2011

School Counseling Site Supervisor Training: An Exploratory Study

Lorraine DeKruyf
George Fox University, ldekruyf@georgefox.edu

Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson

School Counseling Site Supervisor Training: An Exploratory Study

Lorraine DeKruyf & Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson

This study explored the supervision training needs of site supervisors of master's program school counseling interns via the construct of self-efficacy. Using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey developed for this study, the authors surveyed school counseling site supervisors in the states of Oregon and Washington (N = 147) regarding their hours of supervision training and their supervisor self-efficacy. Results indicated that 54% of school counseling site supervisors had little or no counseling supervision training. Supervisor self-efficacy appeared to be relatively strong, consistently so for school counseling site supervisors with over 40 hours of supervision training. A partial correlation indicated a slightly positive relationship between the hours of supervision training received and perceived self-efficacy regarding supervision. Implications regarding school counseling site supervisor training and future research are offered.

Professional school counselors fulfill many responsibilities as outlined in the American School Counselor Association's (ASCA; 2003) National Model and the Education Trust's Transforming School Counseling Initiative (House & Hayes, 2002; Pérusse & Goodnough, 2001). These responsibilities include facilitating all students' academic, personal–social, and career development; promoting equitable access to rigorous educational opportunities for all students; collaborating with stakeholders (e.g., parents, teachers and other school staff, community members, and other mental health professionals) to provide developmentally appropriate prevention and intervention programs; and using data to systematically evaluate outcomes of the school counseling program's services.

Absent from this list of responsibilities is providing site supervision for master's-level school counseling interns. It is therefore not surprising that many school counselors have received little or no formal training in the area of counseling supervision (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002; Kahn, 1999; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Roberts, Morotti, Herrick, & Tilbury, 2001; Studer, 2005). Given that school counseling site supervisors are among the "most critical element[s] of optimal internship experiences that become the apex of a trainee's course of study" (Magnuson, Black, & Norem, 2004, p. 5), the apparent shortage of trained school counseling site supervisors is of concern, particularly when combined with indicators that trained supervisors provide better supervision (Borders,

Lorraine DeKruyf, Graduate Department of Counseling, George Fox University; Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson, Department of Teacher and Counselor Education, Oregon State University. Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson is now at College of Education, University of Nevada–Las Vegas. These data were previously published as part of a doctoral dissertation by Lorraine DeKruyf while at Oregon State University. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lorraine DeKruyf, Graduate Department of Counseling, George Fox University, 12753 SW 68th Avenue, #P510, Portland, OR 97223 (e-mail: ldekruyf@georgefox.edu).

Cashwell, & Rotter, 1995; Kahn, 1999; Spence, Wilson, Kavanagh, Strong, & Worrall, 2001).

The School Counselor Competencies (ASCA, 2008) recognized the critical role of site supervisors and called for school counselors to understand and know "how to provide supervision for school counseling interns" (III-B: Abilities and Skills, III-B-4-d.). This call is in accordance with relevant ethical codes (American Counseling Association, 2005; ASCA, 2004) and builds on the recognition of supervision as a unique endeavor (Dye & Borders, 1990) with distinctive skills (Magnuson, Norem, & Bradley, 2001). Furthermore, given the role conflict and role ambiguity cited in the school counseling literature (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005), there is a need for strong professional identity development in school counseling (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP]; 2009). School counseling site supervisors help shape interns' professional identity (Miller & Dollarhide, 2006) and are in key positions to nurture solid school counseling skills (Magnuson et al., 2001). Identifying and attending to the supervision training needs of site supervisors could augment the preparation of the next generation of school counselors and could foster "a consistent professional identity, improved service delivery consistent with the ASCA National Model, and a transformed profession" (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006, p. 243).

