

2018

The Impact of the School Counselor Supervision Model on the Self-Efficacy of School Counselor Site Supervisors

Carleton H. Brown

Arturo Olivárez Jr.

Lorraine DeKruyf

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gsc>



Part of the [Counseling Commons](#)

THE IMPACT OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR SUPERVISION MODEL ON THE SELF-EFFICACY OF SCHOOL COUNSELOR SITE SUPERVISORS

Supervision is a critical element in the professional identity development of school counselors; however, available school counseling-specific supervision training is lacking. The authors describe a 4-hour supervision workshop based on the School Counselor Supervision Model (SCSM; Luke & Bernard, 2006) attended by 31 school counselors from three southern U.S. school districts. Employing a pre-experimental pretest-posttest research design using the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey-revised (DeKruyf, 2011), the authors found a significant positive relationship ($t(30) = 9.31, p < .001$; Cohen's $d = 1.67$) between supervision training and supervisor self-efficacy. These findings bolstered the efficacy of the SCSM. The authors discuss research and practical implications of this study.

School counselors in training depend on site supervision for bridging the gap between theory and practice, and supervision is a critical element in the professional identity development of school counselors (DeKruyf, Auger, & Trice-Black, 2013; Magnuson, Black, & Norem, 2004, Studer & Oberman, 2006). Furthermore, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2016), the Supervision Best Practices Guidelines (Borders et al., 2014), and the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) Ethical Standards for School Counselors (2016) call for supervisors to be trained. Therefore, being properly trained and feeling effective at providing adequate supervision is imperative for school counselor site supervisors. However, supervisors are often untrained or have received supervision training that is insufficiently specific to school counselors' activities (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Ockerman, Mason, & Chen-Hayes, 2013). This is unfortunate, given that studies have shown that supervision training for site supervisors of interns in mental health settings can result in significant increases in supervisor self-efficacy (Bjornestad, Johnson, Hittner, & Paulson, 2014; Motley, Reese, & Campos, 2014). This dynamic is supported

Carleton H. Brown, Ph.D., is an assistant professor with the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Services at the University of Texas at El Paso. Email: chbrown@utep.edu **Arturo Olivárez, Jr., Ph.D.**, is a professor with the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations at the University of Texas at El Paso. **Lorraine DeKruyf, Ph.D.**, is a professor with the Graduate School of Counseling at George Fox University in Portland, Ore.

in DeKruyf and Pehrsson's (2011) study specific to school counseling site supervisors' self-efficacy in relation to supervision training. These researchers found that site supervisors with more than 40 hours of supervision training had higher supervisor self-efficacy than those with fewer hours of training. Among their recommendations was providing accessible and relatively brief school counselor site supervisor trainings focused on supervision content areas in which supervisors had reported lower self-efficacy ratings; these included models of supervision (See Borders & Brown, 2005, and DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011).

Clearly, site supervisor self-efficacy matters. Bandura (2001) described the concept of self-efficacy as critical to human functioning because "unless people believe that they can produce desired effects by their actions they have little incentive to act" (p. 10). In other words, people's beliefs that they can successfully engage in an action strongly impacts whether or not they will. A primary aim of providing supervision training is to increase site supervisors' self-efficacy and ability to provide competent supervision (Bjornestad et al., 2014; Spence, Wilson, Kavanagh, Strong, & Worrall, 2001). The current study compares the self-efficacy of school counseling site supervisors before and after supervision training using the School Counselor Supervision Model (Luke & Bernard, 2006).

The training of competent supervisors should include content on models of supervision (Borders et al., 2014). Supervision models are ideal frameworks that assist with "organizational context" and "societal and professional contexts" faced by supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014, p. 21). In their study on school counselor supervisors' perceptions of Bernard's (1979, 1997) Discrimination Model of supervision, Luke, Ellis, and Bernard (2011) empirically reasoned out the need for supervision training specific to school counseling based on study results suggesting only "partial similarities in the concep-

tual maps of school counselor and mental health counselor supervisors" (p. 328). A survey of the literature by Wood and Rayle (2006) similarly found that extant clinical supervision models were inadequate for a school counseling setting, indicating that existing models did not "directly reflect the roles that [school counselors in training]...will be expected to fulfill" (p. 253). Peterson and Deuschle (2006) focused on the contextual challenges of working in schools for nonteacher school counselors in training. This gives rise to unique supervision needs that have gone unmet with supervision models that are not school counseling specific.

