FACTORS RELATED TO THE SELF-EFFICACY OF SCHOOL COUNSELORS IN TRAINING

by

Rolanda Levica Mitchell

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Counseling

Charlotte

2016

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Phyllis Post

_____
Dr. John Culbreth

_____
Dr. Lyndon Abrams

_____
Dr. Claudia Flowers

_____
Dr. Rosemarie Tong

ABSTRACT

ROLANDA LEVICA MITCHELL. Factors related to the self-efficacy of school counselors in training. (Under the direction of DR. PHYLLIS POST)

Professional school counselors play an integral role in the academic, personal/social and career development of children. Each day, they are charged with addressing student mental health needs (Burnett-Zeigler & Lyons, 2012; Green et al., 2014), expected to attend to academic issues such as assisting with the college matriculation (Bryan, Moore-Thomas, Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2011), all while managing non-counseling related duties (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008). Unlike individuals in other counseling fields, professional school counselors serve their students without the benefit of clinical supervision (Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015). For most school counselors, the only clinical supervision they receive occurs during the internship component of their graduate program. Therefore, the on-site supervision received during the internship was the focus of this research study. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the supervisory working alliance, level of disclosure and satisfaction with supervision and school counseling self-efficacy. A total of 179 participants completed a web-based survey consisting of a demographic questionnaire and four standardized instruments: The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale, the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee Version, and the Quality of Supervision semantic differential. A standard multiple regression of the data indicated that level of disclosure contributed significantly to self-efficacy, accounting for 12% of the variance. These results can be used to inform the field of counselor education as well as professional school counseling. Future research is encouraged to identify which factors, if not the supervisory working alliance

and satisfaction with supervision, make a significant impact on school counseling self-efficacy.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my aunt, Retha Louise Ward Garner. I am certain that if you had been blessed with more time, you would have had one of your own. Instead, we can share this one.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to begin this section by giving honor to God, who brought me to this place I sometimes feared I would never see. I am unable to enumerate all the blessings that have been bestowed upon me; being able to add this accomplishment to the list is humbling. I am confident that He ordered my steps, as even when they faltered I learned more about myself and the world around me; for that I am grateful.

I would like to acknowledge my dissertation chair, Dr. Phyllis Post, who has remained on this journey with me despite the struggles, and consistently made me feel that I have a contribution to make in the field. Thank you for not giving up on me. I truly appreciate the time and energy you put into your role as my chair. I also thank you for your efforts outside of this process to include me in activities that enhance my ability to present and work with colleagues.

My committee has done so much to help me finish this project; please know how much you are valued. To Dr. Jack Culbreth, thank you for instilling in me an appreciation for supervision, as well as all the words of encouragement, opportunities to teach, and your assistance in networking. To Dr. Lyndon Abrams, I hope you can rest easy knowing that you no longer have to make a call to Ahoskie; I finally got this "little paper" done. The guidance both of you have provided means a great deal to me, and I am proud to know you. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Claudia Flowers for making statistics seem less like a foreign language. Thank you so much for always greeting me with positivity and encouragement, even when I had been off the scene for a while. Finally, I wish to thank Dr. Rosie Tong for sharing the wisdom of your experiences and for taking the time to get to know me as a person.

To all the wonderful friends, classmates and professional colleagues who have supported me over the years, thank you for the check-ins and nudges in the right direction. To, Viva Jordan and Michiko Dowdy at Family First Community Services, thank you providing me an opportunity to grow professionally and for pushing me out of the office to get this project done.

I would not be who I am without my family, and I have the great honor to be a product of the Wards and Mitchells of Bertie County, NC. I grew up surrounded by grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins, who worked hard, were a joy to others, and who accomplished what they set out to do. I was raised to be aware of what it means to be a black woman in this country, but also to never view my culture as an obstacle. Instead, I was taught to be proud, to garner strength from my history, and know that I was as worthy as anyone else. That upbringing is a privilege I do not take lightly. The family members that remain, as well as the memories of those that have gone before, replenish my spirit.

I especially want to thank my immediate family. To my sister Crystal, my brothers Jeron and James, and my wonderful niece and nephew, Jewel and Cameron, I love you more than you know. Thank you for believing in me. To my father, Levi, I hope you are in heaven bragging and reminding everyone that I am named after you. Thank you for loving me in spite of my stubbornness; I hope you know how much you are loved in return. Lastly, I would like to thank my mother Vivian Ward Mitchell for being strong, compassionate, and hilarious. You never questioned whether I would get this dissertation done, and that meant the world to me. I am grateful to have you as a mom, and I love you so very much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION 1

Overview 1

Self-Efficacy 4

Supervisory Working Alliance 6

Supervisee Disclosure 7

Satisfaction with Supervision 9

Purpose of the Study 10

Research Question 11

Delimitations 11

Limitations 11

Assumptions 12

Threats to External and Internal Validity 12

Operational Definitions 13

Pre-Service School Counselors 13

Novice School Counselors 13

Supervisory Working Alliance 14

Supervisee Disclosure 14

Satisfaction with Supervision 14

Summary 14

Organization of Study 15

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 17

The School Counseling Profession 18

History of School Counseling 18

Current Role of the Professional School Counselor 20

Training & Supervision of School Counselors 22

Summary 29

Self-Efficacy 30

Definition and Conceptualization of Theory 30

Research Related to Self-Efficacy and Counseling 32

Research Related to Self-Efficacy and School Counseling 38

Summary 43

The Supervisory Working Alliance 44

Definition and Conceptualization of the Theory 44

Related Research 46

Research Related to the Supervisory Working Alliance and Self-Efficacy 50

Summary 51

Supervisee Disclosure 51

Definition and Conceptualization of the Theory 51

Related Research 52

Research Related to Supervisee Disclosure and Self-Efficacy 56

Summary 57

Satisfaction with Supervision 57

Definition and Conceptualization of the Theory 57

Related Research 58

Research Related to Satisfaction with Supervision and Self-Efficacy 62
Summary and Conclusions 65
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY 67
Introduction 67
Description of Participants 67
Web-Based Administration of Surveys 69
Instrumentation 70
School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix E) 70
Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee Version (Appendix F) 72
Level of Disclosure Scale (Appendix G) 73
Quality of Supervision Scale (Appendix H) 74
Demographic Questionnaire - (Appendix I) 75
Research Design 75
Research Question 76
Data Analysis 76
Screening Data 76
Descriptive Statistics 77
Multiple Regression 77
Summary 78
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS 79
Description of Participants 79
Reliability of Instruments 83
Bivariate Correlations 84

Multiple Regression Analysis 86

Summary 87

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION 89

Results and Conclusions 90

Demographic Data 90

Pearson's Correlation 91

Multiple Regression 92

Contributions and Implications of the Study 93

Implications for On-Site Supervisors 94

Implications for Counselor Educators 95

Limitations of the Study 95

Recommendations for Future Research 97

Concluding Remarks 100

REFERENCES 102

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY EMAIL TO PROGRAM DIRECTORS 114

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM 115

APPENDIX C: EMAIL TO ASCA MEMBERS 117

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT FORM 118

APPENDIX E: SCHOOL COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY SCALE 120

APPENDIX F: THE WORKING ALLIANCE INVENTORY-TRAINEE VERSION 123

APPENDIX G: LEVEL OF DISCLOSURE SCALE 126

APPENDIX H: QUALITY OF SUPERVISION SCALE 127

APPENDIX I: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE 128

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Overview

As an integral part of the educational framework in the United States, professional school counselors find themselves in a position to impact the lives of children. The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) charges professional school counselors with attending to the academic, career and personal/social needs of their students. This task is exacerbated by the multitude of issues with which students present. For example, a survey of 1878 students in an urban setting revealed that while 56.9% of students reported being exposed to violence, only 22.8% had contact with a mental health professional in the past year (Green et al., 2014). Further, in 2013, approximately 2.6 million adolescents age 12-17 experienced at least one major depressive episode; of these children, 70.3% of males and 59.1% of females received no clinical treatment (SAMSHA, 2014). This data supports previous research, which indicates that while many youth present with mental health concerns, few are connected to clinical interventions (Burnett-Zeigler & Lyons, 2012). Very often, children either receive therapeutic interventions in the school first, and/or are connected with mental health professionals through a referral from school personnel (Burnett-Zeigler & Lyons, 2012; Green et al., 2014).

In addition to addressing mental health needs, school counselors engage in work that impacts various aspects of children's futures. This is evidenced by research conducted by Bryan, Moore-Thomas, Day-Vines and Holcomb-McCoy (2011) to determine the impact school counselors can have on college application rates. Data on 4,835 students was analyzed, and researchers reported that student contact with the counselor influenced the likelihood of applying to college. Further, "student contact with the school counselor for college information seemed to reduce the negative effects of SES on applying to two or more colleges" (p. 196).

The school environment also provides unique parameters and challenges. Professional school counselors must work within a system that consists of collaboration with administrators, parents, faculty, and other stakeholders and, very often, the performance of non-counseling related tasks. These non-counseling related tasks can include things such as substituting in the classroom, assisting with individualized education plans and conducting bus and lunch duty (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008).

Unlike counterparts in other branches of the profession, professional school counselors attend to student needs, collaborate with stakeholders and manage all their duties without mandated supervision. Uellendahl and Tenenbaum (2015) surveyed 221 Californian school counselors, and when asked about the supervision they receive, 78% reported receiving no supervision of their own. Of those who did report receiving supervision, half indicated that supervision came from the school administrator as opposed to a counselor or clinician. The lack of supervision is even more detrimental to novice counselors, as many new school counselors are expected to perform duties and interact with stakeholders with the same proficiency as their seasoned colleagues

(Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson & Solomon, 2005). For many professional school counselors, their only experience with supervision will be what was mandated during their graduate program. Therefore, the on-site supervision received during the school-based internship will be examined in this research.

The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) requires that students complete 600 hours of supervised internship (CACREP, 2016). CACREP also requires that the on-site supervisor for this experience be an individual with "pertinent professional experience in the specialty area in which the student is enrolled" (CACREP, 2016, p. 14). With few exceptions, this on-site is a professional school counselor. The on-site supervisor is responsible for helping the school counselor in training (SCIT) navigate the internship experience and build the knowledge and skills necessary to enter the field.

This clinical experience is important in and of itself, but the fact that it may the only clinical supervision the individual will receive makes the internship, and the supervision provided by the on-site supervisor, even more critical. Therefore, this study will examine the factors related to SCITs' on-site supervision that influence their perception of their ability to complete the tasks of the professional school counselor. Specifically, this research project will examine the relationship between the (1) supervisory working alliance, (2) supervisee disclosure, and (3) satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy. The next section of this paper will provide an overview of the variables. The section will begin with the dependent variable (self-efficacy), and will be followed by an overview of the independent variables (supervisory working alliance,

supervisee disclosure, and satisfaction with supervision) and their relationship to self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977a) suggested that individuals have a perceived expectation of their ability to complete a task—self-efficacy. This construct impacts (a) whether the task is attempted (b) the effort used to accomplish the task and (c) the length of time the individual spends to accomplish the task (Bandura, 1977a). Absent or diminished self-efficacy can determine not only the outcome of the work an individual undertakes but also whether certain environments are chosen and the work even attempted. Therefore, according to Bandura's theory, self-efficacy is an integral part of our approach to tasks.

Self-efficacy comes from four sources: vicarious experience, performance accomplishments, emotional arousal and verbal persuasion (Bandura, 1977b). The more reliable the sources, the greater the impact on observers' perceived competency. In the instance of SCITs, their source is the on-site supervisor or professional school counselor. Bandura (1986) lists mastery experiences as one method to increase self-efficacy. For school counselors in training, the bulk of their hands-on mastery experiences occur during their internship or field-based training. These clinical experiences are the first opportunities for school counselors-in-training (SCIT) to put into practice what they have been taught (Hoffman, 2001; Jackson et al., 2002).

Barnes (2004) notes that the fundamental premise of counselor self-efficacy is that individuals who report higher self-efficacy scores will perform higher than those who score lower. Though limited, there has been recent research conducted on the self-efficacy of professional school counselors (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Bodenhorn, Wolfe

& Airen, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez & Johnston, 2009; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston, 2008; Owens, Bodenhorn & Bryant, 2010; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008; Villalba, 2007). For example, a sample of 860 professional school counselors were studied to determine (a) the relationship between self-efficacy and perceptions of the achievement gap and (b) the relationship between self-efficacy and use of the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) National Model (Bodenhorn, Wolfe & Airen, 2010). Results from the investigation show that counselors with higher self-efficacy were both more likely to be cognizant of achievement gap data and more likely to utilize the ASCA National Model. In the light of national trends such as No Child Left Behind Act (Erford, 2011) that call for the closing of the achievement gap, these results are but one way of demonstrating how important school counselor self-efficacy can be for our schools' children.

While the research on the self-efficacy of professional school counselors is limited, studies centering on how the school-based internship experience affects self-efficacy is even more scant. A review of the literature revealed one study that examined the group leader self-efficacy of pre-service counselors (Springer, 2015). The researcher determined that general self-efficacy was the best predictor of group leader self-efficacy (.38, $p < .001$). Additional research on the factors that influence the self-efficacy of novice and pre-service school counselors is needed to inform the field and address the gap in the literature.

Research has shown a connection between supervision and self-efficacy (Bucky, Marques, Daly, Alley & Karp, 2010; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002;

Studer, 2005). Therefore, specific factors associated with the on-site supervision that occurs during the school-based internship will be used as variables to determine the impact they have on self-efficacy. Specifically, the study will examine the relationships between supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure and perceived satisfaction with on-site supervision and counselor self-efficacy. The next three sections of this chapter will provide a brief overview of these variables and their relationship with self-efficacy.

Supervisory Working Alliance

The supervisory working alliance (SWA) consists of three components: "(a) a mutual agreement between the trainee and supervisor about the goals of supervision, (b) a mutual agreement between the trainee and supervisor about the tasks of supervision, and (c) an emotional bond between the trainee and supervisor" (Ladany, 2004, p.5). There has been a great deal of research into SWA in the field of counseling. Research conducted in the past 10 years on SWA has identified concepts such as the impact of the working alliance on client and clinician outcomes (Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012; Lainas, 2014; Sterner, 2009), the impact of culture on the alliance (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Crockett & Hays, 2015; Ng & Smith, 2012), and the manner in which the alliance influences counseling behaviors (Protivnak & Davis, 2008). Ladany (2004) notes that a strong SWA significantly relates to several concepts including increased trainee self-disclosure, trainee satisfaction and enhanced multicultural competence.

Research has also revealed a connection between the working alliance and self-efficacy. For example, in a recently published study, Bertsch et al. (2014) determined that a focus on self-efficacy by the supervisor helped to resolve gender-related critical

events. Further, a multiple linear regression analysis noted that self-efficacy interventions (along with therapeutic processes, focus on skills and exploration of feelings) contributed to positive working alliance scores (Wilks' $\lambda = .48$, $p < .001$).

The aforementioned works provide insight on the working alliance in the general field of counseling, but there are few studies focusing on SWA in the profession of school counseling, and even fewer that specifically investigate the school-based internship. Provitnak and Davis (2008) have, however, conducted research with SCITs. Using the rapport scale of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), they gleaned that supervisees' perception of the SWA was correlated to their actual counseling behaviors. Additional research on this topic will strengthen the knowledge base of counselor educators, provide insight into how on-site supervision is related to the self-efficacy of novice and pre-service school counselors, and address the gap in the literature.

Supervisee Disclosure

The relationship between the supervisee and supervisor is an integral component of the frequency and content of supervisee disclosure (Gray, Ladany, Walker & Ancis, 2001; Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996; Ladany, Mori, & Mehr, 2013; Mack, 2012). Supervision that inspires therapeutic competence in supervisees relies upon the supervisees' disclosure regarding the relationship with the client, relationship with the supervisor, as well as personal information about themselves (Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996). The more the individual is willing to disclose, the more substance the supervisor will have to help the supervisee navigate the learning process; lack of or distorted information can impact client outcomes as well as the effectiveness of supervision (Yourman & Farber, 1996).

A study of 108 counselors in training found that “supervisees' nondisclosures seemed to be directly related to the supervisees' perception of the quality of supervision and the extent to which supervision fit their needs and facilitated their development as counselors” (Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996, p.21). This is important as non-disclosure can limit the supervisor’s ability to strengthen the professional work of the counselor in training, thereby affecting their work with clients. Additionally, fear of “clinical mistakes” was one of the reasons supervisees chose not to disclose. Clinical mistakes most often involved the subjects’ concerns about their performance in counseling situations, specifically whether their performance/selection of counseling interventions was adequate. This can be viewed as a reflection of their perceived efficacy in counseling.

There has been little research in the past 10 years on the relationship between supervisee disclosure and self-efficacy. However, the research that is present has found a connection between the two constructs. For example, in one study of novice counselors, the researcher found a significant correlation between self-efficacy and disclosure (r = .62, $p < .01$); participants with higher levels disclosure also reported higher levels of perceived self-efficacy as measured by the COSE (Morcos, 2010).

While there is research that identifies the relationship between supervisee disclosure and self-efficacy, there is none in the field of school counseling. Therefore, this research project is important, as it will provide tools that can be used in the supervision of school counselors as well as attend to the gap in the literature.

Satisfaction with Supervision

Satisfaction with supervision has been defined as the "supervisee's perception of the overall quality of supervision and the extent to which supervision met the needs and facilitated the growth of the counselor" (Ellis, Friedlander & Stern, 1992, as cited in Crockett & Hays, 2015, p.448). Individuals who report having experienced quality supervision present as being more willing to disclose, more open to feedback and more eager to cooperate with the supervision process (Crockett & Hays, 2015; Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996). In other words, the supervisees' perception of the quality of the supervision can have an impact on their behaviors during supervision, and potentially their counseling behaviors.

One of the seminal studies on the topic of quality supervision was conducted by Ladany, Ellis and Friedlander (1999). Counseling trainees were surveyed to determine the impact of the supervisory working alliance (SWA) on self-efficacy and satisfaction with supervision. Their data yielded a significant relationship between the level of emotional bond in the alliance and reported satisfaction with supervision, with changes in the bond providing a unique, significant contribution to the variance in perceptions of their satisfaction with supervision ($F(1, 103) = 5.4$, $p = .022$).

Recent literature into the supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision suggests that a number of factors, including supervisor style, ethical practices of the supervisor and feedback, can impact perceptions of the satisfaction with supervision (Bucky, Marques, Daly, Alley, & Karp, 2010; Cheon, Blumer, Shih, Murphy, & Sato, 2009; Terranova-Nirenberg, 2013). The fact that there is limited research on professional school counselors' perception of quality supervision is not surprising, as there is little

clinical supervision occurring in the field. One study by Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) did examine the relationship between role conflict/ambiguity and supervision for professional school counselors. Results from 175 high school counselors surveyed revealed that role conflict was a significant predictor of satisfaction with supervision, with role conflict accounting for 3.5% of the variance ($r = -.193$, $p < .001$).

A study even more relevant to this research project is a study conducted by Cinotti (2013), wherein the relationship between the satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy of professional school counselors was examined. Data revealed a small, negative correlation between satisfaction and self-efficacy scores for individuals with non-counseling supervisors, whereas individuals supervised by counselors had a small positive correlation between their satisfaction and self-efficacy scores. Additionally, there was a significant difference between mean self-efficacy scores ($t(199.58) = 2.22$, $p = .03$), in a comparison of individuals with counseling supervisors and those with non-counseling supervisors; results indicated that school counselors with non-counseling supervisors reported lower scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale.

These results lend themselves to the idea that satisfaction with supervision relates to self-efficacy. However, there is no research that investigates SCITs' perceived satisfaction with their on-site supervision. Therefore, this research project is relevant and important, as it will impact the training and supervision of school counselors. Additionally, this research project will add to the body of literature on the subject.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine how (a) the on-site supervisory working alliance (b) supervisee disclosure to the on-site supervisor and (c) satisfaction with on-

site supervision is related to the counselor self-efficacy of novice and pre-service school counselors.

Research Question

The research question for this study is: What is the relationship between (a) supervisory working alliance between the supervisee and on-site supervisor, (b) supervisee disclosure to the on-site supervisor and (c) the supervisee's perceived satisfaction with on-site supervision and counseling self-efficacy among novice and pre-service school counselors?

Delimitations

The delimitations in this study are factors that the researcher can control. They are:

1. The study will be distributed only to individuals who are or have been enrolled in master's level CACREP accredited counseling programs.
2. Responses included in the sample will include only those from participants completing a school-based internship.
3. The assessments will be administered in both online and paper-and-pencil formats.