Although calls for site supervisor training have been made (Herlihy et al., 2002; Kahn, 1999; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Roberts et al., 2001; Steward, 1998), the question remains as to what the training needs of school counseling site supervisors are. Supervision standards and guidelines have been provided (Borders & Brown, 2005; Roberts et al., 2001; Studer, 2005, 2006; Supervision Interest Network of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [SINACES], 1990), but there are no studies that have examined the training needs of school counseling site supervisors of master's-level school counseling interns. To address this gap, the current study explored the training needs of school counseling site supervisors of master's-level school counseling interns in the states of Oregon and Washington. To this end, site supervisors' perceived self-efficacy regarding internship supervision was measured by the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey (S4), which was developed for this study.

Self-efficacy, a sense of oneself as capable of performing a given activity (Bandura, 1977, 1997), is not the equivalent of and does not ensure competence (Bandura, 1997; Steward, 1998). Nonetheless, according to Bandura (1997), one's sense of capability is a key factor in generating actual capability and strongly predicts subsequent behavior (Bandura, 1982). A 1982 study by Bandura, Reese, and Adams indicated that a high level of perceived capability, or self-efficacy, strongly predicted adept execution of a task; a low level of perceived self-efficacy strongly predicted less adept execution of a task or avoidance of it altogether). Counseling self-efficacy literature indicates that training interventions can have a positive impact on counseling self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Daniels & Larson, 2001; Larson et al., 1999; Romi & Teichman, 1995).

Haley (2002) also found this to be true with supervision training and supervisory self-efficacy among clinical and counseling psychology doctoral students.

The current study used the construct of supervisor self-efficacy to initiate exploration of the supervision training needs of site supervisors of master's program school counseling interns in Oregon and Washington. We investigated the following research questions: (a) How many hours of supervision training have current site supervisors of master's program school counseling interns in Oregon and Washington received? (b) How do current site supervisors of master's program school counseling interns rate their self-efficacy regarding supervision ability? and (c) What is the relationship between self-efficacy regarding supervision ability and hours of supervision training received for site supervisors of master's program school counseling interns in Oregon and Washington?

Method

Participants

The population of interest for this study included all current site supervisors of master's program school counseling students in Oregon and Washington. The preponderance of those who participated (N = 147) self-identified as European American/White (95%, n = 139) and female (76%, n = 111). Participants' mean age was 44 years and ranged from 25 to 65+ years. The highest percentage of participants (44%, n = 64) indicated that they provided supervision at the high school level, followed by middle school (32%, n = 47), and elementary school (30%, n = 44). In terms of school counseling experience, most participants worked full time as school counselors (98%, n = 144) for an average of approximately 12 years. Only 28% (n = 41) reported having ever worked part time, for an average of 1 year. The median number of interns supervised per participant was three.

Procedure

We used a two-stage method to recruit participants. The first stage involved contacting clinical or program directors of all but one of the programs for a master's in school counseling in Oregon and Washington to formulate a list of potential participants. Because of the first author's close affiliation with site supervisors connected with one program, that program was excluded from this study to avoid potential bias. This left 18 university programs from which to draw.

Three programs (representing 73 school counseling site supervisors) chose not to participate. These three university programs were similar in size, location, and degrees offered to more than one of the participating programs. No difference would therefore be expected between site supervisors for these programs and the participating programs.

Fifteen university programs participated—five were based in Oregon, where school counseling licensure/certification requirements include a 200-hour teaching practicum but not training in supervision, and 10 were in Washington, which has similar licensure/certification requirements,

but does not require a teaching practicum. Both CACREP-accredited and non-CACREP-accredited programs were represented in this study but were not differentiated in the data collection. We requested from the 15 participating university programs the names, schools, work e-mails, and work phone numbers of all current school counseling site supervisors of master's program interns. Collectively, the university programs' clinical or program directors provided a list of 180 current site supervisors of school counseling interns.

During the second stage of recruitment, we invited all members of this survey population (N = 180) to participate in the study. Accordingly, issues related to nonrandom sampling were not a concern (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2005). By including all members, this study also more than met sample size recommendations using power analysis that followed Cohen's (1988) convention. Power was set at 0.80, the alpha at 0.05, and a medium effect size was expected.