SCHOOL COUNSELING SITE SUPERVISORS ARE OFTEN UNTRAINED OR HAVE RECEIVED SUPERVISION TRAINING THAT IS INSUFFICIENTLY SPECIFIC TO SCHOOL COUNSELORS' ACTIVITIES.

To address the deficit in supervision models that effectively meet the needs of school counselors in training, researchers have proposed several creative models. Wood and Rayle (2006) proposed the Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model, which focuses on the dimensions listed in its name. This model is intended to be practical, interactive, and used within a school counseling context. The authors acknowledged that this model is "primarily theoretical in nature" (p. 265) with more work needed to assess its effectiveness in practice. Another is the Peterson-Deuschle Model for Preparing Nonteachers (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). Their model, as its name suggests, more narrowly focuses on the supervision needs of future school counselors who have no teaching experience. Also more narrowly focused is the Integrative Psychological Developmental Supervision Model proposed by Lambie and Sias (2009). Its attention is on the psychological development of school counselors in training rather than on specific school

counselor activities. The authors provided no evidence of the model's effectiveness or usefulness, describing it rather as "researchable." The Change Agent for Equity supervision model proposed by Ockerman, Mason, and Chen-Hayes (2013) has a similar lack of empirical research. It incorporates the ASCA National Model (2005) in an effort to help site supervisors and counselors in training "foster a change agent identity" (Ockerman et al., p. 44). Swank and Tyson (2012) proposed a six-module, web-based training program for school counseling site supervisors with primary intent of making supervision training more accessible. Again, the authors

did not provide empirical evidence of the effectiveness of their approach. Luke and Bernard's (2006) School Counselor Supervision Model (SCSM) was built on Bernard's (1979, 1997) Discrimination Model, a researchable and useful framework for supervisors in deciding the type of role (teacher, counselor, or consultant) and skill focus (intervention, conceptualization, and personalization skills) that supervisors should undertake in performing their duties (Luke, Ellis, & Bernard, 2011; Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). To heighten its relevance for school counseling site supervisors, they incorporated Gysbers and Henderson's (2012) four ideal domains of a comprehensive school counseling program: (a) planning, coordination, and evaluation; (b) individual and group advisement; (c) counseling and consultation; and (d) large group intervention (Luke & Bernard, 2006). Movement through the steps of the SCSM framework begins with identifying which of the four comprehensive school counseling program

domains best matches a counselor in training's situation. Then, depending on the supervision need, site supervisors determine their supervisory role and the necessary skill focus. In outlining the research implications of their model, Luke and Bernard (2006) made clear the need to investigate the impact of the SCSM on site supervisors' self-efficacy.

Researchers have also indicated that site supervisors' supervision experience may impact both their supervision and their self-efficacy as a result of supervision training (Bjornestad et al., 2014; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Lazovsky & Shimoni, 2007; Motley et al., 2013). Although researchers have explored supervision experience as a possible factor interacting with supervision training, little has been written about how site supervisor's school grade level may impact the results of supervision training.

A PRIMARY AIM OF PROVIDING SUPERVISION TRAINING IS TO INCREASE SITE SUPERVISORS' SELF-EFFICACY AND THEIR ABILITY TO PROVIDE COMPETENT SUPERVISION.

The current study was conducted to empirically explore the impact of the SCSM on school counseling site supervisors' self-efficacy in providing supervision to school counselors in training, taking into account site supervisors' years of supervision experience and grade level. We sought to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Does training based on the SCSM have a significant impact on the supervision self-efficacy of site supervisors?
- 2) Does grade level (i.e., elementary, middle, high school) factor into a site supervisor's supervision self-efficacy after they receive training based on the SCSM?
- 3) Do years of experience factor into a site supervisor's supervision self-efficacy after they receive training based on the SCSM?

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a pre-experimental pretest-posttest research design (Houser, 2009) with institutional review board approval from the lead investigator's university. In conducting the research, the lead investigator provided supervision training with the SCSM (Luke & Bernard, 2006) as the main treatment, years of experience and school level assignment as the independent variables, postsurvey gain scores in self-efficacy as the dependent variable, and presurvey self-efficacy scores as the covariate.

