her own way of behaving professionally" (p. 71), a description that, again, resembles quasi-reflective judgment.

Recommendations. We believe that at the advanced student stage, individual supervision can be a powerful modality to allow for self-exploration as it leads to professional growth. However, supervisees at this level who are well-matched on interpersonal skills and self-insight may provide substantial support to one another. Still, we recommend that individual supervision be provided on a regular basis in lieu of or in tandem with triadic supervision to address potential conflict or to allow for a more confidential opportunity for self-exploration. At the advanced student stage of development, triadic supervision may again provide a normalizing experience for the supervisee (Table 1). The presence of a peer may also stimulate risk-taking and provide for vicarious learning. Additionally, a supervisee may more readily hear feedback from a peer than a supervisor. Having a third person present in supervision may help diffuse conflict or tension between a supervisor and one supervisee, but may do so in ways that obstruct healthy conflict resolution experiences. At the advanced stage of development, supervisees are still working to rely on their newfound confidence and comparing oneself to a peer or getting contradictory feedback from a peer and a supervisor may hinder this process.

New Professionals

New professionals are those who have recently

completed graduate training, but some late-internship students may be moving into this stage. At this stage, we generally recommend triadic supervision, but recognize that in some cases, individual supervision may be ideal.

Overview of new professionals. Following formal training and graduation, new professionals tend to engage in a developmental process of confirmation, disillusionment, and exploration (Table 1; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2013). Personal and professional integration increase as new professionals practice self-exploration and self-reflection and develop a more genuine and personalized approach to counseling (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010). Once they have experienced the complexity and ambiguity of clinical practice, new professionals tend to increasingly recognize the crucial roles the therapeutic relationship and the person of the therapist play in therapeutic outcome. New professionals also become more skilled in regulating boundaries and professional limits. Although new professionals experience insecurity and self-doubt at times, they have more confidence in their efficacy as counselors and trust their clinical judgment and decision-making than they did earlier in their development. Supervisees who reach the reflective thinking stage, view knowledge as, "the outcome of a process of reasonable inquiry in which solutions to ill-structured problems are constructed" (p. 7) and "conclusions are defended as representing the most complete, plausible, or compelling understanding of an issue on the basis of evaluable evidence" (King & Kitchner, 2004, p. 7). Reflective thinkers are open to new information and reevaluating their conclusions based on new and emerging evidence. King and Kitchner (2004) found that only some doctoral students demonstrated the most advanced level of reflective judgment; presumably, some new professionals remain at the quasi-reflective level and some advance.

Recommendations. For novice professionals, we prefer triadic supervision because it can be an opportunity to develop collegial relationships with supervisors and peers as supervisees transition out of the role of student into the role of professional. At this stage, the presence of peers can expose the supervisee to diverse clinical issues and multiple perspectives, something that can complement their focus on personal and professional integration and help them develop reflective thinking (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2013). Potential negatives to the triadic modality at this stage include limited self-disclosure or reflection due to limited time and the possibility that supervision is too generalized for personal integration. However, we believe the positives of developing collaborative relationships and being exposed to diverse clinical experiences outweigh the negatives. As with all supervisees, the development and life circumstances of the individual must be taken into account. For example, individual supervision might be more appropriate if the supervisee is dealing with difficult personal life circumstances that could impact counseling effectiveness.

Summary of Developmental Models

Skovholt and Ronnestad's (2003) lifespan developmental model, Stoltenberg and McNeil's (2010) integrated developmental model, and King & Kitchner's (2004) reflective judgment model have many implications for how counselor educators and supervisors make decisions regarding the use of triadic supervision for beginning students, advanced students, and new professionals. Although developmental models provide a general understanding of trajectory for counselor development, it is essential that supervisors acknowledge and respond to supervisees' developmental differences and individual needs.