Limitations

The researcher is aware of the following limitations to the proposed study:

1. Results cannot be generalized to SCITs enrolled in non-CACREP programs.
2. This study uses a convenience sample of CACREP programs in southeastern US; therefore, results cannot be generalized to the larger population.

3. All information from gleaned from the survey will be based on participants' self-report rather than examination of their behaviors; therefore, social desirability may be a factor.
4. There could be a difference in the experience between individuals who choose to participate and those who choose not to participate.

Assumptions

The following assumptions have been made in this research proposal:

1. All participants will answer questions honestly and completely.
2. Participants will not receive input on how to respond from others.
3. Participants will have received on-site supervision from a professional school counselor.
4. The instruments used in this research are valid and measure the necessary constructs.

Threats to External and Internal Validity

Huck (2008) states that validity relates to the accuracy of the results. In other words, "a researcher's data are valid to the extent that the results of the measurement process are accurate" (p.88). The following sections will speak to how the researcher will attempt to maintain the external and internal validity of the study.

Internal validity is defined as "the ability to infer that a causal relationship exists between two variables" (Johnson & Christensen, 2014, p. 280). As this study is not experimental, causal inferences of limited. Therefore, there are no risks to internal validity.

Glatthorn and Joyner (2005) define external validity as the extent to which findings can be legitimately generalized. A convenience sample of participants from CACREP-accredited master's level counseling programs in two southeastern US states will be invited to participate. Therefore, results cannot be generalized to individuals in non-CACREP programs or the broader population of students.

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, significant terms and variables are defined as follows:

Pre-Service School Counselors

Pre-service school counselors are defined as individuals currently enrolled in a Master's level, CACREP counseling program and are on the school track. These individuals must have completed at least one semester of a school-based internship during their graduate program.

Novice School Counselors

Novice school counselors are defined as individuals who have graduated from a Master's level, CACREP counseling program in the past 6 months and completed a school-based internship during their graduate training. For the purposes of this study, the school-based internship must have occurred during the 2015-2016 school year.

Counselor Self-Efficacy

Counselor self-efficacy is defined as the participants' perception of their competence to conduct counseling (Barnes, 2004). For the purposes of this study, this construct will be defined as the respondents' total score on the School Counselor Self Efficacy Scale (SCSE) (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

Supervisory Working Alliance

Supervisory Working Alliance (SWA) is defined by Bordin (1983) as the tasks, goals and bonds developed by and between the supervisor and supervisee. In this study, SWA will be measured by the participants' total score on the Supervisee Working Alliance – Trainee Version (Bahrick, 1989).

Supervisee Disclosure

Supervisee disclosure is defined by as the level of information the supervisee consciously and accurately shares with their supervisor (Yourman & Farber, 1996). This information can include details or concerns about their work with clients, their professional development and the relationship with the supervisor. For the purposes of this study, supervisee disclosure will be measured by participants' total score on the Level of Disclosure Scale (Armeniox, 2000).

Satisfaction with Supervision

Satisfaction with supervision is defined as the "supervisee's perception of the overall quality of supervision and the extent to which supervision met the needs and facilitated the growth of the counselor" (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro & Wolgast, 1999, p.448). For the purposes of this study, satisfaction with supervision will be defined as the participants' responses to a Quality of Supervision Likert scale (Parikh, Ceballos & Post, 2013).

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the challenges faced by professional school counselors and research that supports the notion that, once entering the field, their participation in clinical supervision is limited. In most instances, the only clinical

supervision received by professional school counselors will have occurred during their graduate training. The lack of research that investigates the supervision received during the on-site, school-based internship supports the need for this study,

The underlying premise of self-efficacy is that individuals who report higher self-efficacy will perform better than those who report less self-efficacy (Barnes, 2004). Therefore, it is important to understand what factors influence the self-efficacy of novice and pre-service counselors. This knowledge will inform training and supervision of future school counselors, and possibly improve their performance in the field. Because research has revealed a connection between supervision and self-efficacy, this researcher seeks to determine how specific factors of on-site supervision during the school-based internship impact self-efficacy.

An overview of these factors, (a) supervisory working alliance, (b) supervisee disclosure and (c) satisfaction with supervision, as well as self-efficacy, was included in this chapter. There are very few studies that examine these concepts with professional school counselors and even fewer that investigate how these factors present during on-site, school-based supervision. This highlights the need for this study, as it will not only address the gap in the literature, but inform the fields of school counseling, counselor education and supervision.

Organization of Study

This proposal is divided into three chapters. In Chapter One, the need for the study, including the importance of self-efficacy, the supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure and quality supervision, was presented. An overview of pertinent research, and specifically gaps in the literature relating to school counseling was also

addressed. Additionally, Chapter One reviewed operational definitions, limitations, and threats to validity.

While Chapter One provided an overview of self-efficacy, the supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure and satisfaction with supervision, Chapter Two will provide a more in-depth analysis of literature relevant to the current study. This literature review includes seminal works, but focus on research published within the past 10 years. Chapter Three addresses the methodology of the proposed research and includes information regarding participants, instruments, and data analysis.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to examine factors related to self-efficacy specifically in school counselors in training (SCIT). The primary research question for this study is: What is the relationship between (a) supervisory working alliance (b) supervisee disclosure (c) quality of on-site supervision and counseling self-efficacy among preservice and novice school counselors? The purpose of this chapter is to review literature relevant to the topic including recent empirical research, pertinent conceptual pieces as well as seminal works.

This chapter is divided into seven sections. The first section will provide an overview of the school counseling profession, including its history, the current state of the profession, as well as the training and supervision of school counselors. The second section will provide an overview of self-efficacy theory and including definitions, concepts, and relevant empirical research related to the fields of counseling and specifically school counseling. Sections three, four and five present empirical and conceptual literature related to the independent variables: (a) supervisory working alliance, (b) supervisee disclosure, and (c) quality of on-site supervision. The final section will offer a summary of the chapter and present conclusions inferred from the overall review of the literature.

The School Counseling Profession

History of School Counseling

Erford (2011) argues that "school counseling is the earliest form of intentional or systematic counseling in the United States" (p. 19). School counseling has been a part of the educational system for more than a century, and as the world has changed, so has the field and practice of counseling. School counseling originated from a need for "vocational guidance", or what would commonly be referred to as career counseling (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Frank Parsons, a founder of the vocational guidance movement, focused on finding a match between young men's aptitudes and abilities and the characteristics of the working environment in the early 1900's (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Parsons established the Vocations Bureau of the Civic Services in Boston in 1908, where he served as vocational counselor and program director (Erford, 2011). Erford (2011) notes that during this time, guidance counselors were often not regarded as an integral component of the school system. In fact, until the 1950s, there were few employed across the country and there was also limited access to counselor training programs.

The formation of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) in 1952 helped to define the role of the guidance counselor. Professional organizations gave credibility to the training, ethical guidelines and standards for professional counselors in various settings (Erford, 2011). Lambie and Williamson (2004) note that in the 1950s, the skills necessary for the performance of the role included one-on-one counseling, building relationships, record keeping, placement, evaluation and information dissemination.

Further changes in the field occurred when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik I in 1957, the first man-made object to orbit the earth (Erford, 2011). This suggested to American citizens that American schools were failing to produce students competitive with those in the Soviet Union. In 1958, the U.S. Congress passed The National Defense Education Act (NDEA), prompting a shift in the role of the secondary school counselor from guidance and counseling to testing to identify gifted and talented students (Erford, 2011). As a result, the number of guidance counselors as well as the number of training programs skyrocketed. During the 1960s, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Vocational Education Act Amendments provided funding to support guidance and counseling programs, allowing guidance to be extended to the elementary school level (Herr, 2002).

The needs of the American population prompted changes in the way guidance counselors were expected to perform. For example, civil rights legislation, along with the integration of public schools, demanded that school counselors be sensitive to the needs of minority students as well as their own biases regarding the aptitude and abilities of these individuals (Erford, 2011). During the 1980s and 1990s, legislation focused on the need for counselors to attend to issues such as career guidance, dropout prevention, substance abuse prevention and child abuse.

Recent years have brought about systemic change in the field of counseling, fueled by counselor struggles with role confusion and a demand for accountability across the board in education (Brott, 2006). Erford (2011) notes that in 2002, the No Child Left Behind Act was signed into law, requiring states to identify a specific approach to testing and accountability in an effort to increase student achievement. This, along with other

major legislative acts, encouraged school districts to have professional school counselors engage in many complex tasks. The professional school counselor's struggle with role identity and role confusion has led to efforts to transform the role of the school counselor.

Current Role of the Professional School Counselor

Changes in the school system, and the world at large, have prompted a call for accountability for all educators, including the professional school counselor. In an effort to solidify the role the counselor should play in students' preparation for a global economy, the Education Trust and the American School Counseling Association initiated actions that began transforming the profession (Erford, 2011). The Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) of 1994 directed school counselors to focus on the removal of systemic barriers for whole groups of students, as opposed to the more individualized approach of years past.

> The Education Trust's TSCI also calls for school counselors to move away from what they term the present focus of school counseling toward the New Vision: away from mental health providers toward an academic/student achievement focus; from individual students' concerns to whole school and system concerns; from record keepers to the use of data to effect change; from guardians of the status quo to agents for change, especially for educational equity for all students. (Pérusse, Goodnough, Donegan, & Jones, 2004, p.153)

Initially, the changes suggested by the TSCI were met with resistance by professionals in the field, but have been since encouraged by school personnel, ASCA and counselor educators.

The term "professional school counselor" was adopted by members of the profession as well as leaders in ASCA to replace the long-used "guidance counselor" (Erford, 2011). Additional developments to solidify the professional role of school counselors occurred with the implementation of the National Standards for School

Counseling Programs (Dahir, Campbell, Johnson, Scholes, & Valiga,1997), which introduced three domains for student development: academic, career and personal/social. Not long after this, ASCA presented The ASCA National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs (ASCA, 2005). This prompted a call for a comprehensive, data-driven method of service delivery. Part of this effort has been founded on the premise that through accountability measures, professional school counselors can specifically outline the ways in which they impact students, firmly identifying themselves as essential members of the school structure.

Despite the efforts of the governing bodies of professional organizations, such as ASCA, have made to clearly delineate the work of school counselors, many still find themselves engaging in non-counseling duties. ASCA policy makers and professional advocates have made a concerted effort to define the duties school counselors should and should not be assigned in the school setting (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006). Some of the appropriate duties of school counselors include designing student academic programs, consultation, and counseling students at the individual and group level. Despite these recommendations, school counselors often find themselves assigned duties outside the realm of what ASCA suggests, which leads to role conflict and ambiguity. For example, although test administration is listed as an inappropriate task for school counselors, many counselors find themselves spending so much time with testing that they are unable to meet the counseling and consultation needs of their students (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; DeMato & Curcio, 2004). Some of the non-counseling related tasks that professional school counselors have reported performing include substituting in the classroom, assisting with individualized education plans, and conducting bus and lunch duty (Perera-

Diltz & Mason, 2008). Paisley and McMahon (2001) suggest that the biggest challenge facing school counselors is doing work other than what they were trained to do; this impedes their ability to meet the personal, social, and academic needs of their students.

In addition to being an impediment to completing counseling tasks, these added duties differentiate school counseling from other branches of the profession. There is much overlap in the graduate training between SCITs and individuals concentrating in other areas, such as clinical mental health career, and addictions counseling, in an effort to ensure that each student possesses fundamental counseling skills. While some aspects of their training are similar, their internship and the work they will do as professionals is markedly different. Therefore, specific inquiry into their efficacy to complete school counseling tasks is warranted. The following section addresses literature relevant to the training and supervision of school counselors.

Training & Supervision of School Counselors

Because this research project focuses on the supervision of SCITs, a review of literature was conducted to gather information about the graduate training, clinical experiences and ensuing clinical supervision that occurs in the field of school counseling. Themes gleaned from the review include the lack of clinical supervision received by professional school counselors (Uellendahl & Tenenbaum 2015; Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2012), the lack of supervision training for on-site supervisors (Cigrand, Wood & Duys, 2014; Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015), different ways supervision is perceived by those in school counseling (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Luke, Ellis, & Bernard, 2011; Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2012) and the overall importance of

supervision for SCITs (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Swank & Tyson, 2012).

Bernard and Goodyear (2009) define supervision as "an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession" (p. 7). The authors go on to note that two primary goals of supervision are to monitor services provided and serve as a gatekeeping tool. Supervision offers an array of benefits for professional school counselors including greater effectiveness and accountability, enhanced skill development and competencies, increased feelings of support, confidence, job satisfaction, professional identity development, and self-efficacy, and decreased feelings of isolation, role ambiguity, burnout, and role stress (Cook, Trepal, & Somody, 2012; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002; Gunduz, 2012).

Cook, Trepal and Somody (2012) gathered qualitative information from professional school counselors receiving supervision through the Professional Academic Response Model. Two emergent themes were the relationship with the supervisor and the relationship with students, with the authors noting that these two themes are influenced by each other. In other words, participants noted that when they had positive relationships with their supervisor, they were better able to advocate for and support their students.

Despite the documented benefits, the field of school counseling continues to be a branch wherein clinical supervision of professionals is not the norm. Uellendahl and Tenenbaum (2015) surveyed 221 school counselors in California regarding their experience as on-site supervisors. Forty-one percent of respondents who answered

questions related to providing supervision felt their own graduate education had not prepared them for the role of on-site supervisor. Further, when asked about the supervision they receive, 78% respondents reported receiving no supervision of their own. Of those who did report receiving supervision, half indicated that supervision came from the school administrator as opposed to a counselor or clinician. These results supported prior research by Perera-Diltz and Mason (2012), who found that the majority (68%, N=1557) of professional school counselors reporting having received supervision indicated that said supervision was provided by the school principal. This suggests that even reported supervision does not clinically address counseling skills and techniques.

It is possible that the lack of supervision in schools is caused in part by the fact that it is not mandated as it in other counseling areas. For example, the state of North Carolina requires that newly licensed (associate) clinical mental health clinicians receive one hour of clinical supervision for every 40 hours worked; a total of 3,000 hours of supervised professional practice must occur before obtaining full licensure (Licensed Professional Counselors Act, 1993). Dollarhide and Miller (2006) suggest that unless further emphasis is placed on clinical supervision in the school setting, "newly trained school counselors enter the profession after internship with supervisors who do not understand or appreciate emerging professional paradigms. Then, as professionals, they are evaluated by administrators who do not understand school counseling. Their pathways to excellence as professional school counselors are rocky at best and impassable at worst" (p. 250). Subsequently, there is likely a connection between the quality of supervision professional school counselors receive and the quality of supervision they are able to provide SCITs.

The internship experience allows school counseling students the opportunity to take the knowledge gained in the classroom and apply it to real-life practice. On-site supervision helps to facilitate a connection between basic skills and the more advanced techniques and awareness needed to work successfully with students (Swank & Tyson, 2012). Organizational bodies, such as the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), help to standardize the experience as much as possible. Counselor educator programs that have been accredited by CACREP must maintain certain standards for all facets of the education process. Specifically, CACREP requires all counseling students, regardless of their program track, to participate in a minimum 600-hour internship wherein they receive a minimum of one-hour of weekly on-site supervisory interaction (CACREP, 2016; Section 3 J). Furthermore, all school counseling interns are expected to experience a variety of professional activities and be allowed to bring audio/videotapes of direct client contact to supervision for monitoring purposes (Hoffman, 2001). However, when on-site supervisors are not trained in supervision, or are not participating in their own clinical supervision, their ability to make the mandated hour of supervision effective is impacted; further, they may fail to successfully observe (either directly or through audio/videotapes) their interns' clinical work.

Despite the attempts to create a standardized experience, unique school environments and varying involvement with supervision make the internship experience different for every student. For many students, there is a gap between what they learn in the classroom and what they experience in the field (Brott & Meyers, 1999; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson & Solomon, 2005; Studer, 2005; Studer & Oberman, 2006).

Studer (2005) notes that trainees are often frustrated and disappointed because they are unable to practice the activities connected with a comprehensive, developmental school counselor program.

One of the goals of on-site supervision is to assist students with navigating this gap. A review of the practices of counselor education programs revealed that in 66% of cases, the on-site supervisor was listed as being solely responsible for the individual supervision of the school counselor during their internship experience (Akos & Scarborough, 2004) which complies with CACREP standards. With few exceptions, the on-site supervisor in these instances is a professional school counselor (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Studer, 2005). This means that professional school counselors, who may experience their own role confusion, are largely responsible for solidifying what the job is to SCITs through the supervision process.

In its listing of best practices, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) states that "The supervisor is knowledgeable about required and recommended experiences that promote self-efficacy, development, and competence in supervisees" (p.14). CACREP demands that on-site supervisors meet academic, professional and experiential standards, in addition to "relevant training in counseling supervision" (CACREP, 2016, Section 3-J, p. 14). Often school counselors are expected to provide supervision as part of their duties (Nelson & Johnson, 1999). Results from a study of on-site school supervisors revealed that 54% of respondents indicated no formal supervision training; yet, the majority of participants indicated high self-efficacy in their role as supervisor (Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). In fact, some school counselors report that they learn how to supervise while they are working with interns (Cigrand, Wood &

Duys, 2014). This could be an indication of an inaccurate sense of efficacy in their ability to supervise. In order for the clinical skills of SCITs to improve, they must be recipients of quality (constructive, timely and allowing for open communication) supervision from on-site supervisors (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007).

An analysis of perceptions of the Discrimination Model of Supervision was conducted to determine if there were differences between the way on-site school supervisors and mental health supervisors view supervision (Luke, Ellis, & Bernard, 2011). The researchers hypothesized that school counselor supervisors' conceptual map, judgments of supervision and attribute ratings would all differ from those of a previous sample of mental health supervisors.

Results for of a MDS analysis revealed fit, $r_{y\hat{y}}$. = .76, 1 - $r_{y\hat{y}}^2$ = -42, and error = .17, supporting the first hypothesis that there were significant differences between the conceptual map of school counselor supervisors. A weighted MDS analysis was used to identify differences between the dimensions used in supervisors' judgments of supervision (hypothesis two). This hypothesis was also supported, with dimension weights for school supervisors reported as .624, .399 and .097 on Dimensions 1-3 respectively; it is also noted that school supervisors typically using only Dimensions 1 and 2. There was a significant difference when compared to mental health supervisors, who used all three dimensions with weights of .340, .362 and .495 for 1-3 respectively. Regression and goodness of fit were used to test hypothesis three (impact of attribute ratings on the conceptual map), with fit being found for only one of the six attribute ratings. The authors note that "the very supportive attribute rating met Kruskal and Wish's (1978) and Davison's (1992) criteria for a good fit on Dimension 3 (i.e., *R* = .92,

adjusted R^2 = .82, ß = .92, p < .01, with adjusted R^2 = 0.00 for Dimensions 1 and 2" supporting hypothesis three (p. 336).

Overall, results from this study suggest that on-site school counselors' perceptions of supervision differ significantly from those of mental health supervisors (Luke, Ellis & Bernard, 2011). In addition to viewing supervision differently, it is also possible that professional school counselors do not see a need for their own clinical supervision or appreciate the benefit it can have to their career (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2012). It is reasonable to assume that school counselors who do not recognize the benefit of supervision may also fail to give the on-site supervision of SCITs the level of attention it deserves.

Researchers conducted a qualitative study with 11 school counseling graduate students to determine factors that led participants to feel they were on the "boundary of a community of practice", or in other words, not a part of the school environment during their internship (Woodside, Ziegler & Paulus, 2009, p.27). All interns have to integrate themselves into an established environment, and failure to engage fully will limit their ability to participate in the experiential activities necessary to their clinical training. The on-site supervisor is the gatekeeper to their experience, therefore one of the elements investigated was the participants' relationship with their on-site supervisor. Results confirmed that negative interactions with supervisors affected trainees' beliefs that they can fully participate in the experience. Further, the inability to navigate this process also limited their ability to "act with confidence" in relation to their clinical skills and dispositions (p. 34).

Lack of training for supervisors, the nature of the school environment, and the challenges SCITs may face when trying to practice clinical skills in said environment can lead to a situation in which it is difficult for trainees to gain competency in school counseling skills (Akos & Scarborough, 2004; Woodside, Ziegler & Paulus, 2009). Further, this calls for a great deal more research in the training and supervision of school counselors. Akos and Scarborough suggest that an exploration into the clinical training of school counselors that is focused on the on-site experience, clinical supervision during the internship, and how the internship phase affects professional identity is warranted. Further, the authors note that research should investigate how "specific differences in internship experiences" relate to constructs such as self-efficacy (p. 106). This supports the necessity of the current research project.