Dillman's (2007) tailored design method guided the online administration of the S4. A web-based format was deemed appropriate because most school counselors have access to and routinely work with computers and e-mail. All e-mails included a preassigned personal identification number to access the survey and for tracking purposes. Care was taken to personalize e-mails, and the final contact offered an attached Microsoft Word version of the S4 as an alternate participation format. Of the 180 invitations to respond to the S4, 147 completed surveys were submitted for a return rate of 82%.

Survey Instrument

The S4 was designed for this study to assess the supervisory self-efficacy of site supervisors of master's program school counseling interns and to determine the hours of supervision training these site supervisors received. It was kept short to minimize the time needed for participation from a busy population and includes three parts, with a total of 28 questions. Section 1 (Items 1–13) deals with self-efficacy regarding supervision ability, Section 2 (Items 14–19) asks for information about hours of supervision training, and Section 3 (Items 20–28) asks for demographic information.

The item pool for Section 1 (Items 1–13) was derived through careful review of the 11 Standards for Counseling Supervisors (SINACES, 1990), followed by a thorough review of all major topics and learning objectives listed under the seven core supervision training curriculum areas identified by Borders et al. (1991). All topics and objectives deemed specifically relevant for site supervisors of school counseling interns were tagged. This initial selection of objectives was informed by supervision guidelines offered to school counseling site supervisors by Roberts et al. (2001) and Studer (2006) as well as by the school-counseling-specific model of supervision offered by Wood and Rayle (2006). The tagged topics and objectives were then formed into potential survey items and eventually narrowed and refined to 12 items. These items were submitted to a panel of experts widely recognized in the field of supervision for their judgment regarding face and content validity. They affirmed face and content validity and suggested minor wording revisions as well as the addition of one item.

With the finalized 13 items (see Table 1 for the item topics), respondents were asked to rate their level of self-efficacy related to questions such as, "I am confident of my ability to describe the characteristics of the stages of development in interns" (Item 6) and "I am confident of my ability to describe the role of the professional school counselor within the framework of the American School Counseling Association's National Model" (Item 13). Respondents used a Likert-type scale ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*. This is in keeping with the scoring used on other self-efficacy scales (Larson et al., 1992; Sutton & Fall, 1995). Cronbach's alpha for the S4's self-efficacy items was 0.91, suggesting strong internal consistency for Items 1–13.

Section 2 of the survey (Items 14–19) asked participants to indicate the hours of supervision training received in various settings. Settings were in-service training, a state or national conference, training at the university of one's intern(s), a unit or module in a master's program course, a graduate-level course in supervision, and/or other. To aid respondents in judging the number of training hours, examples were provided, such as the following: one 50-minute workshop = 1 hour, half day = 4 hours, and three semester credits = 45 hours, three quarter credits = 30 hours. If applicable, for Item 19 (other), respondents were asked to list setting and hours. Responses to Items 14–18 were measured using continuous scales, with respondents selecting the number of hours for each of these settings. Responses to Item 19 (other) provided qualitative information. Section 3 (Items 20–28) of the S4 requested demographic information about respondents.

The S4 was piloted with a group of school counseling site supervisors who were not part of the survey population for this study. The pilot provided an opportunity to fix a faulty Internet link and established 6 to 8 minutes as the time needed to complete the survey.

TABLE 1

Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Ratings

Item	Topic	*n*	*M*	*SD*
1	Internship coordination	147	5.42	0.76
2	Needs, procedures, and policies	147	5.68	0.48
3	Individual differences	147	5.34	0.64
4	Elements of supervision models	144	4.87	0.91
5	Professional and ethical performance	145	5.65	0.56
6	Stages of development	145	4.61	1.10
7	Positive and negative feedback	146	5.40	0.65
8	Supervisory working alliance	145	5.12	0.76
9	Challenge and support	145	4.97	0.87
10	Relationship dynamics	145	4.88	0.83
11	Anxiety, perceptions, performance	145	5.19	0.71
12	Personal supervision model	146	5.14	0.91
13	Role within ASCA National Model	146	5.03	0.92
All	Total site supervisor self-efficacy	138	5.17	0.55

Note. ASCA = American School Counselor Association.