Participants

The large majority of the participants were Latino/a/Hispanic (74.3%), female (80%), and ranged in age from 35 to 64. Of the participants, 35% represented the elementary school

had to meet the following criteria, which also qualified them for this study: (a) at least 3 years of experience as a licensed/certified school counselor, (b) approval of a campus supervisor, and (c) approval of a district supervisor. For the 2016-2017 academic year, School District A had 18 school counselors who met these criteria, but only three interns were available for site supervision; all three site supervisors of the three interns attended the training. In School District B, 10 school counselors met the criteria, and each was assigned an intern; of these counselors, eight attended the training, one was on extended leave, and one chose not to attend. In School District C, 22 school counselors met the criteria; five of these were not assigned interns for the fall 2016 semester, but in preparation for future interns, four of the five deemed it important to attend the training. Thus, 21 school counselors or site supervisors who were assigned an intern attended the training from School District C.

Overall, 32 of 50 members of the accessible population of school counselor site supervisors initially participated in the workshop. The workshop was offered twice in one day. Thirteen participants attended the first session of the workshop and 19 attended the second session. One first session participant left early and was omitted from the study, bringing the final total participant count to 31. This met sample size recommendations using an a priori power analysis that followed Cohen's (1988) convention. Power was set at 0.80, the alpha at 0.05, and a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = .5$) was expected.

Measure

Participants completed the Site Supervisor Self-Efficacy Survey-revised (S4-r; DeKruyf, 2011) immediately before and after a workshop using the SCSM. The revisions to the original S4 (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011) attended to all identified limitations evidenced in its first usage; most important, "clinical supervision" was more clear-

level, 26% represented the middle school level, 29% represented the high school level, and 10% of participants did not report their grade level. More than 65% reported no previous supervision training.

We recruited participants from across three school districts in a southern U.S. state. School District A enrolls up to 12,000 students annually and employed 30 credentialed school counselors for the 2016-17 academic year. School District B enrolls up to 45,500 students annually and employed 121 credentialed school counselors for the 2016-17 academic year. School District C enrolls up to 60,000 students annually and employed 159 credentialed school counselors during the 2016-17 academic year.

Among the counselors employed by these districts, only a select few were approved to become site supervisors for school counseling interns. They

ly operationalized to gain a more accurate response regarding participants' time spent in supervision training. The purpose of the survey is to assess the self-efficacy of site supervisors of school counselors in training. The S4-r has three parts and a total of 30 questions. The first part includes questions related to the self-efficacy of the site supervisors' supervision capabilities (items 1-15) measured on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from *needs development* to *expert*. The range of possible total scores for the self-efficacy scale was from 15 to 90. The second part includes questions related to site supervisors' clinical supervision training (items 16-21). Participants could fill in the number of hours of training they received in a variety of settings. For example, "In-service" (e.g., half day = 4 hours; 1 day = 8 hours). The third part of the survey covers participants' demographic information, including the number of years working as a school counselor and the number of interns supervised (items 22-30). The developers of the original S4 employed an expert panel and a pilot study in order to establish face and content validity (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). Examination of the internal consistency of the S4-r yielded Cronbach's alpha values of 0.97 (pre-intervention), 0.96 (post-intervention), and a test-retest reliability reflected by a Pearson product-moment correlation index of stability of 0.82 (DeVellis, 2016).

Procedure/Workshop Training

Before engaging in the 4-hour supervision workshop, the facilitator provided participants with consent forms, informed them about their participant rights, and gave an explanation of the study and training. The participants signed the consent forms and completed the S4-r as a presurvey. The workshop format included interactive, structured training based on significant aspects of effective supervision and a variety of approaches to pedagogy. These approaches included a Socratic discussion aimed at establishing a collective

definition of supervision, elaborating on the significance of supervision, and facilitating the understanding of important dynamics between site supervisors and school counselors in training. These dynamics included the working alliance, individual differences, evaluation, multicultural influences, anxiety or insecurity, resistance, parallel process, and dual roles (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders et al., 2014; Gibbs & Magnus, 2016). A facilitator-provided explanation of self-efficacy followed, with a brief overview of supervision models, including the SCSM (Luke & Bernard, 2006). In the next step, the facilitator/lead investigator modeled for participants how to use the SCSM before guiding participants through a real-case demonstration scenario. During the subsequent individual guided practice, participants completed a guidance practice form based on the SCSM and developed specifically for this workshop. This allowed them to chart their individual responses to a given scenario through the steps of the SCSM and compare these responses with those of the group as a whole. Next, small groups of participants devised their own scenarios and processed these scenarios through the SCSM without