Summary

This section of Chapter Two reviewed literature relevant to the profession of school counseling as well as the training and supervision of school counselors. Knowledge gleaned from this review included the presence of a discrepancy between what SCITs learn and what they do in the field, the benefits of supervision, the lack of supervision received by professional school counselors, school counselors' perceptions of supervision, and the importance of the on-site supervision experience on SCITs and their professional careers. The literature presented underlines the importance of further examination into school-based on-site supervision, as often it is the only supervision many school counselors will receive. The next sections of this chapter reviews literature related to the variables in this research project, beginning with the dependent variable, self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy

Definition and Conceptualization of Theory

Self-efficacy is a construct based on the social cognitive theory of Albert Bandura. Bandura (1977a, 1977b) proposed that there are two types of individual expectancy, outcome and efficacy. "Outcome expectancy is defined as a person's estimation that a given behavior will lead to certain outcomes. An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes" (Bandura, 1977b, p. 193). Individuals can believe that actions can have an expected outcome, but their own behavior is only impacted if they are confident that they can perform said actions.

The above theories led to the development of the construct known as self-efficacy. Bandura (1977a) suggested that individuals have a perceived expectation of their ability to complete a task—self-efficacy. This construct impacts (a) whether the task is attempted (b) the effort used to accomplish the task and (c) the length of time the individual spends to accomplish the task. Absent or diminished self-efficacy can determine not only the outcome of the work an individual undertakes but also whether certain environments are chosen and the work even attempted. Therefore, according to Bandura's theory, self-efficacy is an integral part of our approach to tasks.

According to Bandura (1977b), self-efficacy comes from four sources: vicarious experience, performance accomplishments, emotional arousal and verbal persuasion. The more reliable the sources, the greater the impact on a person's perceived competency. When individuals have the opportunity to observe others model behavior, they are engaged in vicarious experience. Witnessing someone engage in tasks successfully can

create a sense that they, too, can accomplish the task. There are circumstances that can impact the strength of the vicarious experience. For example, when there is a clear connection between the behavior and the outcome, the observer's self-efficacy is more likely to be affected. Likewise, when the observer can see "diversified modeling," or witness people with varying characteristics complete the task effectively, their own self-efficacy is likely to improve.

Performance accomplishments refer to the hands-on experiences individuals have with behaviors. When one engages successfully in a behavior their efficacy can increase, whereas being unsuccessful can diminish efficacy beliefs. Unsuccessful experiences are particularly harmful when they occur early in the learning process. As individuals consistently obtain more successful experiences, later failures can become less detrimental (Bandura, 1977b).

Emotional arousal refers to the physical response the body has when faced with certain situations. When individuals are overcome with anxiety or fear, it could be evidence that they do not feel confident in their ability to perform well. Bandura also notes that decreased emotional arousal can also limit the amount of avoidance behaviors. Verbal persuasion speaks to the power of suggestion. The feedback received regarding others' belief in their ability can influence self-efficacy, be it negative or positive feedback. The impact of verbal persuasion is, however, impacted greatly by personal experience. In other words, when individuals have endured, firsthand, something that contradicts what they are being told, the impact of the verbal feedback is not as strong. Additionally, the perceived credibility of the source of the feedback can determine the weight it is given.

The influence of these sources of self-efficacy was studied using a group of individuals with a snake phobia (Bandura, 1977b). The participants were separated into three groups, with the first group engaging directly in behaviors with a snake, the second observing someone else engaging in behaviors with a snake, and a control group. Participants were asked to report on their perceived ability to complete threatening tasks related to their phobia. In the end, individuals who engaged directly in the experience reported the highest efficacy expectations (r = .83), with the vicarious experience group being second highest (r = .84).

For counseling trainees, the opportunity to engage directly occurs during experiential activities such as the clinical internship. In the field, self-efficacy relates to the individual's perceived ability to use counseling skills and techniques effectively. Barnes (2004) notes that the fundamental premise of counselor self-efficacy (CSE) is that it can predict counselor performance. Specifically, individuals with increased self-efficacy will complete counseling skills more effectively than those with lower CSE. The next section reviews literature that addresses the construct of self-efficacy in the field of counseling.

Research Related to Self-Efficacy and Counseling

Self-efficacy affects the counseling behaviors of both clinicians and trainees, and therefore has been a topic of interest in the field. The connection between supervision and self-efficacy, the focus for this research project, has also been investigated (Bucky, Marques, Daly, Alley & Karp, 2010; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002; Studer, 2005). This section addresses seminal research, as well as results from a review

of recent literature on the topic of counseling self-efficacy, with a focus on the relationship between self-efficacy and supervision.

One of the integral items of self-efficacy research was the development of the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE) by Larson et al. (1992). This instrument, designed to examine self-efficacy in counseling professionals, was developed after conducting five studies to identify the pertinent dimensions of counseling that relate to self-efficacy. These dimensions were identified as executing microskills, attending to process, dealing with difficult client behaviors, behaving in a culturally competent way, and being aware of one's values. The COSE has been used in a variety of studies to measure the construct of self-efficacy in the field of counseling (Easton, Martin & Wilson, 2008; Gunduz, 2012; Kozina, Grabovari, De Stefano, & Drapeau, 2010; Lam, Tracz, & Lucey, 2013).

Since the development of the COSE, various studies have examined the self-efficacy of licensed, practicing counselors in specific specialties. For example, Chandler, Balkin and Perepiczka (2011) examined the relationship between graduate course work, number of clients and internship hours and the self-efficacy of substance abuse counselors. Though participants presented with high self-efficacy scores (average score of 3.83 on the Substance Abuse Treatment Self-Efficacy Scale), researchers did not find a significant relationship between participant self-efficacy and practicum/internship hours, clients with substance abuse as the primary diagnosis, number of continuing education hours in substance abuse and graduate course work in substance abuse.

A different subset of clinicians, school-based mental health counselors, were the identified population in an investigation of the impact of supervision and graduate

training on self-efficacy (Schiele, Weist, Youngstrom, Stephan & Lever, 2014). In this study, participants were given questionnaires to gather demographics and self-efficacy scores before being assigned to one of two training groups. Over the course of two years, counselors in group A were trained on evidenced based practices, family empowerment and engagement and quality assessment and intervention; participants in group B were trained on general staff wellness (e.g. stress management and burnout prevention). Senior clinicians were identified as supervisors for the course of the study. Supervisors of counselors in group A were tasked with reviewing study-related activities (i.e. use and understanding of evidenced-based practices) during supervision, while supervisors of group B participants were not required to include study-related constructs during supervision.

After controlling for age and years of experience, researchers analyzed results from individuals who participated in the full course of the study (Schiele, Weist, Youngstrom, Stephan & Lever, 2014). Results did not yield a significant change in pre-post intervention self-efficacy scores between the two groups (F (72) = .013, p = .910). However, post-intervention self-efficacy scores were predictors of elements of counseling practice, such as an overall knowledge of evidence-based practice (R^2 = .297, F [44] = 18.20, $p < .001$).

Control and treatment groups were also used in an investigation into how feedback during supervision can impact counseling self-efficacy (Reese et al., 2009). Over a one-year period, trainees in the control group received traditional supervision, while individuals in the treatment group received ongoing feedback from client assessments. While participants in the treatment group had better client outcomes, there

was not a significant relationship between receiving feedback and scores on the self-efficacy scale.

Factors related to the counselors'/trainees' way of being have also been researched to determine what, if any, impact they may have on self-efficacy. For example, Greason and Cashwell (2009) sought to determine how graduate students' level of mindfulness, attention and empathy were connected to perceived self-efficacy. The researchers were able to find a significant relationship between mindfulness and self-efficacy, with 34% of the variance in self-efficacy "being explained by a counselor's ability to be mindful, to be empathic, and to strategically control attention in the counseling session" (p.14). In another study, the concept of emotional intelligence of trainees and professional counselors was examined. Researchers hypothesized that scores of emotional intelligence (identifying their own feelings and the feelings of others) would positively correlate with self-efficacy, and results supported their theory (Easton, Martin & Wilson, 2008). Further, while the level of emotional intelligence did not show significant change for either trainees or their professional counterparts, the levels of self-efficacy did increase over time for trainees. This change was more significant for trainees, 96% of whom were enrolled in either internship or practicum. The researchers' results indicate a link between the trainees' perceived self-efficacy, and their training, supervision and practice of counseling skills.

A different viewpoint was taken by Terranova-Nirenberg (2013); instead of investigating supervisee characteristics, the researcher examined the supervisory style of the supervisor. Supervisory style was used as a predictor variable for a number of factors, including the self-efficacy of doctoral students. An analysis of the data revealed

a significant correlation, with supervisory style predicting self-efficacy (r (71) = .359, p < .01). Further analysis revealed that supervisor style accounted for 11.6% of the variance in self-efficacy for participants who were participating in an internship at the time of the study.

Cultural differences between supervisors and supervisees were examined by Nilsson and Duan (2007) in a study developed to determine the impact of prejudice, role ambiguity, role conflict and level of training on self-efficacy. Racial and ethnic minorities with white supervisors were the identified population. Though not significant, there was a negative correlation between role ambiguity and self-efficacy (r = -. 32, p < .01). Findings revealed a correlation between role ambiguity and self-efficacy.

Most relevant to this study is research that examines how aspects of graduate school training affects the self-efficacy of trainees and clinicians new to the field. Tang et al. (2004) examined how a number of factors, including clinical course work (practicum and internship classes) and on-site internship hours, impacted the self-efficacy of counseling students from CACREP and non-CACREP programs. While there was not a significant difference between total self-efficacy scores of students in the two groups, participants from CACREP programs reported more self-efficacy on specific items such as measuring counseling anxiety reactions (d = .54), clinical assessments (d = .49) as well as counseling individuals with adjustment reactions (d = .49) and affective disorders (d = .48). Overall scores of self-efficacy for all participants was significantly linked with clinical instruction (r = .40, p < .01) and internship hours (r = .47, p < .01), with Pearson r values ranging from .40 to .59.

A study of novice (in graduate school or having earned highest degree no more than 5 years prior) clinical mental health counselors were surveyed to determine factors that influenced their self-efficacy (Morcos, 2010). Hypotheses suggested that perceived supervisor competence, supervisee disclosure, and role conflict and ambiguity and the supervisory working alliance would have a significant relationship with self-efficacy. While there was not a significant relationship between self-efficacy and overall perceived supervisor competence, a small significant effect was discovered when a subset of competence (difficult client behaviors) was examined. The researcher noted that participants reporting higher levels of supervisor competence also reported higher levels of efficacy in dealing with difficult client behaviors. There were also significant relationships between participant self-efficacy and disclosure ($r = .62$, $p < .01$) as well as the supervisory working alliance ($r = -.38$, $p < .01$). The researcher was able to determine that participants who reported higher self-efficacy scores also reported higher levels of disclosure in their supervision. Similarly, participants with high levels of self-efficacy reported higher scores in their supervisory working alliance.

Results from both Tang et al. (2004) and Morcos (2010) support this research project. Each study found significant relationships between elements of the clinical experience (i.e. internship courses, internship hours, supervisee disclosure, supervisory working alliance) and self-efficacy. Further, the differences between individual self-efficacy measures between CACREP and non-CACREP students supports the selection of CACREP trained individuals for the current research project. These studies do not, however, investigate the on-site supervision that occurs during the school-based internship. This research project will expand the aforementioned research by conducting

an examination into how factors (i.e. supervisee disclosure, supervisory working alliance, supervisee perceived satisfaction with supervision) of the school-based on-site supervision are related to the self-efficacy of preservice and novice school counselors. The following section reviews research specific to the self-efficacy in the field of school counseling.

Research Related to Self-Efficacy and School Counseling

A review of literature on the topic of self-efficacy and school counseling revealed that the bulk of the research is focused on practicing professional school counselors, as opposed to preservice school counselors. Research presented in this section addresses how concepts such as role discrepancy (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008; Sutton & Fall, 1995), cultural awareness (Bodenhorn, Wolfe & Airen, 2010; Owens, Bodenhorn & Bryant, 2010), group experience (Bore, Armstrong & Womack, 2010; Springer, 2015; Villalba, 2007) and use of data-driven methods (Cinotti, 2013; Clark, 2006; Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez & Johnston, 2009) affect or are affected by self-efficacy. Only one article (Springer, 2015) used preservice school counselors as the identified population, and the research was specific to their group leader self-efficacy, as opposed to their general self-efficacy for the profession of school counseling.

Some of the first studies regarding self-efficacy and school counseling examined aspects of the school counselors' role (e.g. Sutton & Fall, 1995). This line of research was prompted by the dissonance often found between the clinical skills taught in graduate programs and the actual non-counseling related tasks of school counselors, as well as the way their work environment differed from other professional counselors. A more recent study on these issues examined whether self-efficacy expectancy outcomes predicted the

level of discrepancy school counselors perceived in their job (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). The results demonstrated a relationship between outcome expectancy of self-efficacy and discrepancy, with outcome expectancy accounting for variance (R^2 change = .09, $F(3, 343)$ change = 39.78, $p < .00$. Specifically, counselors who reported lower levels of role discrepancy (i.e. having to engage in fewer non-counseling related tasks) were more likely to engage in tasks, as they believed their typical duties (counseling-related) would lead to positive student outcomes.

Because the role of the professional school counselor differs in many ways from the role of other clinicians, an instrument was needed to address perceived self-efficacy for the tasks of school counselors. To that end, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) developed the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE) to more effectively measure the construct of self-efficacy within the profession of school counseling. Creation of the instrument included an item analysis and validity studies in which masters' level counseling students were asked to complete the SCSE along with several other assessments including the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992). The final version of the SCSE has five subscales: (a) personal and social development (12 items), (b) leadership and assessment (9 items), (c) career and academic development (7 items), (d) collaboration (11 items) and (e) cultural acceptance (4 items). Participants respond using a 5-point Likert scale with 1 being "not confident" and 5 being "highly confident. Since its implementation, it has been utilized in a number of studies into the profession of school counseling.

For instance, the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale was used by Clark (2006) to identify how compliance with the ASCA National Model was connected to self-

efficacy. A comparison of mean scores from the School Counselor Activity Rating Scale and the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale revealed a significant relationship between using National Model activities and participant self-efficacy ($r = .30$, $p < .01$). Similar results were found in a 2014 study that examined how supervision factors for school counselors impacted self-efficacy (Cinotti, 2013). The researcher was able to determine that "years of experience as a school counselor, teaching experience, and use of the ASCA National Model predicted 14% of the variance in scores ($R^2 = .14$, $F(3, 206) = 11.19$, $p < .01$)" (p. 87).

Another factor of accountability related to the National Model is usage of data by professional school counselors. Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez and Johnston (2009) examined the impact of counselor dispositions on "data-based decision making" of school counselors (p. 343). Both school counselor self-efficacy and general self-efficacy factors had a significant effect on data usage, accounting for 25% of the variance. Accountability is becoming increasingly important for all educators, including professional school counselors. These studies suggest significant links between self-efficacy and the use of accountability tools and methods, thereby underscoring the importance of research into self-efficacy in this field.

As the demographics of America's students and families evolve, it is also important to understand whether professional school counselors feel competent working successfully with a diverse student population. Therefore, researchers have examined the cultural self-efficacy and awareness of professional counselors and trainees (Bodenhorn, Wolfe & Airen, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston, 2008; Owens, Bodenhorn & Bryant, 2010). In one such study, researchers sought to determine if scores

of self-efficacy would predict multicultural self-efficacy, as well as how participant demographics would affect results (Owens, Bodenhorn & Bryant, 2010). Respondents' scores on the cultural acceptance subscales on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale provided statistically significant relationships between self-efficacy and multicultural competence subscales. These findings suggest that "school counselors' level of cultural acceptance was related to their reported levels of competence on all three of the multicultural subscales" (p. 12).

Student cultural differences are directly related to the Achievement Gap, or the disparity in academic achievement between students in the majority and those in the minority. Bodenhorn, Wolfe and Airen (2010) surveyed members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) to investigate school counselors' perceptions of the achievement gap and equity in their perspective schools and their school counselor self-efficacy. Analysis yielded a significant relationship ($F(1.847) = 104.70$, $p < .001$, $R^2_{adj} = .11$) between perceptions of equity and school counselor self-efficacy; suggesting that as self-efficacy of the school counselor increases, so do their positive perceptions of equity in their school. Similarly, self-efficacy was significantly correlated to perceptions of the achievement gap ($X^2(6) = 25.52$, $p = .003$, $R^2 = .01$). These studies suggest that cultural and school counselor self-efficacy assist counselors make professional school counselors more aware of and better able to attend to the cultural needs of their students.

Experience, whether vicarious or hands-on, is an important factor in building self-efficacy. Researchers examined how experience (teaching and/or counseling) and professional esteem affected the perceived effectiveness of a sample of 300 professional school counselors (Moyer & Yu, 2012). Results revealed the perceived effectiveness, or

self-efficacy, was positively correlated with both experience and membership esteem. The researcher gleaned that teaching experience alone was not a significant predictor of perceived effectiveness, accounting for only .06% of the variance. School counseling experience, however, was deemed a significant predictor ($\beta = .009$, $p = .001$).

Experience facilitating groups has also been a topic of study. Group work is a component of the comprehensive school counseling program (Villalba, 2007), and self-efficacy as it relates to facilitating groups is an area of interest for researchers. Bore, Armstrong and Womack (2010) examined aspects of supervision, training and implementation of counseling and psychoeducational groups with professional school counselors. Only one-fourth of participants reported having actually led a group of children and/or adolescents during their internship, suggesting that many trainees leave graduate their programs without sufficient training in facilitating groups with children and adolescents. This in turn impacts the frequency with which they implement groups in their schools. Pre-service counselors were the identified participants of a similar study that sought to determine which factors predicted group leader self-efficacy (Springer, 2015). One hundred twenty-three pre-service counselors were surveyed, with the COSE being used to operationalize self-efficacy. The researcher concluded that general self-efficacy was the strongest predictor for group leader self-efficacy (.38, $p < .001$), with general self-efficacy explaining 14% of the variance. Additional variables contributing to group leader self-efficacy were anxiety, feedback, experience with groups and observation of groups.

The impact of supervision on self-efficacy was also examined by Glaes (2010) in a qualitative field study. The researcher implemented an ASCA-informed supervision

modeled entitled the Professional School Counselor Supervision Model; this model was used by professional school counselors in their supervision of interns. When asked questions relating to self-efficacy, supervisors indicated that the model "positively influenced their development as a supervisor" (p. 147). Similarly, one of the themes from the intern feedback was that the model had a positive impact on their self-efficacy as school counselors. Participants reported that the model provided things such as "reflection, increased challenge and accountability, knowledge of and opportunity for engagement in a variety of areas, and the opportunity to ask and get more answers to intern questions" (p. 152) that influenced their growth and development.

The research with professional school counselors summarized in this section demonstrates a connection between self-efficacy and school counseling tasks. School counselors surveyed reported links between their self-efficacy and facilitating groups, being aware of the cultural needs of the school, supervision, as well as the use of data-driven practices utilizing the National Model. It stands to reason that the self-efficacy of preservice and novice school counselors will also impact the work they do in the field. However, despite its importance, research into the self-efficacy of SCITs is inadequate. This research project seeks to expand the research conducted by Springer (2015) and Glaes (2010), gaining an understanding of what aspects of the on-site supervision received during the internship affects school counselor self-efficacy.

Summary

This section of Chapter Two provided a summary of relevant research on the topic of self-efficacy in the clinical mental health field as well as the field of school counseling. Research in this area has focused on the relationship between self-efficacy

and graduate and post-graduate training, cultural competency/awareness, feedback, supervisor and supervisee traits as well as group leadership skills. While the self-efficacy of professional school counselors has been examined, there is very little research with preservice school counselors as the identified population.

This author hopes that by gaining understanding into what builds self-efficacy, preservice school counselors can enter the field with the skills necessary to successfully undertake the tasks assigned. Specifically, this research project seeks to fill this gap by examining the impact the working alliance between the supervisee and their on-site supervisor, supervisee disclosure to the on-site supervisor, and the supervisee's perceived satisfaction with supervision have on school counselor self-efficacy. The next sections of this chapter reviews literature relevant to the identified independent variables, beginning with the supervisory working alliance.

The Supervisory Working Alliance

Definition and Conceptualization of the Theory

Horvath (2001) notes that Sigmund Freud began examining the relationship between the client and therapist as early as 1912, where he reported how important it is that the client connect the therapist with "benevolent persons from her or his past" (p.265). Interest in the relationship broadened from the clients' transference to ways various aspects of therapy affect the alliance, not just the client therapist bond, but in all helping relationships. Bordin (1979) conceptualized the working alliance as consisting of three main factors: "agreement on goals, an assignment of tasks or a series of tasks, and the development of bonds" (p. 253). Bordin's (1983) concept of the therapeutic alliance was not as a factor that influenced treatment, but more that the alliance is treatment; in

other words, he advocated that by building and repairing the alliance, the client receives "new, more satisfied ways of thinking, feeling and acting." (p.60). Though initially constructed to relate to the process of psychotherapy, Bordin broadened the theory to form a model for supervision. As in the therapeutic alliance, Bordin identified tasks, goals and bonds that were relevant to the process of supervision when outlining his model.