Results

Site Supervisor Training

The number of site supervisors' total supervision training hours (see Table 2) was dramatically skewed toward zero. Seventy participants (48%) indicated "none" in response to all the training settings listed. The most common training setting indicated was state or national conference (27%, n = 40), closely followed by in-service, selected by 39 respondents. The training setting least indicated was training at intern's university (12%, n = 18).

Qualitative data regarding supervision training were elicited from 52 respondents who listed "other" for supervision training hours and settings. For 32 of these 52 responses, other work experience was cited. For eight respondents, this other work experience consisted of school administration. A typical response was "I also have my Master's in School Administration so I have recieved [*sic*] supervision through that course work but none in school counseling supervision."

Several respondents categorized their school counseling and teaching experience as other work experience. Representative responses included the following: "I have been in education for over 30 years and feel competent to work with interns" and "I am a seasoned educator and counselor of 8 years. I use my teaching practice and education as a guide. I have received no formal training."

Other respondents cited work experience prior to their school counseling experience. This included supervisor experience as an assistant director of admissions in higher education, "20 years as a United States Army officer," training received at a "youth and family service agency," and "National Supervision of disaster mental health responders." One respondent listed "Leadership and personnel management seminars and 29 years experience in similiar [*sic*] roles," and another cited work in two university graduate programs, stating "I've supervised many interns in the past."

Site visits were cited by 12 respondents under the category other. One respondent stated, "The only 'training' I have received is in talking with University supervisors about what the expectations are for

TABLE 2

Site Supervisor Hours of Supervision Training per Setting

		Hours			
Training	***n***	***M***	***Mdn***	***SD***	**Range**
None	70	0.00	0.00		
In-service	39	2.68	0.00	6.15	0–24
State or national conference	40	2.98	0.00	6.48	0–24
Training at intern's university	18	0.62	0.00	2.54	0–24
Master's course unit/module	29	2.24	0.00	6.06	0–24
Graduate-level course in supervision	34	7.25	0.00	16.57	0–60
Total supervision training hours	147	15.78	1.00	26.90	0–127

Note. N = 147. Some participants responded to more than one item regarding training.

my role in supervising an intern. Usually have received some written description as well." Another wrote, "Met regularly with intern, intern coordinator, and myself to ask questions etc. regarding the internship experience. This was very helpful."

A few respondents mentioned modeling their supervision after the supervision they had received, with statements such as, "The only training I had was reflecting on my experience as an Intern and my mentors." "I have never been offered any sort of training" was a statement typical of seven respondents.

Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy

Participants' responses indicated relatively high supervisor self-efficacy. Mean scores were negatively skewed toward the upper *strongly agree* end of the 6-point Likert-type scale. See Table 1 for an overview of frequency data for Items 1 to 13. Because nine respondents did not answer all 13 self-efficacy items, we used listwise deletion when calculating a total site supervisor self-efficacy score. This deletion may have elevated the resulting mean scores for the items not answered by all respondents because it could be conjectured that respondents were more likely to skip items they were unsure of.

Relationship Between Supervisor Self-Efficacy and Supervisor Training

To determine the relationship between supervisor self-efficacy and supervisor training, we used a second-order partial correlation. Supervisor self-efficacy was operationalized as the total supervisor self-efficacy score from the combined results of S4 Items 1–13. Supervisor training was operationalized as the total hours from the combined training settings on the S4 (Items 14–18). The covariate of school counselor experience combined both part- and full-time hours (Items 24 and 25) because relatively few part-time hours were reported. The covariate of site supervisor experience (Item 26) was operationalized as the number of interns supervised. Table 3 provides a correlation matrix for these variables.