Implications for Counselor Education and Supervision

The following case example illustrates implications of supervision modality research and supervisee development research for counselor education and supervision. Henry and Chloe have been paired for practicum supervision because of their similar theoretical approach. Chloe is in her mid-twenties and self-identified as African American. She excelled in her pre-practicum class, demonstrating an ability to be empathic and non-judgmental toward clients. She has a natural relational capacity and was able to effectively integrate most supervisor feedback into sessions immediately. Toward the end of pre-practicum Chloe consistently demonstrated fundamental counseling skills, and much of Chloe's supervision focused on the impact of her self-doubt or anxiety on her effectiveness in the sessions and on integration of theory in her counseling practice. Henry is a male in his early thirties who identifies as White and who had experienced difficulty in pre-practicum. In fact, at midterm he had been unsure whether he would pass. Henry initially struggled with demonstrating basic counseling skills and developing rapport with the client. Half-way through the semester, he experienced a qualitative change in his thinking and he was able to begin consistently responding in therapeutic ways to the client, but still struggled with falling back into excessive questioning and advice giving. Henry's supervisor had concerns about the extent to which Henry had integrated counseling skills and attitudes

because Henry's responses sometimes seemed focused on pleasing the supervisor rather than meeting the client's needs.

In determining whether to utilize individual supervision, triadic supervision, or triadic supervision supplemented with individual supervision, the practicum instructor would need to consider which modality would best facilitate reaching the goals of supervision. Specifically, the supervisor would want to consider the developmental levels of the supervisees, the supervisor's ability to manage developmental differences and interpersonal concerns in supervision, the length of supervision sessions, how to address sociocultural factors, any programmatic restrictions (e.g. triadic supervision is the policy), and the compatibility of the supervisees. Below is a discussion of possible pros and cons to pairing the two together in supervision followed by a recommendation for supervision of these students.

The partnering of Chloe and Henry in practicum represents a potentially problematic pairing for triadic supervision. Chloe has left the beginning student phase and fully entered the advanced student phase. Henry, on the other hand, fluctuates between the beginning and advanced student phases without being firmly established in either. He is growing in self-confidence, but is still somewhat dependent on supervisors to tell him whether his responses are "right" or not. This discrepancy between phases of development can create challenges for the supervisor (Lawson, et al., 2009; Derrick, 2010). The supervisor may want to focus on building Henry's ability and confidence in demonstrating fundamental skills and limit risk-taking in session because Henry has not yet mastered the skills he needs to take risks appropriately. On the other hand, because of Chloe's developmental level and insight, the supervisor will likely encourage Chloe to take risks and trust her therapeutic judgment more. Rather than focusing primarily on skills, the supervisor is more likely to challenge Chloe to articulate her intentionality behind responses and to explore her personal philosophy or theory of counseling. These different needs may prove difficult for a supervisor to address simultaneously (Lawson et al., 2009; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003). Pairing these students with a developmentally similar peer could help the supervisor make connections between peers and avoid unintentionally sending contradictory messages (i.e. focus on basic skills versus take risks).

If Chloe entered supervision with a well-formed argument regarding application of theory to practice that conflicted with the supervisor's view, the supervisor would consider this conflict an indication that she was developing appropriate self-confidence (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) and quasi-reflective thinking (King & Kitchner,

2004). However, with Henry, disagreement with the supervisor's recommendation that he increase his rapport building or competency with fundamental skills would be a cause for concern due to Henry's limited self-awareness (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010) and his emphasis on "right" responses without a careful consideration of the context (King & Kitchner, 2004; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003). Thus, the supervisor might have difficulty encouraging Chloe's increasing professional confidence while communicating concern toward Henry for frequent questioning of supervisor feedback. Triadic supervision might limit Chloe's willingness to express her disagreement and might limit the supervisor's ability to fully address concerns with Henry.

The potential for positive results from pairing Henry and Chloe in triadic supervision also exists. For example, Henry might learn from observing Chloe, and Chloe could develop further insight from explaining her rationale and providing feedback to Henry (Lawson et al., 2009). Further, their racial differences have the potential provide a space for greater understanding of others' experiences in the world as well as providing them with a supervised forum in which to address power and privilege issues. Depending on each student's level of racial development, placing them together could be a potentially positive or negative experience.