Eight tasks for the supervision model were identified, focusing on topics such as mastery of skill, understanding clients, awareness of both self and process issues, surmounting obstacles, comprehension of concepts and theory, encouraging research, and upholding professional standards (Bordin, 1983). Tasks for both the supervisor and supervisee involved the supervisee reporting on clinical work, the supervisor observing said work, and identifying relevant problems and issues during supervision. Bordin likened the bond in the model to one between that of a player and coach, while addressing the challenge faced by the necessary evaluative component of the process.

Bordin (1983) stressed the importance of recognizing and addressing the power differential in the supervisory relationship, advocating that supervisors engage in a discussion of both parties' previous experiences to begin forming the alliance. Further, the author encouraged research that quantified the impact the alliance has on outcomes. This research project will examine how SCITs' perception of the supervisory working alliance is related to their self-efficacy. The next section of this chapter reviews research related to the supervisory working alliance, followed by research that examines the specific relationship between the supervisory working alliance and self-efficacy.

Related Research

In order to identify research relevant to this research project, literature published in the past 10 years was reviewed. This literature review yielded studies that examined the working alliance between counselors and clients, as well the alliance between clinicians/trainees and supervisor, which is most relevant to this research project. Concepts identified in the review include the impact of the working alliance on client and clinician outcomes (Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012; Lainas, 2014; Sterner, 2009), the impact of culture on the alliance (Bhat & Davis, 2007; Crockett & Hays, 2015; Ng & Smith, 2012), and the manner in which the alliance influences counseling behaviors (Protivnak & Davis, 2008). This section addresses seminal works and general literature on the topic of the working alliance. From there, research that addresses the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and self-efficacy will be reviewed.

Much of the early research on the working alliance was conducted to examine the relationship between the therapist and client. Horvath (2001) performed a meta-analysis of two decades' worth of working alliance research, specifically research related to how the alliance affects client outcomes. Using data from two earlier meta-analyses, Horvath analyzed 90 independent studies to determine that "a little over half of the beneficial effects of psychotherapy accounted for in previous meta-analyses are linked to the quality of the alliance" (p. 366). Further, the report identified factors of the client (severity of presenting problem, quality of attachment) and therapist (empathy, experience, personality) that can impact the alliance.

Just as the alliance between the therapist and client impacts outcomes, so does that between the supervisor and supervisee. These outcomes can include work

satisfaction, work stress, self-efficacy and role ambiguity (Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012; Ladany, Ellis & Friedlander, 1999; Protivnak & Davis, 2008; Sterner, 2009). Sterner (2009) conducted a study with hypotheses involving, among other things, the impact of the supervisory working alliance (SWA) on work-related stress and job satisfaction. The author focused on professional counselors in mental health settings as opposed to trainees. Results from the investigation revealed a significant relationship between positive supervisee perceptions of SWA and high job satisfaction as well as lower levels of work stress. A similar study investigated the relationship between the stress and coping of counseling students and the working alliance with their supervisor, and found negative correlations with stress levels and positive correlations with coping resources (Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012).

The impact of the supervisory working alliance on client outcomes was investigated by Lainas (2014), who surveyed counselors and their clients using the Working Alliance Inventory Trainee (WAI-T) form and the Client Perception of Improvement Survey (CPIS), respectively. The tasks, bonds and goals subscales of the WAI-T were analyzed to determine their relationship between measures of the CPIS. The researcher found moderately significant relationships between the tasks component of the WAI-T and family ($r = .635$, $p, < .01$) as well as bond and health functioning ($r = .436$, $p < .05$); the bond component and family ($r = .624$, $p < .01$); the goal component and health functioning ($r = .427$, $p < .05$) as well as family ($r = .559$, $p < .05$). Though this study had a small sample size (16 client-counselor pairs), the results suggested that clinician perceptions of the working alliance were linked to clients' perception of their own improvement.

Cultural considerations have also been a component of SWA research. A recent study using a mediation model was conducted by Crockett and Hays (2015), who sought to examine the impact the multicultural competence of the supervisor has on self-efficacy and satisfaction with supervision. Researchers concluded that the multicultural competence level of the supervisor had a significant effect on the SWA ($\beta = .78$, $p < .001$); the strength of the alliance increased as the perceived cultural competence of the supervisor increased.

In 2007, supervision dyads were examined to determine interactions of supervisee/supervisory racial identity and race (Bhat & Davis, 2007). Specifically, the researchers hypothesized whether SWA scores would be different for individuals in three main groups: supervisors working with supervisees with similarly high racial identity scores, supervisors and supervisees with similarly low scores on racial identify scores, and supervisors matched with supervisees the same reported race. In this study, SWA scores (reported by the supervisor) were significantly impacted by supervision dyads wherein both parties rated high in racial identity, with the converse being true or dyads with both parties scoring low on racial identity. There was not a significant impact reported when the supervisor and supervisee were matched by race; the researchers note that this was very likely impacted by the low number of persons of color participating in the study.

In another study, the impact of acculturation of international students in U.S. counseling programs on the supervisory working alliance was examined (Ng & Smith, 2012). For the purposes of the study, acculturation was measured by "perceived prejudice by Americans and more use of English" (p. 82). The authors found a relationship between

a positive working alliance and acculturation (more acculturated students report higher the scores on the alliance) and role ambiguity (lower levels of ambiguity lead to a stronger alliance).

There is a significant gap in the recent literature relating to relationship between SCITs and their on-site supervisors. A review of the literature revealed one study, which investigated the link between supervisory relationships and counseling behaviors (Protivnak & Davis, 2008). A total of 97 counseling interns were surveyed; 54% of participants attended CACREP accredited programs. Researchers identified the construct of dispositional optimism, which they defined as "expectancies of school counseling interns that good things, rather than bad things, will happen" (p.5). The researchers controlled for dispositional optimism when analyzing the relationship between supervisory rapport and role ambiguity. Results of the multiple regression revealed a .35 correlation coefficient, which indicated that factors in the on-site supervision relationship accounted for 12% of the variance in counseling behaviors.

The work of Protivnak and Davis (2008) underlines the need for the proposed study, as it highlights the significant impact the relationship between SCITs and on-site supervisors can have on counseling behaviors. Further, the lack of additional research that examines the supervisory working alliance that occurs during school-based on-site internship supervision supports this researcher's intent to address the gap in the literature. From here, this researcher will delve further into the literature, to review empirical research that examines the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and self-efficacy, the dependent variable of this research project.

Research Related to the Supervisory Working Alliance and Self-Efficacy

An examination of peer-reviewed literature revealed only two recently published studies (Bertsch et al., 2014; Ganske, Gnilka, Ashby, & Rice, 2015) that specifically investigated the impact of the supervisory working alliance on self-efficacy. One of the identified studies investigated the connection between trainee perfectionism, their self-efficacy and perceptions of supervisory working alliance (Ganske, Gnilka, Ashby, & Rice, 2015). Researchers noted that of the 143 trainees, those with high perfectionist scores and high scores in self-efficacy often had lower working alliance scores, as rated by the supervisor. Authors suggested that supervisors who work with these individuals have a difficult time navigating the relationship, as the trainee is overly critical but also confident in their own skills, thus creating very high expectations. However, researchers noted that levels of perfectionism did not affect the trainees' perception of the working alliance.

Bertsch et al. (2014) examined how gender-related critical events in supervision were experienced by supervisees and resolved by supervisors. One of the identified interventions used to resolve the event was a focus on self-efficacy by the supervisor; in fact, a frequency analysis revealed that 49% of supervisor interventions were related to the self-efficacy of the supervisee. Further, a multiple linear regression analysis noted that self-efficacy interventions (along with therapeutic processes, focus on skills and exploration of feelings) contributed to positive working alliance scores (Wilks' $\lambda = .48$, $p < .001$).

The results found by Ganske, Gnilka, Ashby and Rice (2015), as well as Bertsch et al. (2014), suggest that there is a link between self-efficacy and the supervisory

working alliance. However, neither of these studies explored supervision in school counseling or the on-site supervision that occurs during the school-based internship. The lack of recent literature that specifically examines the supervisory working alliance in the field of school counseling supports the need for this research project. With the current study, this research sought to gain additional understanding of how the relationship between the supervisor and trainee during the school-based internship is related to self-efficacy, which addresses the current gap in the literature.

Summary

This section of Chapter Two provided an overview of the concept of the supervisory working alliance, general research on the topic, and research that specifically examined the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and self-efficacy, the dependent variable of this research project. While there are a number of studies that identify the supervisory working alliance and self-efficacy as variables of interests, there are significantly less that explicitly examine the impact of the working alliance on self-efficacy, and there are none that examine the alliance between the SCIT and the on-site supervisor. Therefore, this research project seeks to strengthen the literature in this area by examining how the working alliance between SCITs and on-site supervisors is related to self-efficacy. From here, the author will proceed with a review into supervisee disclosure, an additional independent variable.

Supervisee Disclosure

Definition and Conceptualization of the Theory

One important aspect of the supervisory relationship is the opportunity it provides the supervisee to learn and grow from their experiences. In order to make the most of the

process, the supervisee must be willing to bring events to the discussion; in fact, supervisees are expected to disclose (Yourman, 2003). The more the individual is willing to disclose, the more substance the supervisor will have to help the supervisee navigate the learning process; lack of or distorted information can affect client outcomes as well as the effectiveness of supervision (Yourman & Farber, 1996).

Although many clinical supervisors have the opportunity to provide direct observation of their supervisees' clinical work, supervisees have some autonomy over the topics and scenarios brought into the supervision session. The evaluative nature of the supervisory relationship can play a significant role in what is shared (Hess et al., 2008; Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996). For example, a supervisee may be less willing to share an audio recording of a session in which they feel they will be evaluated poorly. Generally speaking, it is more difficult to disclose things that arouse feelings of discomfort, insecurity or concern. For individuals engaging in clinical supervision, the events that are not disclosed can include missteps with clients, concerns about the supervisor/supervisory relationship, and issues with transference. All of these factors emphasize the importance of investigating what hinders or supports disclosure (Walsh, Gillespie, Greer, & Eanes, 2002; Yourman, 2003).

Related Research

This author conducted a review of literature relevant to the topic of supervisee disclosure, identifying early important works as well as research published in the past 10 years. The results of the review are addressed in this section, with findings including things such as which events individuals choose not to disclose, as well as the factors that lead to disclosure/non-disclosure.

Ladany, Hill, Corbett and Nutt (1996) noted that nondisclosure in the counseling relationship has been studied for many years. One of the earliest investigations into counselor disclosure in the supervisory relationship was conducted by Banikiotes and McCabe (1974) in an effort to validate the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. Results were published comparing subjects' willingness to disclose in supervision and in personal relationships. Though significant results were found when comparing supervisors' and supervisees' perceptions of disclosure, the researchers note the possible impact of supervisees wanting to appear as if they are open to disclosure. Investigation into supervisee nondisclosure in the supervisory relationship is relatively new.

Very often, the relationship between the supervisee and the supervisor is an integral component of the frequency and content of disclosure (Gray, Ladany, Walker & Ancis, 2001; Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996; Ladany, Mori, & Mehr, 2013; Mack, 2012). One of the earlier studies into the frequency and consistency of supervisee disclosure was conducted by Ladany, Hill, Corbett and Nutt (1996). The researchers found that of the 110 participants surveyed, 97.2% chose not to disclose information during supervision, with an average of 8.06 instances of non-disclosure reported. The types of disclosures most often reported were "negative reactions to the supervisor, personal issues, evaluation concerns, clinical mistakes, and general client observations" (p. 13). Reasons for not disclosing included beliefs such as the information was not important, the feelings involved were too negative, the topic was too personal or that the working alliance with their supervisor was not strong.

Although supervisory style did not impact the frequency of non-disclosure, researchers were able to determine a relationship between style and the reasons

participants chose not to disclose as well as style and the content of the non-disclosure (Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996). For example, when the supervisee viewed their supervisor as unsupportive, they were less likely to disclose a negative reaction and withheld information they deemed to be important. Despite withholding the information from their supervisor, respondents still felt the need to discuss the issue. Most participants disclosed the information to someone in their personal (significant other) or professional/academic (peer in the field) lives. Disclosures to peers in the field was one element examined in a study of the effectiveness of online peer supervision groups (Yeh et al., 2008). Data analysis revealed that 40% of the information shared in the online group was either experiential disclosure or self-disclosure.

The willingness of doctoral students to disclose countertransference issues was examined in two separate studies (Mack, 2012; Pakdaman, Shafranske, & Falender, 2015), with both studying the interaction of the working alliance and supervisee disclosure and yielding significant results. Mack (2012) noted a positive working alliance predicted comfort of general disclosure to both peers ($\beta = .69$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .481$) and primary supervisors ($\beta = .56$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .312$). There was also a significant positive relationship between the likelihood of countertransference disclosures to peers ($\beta = .67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .451$) and primary supervisors ($\beta = .48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .235$). Researchers in the second study noted that the aspects of the alliance (tasks, goals, bonds) accounted for 35.9% of the variance in supervisee's likelihood to disclose (Pakdaman, Shafranske, & Falender, 2015). While high scores in the tasks and bond area predicted higher likelihood of disclosure, participants who reported higher scores in the goal component were less likely to disclose. The researchers also examined gender

differences, and reported that male participants were more likely to report sexualized issues of transference ($t(325) = 204$, $p = .042$, $p = .128$) than their female counterparts, suggesting that gender pairing in supervisory relationships can have a significant impact on disclosure.

Results from this study supported the findings from an earlier study that identified "counterproductive events" in supervision and their impact on supervisee disclosure (Gray, Ladany, Walker & Ancis, 2001). Most supervisees did not disclose the counterproductive events to their supervisors, often due to perceived low-quality relationships. However, those who did disclose were able to experience positive outcomes (i.e. getting a helpful response from the supervisor). Similar results were found in a 2008 study, where individuals in problematic supervisory relationships disclosed less, but those in quality supervisory relationships disclosed without negative consequence (Hess et al., 2008).

As a result of the literature review, this researcher learned that non-disclosure is a frequent event in supervision and can be impacted by factors such as supervisor style, the type of event (i.e. counterproductive events in supervision, countertransference) and the relationship with the supervisor. The relationship between supervisor and supervisee, or the working alliance, was very impactful; individuals who felt the relationship was stronger were more likely to disclose. As this research project sought to find a link between disclosure and self-efficacy, this next subsection reviews literature pertinent to that topic.

Research Related to Supervisee Disclosure and Self-Efficacy

The literature mentioned in the previous section identifies studies that examine factors that impact supervisee disclosure to the supervisor. A search of recent literature that sought to find a connection between supervisees' disclosure and their self-efficacy produced extremely limited results. In fact, only two recent (published within the past 10 years) studies were found. A survey of 130 novice mental clinical mental health workers was conducted, asking participants to report information relating to, among other factors, their levels of disclosure in supervision (Morcos, 2010). The researcher found a significant relationship between self-efficacy and disclosure ($r = .62$, $p < .01$); participants with higher levels of perceived self-efficacy also reported higher levels of disclosure as measured by the COSE. The researcher also analyzed how disclosure correlated to subscales of the COSE, with medium significance revealed between microskills ($r = .49$, $p < .01$), cultural competence ($r = .47$, $p < .01$) and values ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). Larger significance was found between disclosure and counseling process ($r = .61$, $p < .01$) and difficult client behaviors ($r = .59$, p, $< .01$).

Mehr, Ladany, and Caskie (2015) examined a number of factors related to disclosure, including anxiety and the working alliance. Concerns about professional inadequacy was one of the reasons provided for non-disclosure, with the researchers defining this construct as "Feelings of uncertainty, inadequacy, and low self-efficacy with regards to one's professional abilities" (p. 108). Nondisclosures due to low self-efficacy was reported by 14.3% of individuals surveyed. When discussing implications for future research, the authors go on to note that feelings of inadequacy should be normalized in supervision to foster supervisee self-efficacy.

The lack of research addressed in this section highlights the need for the proposed research. More importantly, the complete lack of research on the relationship between disclosure in on-site school-based supervision and self-efficacy suggests that the proposed research is needed to inform the field.

Summary

This section of Chapter Two began with an overview of the concept of supervisee disclosure, the impact of its presence in the supervisory relationship and the factors that influence supervisees not to disclose. Information gleaned from this review include the impact of supervisee perceptions, including their view of the supervisory relationship and their perceived performance; specifically, individuals are more likely to disclose when they perceive they have a good relationship with their supervisor and are less likely to disclose when they feel their performance is lacking.

Though limited, recent research on the topic does suggest a relationship between self-efficacy and supervisee disclosure. One goal of the current study was to add to the literature, specifically investigating the relationship between SCIT disclosure to the on-site supervisor and self-efficacy. The next section of this chapter addresses the final independent variable, satisfaction with supervision, beginning with an overview and then proceeding into relevant research.

Satisfaction with Supervision

Definition and Conceptualization of the Theory

Perceived satisfaction with supervision was considered by Holloway and Wampold (1983) to consist of three main elements: evaluation of self, evaluation of other and level of comfort during supervision. Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro and

Wolgast (1999) further define the concept as the "supervisee's perception of the overall quality of supervision and the extent to which supervision met the needs and facilitated the growth of the counselor" (p.448).

Benefits of satisfactory supervision include supervisee willingness to disclose, openness to supervisor feedback as well as eagerness to cooperate with the supervision process (Crockett & Hays, 2015; Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996). The next section reviews both seminal works and recent literature related to satisfactory supervision, and later how satisfaction with supervision relates to self-efficacy.

Related Research

In an effort to build support for the variables identified in this proposed research, a review of research relevant to perceptions of satisfactory supervision, and specifically its impact on self-efficacy, was conducted. One overwhelming theme revealed by this search was the impact supervisors' behaviors (e.g. ethical practices) and characteristics (e.g. intelligence) had on the supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision. The working alliance was also proven to have an impact on satisfaction with supervision ratings, with individuals with stronger alliances reporting more satisfaction with supervision. Empirical research, the bulk of which was conducted in the past 10 years, will be reviewed in this subsection of Chapter Two.

One of the earlier studies on the effectiveness of supervision, as reported by supervisees, was conducted in 1979 by Worthington and Roehlke. "Good supervision" (p.65) was evaluated by three measures including satisfaction with supervision, supervisor competence and how supervision contributed to improvements in their skills; all three factors were significantly correlated. Researchers note that the supervisor

behaviors that were the best predictors of satisfaction fell into two groups: (a) developing a good relationship between the supervisor and supervisee and (b) providing direct help to supervisees with counseling skills.

In a later study, Worthington and Stern (1985) examined how time and characteristics of the supervisor and supervisee (i.e. degree level, gender) affected the quality of the relationship. While degree level of supervisee impacted ratings of the relationship (doctoral level students reported less satisfactory relationships than their master's level counterparts), the status of the supervisor (faculty member versus doctoral student) did not have a significant impact on the relationship. Gender differences were also of note; male supervisors and supervisees reported better supervisory relationships than their female counterparts.

Ladany, Ellis and Friedlander (1999) conducted a study of 107 counseling trainees to investigate the impact of the supervisory working alliance (SWA) on self-efficacy and satisfaction with supervision. They defined the alliance as involving supervisor and supervisee agreement on the tasks and goals, as well as the level of emotional bond between the two parties. Their assertion was that as the agreement and bond increases, participants will experience higher levels of satisfaction with supervision as well as self-efficacy. While their results did not show significant results for the agreement on tasks and goals component, their data did yield a significant relationship between the level of emotional bond and reported satisfaction with supervision, with changes in the bond providing a unique, significant contribution to the variance in ratings of supervision, $F(1, 103) = 5.4$, $p = .022$. These findings were supported in a survey of counseling students participating in traditional and distance practicum courses (Dickens,

2010). An analysis of the data revealed no significant difference in satisfaction with supervision between participants receiving distance supervision and those receiving face-to-face supervision, $F(4, 183) = 2.306$, $p = .060$. A correlational analysis revealed that students who reported a strong alliance were also likely to report satisfaction with supervision, with the converse also being true; the correlational analysis revealed significant relationships greater or equal to .55.