Skew calculated with Fisher's technique was evident in both supervisor training (2.19) and supervisor self-efficacy (–0.70). Miles and Shevlin (2001) cautiously suggested that skewness less than 1.00

TABLE 3

Correlation Matrix for Supervisor Training, Supervisor Self-Efficacy, School Counselor Experience, and Site Supervisor Experience Ratings

Variable	1	2	3	4	*M*	*SD*
1. Supervisor training	—	.23*	.02	.12	14.80	24.93
2. Supervisor self-efficacy		—	.11	.36**	5.17	0.55
3. School counselor experience			—	.44**	12.52	6.02
4. Site supervisor experience				—	3.68	3.35

Note. $n = 138$. Conventional effect sizes for r: ±0.1 = small, ±0.3 = medium, ±0.5 = large.
*$p < .01$ (one-tailed). **$p < .001$ (one-tailed).

should present little problem, skewness greater than 1.0 but less than 2.0 may affect parameter estimates, and skewness greater than 2.0 is of concern. Accordingly, these data, which depart from normality, must be viewed with caution. Furthermore, outliers with high numbers of supervisor training hours were detected, but we chose to include them because this study is descriptive in nature, and there was no theoretical reason to delete these data.

Although the resulting partial correlation ($r = .20$) was statistically significant at $p = .009$ (one-tailed), supervisor training accounted for only 4.08% of the variance in supervisor self-efficacy. According to Miles and Shevlin (2001), this falls between a small (±0.1) and medium (±0.3) correlation; therefore, its practical significance is limited.

Study Limitations

The results of this study should be viewed in light of its limitations. First, despite concerted effort, the accessible population of 253 was diminished to a survey population of 180. This loss of study participants is mitigated somewhat by the similarity of the nonparticipating university programs with the programs that did participate and is also offset by the high return rate of 82%. This is near the cutoff of 85% suggested by Lindner, Murphy, and Briers (2001) to determine that nonresponse error poses no threat to external validity. Nonetheless, generalizing these findings to university programs beyond Oregon and Washington should only be done after further research determines whether site supervisors outside of these states differ in their responses to the S4.

A second limitation becomes apparent when reviewing the qualitative responses regarding hours of supervisor training. Supervision training was not explicitly operationalized as clinical or counseling supervision training for Items 14 to 19 of the S4; therefore, 10 participants listed 577 hours of supervision training received as part of administrative course work or the administrative licensure process. If one corrects for this instrument error and deletes these training hours that are not specifically related to counseling supervision, the number of nontrained site supervisors increases to 54% ($n = 80$) of respondents who reported they had received no counseling supervision training; 46% ($n = 67$) reported receiving some counseling supervision training.

A third limitation inherent in all survey research is its dependence on self-report. Respondents, all engaged in providing supervision, may have felt the need to appear strong in their supervisor self-efficacy and may have inflated their self-efficacy ratings to increase the social desirability of their answers. A fourth limitation is the negative skew of the self-efficacy responses. This violates the assumption of a normal distribution, which can limit the possibility of finding accurate effects. A fifth limitation concerns the lack of construct validity for the S4. Although face and content validity were confirmed, there is a need for further validation data.

The brevity of the S4 is perhaps both a strength and a limitation. We curtailed the number of items on the survey out of respect for busy school counselors' limited time, which may have contributed to

the high return rate. However, this severe limiting of items also limits the detail available in the results and therefore the detail with which supervisor training needs may be understood via these results.

Discussion

Consistent with the literature (Herlihy et al., 2002; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Studer & Oberman, 2006), results of this study indicate that although some individuals have received considerable training in supervision, for many, training is limited. After correcting for respondents who listed hours of course work taken in pursuit of administrative licensure, we determined that over half the respondents reported no counseling supervision training. The number of training hours for each setting was heavily skewed toward zero, resulting in a median number of 0 hours for each training setting (see Table 2). For all settings combined, the median number of training hours was 1, with a dramatic skew toward zero.

Despite the absence of clinical or counseling supervision training for most participants, their supervisor self-efficacy appears to be relatively strong. However, respondents with more than 40 hours of reported supervision training consistently scored in the upper end of the scale, whereas respondents with fewer than 40 hours of supervision training reported a wider range of self-efficacy. This contrast gives credence to the importance of training for supervisors (Borders et al., 1995) and supports the tentative evidence found by Spence et al. (2001) suggesting that the training of clinical supervisors positively affected supervision practice.