guidance from the workshop facilitator. These were then reported back to the whole group, where the facilitator and participants answered additional questions. Participants communicated their impressions to the group and assisted each other in understanding the concepts and ideas presented earlier in the workshop and subsequently implemented in guided practice. After they had been given a chance to debrief and process their workshop

experience, the participants completed the S4-r again as a post-survey. The overall goal of the training was for school counseling site supervisors to internalize and utilize key concepts of supervision via the SCSM, and in so doing, increase their self-efficacy in providing supervision.

Data Analysis

We conducted data analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22. We used both descriptive and inferential tests of significance to examine the specific variables and constructs in this study. To explore the first research question, we used a *t* test for related or dependent samples as recommended by Gravetter and Wallnau (2013) to examine the mean gain/differences on self-efficacy scores (i.e., pre- and post-survey S4-r scores) due to the treatment. To explore research question two, a univariate analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to examine the overall self-efficacy outcome adjusted by the initial self-efficacy score responses (i.e., presurvey S4-r scores) across school/grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school). Similarly, for research question three, we used a univariate ANCOVA to determine mean postsurvey self-efficacy

THE OVERALL GOAL OF THE TRAINING WAS FOR SUPERVISORS TO INTERNALIZE AND UTILIZE KEY CONCEPTS OF SUPERVISION VIA THE SCSM, AND IN SO DOING, INCREASE THEIR SELF-EFFICACY IN PROVIDING SUPERVISION.

responses across supervisors' years of experience (i.e., Group 1, less than or equal to 10 years; Group 2, more than 10 years). We selected 10 years as the cutoff point for the groups because this allowed for a comparison between more equally sized groups and represented participants' median years of experience. Cohen's *d* was used to calculate the effect size (Cohen, 1988).

RESULTS

Relationship Between Supervision Training and Supervisor Self-Efficacy

A *t* test for related or dependent samples indicated a statistically and practically significant improvement ($t(30) = 9.31, p < .001$) in posttraining supervisor self-efficacy as indicated by the large effect size (Cohen's *d*) equaling 1.67. Supervision training explained 24% of the variance in self-efficacy. Power analyses and sample size estimation using G*Power 3.010 software indicated that these results satisfy the minimum values for at least a power of .80; furthermore, given the sample size of 31, the assumption of normality may be ignored (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2013). The *t* test for related samples used only one group of individuals who provided pre- and postsurvey scores derived from the same group of participants, thus the homogeneity of variances is typically not part of the assumptions required when using this statistical test (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2013). See Table 1 for descriptive statistics.

Relationship Between Grade Level and Supervisor Self-Efficacy

A univariate ANCOVA using presurvey scores as the covariate produced a significant covariate but yielded a nonsignificant result across the mean for the categorical variable of the three school levels, $F(2, 24) = 0.822, p > 0.10$. The homogeneity of variances assumption was met using Levene's test, $F(2, 25) = 0.327, p = 0.724$. The missing data (three participants did not provide grade level information) were deemed "ignorable" per Sterner's (2011) "missing completely at random" (p. 58) classification, and were not included in the final analysis.

Although not statistically significant, the postsurvey composite self-efficacy scores were higher for site supervisors serving interns at the middle school level than those serving elementary and high school interns. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the self-efficacy

TABLE 1 TOTAL COMPOSITE SELF-EFFICACY PRESURVEY, POSTSURVEY, AND DIFFERENCE SCORES

Measure	Self-Efficacy Total Scores				
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.
Presurvey	31	59.32	14.35	19.00	81.00
Postsurvey	31	73.18	10.78	35.00	90.00
Difference/Gain	31	13.86	8.29	- 5.00	32.00

TABLE 2 SELF-EFFICACY DIFFERENCE SCORES ACROSS SITE SUPERVISORS' SCHOOL GRADE LEVEL ASSIGNMENTS AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE GROUPS

Measure/Group	Self-Efficacy Total Scores				
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min.	Max.
Grade Level Difference/Gain					
Elementary	11	13.14	8.75	2.00	26.00
Middle	8	16.25	10.74	-5.00	32.00
High	9	13.25	6.88	4.00	25.00
Total	28	14.02	8.62	-5.00	32.00
Years of Experience Difference/Gain					
Less than 10 years	16	16.13	7.56	2.00	32.00
More than 10 years	13	11.54	9.17	- 5.00	25.00
Total	29	14.07	8.49	- 5.00	32.00

Note. Three participants did not provide grade level information. Two participants did not provide years of experience information.

score differences across site supervisors' school-level assignments.