Similar results were found in a study of marriage and family therapy trainees (Cheon, Blumer, Shih, Murphy, & Sato, 2009). Researchers examined the effect of supervisor/supervisee fit, along with other identified variables, on the level of satisfaction with supervision reported by the supervisee. What they found to be significant was that the relationship (alliance) had the greatest impact on supervision satisfaction, with working alliance explaining 67.24% of the variance. Marriage and family therapy trainees were also the identified population in research designed to determine relationships between supervisor cultural competence, supervisory working alliance, trainee cultural competence and satisfaction with supervision (Inman, 2006). The researcher found a positive relationship between supervisory working alliance and trainee perception of quality supervision.

Because supervisor behaviors and characteristics can affect the relationship, their relationship on perceived satisfaction with supervision has been examined in the literature. For example, 151 counseling trainees were surveyed to determine how their supervisors' ethical practices impacted their perceived satisfaction with the supervisory relationship (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). The researchers hypothesized that there would be a correlation between ethical behaviors and trainees'

level of satisfaction with supervision. For the purposes of the study, ethical behaviors were measured by respondent scores on two different instruments, the Supervisor Ethical Practices Questionnaire and the Supervisor Ethical Behavioral Scale. After analyzing results, they were able to determine that more unethical practices on the part of the supervisor were significantly related to lower levels of satisfaction with supervision (r = –.72, η^2 = .52, p < .0001), with the converse also being true. The authors concluded that "supervisees who are not satisfied may be less apt to learn from supervision" (p. 466).

In a more recent study, Bucky, Marques, Daly, Alley, and Karp (2010) surveyed counseling psychology doctoral students to determine how supervisor characteristics affected perceived satisfaction with supervision. The following traits were identified as having a positive impact on perceptions of quality supervision: "above-average intelligence, a positive attitude towards themselves, ethical integrity, and strong listening skills" (p. 159). In a separate study, perceived role of the supervisor was found to be a significant predictor of satisfaction with supervision (Herbert & Trusty, 2006). Rehabilitation counselors surveyed who felt their supervisor assumed an administrative role indicated less satisfaction than those who perceived their supervisor as being more of a consultant.

One role of the supervisor is to provide feedback to the supervisee, which can include facilitating feedback from the supervisees' clients. Feedback can assist the supervisee in understanding what skills/techniques are effective, as well as potential areas for growth. Reese et al. (2009) implemented a study to examine the impact of client feedback on, among other things, perceived satisfaction with supervision. Though there were concerns that negative feedback may impact satisfaction with supervision scores,

there was not a significant relationship between alliance scores for individuals receiving feedback and those in the non-feedback group.

As little supervision of school counselors occurs, the research into satisfaction with supervision with school counselors is limited. However, Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) did in fact examine the relationship between role conflict/ambiguity and supervision for professional school counselors. Results from 175 high school counselors surveyed revealed that role conflict was a significant predictor of satisfaction with supervision, with role conflict accounting for 3.5% of the variance ($r = -.193$, $p < .001$). Another investigation into professional school counselors' satisfaction with group-specific supervision was published in 2010 (Bore, Armstrong, & Womack). Results indicated low levels of satisfaction with supervision, with less than half (48%) reporting satisfaction with the group-specific supervision they received. Fewer still (36%) reported being satisfied with the supervision they received for leading groups with difficult children and adolescents.

This section summarized seminal and recent literature focused on perceived satisfaction with supervision. The aforementioned studies suggest that a number of factors, including supervisor style, ethical practices of the supervisor and feedback, can affect perceptions of satisfaction with supervision. The following section takes the review of literature a step further by identifying studies that speak to the relationship between satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy.

Research Related to Satisfaction with Supervision and Self-Efficacy

As the proposed research seeks to determine the relationship between SCITs perceived satisfaction with supervision and their self-efficacy, a review of research

relevant to the topic was conducted. The literature reveals that several factors, such as culture, cultural competence and status of the supervisor, can have an impact on supervisees' perception of the quality of the relationship. This subsection will provide the reader with an overview of the information gleaned from the literature review.

Crockett and Hays (2015) used a mediation model to determine the interaction of supervisor multicultural competence, supervisee self-efficacy, as well as the working alliance and general satisfaction with supervision. Researchers found that strong alliances were developed when participants perceived their supervisor to be culturally competent. Participants who perceived their supervisor to be culturally competent were more likely to report higher levels of satisfaction with supervision and higher levels of self-efficacy.

Culture, self-efficacy, the working alliance and satisfaction with supervision were also variables used in a recent dissertation, in which graduate counseling students were surveyed (Logan, 2014). The researcher found a significant relationship between type of clinical experience (internship or practicum) and level of satisfaction with supervision (F =3.740, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^{=}$ .059, Power = .675); respondents in internship reported higher levels of satisfaction (M = 2.46) than those enrolled in practicum (M = 2.38).

One aspect of culture, gender, was a focus of investigation in Terranova-Nirenberg's (2013) study of traditional versus non-traditional female graduate students. Participants' self-efficacy was significantly predicted by their perceived level of satisfaction with supervision, with supervisory satisfaction accounting for 46% of the variance in self-efficacy; specifically, "the higher a supervisee's perceived satisfaction with supervision, the higher the level of reported self-efficacy of the supervisee" (p.95).

However, there was not a statistical difference between reports of traditional and non-traditional students in relation to satisfaction with supervision. Another comparison study, this time with differences in supervisor (faculty versus doctoral student) was examined in conjunction with satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy by Fernando (2013). Though the researcher hypothesized differently, there were significant results in both satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy when comparing participants with doctoral supervisors and those with faculty supervisor, with doctoral supervisors reporting higher satisfaction scores.

Cinotti (2013) also examined the possible relationship between perceived satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy for professional school counselors. Participants were asked to identify the type of professional from whom they receive supervision (i.e. administrator, counselor, etc.), with over 50% of counselors indicating that their supervision was not provided by a counselor. Though there was not a significant relationship between overall self-efficacy and satisfaction with supervision, it is important to note the impact of type of supervisor. Data revealed a small negative correlation between scores of the satisfaction instrument and those on the self-efficacy instrument for individuals with non-counseling supervisors, whereas individuals supervised by counselors had a small positive correlation between their satisfaction and self-efficacy scores. Additionally, there was a significant difference between mean self-efficacy scores, t(I99.58) = 2.22, p = .03, in a comparison of individuals with counseling supervisors and those with non-counseling supervisors; results indicated that participants with non-counseling supervisors reported lower scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale.

The literature reviewed in this section demonstrates the impact of several factors (type of supervisor, cultural awareness, and culture) on the construct of perceived quality of supervision. Cinotti's (2013) research is the one recent example of research that examines the relationship between satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy with professional school counselors. Though the results were not significant, the small impact of counseling versus non-counseling supervisors suggests the importance of supervision on self-efficacy. This literature does not address the on-site supervision received during the school-based internship. The proposed research will add to the literature by examining preservice and novice school counselors' perception of the supervision they received during their clinical internship.

Summary and Conclusions

Professional school counselors are charged with handling a myriad of duties, both counseling and non-counseling related (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008). Though there has been an increase in the numbers of professional school counselors who receive clinical supervision, the majority receive only administrative supervision if they receive supervision at all (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2012; Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015). This lack of supervision leaves them susceptible to things such as stress and burnout (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005; Gundoz, 2012). Additionally, it can minimize the importance or perceived necessity of clinical supervision, despite its proven benefits.

Bernard (1979) notes, "the goal of supervision is to produce more competent counselors" (p. 61). Not only is the graduate clinical experience fundamental for skill development (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007), it very often is the last formal, clinically

based-supervision they will receive in their career. Therefore, it is important that we broaden the research into how aspects of this clinical experience are related to their self-efficacy.

This chapter summarized the prior research on the variables selected for this study: self-efficacy, supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure and quality of supervision. There is a substantial amount of research that solidifies these constructs as valid areas of inquiry related supervision (Bucky, Marques, Daly, Alley, & Karp, 2010; Crockett & Hays, 2015; Fernando, 2013; Mehr, Ladany, & Caskie, 2015). Further, the need to examine how the internship experience can affect self-efficacy has been suggested by past research (Barnes, 2004; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Springer 2015).

There is insufficient research that specifically investigates how school-based, on-site supervision, specifically the supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure to the on-site supervisor and the SCITs' perception of their satisfaction with supervision are related to counselor self-efficacy. This study seeks to add to the research in this area, informing the training and supervision practices for school counseling professionals.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between factors of the on-site supervision received during the school-based internship, specifically (a) the supervisory working alliance, (b) supervisee disclosure, (c) satisfaction with supervision and school counselor self-efficacy, as reported by preservice and novice school counselors. This chapter presents the methodology for the study and is divided into six sections. The first provides a description of the participants. The second section includes the data collection procedures and is followed by a third section that provides detail regarding instrumentation. The fourth section provides a description of the research design and the research question. The fifth section offers an overview of the data analysis procedures and is followed by the final section that summarizes the chapter.

Description of Participants

Granello (2007) notes that participants should be culled from a "well-defined population that is relevant to the research question(s)" (p. 68). Participants for this study were recruited from master's level counseling programs and the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). Further, only results from students who had completed at least one semester of a school-based internship were included in the data analysis. For the purposes of this study, a convenience sample of current students and recent graduates from programs in the southeastern United States were invited to participate. A

convenience sample includes individuals who can be “easily recruited”, and will be used for practical purposes (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Specifically, counseling students from CACREP accredited counseling programs in North and South Carolina were initially invited to participate.

Prior to data collection, the instructions and survey items were reviewed for by a convenience sample of graduate students and counselor educators. The sample attended to issues of clarity and assessed the level of difficulty of the instrument. This review also provided information about the amount of time needed to complete the survey, in order to accurately inform participants. Modifications were made to the survey based on feedback.

While surveys are being utilized with increased frequency in research, response rates are declining (Van Horn, Green & Martinussen, 2009) due to issues such as firewall block and decreased novelty of online surveys. Low response rates lead to issues such as “less precision, less statistical power, potential bias of results and less credible studies” (Van Horn, Green & Martinussen, 2009, p.389). However, the researcher was unable to utilize paper-and-pencil surveys; all data was collected via a web-based survey.

Participation in this study was voluntary and participants in the proposed study were assured that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. Participants had the option to enter a drawing for a Visa gift card as an incentive to participate. While entering the drawing required supplying an email address, email addresses were not connected to the survey responses during the data analysis process.

Web-Based Administration of Surveys

After permission was obtained from the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, program coordinators were contacted via email regarding the purpose and goals of the study. The introductory email (Appendix A) to program directors stated the intention of the study, the proposed population, a link to the survey and a request that contacts forward the email to current Master's level students and recent graduates. Master's level students found in the forwarded email details that allowed them to self-select and choose to participate. The email also contained a link to the web-based survey.

After clicking on the link for the survey, participants were presented with informed consent information, as shown in Appendix B. In order to give participants a clear understanding of the inclusion criteria, the informed consent reminded them that enrollment in or recent completion of a school-based internship was required for participation. The demographic questionnaire included a question that confirmed that participants met inclusion criteria as well. Only results from appropriate participants was used for this study. The consent also explained that participation in the study was voluntary and that all responses would be anonymous and confidential. Participants were informed that should they begin the survey and decide to stop, they could do so without penalty. Finally, the informed consent informed participants of the approximate length of time required to complete the survey.

The informed consent was followed by the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix E), Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee Version (Appendix F), Supervisee Disclosure Scale (Appendix G), and Quality of Supervision Scale (Appendix

H). The final portion of the survey was the Demographic Questionnaire as shown in Appendix I.

After the initial data collection yielded significantly small numbers (approximately 10 responses), the researcher submitted an IRB amendment request to expand the recruitment of participants. The researcher was granted permission to recruit participants from the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), via the online membership directory. The amended email template is included in Appendix C, with the revised informed consent available in Appendix D.

Timing for the survey was selected based on past research into the use of surveying participants via email. Schaefer and Dillman (1998) found a response rate of 9.16 days for subjects contacted through email. Therefore, after inviting ASCA members, the survey was available to participants for a total of two weeks, with a reminder email sent at the end of the first week. After the survey closed, data was uploaded into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Instrumentation

School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Appendix E)

Larson et al. (1992) developed an inventory to measure counseling self-efficacy. The authors studied counseling trainees and were able to identify five dimensions of self-efficacy including: (a) microskills, (b) attending to process, (c) cultural competence, (d) dealing with challenging client behaviors and (e) awareness of one's values. Though Larson et al. were able to develop a valid, reliable instrument (Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory), further research was needed to develop an instrument to assess the counseling self-efficacy of professional school counselors.

Starting with identified items that were most relevant for a school counselor self-efficacy scale using the National Standards for School Counseling and CACREP School Counseling Program Standards, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) worked to develop the School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) Scale. Creation of the instrument included an item analysis and validity studies in which masters' level counseling students were asked to complete the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) scale along with several other assessments including Larson's Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (CSEI) (1992). The SCSE has five subscales: (a) personal and social development (12 items), (b) leadership and assessment (9 items), (c) career and academic development (7 items), (d) collaboration (11 items) and (e) cultural acceptance (4 items). Participants respond using a 5-point Likert scale with 1 being "not confident" and 5 being "highly confident".

All of the subscales, with the exception of the career and academic, correlated positively with each other with correlations ranging from .27 to .43. Career correlated negatively with correlations ranging from -.28 to -.41. The researchers calculated internal consistency reliability coefficients, with alphas being .91 for personal/social; .90 for leadership and assessment; .85 for career and academic; .87 for collaboration and consultation; and .72 for cultural acceptance.

The results did not reveal a significant result across grade level, indicating that the scale was appropriate for studying individuals working in various school settings. Respondents were 342 individuals who were a combination of master's level students and practicing school counselors. Coefficient alpha for the total score was .96, the mean of all item responses was 3.91 with a standard deviation of .77. Range of average scores

was 3.4 to 4.7. To obtain self-efficacy scores, the means of the subscales are tabulated to develop a composite mean. The composite mean translates into the participants' total score for the instrument, which is the score that will be used in this study to measure self-efficacy.

Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee Version (Appendix F)

The Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee Version was adapted from the Working Alliance Inventory, an instrument designed to assess the working alliance in counseling relationships (Horvath & Greenberg, 1989). Both the adapted and the original instruments are based on Bordin's (1979) conceptualization of the working alliance, which consists of three components—task, bond and goal (Bahrick, 1989). According to Hovarth and Greenberg (1989), strong working alliances involve both parties accepting the responsibility of completing the tasks, endorsing the values the goals of supervision and having positive personal attachments. There were three studies done to develop the instrument, and the researchers were able to deem the instrument reliable and the scales stable with an estimated alpha of .93 on the client's version of the instrument (Hovarth & Greenberg, 1989). Participants were asked to complete similar instruments in addition to the Working Alliance Inventory in an effort to determine validity. Results from the comparisons were able to prove convergent, concurrent and predictive validity

In order to adapt Hovarth and Greenberg's instrument, Bahrick (1989) made adjustments to the terminology, for example exchanging the words "therapist" and "client" with "supervisor" and "supervisee." Seven raters (doctoral students and PhD's) were asked to complete the instrument in order to test to reliability and validity. Results revealed Cronbach's alphas of .92, .93 and .91 for the three subscales (goal, task and

bond respectively). Additionally, an inter-rater agreement of 97.6% for items related to the bond component. However, raters were not able to make a clear distinction between tasks and goals; therefore, the adapted instrument has only two subscales, bond and tasks/goals. Just as in the original instrument, Bahrick's adapted version has 36 items with 12 items representing each subscale (goals, task, and bond). Each item prompts respondents to choose an appropriate response from a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 equaling "never" and 7 equaling "always". This instrument has been proven reliable in previous research, with investigators finding reliability coefficients of .98 for the total score and .94, .94, and .93 for the goal, bond and tasks subscales respectively (Walker, Ladany, & Pate-Carolan, 2007). For the purposes of this study, the total scores on the SWAI-T were used in the analysis.

Level of Disclosure Scale (Appendix G)

The Level of Disclosure Scale is an instrument modified from the Supervisee Nondisclosure Survey developed by Ladany, Hill, Corbett and Nutt (1996). The Supervisee Nondisclosure Survey measures nondisclosures in six categories--clients, interactions with current supervisor, personal issues or concerns, interactions with current supervisor, interactions with clients, and supervisor evaluation. In order to adapt the instrument, the Delphi Technique was utilized (Armeniox, 2001). This technique required the researcher to get opinions about the placement, wording and clarity of the items of the scale. Seven counselors with training in supervision and the development of instruments agreed to review the Level of Disclosure Scale and compare it to the Supervisee Nondisclosure Survey. After three reviews, the group was able to come to consensus on the instrument.

The Level of Disclosure Scale consists of seven items which ask participants to respond to a five-point likert scale regarding their level of disclosure (Armeniox, 2001). Six of the items are based on categories used in the Supervisee Nondisclosure Survey, while the seventh item attends to overall disclosure across the all categories (Armeniox, 2001). Scale scores range from 5 (highly likely to disclose) to 1 (not at all likely to disclose); possible total scores for the instrument range from 7 to 35 points. Total scores from the instrument are used to create a score for this variable with higher scores indicating a higher level of disclosure. The developer of the instrument ran a pilot study for reliability, which revealed a Cronbach's alpha of .88 (Armeniox, 2001). Total scores from this instrument were utilized for this study.

Quality of Supervision Scale (Appendix H)

The Quality of Supervision instrument utilizes a semantic differential scale, established by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). The semantic differential consists of six bi-polar adjective pairs (i.e. kind/cruel) that allow participants to indicate their feelings about supervision. The selected adjectives relate to three dimensions of affective meaning: evaluation, potency and activity. Previous research into the use of semantic differential scales for the quality of supervision utilized two adjectives from each domain, and the same adjective pairs were in the proposed study (Parikh, Ceballos & Post, 2013). The respondents' total score on the scale is a sum of the six items that indicates their perceived quality of the supervision provided. According to Bahrick (1989), "Osgood reported test-retest correlations of .85 on group averages for the semantic differential over time intervals as long as three weeks" (p. 52).

Demographic Questionnaire - (Appendix I)

The Demographic Questionnaire consists of 13items. The purpose was to provide demographic information on participants and their supervisors, as well as information regarding their internship site. Questions include the participants' age, gender race/ethnicity, level of their school-based internship site, descriptive information about the supervisor, and the amount of one-on-one time they spend with their on-site supervisor.

Research Design

This study utilized a non-experimental correlational research design to examine how (a) supervisory working alliance (b) supervisee disclosure and (c) satisfaction with supervision related to the dependent variable, counselor self-efficacy. A correlation is a "statistical technique used to measure and describe a relationship between two variables" (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007, p.506). Typically, correlations do not require the manipulation of variables, and no manipulation of variables will occur in this study. A common error in correlation is the assumption of causation; the existence of a correlation does not prove any causation (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). Despite this, correlations are valuable as they provide insight into the presence and strength of the relationship between variables. Therefore, in addition to the regression, the researcher utilized a correlation coefficient to examine relationships between the variables.

A regression analysis was used as the primary analysis to determine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Specifically, a multiple regression was used because there was more than one predictor variable (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). The data from each variable was be entered into SPSS and analyzed to

determine if there was a linear relationship between counselor self-efficacy and supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure and satisfaction with supervision.

Research Question

This research project investigated factors of the on-site supervision that occurred during the school-based internship and their impact on participant self-efficacy. The research question for this study was: What is the relationship between (a) supervisory working alliance, (b) supervisee disclosure (c) quality of on-site supervision and counseling self-efficacy among preservice and novice school counselors?

Data Analysis

Data from the web-based surveys was downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet and then uploaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Excel data was stored on the secured, password protected google drive, monitored by the University of North Carolina at Charlotte for confidentiality purposes. SPSS software allowed the research to screen data, collect descriptive statistics and run the regression analysis.

Screening Data

Prior to running the regression analysis, data was screened. The purpose of the screening was to locate issues such as incomplete entries, outliers, accuracy and normality. A total of 181 individuals attempted to complete the survey, and two were removed due to missing a majority of responses. Therefore, responses from 179 participants was included in the final analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

The researcher utilized descriptive statistics to describe the participants in the study. Descriptors included information about participants' age, race, gender, as well as information about their internship site. Descriptors also included information about the participants' on-site supervisors. Further descriptive analysis presented results of the means, standard deviations, and measures of central tendency of the variables in the study.

The researcher used the G*Power tool (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner & Lang, A.-G., 2009) to determine the effect size and power based on the study's sample of 179 participants. The level of significance was set to $\alpha = .05$, indicating that the probability of a Type I error would be 5%. The researcher entered the R^2 from the data analysis (.110), the sample size (179) and the number of predictors (3). Calculations revealed an effect size of .15 and power of .98. While the effect size was less than medium, these results indicated that the sample provided allowed for a high level of power.