Implications for Counselor Educators

Training importance. A first implication of this study's results for counselor educators focuses on the importance of supervision training. It is fair to ask, despite requirements outlined by CACREP (2001, 2009), whether counselor educators need to provide any site supervisor training at all given that responses for all S4 supervisor self-efficacy items were relatively high (see Table 1). It is our belief that they do.

First of all, the generally high self-efficacy scores reported by respondents are not that surprising. As Borders and Brown (2005) pointed out, "even untrained supervisors arrive at their first supervision session with a good bit of relevant training and experience" (p. 1). Training received to become a school counselor is certainly relevant to the task of supervising, as is teacher training. The S4 scores representing supervisor self-efficacy seem to reflect this.

Second, it is noteworthy that respondents with more than 40 hours of reported supervision training consistently scored in the upper end of the self-efficacy scale, whereas respondents with fewer than 40 hours of supervision training reported a wider range of self-efficacy. This suggests that more training in supervision (40+ hours) predicts a consistently higher sense of supervisor self-efficacy than less training (fewer than 40 hours) predicts. As Bandura et al. (1982)

established, high self-efficacy predicts more adept execution of a task. Counselor educators have a responsibility to ensure that their master's students are mentored by adept site supervisors. Supervision training opportunities for school counseling site supervisors must be provided.

Training content. A second implication for counselor educators speaks to curricular content areas (as outlined by Borders et al., 1991, and Borders & Brown, 2005) wherein school counseling site supervisors may benefit from supervisor training, namely (a) counselor development, (b) supervision methods and techniques, (c) the supervisory relationship, and (d) models of supervision. Providing more support for supervisor training in these areas is indicated by the four lowest mean scores of the S4 items that asked site supervisors to rate their supervisor self-efficacy in various areas (see DeKruyf, 2007, for a discussion of all S4 self-efficacy item mean scores).

The curricular content areas of counselor development and supervision methods and techniques are suggested by two S4 item scores. The first of these lower mean scores (4.61) is on describing the characteristics of the stages of development in interns (Item 6) and the second score (4.97) is on using both challenge and support interventions appropriate to interns' developmental stages (Item 9). Such interventions include confronting, managing resistance to assessment and goal setting, and various assessment techniques such as videotape review or live observation. School counselors' exposure to these assessment techniques may well be limited to having been on the receiving end of such techniques during their own internship experiences. Furthermore, consider the interplay that should exist between an intern's development in various areas and a supervisor's roles and tasks or functions. A high level of competence is called for on the part of the supervisor in tailoring interactions and interventions to supervisees' development (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007).

A third curriculum content area is the supervisory relationship. This area is suggested by the lower mean score (4.88, Item 10) on addressing relationship dynamics between supervisor and supervisee (e.g., power, parallel process, trust). Although the power differential inherent in the counselor–client relationship may receive coverage in theory courses, the important construct of parallel process is often first learned in courses specific to supervision.

A fourth curriculum content area that could be of benefit to school counseling site supervisors is models of supervision. This area is suggested by the lower mean score (4.87) on describing the elements of various models of supervision (Item 4). It is unlikely that untrained school counseling site supervisors would have had exposure to the literature on supervision models. Models offer a framework for supervision and can provide site supervisors with a clearer understanding of their roles, of the goals and foci of supervision, and of techniques for facilitating intern growth and change (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007).

In summary, supervision training that incorporates the four core curricular competency areas of counselor development, supervision

methods and techniques, the supervisory relationship, and models of supervision is needed. For coverage of all core curricular competency areas see Borders and Brown (2005).

Training opportunities. A third implication of this study's findings for counselor educators is that supervisor training opportunities must be accessible and relatively brief. The settings accessed most by study participants included training at state or national conferences and in-service training. Scheduling state, regional, or program-specific training opportunities on school district in-service days heightens the likelihood that school counseling site supervisors would participate. It should be noted that in-service days are limited, which calls for training modules that can be used in short blocks of time.

Furthermore, training opportunities should vary in location to ensure access throughout a region. Counselor educators can coordinate with one another, with district personnel, and/or with professional association conference planners to ensure well-planned and well-attended training sessions. Indeed, the new CACREP (2009) Standards mandate action on the part of counselor educators to provide "orientation, assistance, consultation, and professional development opportunities . . . to site supervisors" (Section 3.C.5.), who must have "relevant training in counseling supervision" (Section 3.C.4.).