Although some benefits to placing these students together in triadic supervision exist, we argue that potential problems outweigh potential benefits and would recommend individual supervision for both students. If triadic supervision is the policy of the program, we would recommend placing these students with more developmentally similar peers and/or augmenting triadic supervision with individual supervision. We assume that competent supervisors of practicum students will address issues of race, gender, culture, and privilege with both of these students regardless of the modality used.

Recommendations and Conclusion

In the case example, we primarily addressed the beginning and advanced stages of supervision. New professionals may also benefit from increased personal attention in individual supervision as they seek to integrate personal and professional aspects of themselves into counseling. However, supervisees at this level may also benefit from the presence of a peer because of the increased exposure to differing viewpoints and counseling situations. For any level of supervisee development, extended time in triadic supervision or periodic individual sessions are often necessary in order to adequately meet supervisee and

client needs and to promote self-reflection and integration.

Whenever triadic supervision is used, compatibility between peers is essential to the process and outcome (Derrick, 2010; Lawson, et al., 2009; Stinchfield, et al., 2007). The ACES Best Practices in Supervision Task Force (2011) recommended that supervisors choose appropriate supervision interventions and supervision modalities following an assessment of the supervisee's developmental level, learning style, self-confidence, and self-efficacy. Often within counselor education programs, supervision modality and supervisory triads are determined before each student's developmental level, learning style, and needs have been appropriately assessed. Many courses and counselor education programs have established supervisory structures that are utilized on the basis of student enrollment and availability of resources rather than a comprehensive assessment of students' supervisory needs. Counselor education programs and supervisors need to improve methods for assessing students' development and learning needs and incorporate ongoing evaluation as part of the supervisory process on both an individual and systemic level. Counselor educators and supervisors need to consider how to involve students in the decision-making process when determining whether to provide individual or triadic supervision (Derrick, 2010; Stinchfield, et al., 2007) When triadic supervision is the modality of choice, supervisees should have a voice in the matching process as peer compatibility significantly impacts the process and outcome of supervision. Compatibility is particularly important for supervisees in the early stages of development when anxiety and self-doubt tend to be higher.

Furthermore, supervisors need to be adequately trained to provide triadic supervision (Hein & Lawson, 2008). Few models of triadic supervision exist and many variables unique to the triadic process have yet to be researched (Stinchfield et al., 2010). Training should also include assessment of student developmental level and decision-making models for appropriately matching supervision interventions and modalities to student's needs. Supervisors need to approach supervision with flexibility and incorporate feedback processes and continuous evaluation and re-evaluation of supervisees' learning needs as part of the supervision process. Borders and Brown (2005) identified several important factors for supervisors to consider when choosing supervision interventions such as the developmental level of the supervisee, the supervisees' learning goals, the supervisor's goals for the supervisee, the supervisor's learning goals for the supervision experience, and contextual factors such as setting, course and licensure requirements, and timeframe for supervision experience.

Additional research is needed to inform supervisor training and decision-making regarding supervision modalities in supervision and in counselor education programs. Future research should examine the efficacy of triadic or individual supervision within the context of developmental stages. However, before such research can take place, a better understanding of developmental models of supervision is necessary. Such an understanding includes creating a means by which to assess supervisee development and competence. Without a measure of supervisee development, further research will not have the specificity needed to look at differences in supervisee needs, experiences, or challenges within developmental stages. Once measures exist to identify supervisee development, research should focus on both the efficacy of triadic or individual supervision and on developing a better understanding of what contributes to the success of supervision at different developmental stages. For example, further research that examines compatibility factors at each developmental level could help inform supervisors and counselor educators as they make decisions about triadic supervision partners.

Triadic supervision is widely used in counselor education programs (Lyman, 2010). Although CACREP (2009; 2016) presented individual and triadic supervision as equally acceptable modalities, research indicates differences between how triadic and individual supervision are experienced by supervisors and supervisees. Further research is necessary to determine the effectiveness of individual, triadic, and group supervision and how variables unique to each modality impact counselor development and competence. Furthermore, given the many shared benefits of triadic and group supervision, such as exposure to multiple perspectives, support, normalization, and vicarious learning, we recommend that CACREP and counselor educators evaluate use of triadic supervision as an alternative to group rather than individual supervision.