Multiple Regression

A regression analysis was used to determine the variance between the variables. A regression is a "statistical technique for finding the best-fitting straight line for a set of data" (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007, p.551). Regressions are commonly used for prediction, and this procedure was selected for this study to determine how each independent variable predicted self-efficacy. Specifically, the regression analysis determined the amount of variance accounted for by each independent variable (supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure, and satisfaction with supervision). An F-ratio was used to establish whether the amount of variance is significant. Beta

values were presented in the results section to explain the level of variance for each variable.

There are several types of regression analyses (linear, multiple, hierarchical) that are delineated based on details such as the number of variables as well as how the variables are added into the regression equation (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). Because this study used more than one independent variable and did require an order for the input of variables, the specific type of analysis used was a standard multiple regression analysis.

Summary

Chapter Three provided the reader with an overview of the methodology of the proposed non-experimental study. Details regarding the identified participants, methods of recruitment and data collection procedures were included. The researcher provided information on the instruments selected for this study, as well as their reliability and validity data. Total scores from the instruments were analyzed using a multiple regression, in an effort to understand the relationships between the supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure, and satisfaction with supervision and counselor self-efficacy.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between aspects of the on-site school counseling internship experience and school counseling self-efficacy. Specifically, the study investigated how the following independent variables, the supervisory working alliance, supervisee disclosure to the supervisor, and the supervisee's perception of the working alliance, were related to the dependent variable, counseling self-efficacy. The primary research question was: what is the relationship between (a) supervisory working alliance between the supervisee and on-site supervisor, (b) supervisee disclosure to the on-site supervisor and (c) the supervisee's perceived quality of on-site supervision and counseling self-efficacy among novice and pre-service school counselors?

This chapter presents the results of this research study and has five sections. Section one provides a description of the participants in the study, followed by section two which provides an overview of the reliability of the instruments used in this research project. The third section includes data screening procedures and relevant findings. Section four provides the results of the major analysis of this study, a multiple regression analysis. The final section consists of a summary of information presented in the chapter.

Description of Participants

The sample consisted of subjects either enrolled in or recently graduated from master's level counseling programs, as well as individuals identified as student members

of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). Program coordinators were emailed and asked to forward the survey to current students and recent graduates. Members of ASCA were emailed directly by the researcher. Requests to participate were sent to approximately 1800 individuals, and 181 chose to respond to the survey, indicating a response rate of 10%. The exact response rate is uncertain for two reasons: there is no way to guarantee that all program coordinators forwarded the survey to students and some individuals in the ASCA directory did not receive the email due to server blocks or invalid email addresses. Of the 181 individuals who chose to participate, two were removed from the analysis due to failure to answer the majority of questions. A total of 179 participants were included in the data analysis.

Frequencies and percentages of the demographic variables in this study are reported in Table 1. A frequency report of the demographic data indicated that of the 179 participants included in this study, 85.1% identified as female and 12.7% identified as male. The majority (60.8%) of respondents identified as Caucasian and 30.4% identified as African-American. Of the participants in the study, 84% (n = 152) indicated that their graduate program was accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Additionally, 41.9% reported that they were still enrolled in their Master's program, while 58.1% were identified as recent graduates.

All participants, including recent graduates, were asked to provide information about the school in which they completed their on-site internship. When asked to indicate their internship site level, 31.5% reported high school, 28.7% reported elementary school, and 22.7% reported that they completed their internship at a middle school. Additional demographic information for the internship site included geographic

level. The majority (49%) of participants indicated that they their internship site was in an urban setting, while 37% indicated that they were at a rural site.

In addition to information about their school site, questions regarding their on-site supervisor were asked. Professional school counselors supervised the overwhelming majority (92%) of participants. In terms of years of counseling experience, 37% of participants indicated that their supervisor had 6-10 years of experience, and 34% reported having a supervisor with 11-20 years of experience. The ethnicity of on-site supervisors was similar to that of the participants (68%), in that the majority of on-site supervisors were Caucasian, with the next largest group consisting of African-American supervisors (28.2%).

Table 1. Demographic data

Variable	**Number**	**Percentage**
Participant Gender		
Female	154	86.0
Male	23	12.8
Prefer not to disclose	2	1.1
Participant Age		
20-29	103	57.5
30-39	41	22.9
40-49	26	14.5
50-59	7	3.9
60 or over	2	1.1
Participant Ethnicity		
African-American	55	30.7
Asian/Pacific Islander	3	1.7
Caucasian	110	61.5
Hispanic/Latino	6	3.4
Multi-Racial	2	1.1
Prefer not to disclose	3	1.7
Role of Supervisor		
Administrator	8	4.5
Other Student Services Personnel	4	2.2
Professional School Counselor	167	93.3
	15	8.4

Supervisor Years of Counseling	61	34.1
Experience	67	37.4
1-5	3	1.7
11-20	27	15.1
6-10	6	3.4
N/A		
Over 20	20	11.2
Unsure	94	52.5
Frequency of Supervision	65	36.3
Less than one hour per week	51	28.5
More than one hour per week	123	68.7
One hour per week	1	.6
Supervisor Ethnicity	1	.6
African-American	2	1.1
Caucasian		
Hispanic/Latino	52	29.1
Multi-Racial	57	21.8
Prefer not to disclose	21	11.7
Unsure	8	4.5
Internship Site Level	41	22.9
Elementary		
High	67	37.4
K-12	23	12.8
K-8	89	49.7
Middle		
Internship Site Location	152	84.9
Rural	13	7.3
Unsure	7	3.9
Urban		
Graduate Program Accreditation Status		
CACREP		
Non-CACREP		
Unsure		

Reliability of Instruments

In this section, the researcher will outline results of a reliability analysis for the data collection instruments. The means, standard deviations, number of items and alpha coefficients for each instrument are included in Table 2.

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES) was used to collect data for self-efficacy, the identified dependent variable. This instrument uses a Likert scale (5 = Highly Confident, 1 = Not Confident) to identify participants' perceived self-efficacy on 43 items relating to various school counseling tasks. Participant scores could range from 43-215, with higher total scores indicating higher levels of self-efficacy. The Cronbach's reliability estimate for the self-efficacy instrument yielded an alpha coefficient of .969, indicating internal consistency.

The Working Alliance Inventory – Trainee Version was used to collect data for the participants' perception of the alliance between themselves and their on-site supervisor. This instrument has 36 items and utilizes a Likert scale (7 = Always, 1 = Never) to gather information about the participants' working relationship with their on-site supervisor. The Cronbach's reliability estimate for this instrument yielded an alpha coefficient of .823, indicating adequate internal consistency.

Participants completed the Level of Disclosure Scale (LDS) to indicate the likelihood of disclosing topics to their on-site supervisor. This is a seven item instrument that utilizes a Likert scale (5 = Highly Likely, 1 = Not at all Likely) to indicate their level of disclosure. The Cronbach's reliability estimate for the LDS was .881, indicating adequate internal consistency.

The final instrument completed by participants was the Quality of Supervision Scale, which utilizes a semantic differential. Individuals are presented with six adjective pairs, and asked to indicate their feelings about supervision on the scale in relation to the adjectives. The Cronbach's reliability estimated for this instrument was .823, which indicates adequate internal consistency.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha, number of items, means and standard deviations of assessments

Instrument	Alpha Coefficient	Items	M	SD
SCSES	.969	43	170.31	26.65
SWAIT	.958	36	190.88	32.09
LDS	.881	7	35.97	5.99
QSS	.823	6	23.12	5.04

Bivariate Correlations

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data. Prior to running the analysis, all variables were examined for outliers, missing data, normality, linearity, and collinearity. There were three cases missing from the Quality of Supervision Scale instrument. As these missing values accounted for .02% of the data, they were not removed from the study. To obtain maximum contribution to the study, imputation was used to replace missing values with the mean scores from other participants. A review of skewness and kurtosis scores did reveal a normality issue for the SWAIT total scores; the skewness score was less than -1, and the kurtosis score was greater than 1. Skewness and kurtosis scores for all instruments are reported in Table 3.

Table 3: Skewness and Kurtosis Values

Variable	Skewness	Kurtosis
SCSES	-.461	.465
SWAIT	-1.390	1.614
LDS	-.687	.211
SSS	-.903	.396

A bivariate correlation analysis was run to identify issues with multicollinearity. Tolerance scores for the independent values ranged from .494 to .657, while Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) scores ranged from 1.522 to 2.024. As the tolerance scores were all above .2, and VIF scores were below 3, multicollinearity was not identified to be problematic for this study.

Pearson's correlation scores revealed positive, significant correlations between each predictor variable (working alliance, disclosure, and satisfaction with supervision) and the outcome variable. This indicates that participants who scored high on the IV instruments also presented with higher self-efficacy. Further, there were significant, positive relationships among each predictor variable. A Pearson correlation matrix is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Pearson correlation matrix between predictor and outcome Variables

Variable	Self-Efficacy	Working Alliance	Disclosure	Satisfaction with Supervision
Self-Efficacy	1	.327**	.327**	.248**
Working Alliance	--	1	.571**	.642**
Disclosure	--	--	1	.467**
Satisfaction with Supervision	--	--	--	1

Note. ** Indicates significant correlation at $p < .01$ level (2-tailed).

Multiple Regression Analysis

A standard multiple regression analysis was run to determine the relationship between the supervisory working alliance, level of disclosure, and satisfaction with supervision and school counselor self-efficacy. Variables were entered into the equation at the same time. The unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), and semipartial correlations (sr_i) are reported in Table 5. The variance accounted for (R^2) equaled .137 (adjusted $R^2 = .122$), which was significantly different from zero ($F = 9.236$, $p < .01$).

Only level of disclosure was statistically significant at the .05 level. This suggests that individuals who disclose information to their supervisor will experience higher levels of self-efficacy than those who are less likely to disclose. While the working alliance and satisfaction with supervision were hypothesized to be related to self-efficacy, they were not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 5: Unstandardized regression coefficients (B) and intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), semipartial correlation, t-values, and p-values

Independent Variable [a]	*B*	β	sr_i^2	*t-value*	*p-value*
Intercept	111.82			9.580	<.01
Level of Disclosure	.91	.20	.17	2.35	<.05
Working Alliance	.16	.19	.14	1.92	.057
Satisfaction with Supervision	.16	.03	.02	.32	.747

Note. $R^2 = .12$, $F = 9.236$, $p < .001$.

Summary

The purpose of this research study was to examine how supervisory working alliance, level of disclosure and satisfaction with supervision relate to the school counseling self-efficacy of pre-service and novice school counselors. Demographic data, instrument reliabilities, bivariate correlations, and a review of the major analysis, standard multiple regression, were included in this chapter.

An analysis of the demographic data indicated that the majority of participants were Caucasian, female, in their 20's, and attended a CACREP counseling program. Further, the majority of participants were supervised by professional school counselors who provided more than one hour a week of supervision during their internship.

Five instruments were used to measure the identified variables: a demographic questionnaire, the School Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSES), the Supervisory Working Alliance-Trainee Version (SWAIT), the Level of Disclosure scale (LDS), and the Quality of Supervision semantic differential scale (QSS). The alpha coefficients for each standardized instrument indicate that these measures were reliable with respective

Cronbach alpha scores revealed to be .969 (SCSES), .958 (SWAIT), .881 (LDS) and .823 (QSS).

The primary research question examined how the working alliance, level of disclosure, and satisfaction with supervision related to school counseling self-efficacy. A standard multiple regression was used for the primary analysis. The results of the regression indicated that only level of disclosure contributed significantly to self-efficacy, and it accounted for 12% of the variance. These results suggest that individuals who are more likely to disclose information to their on-site supervisor will feel more confident in their skills to complete school counseling tasks. The other predictor variables were not related to school counselor self-efficacy.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how the supervisees' perception of the supervisory working alliance, level of disclosure to their on-site supervisor, and perception of the quality of their onsite supervision were related to their school counseling self-efficacy. This chapter contains an overview of the study, results of the data analysis, contributions and limitations of the study, implications and recommendations for future research. The chapter will end with concluding remarks from the researcher.

Overview

Professional school counselors play an integral role in the academic, personal/social and career development of children. Each day, they are charged with addressing student mental health needs (Burnett-Zeigler & Lyons, 2012; Green et al., 2014), expected to attend to academic issues such as assisting with the college matriculation (Bryan, Moore-Thomas, Day-Vines & Holcomb-McCoy, 2011), all while managing non-counseling related duties (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008). Unlike individuals in other counseling fields, professional school counselors serve their students without the benefit of clinical supervision (Uellendahl & Tenenbaum, 2015).

Supervision provides a number of benefits to school counselors including include enhanced skill development and competencies (Cook, Trepal & Somody, 2012), reduced role stress (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson & Solomon, 2005), increased ability

to respond to legal and ethical issues (Herlihy, Gray & McCollum, 2002) and increased self-efficacy (Gunduz, 2012). Nevertheless, many professional school counselors' last experience with supervision occurs during the on-site internship portion of their graduate training. Therefore, it is imperative that we identify ways to make the supervision school counselors in training receive as impactful as possible.

Supervision during the on-site internship not only helps to address the gap between the classroom and the job, but it also provides the guidance and skills practice needed to build the foundation of school counseling self-efficacy. Professional school counselors charged with the task of supervising school counselors in training (SCITs) must provide clinical supervision along with practical guidance, ensuring that interns experience a level of self-efficacy necessary to enter the field upon graduation. For this reason, the researcher chose the supervision received during the on-site internship as a focus for this research study.

Results and Conclusions

Demographic Data

The 179 pre-service and novice school counselors who participated in the survey were predominately Caucasian (62%), with the next largest group identifying as African-American (30.7%). Participants were also mostly female (86%), aged 20-29 (58%) and attendees or graduates of a CACREP accredited counseling program (85%).

The fact that the majority of the participants in this study were Caucasian women aligns with the demographics of similar studies in the literature. For example, Springer (2015) surveyed preservice school counselors and reported a predominately female (84%) and Caucasian (81.3%) sample. Similar demographics were reported in studies with

professional school counselors as the identified population. Cervoni and Delucia-Waack (2011) had a population that was 73% female and 88.6% Caucasian. A more recent study by Cinotti (2014) included a sample that was 80% female and 83.8% Caucasian.

However, the larger percentage of African-American participants in the current study is a marked difference from previous research. In the aforementioned studies, percentages for African-American respondents were 6.7% (Cinotti, 2014), 6.9% (Cervoni & Delucia-Waack, 2011) and 8.9% (Springer, 2015). This is in stark contrast to the current study that had 30.7% African-American participants. For this study, the researcher contacted counseling programs in North and South Carolina in an effort to recruit participants. Three of these schools are recognized as Historically Black Colleges or Universities (HBCUs); the inclusion of these colleges could account for the increased participation from African-Americans. It is also possible that African-American participants may have been motivated to respond to the survey based on their perception of the ethnicity of the researcher. These demographics also may reflect changes in the demographics of professional school counselors.

Pearson's Correlation

Significant, positive correlations were found between the predictor variables, working alliance, level of disclosure and satisfaction with supervision, and the outcome variable, self-efficacy. These results indicated that individuals who reported a strong working alliance, high levels of disclosure and high levels of satisfaction with supervision also had high self-efficacy scores.

Results from this study support the findings of previous research. For example, Morcos (2010) surveyed novice clinical mental health counselors to determine if

supervisor competence, supervisee disclosure, role conflict/ambiguity and the supervisory working alliance would have a significant relationship with self-efficacy. Morcos found positive correlations between the working alliance and self-efficacy ($r = .38$, $p < .01$) as well as level of disclosure and self-efficacy ($r = .62$, $p < .01$); these results suggested that higher levels of disclosure and stronger working alliances are associated with higher self-efficacy. The positive correlations between the predictor variables is also consistent with past research. In the current study, the predictors with the highest correlation were the supervisory working alliance and satisfaction with supervision. Dickens (2010), who surveyed master's level counseling students in distance and traditional educational programs reported a significant, positive relationship between working alliance and satisfaction with supervision ($r = .79$, $p < .01$).

Multiple Regression

The major analysis for this study was a standard multiple regression, designed to determine if the working alliance, level of disclosure and satisfaction with supervision were related to counselor self-efficacy. Results indicated that only level of disclosure made a significant contribution to self-efficacy. These results were consistent with the findings of Morcos (2010) who reported that level of disclosure was significantly related to self-efficacy in a survey of novice clinical mental health clinicians, $\beta = .467$ ($t[84] = 4.6$, $p < .0001$).

As in the current study, Morcos (2010) did not find that the supervisory working alliance was a significant predictor of self-efficacy. However, there have been instances in the research where data analysis provides more than a correlational relationship between these two variables. When a population of supervisor/supervisee dyads in

counseling centers were surveyed by Hanson (2007), the researcher found that the total score on the working alliance instrument (SWAI) accounted for 31% of the variance in self-efficacy total score ($R = .55$, $R2 = .31$, F 1,56 = 24.62, $p < .01$). While Protivnak and Davis (2008) did not look specifically at self-efficacy or one's confidence in completing counseling tasks, the researchers investigated how the supervisory working alliance affected the counseling behaviors of preservice school counselors. As opposed to utilizing total scores, the researchers used the rapport scale of the SWAI and found that the working alliance accounted for 12% of the variance of behaviors.

The lack of a significant predictive relationship between satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy in this study is consistent with the findings of Cinotti (2014). However, Cinotti surveyed professional school counselors about the supervision they received in the field, as opposed to this study that focused on the supervision received during the internship.

Contributions and Implications of the Study

This research study adds to the literature regarding how supervision experiences during school-based on-site internships contribute to SCIT self-efficacy. The results are relevant to the work of school-based on-site supervisors and counselor educators. Prior research has addressed the supervisory working alliance, satisfaction with supervision, level of disclosure and self-efficacy; however, the population surveyed typically has included clinical mental health counselors and trainees (Gray, Ladany, Walker & Ancis, 2001; Mehr, Ladany, & Caskie, 2015; Morcos, 2010). The role of professional school counselors is unique, and research such as this, which investigates the relationship between supervision and school counseling self-efficacy, is important.

Results from this study can inform the practice of on-site school-based supervisors, ensuring that they appreciate how the supervision they provide can affect their interns' self-efficacy. Additionally, counselor educators have a stake in preservice school counselors receiving effective on-site supervision. Research indicates that while many professional school counselors felt that they were equipped to supervise preservice counselors, most lacked formal training in supervision (Dekruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). Counselor educators are in an optimal position to address this need. Therefore, results from this study hold implications for both on-site supervisors and counselor educators.

Implications for On-Site Supervisors

The results of the correlational analysis indicated that individuals who report a strong working alliance with their supervisor, have high levels of disclosure and feel satisfied with supervision are likely to have higher self-efficacy. On-site supervisors with this knowledge can make an effort to build positive relationships with their supervisees and create safe, supportive environments that are conducive to disclosure from supervisees. Additionally, on-site supervisors can gauge supervisees' level of satisfaction throughout the term. Informal strategies such as verbal check-ins can be utilized, during which the supervisor allows supervisees space to address their feelings about the process of supervision. For example, during these check-ins, the supervisee can report concerns about supervision sessions feeling rushed or make requests for specific feedback on the use of a particular counseling skill.

Direct observation, either face-to-face or through audio/videotapes, of SCITs' direct work with students and stakeholders can decrease obstacles to supervisees' level of disclosure. Findings from previous research indicated that supervisees chose not to

disclose for a number of reasons, including concerns about supervisors' perceptions and feelings of inadequacy (Mehr, Ladany & Caskie, 2010). Through this observation, supervisors would have the opportunity to identify progress and areas of concern, address things directly in supervision, and normalize client feelings about their performance. This can in turn increase the frequency of supervisees' disclosure during supervision.

Implications for Counselor Educators

Counselor educators have a vested interest in the supervision that takes place during the school-based internship. Based on the correlations in this study, individuals with high self-efficacy will also have strong working alliances with their supervisor, have high levels of disclosure, and also report more satisfaction with supervision. Therefore, counselor educators must educate on-site supervisors on the importance of these constructs and provide training on strategies that foster the constructs in supervisory relationships.

While formal training in supervision is not a requirement at the master's level, counselor educators can dedicate time to educating preservice school counselors of the tenets of supervision, including the connection between self-efficacy and level of disclosure. Trainees with an understanding of how their level of disclosure in supervision can influence their self-efficacy may feel more empowered to be vocal in supervision. This understanding of supervision can also prove beneficial for SCITs who go on to become on-site supervisors in their career.

Limitations of the Study

A limitation of this study relates to issues with generalizability. The research design initially involved recruiting participants based on their enrollment in master's

programs in North and South Carolina. Due to a low response, the researcher also recruited individuals designated as student members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). Only participants from the southeastern U.S. were invited to participate to maintain consistency with the original geographic location of the sample. Ultimately, there is no way to measure which of the 179 respondents were recruited via their master's program, and which were recruited from ASCA. Not only does this limit generalizability at a national level, it also provides challenges to replication of the study.