It is also important not to minimize site visits because they are viewed by school counseling site supervisors as valuable connections that provide useful guidance. Counselor educators should maximize these visits as avenues for unofficial training or as boosters to more formal training.

Training requirements. A fourth implication of this study's findings is that state certification or licensing institutions should consider requiring supervision training as part of continuing education for school counseling site supervisors. Although 46% of the study participants reported receiving supervisor training, 54% did not. One could conjecture either that opportunities for training were absent or that available training options were not chosen by school counseling site supervisors. Continuing education requirements could encourage more school counselors to choose training in supervision. This training would be relevant not only for the site supervision of school counseling interns, but also for the supervision of practicing professional school counselors. The ASCA (2008) School Counselor Competencies call for trained school counseling site supervisors. The onus is on counselor educators to advocate for such at the state level.

Implications for Research

Much can be gained via quantitative survey research, although it is inherently limited by its items and its scales (Huck, 2008). A qualitative study could build on and enrich the picture provided by the current study. Use of a stratified sample that included both more and less experienced site supervisors would allow for differentiation between training needs for beginning site supervisors and for more experienced site supervisors.

Further refining of the S4 is also needed. One such refinement is clearer operationalization of the term *supervision* in a way that would more accurately gauge respondents' supervision training specific to counseling and school counseling. Such a refinement has its challenges. As Akos and Scarborough (2004) suggested, clinical supervision in a school counseling setting calls for an expanded definition that includes oversight of both direct and indirect service as well as administrative responsibilities. Internship site supervisors routinely engage in clinical, program, and administrative supervision, categories delineated elsewhere in the literature (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Nelson & Johnson, 1999). We maintain that respondents who have had training in supervision as part of school administration training, although undoubtedly possessing skills that transfer positively, may well be missing vital clinical supervision skills. They may also be missing essential program knowledge regarding the role of the professional school counselor (Leuwerke, Walker, & Shi, 2009). These issues warrant further exploration because such knowledge gaps for site supervisors may well impede the holistic development of an intern's professional school counseling identity (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Studer, 2005), which in turn may have an impact on the services provided to a school community.

Other revisions that could strengthen the S4 would be to include parenthetical clarifiers (e.g., bonds, tasks, goals) for terms such as s*upervisory working alliance* so that their intended meaning will be clearly conveyed. Also, dividing Item 7 into separate questions—one asking about providing interns with positive feedback, the other about negative feedback—would provide more specific information without sacrificing the intentional brevity of the S4.

Further construct validation is also needed for the S4. This validation could be accomplished via an exploratory factor analysis of the self-efficacy items. In addition, use of a revised S4 in another geographical region could strengthen the external validity of this study's findings and also contribute to reliability data for the S4. Results from additional studies could further inform those in positions to equip school counseling site supervisors for their critical work. Continuing research that examines the relationship between supervisor self-efficacy and supervisor performance is also needed. This could perhaps be achieved via direct observations by trainers and/or supervisees of supervisors.

References

Akos, P., & Scarborough, J. L. (2004). An examination of the clinical preparation of school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44,* 96–107.

American Counseling Association. (2005). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2003). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2004). *Ethical standards for school counselors*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association. (2008). School counselor competencies. *ASCA School Counselor, 45,* 64–73. Retrieved from http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/SCCompetencies.pdf