Relationship Between Years of Supervisor Experience and Supervisor Self-Efficacy

To determine the relationship between years of supervisor experience and self-efficacy, we used a univariate ANCOVA with the presurvey overall responses as the covariate and a post-hoc dichotomized categorical variable for years of experience (i.e., Group 1, less than or equal to 10 years; Group 2, more than 10 years). The data met the homogeneity of variances assumption using Levene's test, $F(2, 27) = 1.53, p = 0.228$. Two participants did not provide years of experience information. These missing data

were deemed "ignorable" per Sterner's (2011, p. 58) classification, and were not included in the final analyses.

The procedure produced a significant covariate but yielded a nonsignificant result across the mean for the categorical variable relating to the two levels of experience, $F(1, 26) = 0.04, p > 0.10$. Although no statistically significant differences were obtained, the descriptive statistics did yield a visually distinguishable difference in the postsurvey score means between the two group levels in relation to their job experiences: site supervisors having less than 10 years of experience reported almost a 5-point difference in self-efficacy by the end of the workshop compared to site supervisors having more than 10

years of experience. See Table 2 for descriptive data.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated changes in the supervision self-efficacy of school counseling site supervisors in relation to supervision training based on the SCSM (Luke & Bernard, 2006), while taking into consideration both supervision experience and grade level. These findings show statistical and practical significance in participants' improved supervisor self-efficacy after receiving training in using the SCSM. The findings are consistent with the notion that school counseling site supervisors benefit from supervision training that takes into account the school counseling context (Luke & Bernard, 2006; Luke et al., 2011). Previous research has shown that school counseling site supervisors undergo little to no supervision training or, in some cases, receive training that primarily uses traditional supervision models associated with agency- or private practice-focused mental health supervision (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Page, Pietrzak, & Sutton, 2001; Studer & Oberman, 2006). The current study offers some indication of the positive impact supervision training using the SCSM can have on school counseling site supervisors' self-efficacy. We hope that school counselors in training may be more likely to enjoy a meaningful supervision experience when they are supervised by school counseling site supervisors who have acquired knowledge, understanding, and skill through training centered on the school counseling setting (Lazovsky & Shimoni, 2007). In so doing, school counseling interns may become better equipped for the expectations regarding school counseling positions.

Although our findings do not show any significant differences in self-efficacy scores in relation to the various grade levels served by site supervisors, overall self-efficacy scores at the middle school level were higher than those of supervisors at other levels.

Reasons for this difference are not readily apparent, but research has shown that middle school counselors tend to be the "most closely aligned with the goals" of a comprehensive school counseling program (Dahir, Burnham, & Stone, 2009, p. 189). Might the difference in scores with respect to grade level therefore be a reflection of this, given that the SCSM focuses on the common components of a comprehensive school counseling program? This may warrant further exploration.

THESE FINDINGS SHOW STATISTICAL AND PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE IN PARTICIPANTS' IMPROVED SUPERVISOR SELF-EFFICACY AFTER RECEIVING TRAINING IN USING THE SCSM.

We also did not observe any significant differences in the self-efficacy of school counseling site supervisors in relation to their years of supervision experience. Perhaps this is because, in spite of the years of supervision experience, the training content was nonetheless new. The lack of supervision training is well documented in the literature (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Page et al., 2001; Swank & Tyson, 2012), and significant content related to supervision exists—including content on supervision models—that school counseling site supervisors are unlikely to know unless they receive specific training (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). This may well explain why participants with much experience benefited from the training in this study just as much as participants with limited experience.