A number of potential participants notified the researcher that their designation as "student member" of ASCA was inaccurate; many had been in the field several years. This suggests that some individuals who did not meet criteria for the study were contacted and did not respond. While not responding was appropriate, the inaccurate data from the membership directory affected the response rate. As a safeguard, the informed consent clearly stated that only (a) individuals who completed at least one semester of a school-based internship in the 2015-2016 school year and (b) individuals who graduated no earlier than December 2015 were to complete the survey.

A final limitation of this study relates to social desirability, which may have influenced overall participation as well as the reporting of information. For example, preservice counselors who had negative experiences in their internships may have been less inclined to complete a survey on the topic due to fear of reprisal should results gets back to on-site supervisors. Though on-site supervisors do not assign final grades, their direct feedback does factor into university instructors' overall evaluation. Additionally, many trainees hope to maintain a positive relationship with their supervisor for professional reasons. Should trainees seek employment in their supervisors' district,

positive endorsements can assist in obtaining job interviews and increased networking opportunities. Individuals concerned about supervisors learning about unfavorable survey responses would be less inclined to participate. Social desirability may have also affected participants' responses. For instance, participants' concerned about being perceived as having low self-efficacy or having complaints about the supervision they received may have had inflated scores.

Recommendations for Future Research

The first recommendation for future research is to replicate the study with a larger sample, randomized from a national group. Researchers who intend to build a sample based on counseling program enrollment should consider contacting students and graduates directly when possible; this alleviates the uncertainty regarding program directors forwarding the email. Further, recruiting participants directly from professional organizations such as ASCA will also provide limitations, as not all pre-service and novice school counselors are members of professional organizations such as ASCA.

While web-based surveys are frequently used in research, response rates frequently suffer in this method due to factors such as invitations being filtered to spam folders, changes in email addresses, blocked firewalls, and the decreased novelty of internet surveys (Van Horn, Green & Martinussen, 2009). Researchers who have the opportunity to collect paper-and-pencil responses are encouraged to do so. Potential sources for collecting data would be internship classes, professional conferences, and district level meetings. This method also allows individuals to ask questions about the research directly, which could make them more interested in being a part of the study.

Results from this study indicated that there was a large percentage (30%) of African-American participants. Because this percentage is markedly higher than the demographics of previous studies, an area for future research would be investigation into what made this survey different. Further, general research could be conducted to identify ways to increase the number of minority respondents to requests for research in their field. Surveys could include questions that address motivation to respond in an effort to identify contributing factors. From there, data could be analyzed to determine if minority respondents are more likely to respond based on criteria such as the method of recruitment (i.e. the survey indicated that they received the invitation based on their membership in the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development), the topic of the study, or perceived ethnicity of the primary researcher. Qualitative research on this topic would also be worthwhile, as it could reveal factors not previously considered by the researcher.

This research was conducted with individuals based on their internship experience, and only individuals who had completed at least one semester of an internship were invited to participate. However, it may be beneficial to do a comparison study of practicum versus internship. It makes sense that individuals in internship may have increased self-efficacy, but there may be differences in the way they experience supervision. Similarly, research about the differences in self-efficacy between pre-service counselors and novice school counselors, while still examining the school-based on-site internship, could prove beneficial in determining how self-efficacy changes post-graduation, as well as what factors contribute to the change.

A pre-post research design is an additional recommendation for research. This could entail assessing self-efficacy, level of disclosure and working alliance at the beginning of the internship, midway through the term, and again at the end. This would provide data on changes in the variables over the course of the school year, as well as any differences in the way variables change.

The directional relationship between the level of disclosure and self-efficacy is yet another recommended focus for future research. Results from the current study indicated that level of disclosure was a significant predictor of self-efficacy. However, future research could delve deeper into the relationship between these two variables. For example, are individuals disclosing more as their self-efficacy increases, or is their self-efficacy increasing because they are disclosing more?

This study focused solely on perceptions of supervisees; future studies could also include feedback from on-site supervisors. For example, a study could be conducted wherein the perceptions of supervisors and supervisees are compared to determine if there are differences in how they perceive working alliance, supervisee performance and self-efficacy.

Counselor educators are also encouraged to use research to determine the impact training in supervision can have on SCIT outcomes. For example, researchers can create supervisory dyads in which some on-site supervisors have received data-informed training in supervision and others have received traditional on-site supervisor training. From there, researchers can identify if there are differences in self-efficacy and disclosure scores for individuals working with supervisors in each group. In addition to gaining

valuable data, avenues such as this can help counselor educators be more engaged in the internship experience.

The fact that the supervisory working alliance and satisfaction with supervision did not prove to be predictors of self-efficacy inspires research to determine what factors, in addition to level of disclosure, contribute to self-efficacy. A qualitative study of pre-service and novice school counselors could enable participants to speak freely about their experience without focusing on predetermined constructs. This would allow an opportunity to identify predictive factors not previously examined in the research.

Concluding Remarks

Professional school counselors are in a position to make a significant impact on our nation's children. Because of this, it is important that we learn as much as we can about their training and self-efficacy, or perceived ability to perform the job. The on-site internship is an integral part of their graduate program, a component that builds the foundation for what they believe the role of the school counselor to be. The on-site supervisor is responsible for helping school counselors-in-training navigate this process successfully.

Results from this study yielded a significant relationship between level of disclosure and school counseling self-efficacy. In other words, supervisees' level of disclosure proved to be a significant predictor of their level of school counseling self-efficacy. While they did not prove to be predictors, the remaining variables (working alliance, satisfaction with supervision) were positively correlated to participant self-efficacy. The current study is important initially because it addresses a significant gap in the literature. The paucity of recent literature addressing the school-based on-site

internship is by no means indicative of the value of this experiential component of graduate training. Beyond contributing to the literature, data from this research study revealed a relationship between level of disclosure and self-efficacy, similar to the link present in clinical mental health research. Research demonstrating that the level of disclosure in a school-based internship significantly contributes to self-efficacy can possibly help counselor educators and professional school counselors recognize the value of on-site school-based supervision.

Our responsibility as professionals is to ensure that the school counselors with whom our children interact are skilled, culturally aware, ethical and able to advocate on their behalf. Until supervision in the field of school counseling is as prevalent as it is in other areas of the profession, our focus must be on making sure that the supervision received during the on-site internship is shaping the kind of professionals that make a positive impact in our schools.

REFERENCES

Akos, P., & Scarborough, J. L. (2004). An examination of the clinical preparation of school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*(2), 96-107. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01863.x

American School Counselor Association (2005). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs.* (2nd ed.) Alexandria, VA: Author.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (2011). *Best practices in clinical supervision.* Retrieved from http://www.acesonline.net/sites/default/files/ACES-Best-Practices-in-clinical-supervision-document-FINAL.pdf

Armeniox, L. F. (2000). *Level of supervisee disclosure in the clinical supervision of counselors -in -training*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 9996513)

Baggerly, J., & Osborn, D. (2006). School counselors' career satisfaction and commitment: Correlates and predictors. *Professional School Counseling, 9*(3), 197-205. doi:10.5330/prsc.9.3.547188866k76qg76

Bahrick, A. S. (1989). *Role induction for counselor trainees: Effects on the supervisory working alliance.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 9014392).

Bandura, A. (1977a). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977b). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191-215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banikiotes, P. G., & McCabe, S. P. (1974). Measurement of self-disclosure: Self-report, ratings of peers and supervisors. *Psychological Reports, 34*(3, Pt. 1), 754. doi:10.2466/pr0.1974.34.3.754

Barnes, K. L. (2004). Applying self-efficacy theory to counselor training and supervision: A comparison of two approaches. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*(1), 56-69. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01860.x

Beretvas, S. N., Meyers, J. L., & Leite, W. L. (2002). A reliability generalization study of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62*(4), 570-589. doi:10.1177/0013164402062004003

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

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson.

Bertsch, K. N., Bremer-Landau, J. D., Inman, A. G., DeBoer Kreider, E. R., Price, T. A., & DeCarlo, A. L. (2014). Evaluation of the critical events in supervision model using gender related events. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 8(3), 174-181. doi:10.1037/tep0000039

Bhat, C., & Davis, T. E. (2007). Counseling supervisors' assessment of race, racial identity, and working alliance in supervisory dyads. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35*(2), 80-91. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2007.tb00051.x

Bodenhorn, N., & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 38*(1), 14-28.

Bodenhorn, N., Wolfe, E. W., & Airen, O. E. (2010). School counselor program choice and self-efficacy: Relationship to achievement gap and equity. *Professional School Counseling, 13*(3), 165-174. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-13.165

Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 16*(3), 252-260. doi:10.1037/h0085885

Bordin, E. S. (1983). Supervision in counseling: II. Contemporary models of supervision: A working alliance based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 35-42. doi:10.1177/0011000083111007

Bore, S. K., Armstrong, S. A., & Womack, A. (2010). School counselors' experiential training in group work. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(26). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ895906)

Brott, P. E. (2006). Counselor education accountability: Training the effective professional school counselor. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(2), 179-188. doi:10.5330/prsc.10.2.d61g0v3738863652

Brott, P. E., & Myers, J. E. (1999). Development of professional school counselor identity: A grounded theory. *Professional School Counseling, 2*(5), 339.

Bryan, J., Moore-Thomas, C., Day-Vines, N. L., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2011). School counselors as social capital: The effects of high school college counseling on college application rates. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 89*(2), 190-199. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00077.x

Bucky, S. F., Marques, S., Daly, J., Alley, J., & Karp, A. (2010). Supervision characteristics related to the supervisory working alliance as rated by doctoral-

level supervisees. *The Clinical Supervisor, 29*(2), 149-163. doi:10.1080/07325223.2010.519270

Burnett-Zeigler, I., & Lyons, J. S. (2012). Youth characteristics associated with intensity of service use in a school-based mental health intervention. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 21*(6), 963-972. doi:10.1007/s10826-011-9555-z

Cashwell, T. H., & Dooley, K. (2001). The impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*(1), 39-47. doi:10.1300/J001v20n01_03

Ceballos, P. L., Parikh, S., & Post, P. B. (2012). Examining social justice attitudes among play therapists: Implications for multicultural supervision and training. *International Journal of Play Therapy, 21*(4), 232-243. doi:10.1037/a0028540

Cervoni, A., & DeLucia-Waack, J. (2011). Role conflict and ambiguity as predictors of job satisfaction in high school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*(1). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ914271)

Chandler, N., Balkin, R. S., & Perepiczka, M. (2011). Perceived self-efficacy of licensed counselors to provide substance abuse counseling. *Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling, 32*(1-2), 29-42. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1874.2011.tb00205.x

Cheon, H., Blumer, M. C., Shih, A., Murphy, M. J., & Sato, M. (2009). The influence of supervisor and supervisee matching, role conflict, and supervisory relationship on supervisee satisfaction. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An International Journal, 31*(1), 52-67. doi:10.1007/s10591-008-9078-y

Cigrand, D. L., Wood, S. M., & Duys, D. (2014). School counselors' use of solution-focused tenets and techniques in school-based site supervision. *Journal of School Counseling, 12*(15). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ1034761)

Cinotti, D. (2013). *The relationship between aspects of supervision and school counselor self-efficacy*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global. (Order No. 3558286).

Clark, D. M. (2006). *School counselor self-efficacy as related to the ASCA national model for school counselors.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from https://librarylink.uncc.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.librarylink.uncc.edu/docview/304945025?accountid=14605

Cook, K., Trepal, H., & Somody, C. (2012). Supervision of school counselors: The SAAFT model. *Journal of School Counseling, 10*(21). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ981202)

Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (2016). 2016 Standards. Retrieved from cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards.

Crockett, S., & Hays, D. G. (2015). The influence of supervisor multicultural competence on the supervisory working alliance, supervisee counseling self-efficacy, and supervisee satisfaction with supervision: A mediation model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 54*(4), 258-273. doi:10.1002/ceas.12025

Crutchfield, L. B., & Borders, D. (1997). Impact of two clinical peer supervision models on practicing school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*(3), 219-230. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1997.tb02336.x

Culbreth, J. R., Scarborough, J. L., Banks-Johnson, A., & Solomon, S. (2005). Role stress among practicing school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(1), 58-71. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb00130.x

Dahir, C., Campbell, C., Johnson, L., Scholes, R., & Valiga, M. (1997). Supporting a nation of learners: The development of national standards for school counseling programs. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED411306)

DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50*(5), 314-327. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01918.x

DeMato, D. S., & Curcio, C. C. (2004). Job satisfaction of elementary school counselors: A new look. *Professional School Counseling, 7*(4), 236-245.

Dickens, A. D. H. (2010). *Satisfaction of supervisory working alliance: Distance versus face-to-face* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Central. (Order No. 3400640).

Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(4), 242-252. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00001.x

Easton, C., Martin, W. J., & Wilson, S. (2008). Emotional intelligence and implications for counseling self-efficacy: Phase II. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 47*(4), 218-232. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008.tb00053.x

Erford, B. T. (2011). *Transforming the school counseling profession*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.

Fernando, D. M. (2013). Supervision by doctoral students: A study of supervisee satisfaction and self-efficacy, and comparison with faculty supervision outcomes. *Clinical Supervisor, 32*(1), 1-14. Doi:10.1080/07325223.2013.778673

Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's-level counseling students. Counselor Education and Supervision, 44(4), 293-304. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ741926)

Ganske, K. H., Gnilka, P. B., Ashby, J. S., & Rice, K. G. (2015). The relationship between counseling trainee perfectionism and the working alliance with supervisor and client. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 93*(1), 14-24. Doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2015.00177.x

Glaes, J. M. (2010). *Implementing an ASCA-informed school counselor supervision model: A qualitative field-based study* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Central. (Order No. 3410401)

Glatthorn, A. A., Joyner, R. L., & Glatthorn, A. A. (2005). *Writing the winning thesis or dissertation: A step-by-step guide*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin Press.

Gnilka, P. B., Chang, C. V., & Dew, B. J. (2012). The relationship between supervisee stress, coping resources, the working alliance, and the supervisory working alliance. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 90*(1), 63-70.

Granello, D. H. (2007). Publishing quantitative manuscripts in counselor education and supervision: General guidelines and expectations. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 47*(2), 66-75. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2007.tb00039.x

Gravetter, F. J. & Wallanau, L. B. (2007). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Wadsworth.

Gray, L. A., Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Ancis, J. R. (2001). Psychotherapy trainees' experience of counterproductive events in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(4), 371-383. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.48.4.371

Greason, P. B., & Cashwell, C. S. (2009). Mindfulness and counseling self-efficacy: The mediating role of attention and empathy. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 49*(1), 2-19. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00083.x

Green, J. G., Johnson, R. M., Dunn, E. C., Lindsey, M., Xuan, Z., & Zaslavsky, A. M. (2014). Mental health service use among high school students exposed to interpersonal violence. *Journal of School Health, 84*(2), 141-149. doi:10.1111/josh.12125

Gunduz, B. (2012). Self-efficacy and burnout in professional school counselors. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 12*(3), 1761-1767.

Hanson, M. G. (2007). Counselor self-efficacy: Supervision contributions, impact on performance, and mediation of the relationship between supervision and performance. Dissertation Abstracts International, 67, 4708.

Herbert, J. T., & Trusty, J. (2006). Clinical supervision practices and satisfaction within the public vocational rehabilitation program. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 49*(2), 66-80.

Herlihy, B., Gray, N., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(1), 55-60.

Herr, E. L. (2002). School reform and perspectives on the role of school counselors: A century of proposals for change. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(4), 220-234.

Hess, S. A., Knox, S., Schultz, J. M., Hill, C. E., Sloan, L., Brandt, S., Kelley, F., & Hoffman, M. A. (2008). Predoctoral interns' nondisclosure in supervision. *Psychotherapy Research, 18*(4), 400-411. doi:10.1080/10503300701697505

Hoffman, R. M. (2001). *Maximizing Internship Experiences for School Counselors-in-Training*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED454487)

Holcomb-McCoy, C., Gonzalez, I., & Johnston, G. (2009). School counselor dispositions as predictors of data usage. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(5), 343-351. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.343

Holcomb-McCoy, C., Harris, P., Hines, E. M., & Johnston, G. (2008). School counselors' multicultural self-efficacy: A preliminary investigation. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(3), 166-178. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.166

Holloway, E. L., & Wampold, B. E. (1983). Patterns of verbal behavior and judgments of satisfaction in the supervision interview. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*(2), 227-234. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.30.2.227

Horvath, A. O. (2001). The alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 38*(4), 365-372. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.38.4.365

Horvath, A. O., & Greenberg, L. S. (1989). Development and validation of the Working Alliance Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*(2), 223-233. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.36.2.223

Huck, S. W. (2008). *Reading statistics and research*. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Inman, A. G. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 32*(1), 73-85. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2006.tb01589.x

Jackson, C. M., Snow, B. M., Boes, S. R., Phillips, P. L., Powell Stanard, R., Painter, L. C., & Beth Wulff, M. (2002). Inducting the transformed school counselor into the profession. *Theory into Practice, 41*(3), 177.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. B. (2014). Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications

Koskey, K. K., Cain, B., Sondergeld, T. A., Alvim, H. G., & Slager, E. M. (2015). A mixed-methods investigation of factors and scenarios influencing college students' decision to complete surveys at five mid-western universities. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 27*(1), 3-30.

Kozina, K., Grabovari, N., De Stefano, J., & Drapeau, M. (2010). Measuring changes in counselor self-efficacy: Further validation and implications for training and supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 29*(2), 117-127. doi:10.1080/07325223.2010.517483

Ladany, N. (2004). Psychotherapy Supervision: What lies beneath. *Psychotherapy Research, 14*(1), 1-19. doi:10.1093/ptr/kph001

Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*(4), 447-455. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02472.x

Ladany, N., Hill, C. E., Corbett, M. M., & Nutt, E. A. (1996). Nature, extent, and importance of what psychotherapy trainees do not disclose to their supervisors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*(1), 10-24. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.43.1.10

Ladany, N., & Lehrman-Waterman, D. E. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisory working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*(3), 143-160.

Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D., Molinaro, M., & Wolgast, B. (1999). Psychotherapy supervisor ethical practices: Adherence to guidelines, the supervisory working alliance, and supervisee satisfaction. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*(3), 443-475. doi:10.1177/0011000099273008

Ladany, N., Mori, Y., & Mehr, K. E. (2013). Effective and ineffective supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist, 41*(1), 28-47. doi:10.1177/0011000012442648

Lainas, H. L. (2014). The relationship between supervisory working alliance and supervisees' client outcomes (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3685810)

Lam, S., Tracz, S., & Lucey, C. (2013). Age, gender, and ethnicity of counsellor trainees and corresponding counselling self-efficacy: Research findings and implications for counsellor educators. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 35*(3), 172-187. doi:10.1007/s10447-012-9175-3

Lambie, G. W., & Williamson, L. L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(2), 124-131.

Larson, L. M., Suzuki, L. A., Gillespie, K. N., Potenza, M. T., Bechtel, M. A., & Toulouse, A. L. (1992). Development and validation of the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*(1), 105-120. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.39.1.105

Licensed Professional Counselors Act, NC General Statutes, Article 24 § 90-330 (1993).

Logan, J. D. (2014). *The relationship among counseling supervision satisfaction, counselor self-efficacy, working alliance and multicultural factors (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.* (Order No. 3581837)

Luke, M., Ellis, M. V., & Bernard, J. M. (2011). School counselor supervisors' perceptions of the discrimination model of supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50*(5), 328-343. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01919.x

Mack, S. (2012). Supervisory alliance and countertransference disclosure in peer supervision (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3503820)

Mehr, K. E., Ladany, N., & Caskie, G. L. (2015). Factors influencing trainee willingness to disclose in supervision. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 9*(1), 44-51. doi:10.1037/tep0000028

Morcos, S. (2010). Supervision factors related to the self-efficacy of novice mental health workers (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3407218)

Moyer, M. S., & Yu, K. (2012). Factors Influencing School Counselors' Perceived Effectiveness. Journal of School Counseling, 10(6). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ978862)

Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA national model®: The foundation for supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(3), 289-296. doi:10.5330/prsc.10.3.d4t0g103013n88t6

Nelson, M. D., & Johnson, P. (1999). School counselors as supervisors: An integrated approach for supervising school counseling interns. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*(2), 89-100. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb01220.x

Ng, K., & Smith, S. D. (2012). Training level, acculturation, role ambiguity, and multicultural discussions in training and supervising international counseling students in the United States. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 34*(1), 72-86. doi:10.1007/s10447-011-9130-8

Nilsson, J. E., & Duan, C. (2007). Experiences of prejudice, role difficulties, and counseling self-efficacy among U.S. racial and ethnic minority supervisees

working with White supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35*(4), 219-229. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2007.tb00062.x

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Oxford, England: Univer. Illinois Press.