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191–215.
Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122–147.
Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York, NY: Freeman.
Bandura, A., Reese, L., & Adams, N. E. (1982). Microanalysis of action and fear arousal as a function of differential levels of perceived self-efficacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,* 5–21.
Barret, R. L., & Schmidt, J. J. (1986). School counselor certification and supervision: Overlooked professional issues. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 26,* 50–55.
Borders, L. D., Bernard, J. M., Dye, H. A., Fong, M. L., Henderson, P., & Nance, D. W. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: Rationale, development, and implementation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31,* 58–80.
Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Borders, L. D., Cashwell, C. S., & Rotter, J. C. (1995). Supervision of counseling licensure applicants: A comparative study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 35,* 54–69.
Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2001). *2001 standards.* Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2001%20Standards.pdf
Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). *2009 standards.* Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards.pdf
Culbreth, J. R., Scarborough, J. L., Banks-Johnson, A., & Solomon, S. (2005). Role stress among practicing school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 58–71.
Daniels, J. A., & Larson, L. M. (2001). The impact of performance feedback on counseling self-efficacy and counselor anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41,* 120–130.
DeKruyf, L. (2007). Training needs of school counseling site supervisors in the Pacific Northwest: An exploration via the construct of self-efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 68*(07A), 2825. (UMI No. 3276923)
Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 242–252.
Dye, H. A., & Borders, L. D. (1990). Counseling supervisors: Standards for preparation and practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69,* 27–32.
Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., & Borg, W. R. (2005). *Applying educational research: A practical guide* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
Haley, S. J. (2002). The influence of supervision training on supervisor self-efficacy among doctoral interns at university counseling centers. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B. Sciences and Engineering, 62*(7-B), 3378. (UMI No. AAI3022046)
Herlihy, B., Gray, N., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 6,* 55–60.
House, R. M., & Hayes, R. L. (2002). School counselors: Becoming key players in school reform. *Professional School Counseling, 5,* 249–256.
Huck, S. W. (2008). *Reading statistics and research* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
Kahn, B. B. (1999). Priorities and practices in field supervision of school counseling students. *Professional School Counseling, 3,* 128–136.
Larson, L. M., Clark, M. P., Wesley, L. H., Koraleski, S. F., Daniels, J. A., & Smith, P. L. (1999). Video versus role plays to increase counseling self-efficacy in prepractica trainees. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38,* 237–248.
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,* 105–120.

Leuwerke, W. C., Walker, J., & Shi, Q. (2009). Informing principals: The impact of different types of information on principals' perceptions of professional school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 12,* 263–271.
Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 42,* 43–53.
Magnuson, S., Black, L. L., & Norem, K. (2004). Supervising school counselors and interns: Resources for site supervisors. *Journal of Professional Counseling, Practice, Theory, & Research, 32,* 4–15.
Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Bradley, L. J. (2001). Supervising school counselors. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Eds.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (3rd ed., pp. 207–221). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner-Routledge.
Miles, J., & Shevlin, M. (2001). *Applying regression and correlation: A guide for students and researchers.* London, England: Sage.
Miller, G. M., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2006). Supervision in schools: Building pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 296–303.
Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA National Model: The foundation for supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School Counseling, 10,* 289–296.
Nelson, M. D., & Johnson, P. (1999). School counselors as supervisors: An integrated approach for supervising school counseling interns. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39,* 89–100.
Pérusse, R., & Goodnough, G. E. (2001). A comparison of existing school counselor program content with the education trust initiatives. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41,* 100–110.
Roberts, W. B., Morotti, A. A., Herrick, C., & Tilbury, R. (2001). Site supervisors of professional school counseling interns: Suggested guidelines. *Professional School Counseling, 4,* 208–215.
Romi, S., & Teichman, M. (1995). Participant and symbolic modelling training programmes: Changes in self-efficacy of youth counsellors. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 23,* 83–94.
Spence, S. H., Wilson, J., Kavanagh, D., Strong, J., & Worrall, L. (2001). Clinical supervision in four mental health professions: A review of the evidence. *Behaviour Change, 18,* 135–155.
Steward, R. J. (1998). Connecting counselor self-efficacy and supervisor self-efficacy: The continued search for counseling competence. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26,* 285–294.
Studer, J. R. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training: A guide for field supervisors. *Professional School Counseling, 8,* 353–359.
Studer, J. R. (2006). *Supervising the school counselor trainee: Guidelines for practice.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA National Model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 10,* 82–87.
Supervision Interest Network of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (1990). Standards for counseling supervision. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 69,* 30–32.
Sutton, J. M., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73,* 331–336.
Wood, C., & Rayle, A. D. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals, functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45,* 253–266.