Limitations

The limitations of this study include the sample size, nonrandom selection, and voluntary participation of school counseling site supervisors in the training. Another limitation is the possibility of bias stemming from the lead investigator serving as the workshop facilitator. The sample size is considered small to moderate for

the population of counselors studied; nonetheless, the effect size was large, indicating support for the notion that supervision training utilizing small sample sizes has beneficial outcomes (McMahon & Simons, 2004; Motley et al., 2014). Furthermore, because district and campus supervisor approval was a requirement for becoming a site supervisor, school counselors not selected to be site supervisors might have responded differently than those selected. The study does not take into account the participants' cultural

and ethnic influences even though the representative sample used for this study included participants who were majority female and Hispanic. Readers would need to consider such information before generalizing findings of this study to a more culturally and ethnically diverse population. As always with survey research, dependence on self-reported responses could introduce a social desirability bias on the part of respondents wanting to appear capable. The use of more than one instrument might have provided richer data that could have been triangulated with the data gained from the S4-r, yielding greater reliability.

As is typical in survey research, not all participants answered all survey questions. However, upon closely examining these data and the participants' registration information, the researchers observed that district-level supervisors who did not work at a specific grade level or for whom counting years of experience could be challenging did not respond to those demographic items in spite of having "Other" as a survey response option on the S4-r. If that observation is accurate, the findings regarding the relationship between grade level and supervisor self-efficacy and between years of supervisor experience and supervisor

self-efficacy can perhaps receive greater trust. That said, this study did not provide potentially useful information regarding the self-efficacy of district-level school counseling supervisors. This is unfortunate and could perhaps be rectified by having specific district-level survey response options for those demographic items on the S4-r.

SCHOOL COUNSELING INTERNS MAY BECOME BETTER EQUIPPED FOR THE EXPECTATIONS REGARDING SCHOOL COUNSELING POSITIONS.

Face, content, and external validity for the S4 have been confirmed; however, construct validation data is still needed (DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011). This study's relatively small sample size ($N = 31$) prevented accurate statistical examination of the internal structure of the S4-r. Greater sample size would enable researchers to more rigorously establish the psychometric properties of the S4-r. Finally, the actual training format was perhaps both a limitation and a strength. Given its brevity (4 hours), the training focus was necessarily limited, and the facilitator/lead investigator only briefly touched on several key supervision topics, using the bulk of the training time to explain, model, and facilitate the practice of using the SCSM. This brevity could also be a strength in that it may have contributed to the training's accessibility for over-stretched school counseling site supervisors for whom it can be difficult to take time away from their sites.

Recommendations

The last decade has seen the development of several supervision models for use by school counseling supervisors. Few have undergone empirical testing regarding their impact on the self-efficacy or practice of school counseling site supervisors. This study, despite its limitations, offers a model for addressing this critical need in the school counseling supervision literature and in the field.

Future researchers may wish to replicate this study with a larger and more diverse sampling of site supervisors in order to arrive at conclusions that are more generalizable. A larger and more representative sample could also be used to establish accurate factor loading estimates for the S4-r. Following up with participants us-

ing a mixed-methods approach after workshops could help determine the long-term effect of supervision training on self-efficacy and actual supervision performance. Correlating actual supervision performance with initial self-efficacy scores could also help researchers gain a sense of other supervision content that would be beneficial to include in future required trainings.

A larger and more diverse sample might also assist with further exploration of the interaction among grade-level, the SCSM, and site supervisor self-efficacy. Does grade level affect supervisor self-efficacy? Does the supervision model used affect self-efficacy? Does the overlap between supervision model and school counseling practice affect supervisor self-efficacy? Answers to these questions could contribute to the fine tuning of supervision models and trainings for school counselor site supervisors. Further, a larger and more diverse sampling could shed light on the impact of culture and ethnicity on site supervisor self-efficacy.

Future researchers could also replicate this study using the face-to-face training materials developed and standardized for this study and compare outcomes with online training modules or webinars using training materials adapted for those platforms. Given the rise of both synchronous and asynchronous online training venues, this could provide valuable information regarding the efficacy of both face-to-face and online delivery methods.