Owens, D., Bodenhorn, N., & Bryant, R. M. (2010). Self-efficacy and multicultural competence of school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(17). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ885220)

Paisley, P. O., & McMahon, H. G. (2001). School counseling for the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling, 5*(2), 106.

Pakdaman, S., Shafranske, E., & Falender, C. (2015). Ethics in supervision: Consideration of the supervisory alliance and countertransference management of psychology doctoral students. *Ethics & Behavior, 25*(5), 427-441. doi:10.1080/10508422.2014.947415

Perera-Diltz, D. M., & Mason, K. L. (2008). Ideal to real: Duties performed by school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 6*(26). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ894797)

Perera-Diltz, D. M., & Mason, K. L. (2012). A national survey of school counselor supervision practices: Administrative, clinical, peer, and technology mediated supervision. *Journal of School Counseling, 10*(4). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ978860)

Pérusse, R., Goodnough, G., Donegan, J., & Jones, C. (2004). Perceptions of School Counselors and School Principals about the National Standards for School Counseling Programs and the Transforming School Counseling Initiative. Professional School Counseling, 7(3), 152-161. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ701883)

Protivnak, J. J., & Davis, T. E. (2008). The impact of the supervision relationship on the behaviors of school counseling interns. *Journal of School Counseling, 6*(19). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ894790)

Reese, R. J., Usher, E. L., Bowman, D. C., Norsworthy, L. A., Halstead, J. L., Rowlands, S. R., & Chisholm, R. R. (2009). Using client feedback in psychotherapy training: An analysis of its influence on supervision and counselor self-efficacy. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3*(3), 157-168. doi:10.1037/a0015673

Scarborough, J. L., & Culbreth, J. R. (2008). Examining discrepancies between actual and preferred practice of school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*(4), 446-459. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00533.x

Schaefer, D. R., & Dillman, D. A. (1998). Development of a standard E-mail methodology: Results of an experiment. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 62*(3), 378-397. doi:10.1086/297851

Schiele, B. E., Weist, M. D., Youngstrom, E. A., Stephan, S. H., & Lever, N. A. (2014). Counseling self-efficacy, quality of services and knowledge of evidence-based practices in school mental health. *Professional Counselor, 4*(5), 467-480.

Sills, S. J., & Song, C. (2002). Innovations in survey research: An application of web-based surveys. *Social Science Computer Review, 20*(1), 22-30. doi:10.1177/089443930202000103

Springer, S. I. (2015). Aspects of site supervision as predictors of group leader self-efficacy for pre-service school counselors (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3715897)

Sterner, W. R. (2009). Influence of the supervisory working alliance on supervisee work satisfaction and work-related stress. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 31*(3), 249-263. doi:10.17744/mehc.31.3.f3544l502401831g

Studer, J. R. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(4), 353-359.

Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA National Model® in supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(1), 82-87. doi:10.5330/prsc.10.1.f82t14475451422m

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. *Behavioral Health Equity Barometer: United States, 2014*. HHS Publication No. SMA–15–4895EQ. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2015.

Sutton, J. M., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*(3), 331-336. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01759.x

Swank, J. M., & Tyson, L. (2012). School counseling site supervisor training: A web-based approach. *Professional School Counseling, 16*(1), 40-48. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2012-16.40

Tang, M., Addison, K. D., LaSure-Bryant, D., Norman, R., O'Connell, W., & Stewart-Sicking, J. A. (2004). Factors that influence self-efficacy of counseling students: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*(1), 70-80. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb01861.x

Terranova-Nirenberg, J. (2013). *A quantitative study investigating supervisory style, satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy among female clinical training*

supervisees (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3598484)

Uellendahl, G. E., & Tenenbaum, M. N. (2015). Supervision training, practices, and interests of California site supervisors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 54*(4), 274-287. doi:10.1002/ceas.12026

Van Horn, P. S., Green, K. E., & Martinussen, M. (2009). Survey response rates and survey administration in counseling and clinical psychology: A meta-analysis. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69*(3), 389-403. doi:10.1177/0013164408324462

Villalba, J. A. (2007). Incorporating wellness into group work in elementary schools. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 32*(1), 31-40. doi:10.1080/01933920600977556

Walker, J. A., Ladany, N., & Pate-Carolan, L. M. (2007). Gender-related events in psychotherapy supervision: Female trainee perspectives. *Counselling & Psychotherapy Research, 7*(1), 12-18. doi:10.1080/14733140601140881

Walsh, B. B., Gillespie, C., Greer, J. M., & Eanes, B. E. (2002). Influence of dyadic mutuality on counselor trainee willingness to self-disclose clinical mistakes to supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor, 21*(2), 83-98. doi:10.1300/J001v21n02_06

Weigold, A., Weigold, I. K., & Russell, E. J. (2013). Examination of the equivalence of self-report survey-based paper-and-pencil and internet data collection methods. *Psychological Methods, 18*(1), 53-70. doi:10.1037/a0031607

Woodside, M., Ziegler, M., & Paulus, T. M. (2009). Understanding school counseling internships from a communities of practice framework. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 49*(1), 20-38. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00084.x

Worthington, E. L., & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26*(1), 64-73. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.26.1.64

Worthington, E. L., & Stern, A. (1985). Effects of supervisor and supervisee degree level and gender on the supervisory relationship. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*(2), 252-262. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.32.2.252

Yeh, C. J., Chang, T., Chiang, L., Drost, C. M., Spelliscy, D., Carter, R. T., & Chang, Y. (2008). Development, content, process and outcome of an online peer supervision group for counselor trainees. *Computers in Human Behavior, 24*(6), 2889-2903. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2008.04.010

Yourman, D. B. (2003). Trainee disclosure in psychotherapy supervision: The impact of shame. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 59*(5), 601-609. doi:10.1002/jclp.10162

Yourman, D. B., & Farber, B. A. (1996). Nondisclosure and distortion in psychotherapy supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 33*(4), 567-575. doi:10.1037/0033-3204.33.4.567

APPENDIX A: INTRODUCTORY EMAIL TO PROGRAM DIRECTORS

To the Director,

I am currently conducting my dissertation research focusing on the relationships between (a) the supervisory working alliance, (b) supervisee disclosure, (c) satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy among students and recent graduates who have complete at least one semester of an internship in a school setting.

I would appreciate it greatly if you would forward this email to your listserv so that it may reach individuals in the identified population.

If you have any questions about the project, please contact Rolanda Mitchell at rmitch1@uncc.edu. You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Phyllis Post, at ppost@uncc.edu.

Sincerely,

Rolanda L. Mitchell, MAEd.
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education & Supervision
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Department of Counseling
9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704-687-8960 f/ 704-687-8960 http://education.uncc.edu/counseling

Dear Participant,

You are being invited to participate in a quantitative research study that will examine factors related to the self-efficacy of school counselors in training. This study is being conducted as part of the requirement for a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Counseling at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. The principal investigator for this study is Rolanda Mitchell, Doctoral Candidate.

In this study, you will be asked questions relating to the on-site supervision you received during your school-based internship. Responses collected will be used to compile research data research that may inform the field of school counseling as well as counselor education.

In order to participate in this study, you must meet the following inclusion criteria:

(a) Participants must be currently enrolled OR be a recent graduate of a CACREP-accredited Master's level counseling program
(b) Participants must have completed at least one semester of a school-based internship during the 2015-2016 school year

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. All information collected will remain confidential.

Individuals who complete the survey have the option to enter a drawing for a $50 Visa gift card. If you would like to enter, you will be advised to enter your email address at the end of the survey. The researcher will use this email address to contact you should you be selected in the drawing. Additional benefits of your participation in this study include contributing to the field of counselor education by increasing our knowledge regarding the training and supervision needs of future professional school counselors.

There are no known risks to participating in this study. You are a volunteer and the decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. You may withdraw or decline without penalty at any time.

UNC Charlotte wants to make sure that you are treated in a fair and respectful manner. Contact the University's Research Compliance Office (704-687-1871 or uncc-irb@uncc.edu) if you have any concerns about how you are treated as a study participant. If you have any questions about the project, please contact Rolanda Mitchell at rmitch1@uncc.edu. You may also contact the dissertation chair for this project, Dr. Phyllis Post, at ppost@uncc.edu.

By clicking on the "Continue to Survey" button at the bottom of this page, you indicate that you have read the information above and consent to participate in this study.

Thank you for taking the time to participate!

Sincerely,

Rolanda L. Mitchell, MAEd., LPC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education & Supervision
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

APPENDIX C: EMAIL TO ASCA MEMBERS

Hello!

You are being invited to participate in a quantitative research study that will examine factors related to the self-efficacy of individuals who are training to become school counselors, as well as those who are new to the profession. In this study, you will be asked questions regarding your ability to complete counseling tasks as well as the on-site supervision you received during your school based internship.

In order to participate in this study, you must meet the following inclusion criteria:

a. Participants must be currently enrolled in OR be a recent graduate (December 2015 or later) of a Master's level counseling program
b. Participants must have completed at least one semester of a school based internship during the 2015-2016 school year

The survey takes approximately 15-20 minutes to complete, and all information collected will remain confidential. There are no known risks to participating in this study, but the data collected may prove beneficial to the fields of school counseling and counselor education. You are a volunteer, and may withdraw or decline without penalty. Individuals who complete the survey have the option to enter a drawing for a $75 Visa gift card.

Please click on the following link to access the survey: http://www.surveyshare.com/t/SCIT-Self-Efficacy

Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,

Rolanda L. Mitchell, MAEd., LPC
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education & Supervision
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT FORM

UNC CHARLOTTE
Department of Counseling
9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001
t/ 704-687-8960 f/ 704-687-8960 http://education.uncc.edu/counseling

Greetings!

Thank you for choosing to participate! This is a quantitative research study that will examine factors related to the self-efficacy of pre-service and novice school counselors. This study is being conducted as part of the requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Counselor Education and Supervision at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. The principal investigator for this study is Rolanda Mitchell, Doctoral Candidate.

In this study, you will be asked questions relating to the on-site supervision you received during your school based internship. Responses collected will be used to compile research data that may inform the field of school counseling as well as counselor education.

In order to participate in this study, you must meet the following inclusion criteria:

a. Participants must be currently enrolled in OR be a recent graduate (December 2015 or later) of a Master's level counseling program
b. Participants must have completed at least one semester of a school based internship during the 2015-2016 school year

The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. All information collected will remain confidential.

Individuals who complete the survey have the option to enter a drawing for a $75 Visa gift card. If you would like to enter, you will be advised to enter your email address at the end of the survey. The researcher will use this email address to contact you should you be selected in the drawing. Additional benefits of your participation in this study include contributing to the field of counselor education by increasing our knowledge of the training and supervision needs of future professional school counselors.

There are no known risks to participating in this study. You are a volunteer and the decision to participate in this study is completely up to you. You may withdraw or decline without penalty at any time.

UNC Charlotte wants to make sure that you are treated in a fair and respectful manner. Contact the University's Research Compliance Office (704-687-1871 or uncc-irb@uncc.edu) if you have any concerns about how you are treated as a study participant. If you have any questions about the project, please contact Rolanda Mitchell at rmitch1@uncc.edu. You may also contact the dissertation chair for this project, Dr. Phyllis Post, at ppost@uncc.edu.

By clicking on the "Continue to Survey" button at the bottom of this page, you indicate that you have read the information above and consent to participate in this study.

Again, thank you! Your time is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Rolanda L. Mitchell, MAEd., LPC

Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education & Supervision

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

APPENDIX E: SCHOOL COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Below is a list of activities representing many school counselor responsibilities. Indicate your confidence in your current ability to perform each activity by circling the appropriate answer next to each item according to the scale defined below. Please answer each item based on one current school, and based on how you feel now, not on your anticipated (or previous) ability or school(s). Remember, this is not a test and there are no right answers.

Use the following scale:

1 = not confident,
2 = slightly confident,
3 = moderately confident,
4 = generally confident,
5 = highly confident.

Please circle the number that best represents your response for each item.

1. Advocate for integration of student academic, career, and personal development into the mission of my school.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Recognize situations that impact (both negatively and positively) student learning and achievement.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Analyze data to identify patterns of achievement and behavior that contribute to school success	1	2	3	4	5
4. Advocate for myself as a professional school counselor and articulate the purposes and goals of school counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Develop measurable outcomes for a school counseling program which would demonstrate accountability.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Consult and collaborate with teachers, staff, administrators and parents to promote student success.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Establish rapport with a student for individual counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Function successfully as a small group leader.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Effectively deliver suitable parts of the school counseling program through large group meetings such as in classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Conduct interventions with parents, guardians and families in order to resolve problems that impact students' effectiveness and success.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Teach students how to apply time and task management skills.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Foster understanding of the relationship between learning and work.	1	2	3	4	5

13. Offer appropriate explanations to students, parents and teachers of how learning styles affect school performance.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Deliver age-appropriate programs through which students acquire the skills needed to investigate the world of work.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Implement a program which enables all students to make informed career decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Teach students to apply problem-solving skills toward their academic, personal and career success.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Evaluate commercially prepared material designed for school counseling to establish their relevance to my school population.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Model and teach conflict resolution skills.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Ensure a safe environment for all students in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Change situations in which an individual or group treats others in a disrespectful or harassing manner.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Teach students to use effective communication skills with peers, faculty, employers, family, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Follow ethical and legal obligations designed for school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Guide students in techniques to cope with peer pressure.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Adjust my communication style appropriately to the age and developmental levels of various students.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Incorporate students' developmental stages in establishing and conducting the school counseling program.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I can find some way of connecting and communicating with any student in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Teach, develop and/or support students' coping mechanisms for dealing with crises in their lives – e.g., peer suicide, parent's death, abuse, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Counsel effectively with students and families from different social/economic statuses.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Understand the viewpoints and experiences of students and parents who are from a different cultural background than myself.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Help teachers improve their effectiveness with students.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Discuss issues of sexuality and sexual orientation in an age appropriate manner with students.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Speak in front of large groups such as faculty or parent meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Use technology designed to support student successes and progress through the educational process.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Communicate in writing with staff, parents, and the external community.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Help students identify and attain attitudes, behaviors, and skills which lead to successful learning.	1	2	3	4	5

36. Select and implement applicable strategies to assess school-wide issues.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community to enhance a positive school climate.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Develop school improvement plans based on interpreting school-wide assessment results.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Identify aptitude, achievement, interest, values, and personality appraisal resources appropriate for specified situations and populations.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Implement a preventive approach to student problems.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Lead school-wide initiatives which focus on ensuring a positive learning environment.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Consult with external community agencies which provide support services for our students.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Provide resources and guidance to school population in times of crisis.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F: THE WORKING ALLIANCE INVENTORY-TRAINEE VERSION

The following sentences describe some of the different ways a person might think or feel about his or her supervisor. As you read the sentences, please respond based on your experience with your on-site, school-based internship supervisor.

With each statement there is a seven-point scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Always

If the statement describes the way you *always* feel (or think), select the number "7"; if it *never* applies to you, select the number "1." Use the numbers in between to describe the variations between these extremes. This questionnaire is confidential. Neither your supervisor nor the school will see your answers.
Please work fast; your first impressions are the ones we would like to have. PLEASE DO NOT FORGET TO RESPOND TO *EVERY ITEM.*

Thank you for your cooperation.

1. I feel uncomfortable with my on-site supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. My on-site supervisor and I agree about the things I will need to do in supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. I am worried about the outcome of our supervision sessions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. What I am doing in supervision gives me a new way of looking at myself as a counselor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. My on-site supervisor and I understand each other.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. My on-site supervisor perceives accurately what my goals are.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I find what I am doing in supervision confusing.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. I believe my on-site supervisor likes me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I wish my on-site supervisor and I could clarify the purpose of our sessions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I disagree with my on-site supervisor about what I ought to get out of supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. I believe the time my on-site supervisor and I are spending together is not spent efficiently.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. My on-site supervisor does not understand what I want to accomplish in supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. I am clear on what my responsibilities are in supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. The goals of these sessions are important to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. I find what my on-site supervisor and I are doing in supervision is unrelated to my concerns.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. I feel that what my on-site supervisor and I are doing in supervision will help me to accomplish the changes that I want in order to be a more effective counselor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. I believe my on-site supervisor is genuinely concerned for my welfare.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. I am clear as to what my on-site supervisor wants me to do in our supervision sessions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. My on-site supervisor and I respect each other.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20. I feel that my on-site supervisor is not totally honest about his/her feelings toward me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
21. I am confident in my on-site supervisor's ability to supervise me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22. My on-site supervisor and I are working towards mutually agreed-upon goals.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23. I feel that my on-site supervisor appreciates me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24. We agree on what is important for me to work on.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25. As a result of our supervision sessions, I am clearer as to how I might improve my counseling skills.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26. My on-site supervisor and I trust one another.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. My on-site supervisor and I have different ideas on what I need to work on.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28. My relationship with my on-site supervisor is very important to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29. I have the feeling that it is important that I say or do the "right" things in supervision with my on-site supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30. My on-site supervisor and I collaborate on setting goals for my supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31. I am frustrated by the things we are doing in supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32. We have established a good understanding of the kinds of things I need to work on.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
33. The things that my on-site supervisor is asking me to do don't make sense.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
34.1 don't know what to expect as a result of my supervision.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
35.1 believe the way we are working with my issues is correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36.1 believe my on-site supervisor cares about me even when I do things that he/she doesn't approve of.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX G: LEVEL OF DISCLOSURE SCALE

When answering the questions for this portion of the survey, please refer to your most recent on-site internship supervisor. Please use the following scale as you answer questions:

1	2	3	4	5
not at all likely	not likely	perhaps	likely	highly likely

1.	Your personal issues or concerns (e.g. your internal feelings, conflicts, and issues that may influence the counseling or supervision process) to your current supervisor during supervision?	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Clients (e.g. clients' thoughts, appearance, dynamics, conflicts or issues) to your current supervisor during supervision?	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Your interactions with your clients (e.g. things that happen between you and your clients within the context of the counseling relationship) to your current supervisor during supervision?	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Your current supervisor (e.g. supervisor's thoughts, appearance, behaviors, theoretical orientation, conflicts or issues) to this supervisor during supervision?	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Your interactions with your current supervisor (e.g. things that happen between you and your supervisor within the context of the supervision relationship) to this supervisor during supervision.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Your current supervisor's evaluation of your work (e.g. worry or concern about your grade, your supervisor's opinion of you, your supervisor's discussion of you with the other faculty, your supervisor taking advantage of you) to this supervisor during supervision?	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Overall, how likely would you be to disclose thoughts, feelings and reactions to your current supervisor during supervision?	1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX H: QUALITY OF SUPERVISION SCALE

Use the following scale to identify your feelings about your overall supervision experience with your on-site (school-based) supervisor.

Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	Bad
Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	Positive
Strong	1	2	3	4	5	6	Weak
Easy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Hard
Active	1	2	3	4	5	6	Passive
Tense	1	2	3	4	5	6	Relaxed

APPENDIX I: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you currently enrolled in a CACREP-accredited Master's Level Counseling Program? (If no, proceed to number 3)

   ____Yes ____No

2. If yes, have you completed at least one semester of a school-based internship? (If yes, proceed to number 5)

   ____Yes ____No

3. Are you a recent (within the past 9 months) graduate of a CACREP-accredited Master's Level Counseling Program?

   ____Yes ____No

4. Did you complete a school-based internship during your program?

   ____Yes ____No

5. Circle the grades served at your internship site:

   Elementary Middle High K-8 K-12

6. How would you describe the area in which you school is located?

   Urban Rural Unsure

7. Please indicate the role/title of your on-site supervisor:

   _____Professional School Counselor
   _____Other Student Services Professional (i.e. Social Worker, School Psychologist)
   _____Administrator

8. Which best describes the race/ethnicity of your on-site supervisor:

   African-American
   Asian/Pacific Islander
   Caucasian
   Hispanic/Latino
   Multi-Racial
   Native American
   Prefer not to Disclose

Unsure

9. How many years has your on-site supervisor been a school counselor?

   1-5 6-10 11-20 Over 20 Unsure

10. How much one-on-one time do you spend in face-to-face clinical supervision with your on-site supervisor?

    Less than one hour per week One hour per week More than one hour per week

11. What is your identified gender:

    _____Male _____Female _____Prefer not to Disclose

12. What is your age?

13. Which best describes your race/ethnicity?

    African-American
    Asian/Pacific Islander
    Caucasian
    Hispanic/Latino
    Multi-Racial
    Native American
    Prefer not to Disclose