For supervisors and program directors who are considering whether to utilize individual supervision, triadic supervision, or some combination, we wish that we could provide a flow chart or other concrete, guaranteed method of determining the supervision modality that is best for a particular student or group of students. However, as with most aspects of counseling, what is best for human being depends on each unique human being. However, we hope that the considerations we have presented in this manuscript and summarized in Table 1 provide a useful starting place for what can be challenging decisions. By considering the unique development and needs of students, counselor educators and supervisors can help each student develop into the best counselor that student can be.

References

American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, ACES Executive Council. (2011). *BestPractices in Supervision*. Retrieved from http://www.aces online.net/resources

Averitt, J. (1988). Individual versus group supervision of counselor trainees (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 624. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (8911702)

Bakes, A. S. (2005). *The supervisory working alliance: A comparison of dyadic and triadic supervision models.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (305405714)

Bland, C. S. (2012). *Supervision outcomes: Comparison of individual, triadic, and group supervision.* Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (1240976596)

Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2013). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Borders, L. D. (2009). Subtle messages in clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 28,* 200-209. doi:10.1080/073220903324694

Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Mahwah, NJ: Lahaska Press.

Borders, L. D., Welfare, L. E., Greason, P. B., Paladino, D. A., Mobley, A. K., Villalaba, J. A., & Wester, K. L. (2012). Individual and triadic and group: Supervisee and supervisor perceptions of each modality. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 51*, 281-295. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2012. 00021.x

Brabeck, M. M., & Welfel, E. R. (1985). Counseling theory: Understanding the trend toward eclecticism from a developmental perspective. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 63*(6), 343-348. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1985.tb02714.x

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *2016 Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *2009 Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/2009-Standards.pdf

Derrick, E. C. (2010). *Exploring supervisor and supervisee experiences of triadic supervision.* Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (858094363)

Dollarhide, C. T., & Granello, D. H. (2012). Humanistic perspective on counselor education and supervision. In M. B. Scholl, S. A. McGowen, & J. T. Hansen, (Eds.), In *Humanistic Perspectives on Contemporary Counseling Issues*, (pp. 277-306). New York, NY: Routledge.

Granello, D. H. (2010). Cognitive complexity among practicing counselors: How thinking changes with experience. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 88*(1), 92-100. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2010.tb00155.x

Hein, S., & Lawson, G. (2008). Triadic supervision and its impact on the role of the supervisor: A qualitative examination of supervisors' perspectives. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *48*(1), 16-31. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008. tb00059.x

Hein, S. F., Lawson, G., & Rodriguez, C. P. (2011). Supervisee incompatibility and its influence on triadic supervision: An examination of doctoral student supervisors' perspectives. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*(6), 422-436. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01925.x

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. *Educational Psychologist*, 39(1), 5-18. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep3901_2

Lanning, W. (1971). A study of the relations between group and individual counseling supervision and three relationship measures. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 18,* 401-406.

Lawson, G., Hein, S. F., & Stuart, C. S. (2009). A qualitative investigation of supervisees' experiences of triadic supervision. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 87*(4), 449-457. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00129.x

Lyman, S. R. (2010). *Triadic supervision in CACREP accredited counselor education programs: Current practices and rationale.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (251021467)

Newgent, R. A., Davis, H., Jr., Farley, R. C. (2004). Perceptions of individual, triadic and group models of supervision: A pilot study. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *23* (2), 65-79. doi:10.1300/ J001v23n02_05

Nguyen, T. V. (2003). *A comparison of individual supervision and triadic supervision*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (3106902)

Ray, D., & Altekruse, M. (2000). Effectiveness of group supervision versus combined group and individual supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *40,* 19-30.

Ronnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2013). *The developing practitioner: Growth and stagnation of therapists and counselors.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Scholl, M. B., McGowan, A. S., & Hansen, J. T. (Eds.). (2012). *Humanistic persepectives on contemporary counseling issues.* New York, NY: Routledge

Skovholt, T. M., & Ronnestad, M. H. (2003). Struggles of the novice counselor and therapist. *Journal of Career Development, 30*(1), 45-58. doi:10.1177/089484530303000103

Stinchfield, T. M., Hill, N. R., Kleist, D. M. (2007). The reflective model of triadic supervision: Defining an emerging modality. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *46*(3), 172-183. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00023.x

Stinchfield, T. M., Hill, N. R., Kleist, D. M. (2010). Counselor trainees' experiences in triadic supervision: A qualitative exploration of transcendent themes. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, *32*(4), 225-239. doi:10.1007/s10447-0109099-8

Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeill, B. W. (2010). *IDM: An integrated developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Table 1

Developmental Considerations for Triadic Supervision

Lifespan Developmental Model (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003)	Integrated Developmental Model (Stoltenberg & McNeill, 2010)	Reflective Judgment Model (Kitchener & King, 2004)	Potential Benefits of Triadic Supervision	Potential Limitations of Triadic Supervision
Beginning Student -High performance anxiety -Highly dependent on supervisors -Fear of evaluation -Sensitive to feedback -Hide struggles in supervision -Prefer structure and direction -Focused on learning skills	**Level 1** -Highly motivated and anxious -Focused on learning skills -Desire "right/best" answers -Dependent on supervisor -Need structure -Highly self-focused -Limited self-awareness	**Prereflective Thinking** -Knowledge is assumed to be certain and absolute -No differentiation between well and ill-defined problems -Do not use evidence to reason towards conclusions -Rely on personal beliefs or authorities views	-Peer presence can normalize anxiety -Shared time/attention can decrease self-focus -Increased peer support -Receive feedback from multiple sources -Vicarious learning opportunities -Exposed to multiple perspectives and challenged to explore alternative ways of thinking	-Peer presence can increase performance anxiety -Difficultly giving/receiving feedback with peer present -Easier to hide struggles/clinical issues due to split attention/time -Not enough time and attention to adequately address needs/concerns -Confusion due to contradictory feedback from peer and supervisor -Avoid self-disclosure, hold back due to peer presence, insufficient time -Inadequate monitoring of client welfare based on counselor skill level
Advanced Student -Tend to be cautious -Gaining confidence but still reliant on external feedback -Feel overly responsible in professional role -Tension and conflict peak in supervision -Strongly influenced by supervision	**Level 2** -Fluctuate between autonomy and dependence -Alternately confident and insecure -Resistant and challenging in supervision -More empathic towards clients -Difficulty regulating boundaries of professional role	**Quasireflective Thinking** -Knowledge is uncertain, contextual, and subjective -Choose evidence that confirms existing beliefs -Link between evidence and conclusions is tenuous	-Peer presence can stimulate risk-taking -Peer presence can normalize experience -Vicarious learning opportunities -Peer feedback less threatening than supervisory feedback -Peer can potentially support conflict resolution in supervisory relationship	-Peer alignment/relationship can interfere with supervisor feedback and working alliance -Compare development to peer, expanding power differential between peers -Contradictory feedback from peer and supervisor -Difficult to resolve tension, conflict in supervisory relationship with peer present -Confusion due to multiple perspectives and contradictory feedback
Novice Professional -Increased focus on personal and professional integration -Increased sense of freedom and independence -Recognize importance of therapeutic relationship -May feel unprepared or inadequately trained -Increased use of self as therapeutic tool	**Level 3** -Focused on more personalized approach to counseling -Occasional self-doubt -Increased trust in professional judgment -Increased self-awareness including personal reactions in therapy and strengths and weaknesses	**Reflective Thinking** -Knowledge is the outcome of a process of reasonable inquiry -Knowledge is constructed and reevaluated in light of new evidence -Conclusions are justified by consistent, coherent, compelling evidence	-Collegial relationships among supervisors and peer -Exposure to diverse clinical issues and settings -Exposure to multiple perspectives	-Personal reflection and self-disclosure limited due to divided attention/time -Supervision too generalized for personal integration process