A practical application could include master in school counseling programs and/or district school counseling supervisors replicating the accessible and brief training format used in this study to create other training modules that build on the foundation laid with the SCSM training. District-level school counselor supervisors could, independently or in collaboration with university programs, implement supervision trainings. Other supervision training content could be identified using the literature (see Borders & Brown, 2005; Borders et al., 2014; DeKruyf & Pehrsson, 2011; and Motley et al., 2014) and by interviewing or observing practicing site supervisors. This would be a positive step toward realizing ASCA's (2016) call for "supervisors [to] regularly pursue continuing education activities on... supervision topics and skills" in order that they might "have the education and training to provide clinical supervision" (ASCA, 2016, D.b). This could also better enable practicing school counselors to fulfill the ASCA (2012) School Counselor Competency IV-B-6c to understand and know "how to provide supervision for school counseling interns consistent with the principles of the ASCA National Model" (p. 158). Ongoing research that offers insights relating to school counseling training, supervision models, and site supervisor self-efficacy is likely to benefit counselor educators and site supervisors in the field, and, in turn, the school counselors in training with whom they work.

REFERENCES

- American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- American School Counselor Association. (2012). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

- American School Counselor Association. (2016). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1-26.
- Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 19, 60-68. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1979.tb00906.x>
- Bernard, J. M. (1997). The discrimination model. In C. E. Watkins, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 310-327). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Bjornestad, A., Johnson, V., Hittner, J., & Paulson, K. (2014). Preparing site supervisors of counselor education students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 53, 242-253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00060.x>
- Borders, L. D., & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 33, 26-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2014.905225>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs. (2016). *2016 CACREP standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.cacrep.org/for-programs/2016-cacrep-standards/>
- Dahir, C. A., Burnham, J. J., & Stone, C. (2009). Listen to the voices: School counselors and comprehensive school counseling programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 12, 182-192. <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.182>
- DeKruyf, L. (2011). Site supervisor self-efficacy survey-revised. Unpublished instrument.
- DeKruyf, L., Auger, R., & Trice-Black, S. (2013). The role of school counselors in meeting students' mental health needs: Examining issues of professional identity. *Professional School Counseling*, 16, 271-282. <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2013-16.271>
- DeKruyf, L., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2011). School counseling site supervisor training: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50, 314-327. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb01918.x>
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00001.x>
- Gibbs, K. A., & Magnus, V. A. (2016). Supervision as a developmental passage. In J. R. Studer (ed.), *A guide to practicum and internship for school counselors-in-training* (2nd ed., pp. 75-88). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2013). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Gysbers, N. C., & Henderson, P. G. (2012). *Developing and managing your school guidance program* (5th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Houser, R. (2009). *Counseling and educational research: Evaluation and application* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lambie, G. W., & Sias, S. M. (2009). An integrative psychological developmental model of supervision for professional school counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 87, 349-356. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00116.x>
- Lazovsky, R., & Shmoni, A. (2007). The on-site mentor of counseling interns: Perceptions of ideal role and actual role performance. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 85, 303-316. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2007.tb00479.x>
- Luke, M., & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An extension of the discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45(4), 282-295. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00004.x>
- Luke, M., Ellis, M. V., & Bernard, J. M. (2011). School counselor supervisors' perceptions of the discrimination model of supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50, 328-343. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb00124.x>
- 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.
- McMahon, M., & Simons, R. (2004). Supervision training for professional counselors: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 301-309. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2004.tb00005.x>
- Motley, V., Reese, M. K., & Campos, P. (2014). Evaluating corrective feedback self-efficacy changes among counselor educators and site supervisors. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 53(1), 34-46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00047.x>
- Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA National Model: The foundation for supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School Counseling*, 10, 289-296. <https://doi.org/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, 89-100. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb01220.x>
- Ockerman, M. S., Mason, E. C. M., & Chen-Hayes, S. T. (2013). School counseling supervision in challenging times: The CAFE supervisor model. *The Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 5, 44-57. <https://doi.org/10.7729/51.0024>
- Page, B. J., Pietrzak, D. R., & Sutton, J. M. (2001). National survey of school counselor supervision. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41, 142-149. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01278.x>
- Peterson, J. S., & Deuschle, C. (2006). A model for supervising school counseling students without teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 45, 267-281. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00003.x>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1375/bech.18.3.135>
- Sterner, W. R. (2011). What is missing in counseling research? Reporting missing data. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 89, 56-62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00060.x>
- Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA National Model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, 10, 82-87. <https://doi.org/10.5330/prsc.10.1.f82t14475451422m>

Swank, J. M., & Tyson, L. (2012). School counseling site supervisor training: A web-based approach. *Professional School Counseling, 16*, 40-48. <https://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n2012-16.40>

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. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00002.x>