University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations

Dissertations and Theses

The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselors' Perceptions of Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

Reshelle C. Marino
University of New Orleans, rcruiz@my.uno.edu

Recommended Citation

The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselors' Perceptions of
Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Counselor Education

by

Reshelle Catherine Marino

B.S., Southeastern Louisiana University, 1998
M.Ed., University of New Orleans, 2008

December 2011

ii

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Joe, whose unconditional love has carried me through this process. Your immeasurable support and understanding helped me reach this dream. Thank you for always being my anchor.

And to my mother, who has instilled in me the love of learning. Thank you for setting high expectations of me since I was a little girl. You have provided me with a strong background in which to pursue my educational goals. Thank you for always believing in me, supporting and encouraging me, and for being the best editor in the world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Despite the vast array of research evidence supporting supervision as a necessary component of the professional identity development of counselors, many counselors in training do not receive adequate supervision (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001). The school counseling profession has continued to struggle with the development of a widely recognized and consistent professional identity (Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002). Although there are many supervision models provided in the counseling literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008), there are not any consistently agreed-upon supervision models specific to the training of school counselors.

The purpose of this research was to evaluate school counselors' perceptions of their preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness related to specialization-specific supervision (SSS). School counselors from ASCA's southern region were asked to respond to the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)*. The findings of this study demonstrated that school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision felt better prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position, had a stronger sense of their professional identity, and expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not. These results support the conclusions of previous research, which indicated that supervision serves the following purposes: varies from discipline to discipline (Campbell, 2000); is a vital component of school counselor training (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008); is a conduit for professional identity development (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006); and is a contributing factor to the overall supervisory experience (Lazovsky & Shimon, 2005).

Supervision, School Counseling, Specialization-Specific Supervision, Perceived Preparedness, Perceived Professional Identity, Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

Chapter 1

Introduction

Supervision at the master's level is a significant factor and critical component in the professional training and development of counselors (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2008; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Gazzola & Theriault, 2007; Hart & Nance, 2003; Nelson & Johnson, 1999; Somody, Henderson, Cook, & Zambrano, 2008). Supervision for counselors can be traced to Freud and remains an important concept in the counseling profession (Gazzola & Theriault, 2007). The goal of supervision is to ensure that no harm occurs, and that useful and appropriate treatment is provided to the client (Milliren, Clemer, & Wingett, 2006). Correspondingly, a vast amount of literature supports the contention that supervision is the main conduit for counseling trainees to develop a professional identity (e.g., Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss, 2010; Harris, 2009; Henderson, Cook, Libby, & Zambrano, 2007; Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Nelson & Jackson, 2003; Preez & Roos, 2008; Studer, 2006; Wiley & Ray, 1986) ultimately leading to one's preparation and professional growth (Devlin, Smith, & Ward, 2009).

In particular, Dollarhide and Miller (2006) reported that there is a crucial connection between supervision and the professional identity of school counselors. Because school counseling programs have been undergoing transformations nationally as part of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) *National Model*, they emphasized that supervision should be conducted in a manner closely aligned with the transformed roles of 21st century school counselors in order to ensure a clear and consistent professional identity for school counselors in training.

According to Studer (2006), professional identity is an ongoing process that is initiated when a school counseling trainee enters into a graduate program, which is further defined in supervision, and continues to evolve throughout one's career. Professional identity has been defined as encompassing the following themes: (a) self-labeling as a professional; (b) integration of skills and attitudes as a professional; and (c) a perception of context in a professional community (Gibson et al., 2010). One's professional identity is a framework from which one carries out a professional role, makes significant professional decisions, and develops into a competent professional (Brott & Myers, 1999). Despite the vast array of research evidence supporting supervision as a necessary component of the professional identity development of counselors, many counselors in training do not receive adequate supervision (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001). Not only has the school counseling professional identity been a problem for educators and members in society, but mainly for school counselors themselves (Studer, 2006). In general, the school counseling professional continues to struggle with the development of a widely recognized and consistent professional identity (Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002).

Lazovsky and Shimon (2005) have suggested that a supervised school counseling experience is an important and rewarding component of trainees' preparation, and because the duties and roles of school counselors are numerous and varied, supervisees need supervision models that are comprehensible, concise, realistic, and provide concrete direction in the supervision process (Nelson & Johnson, 1999). Paisley and Borders (1995) contended that a school counselor's role continues to be explicitly or implicitly defined by several individuals, few of whom have any background or experience in school counseling and who often provide somewhat contradictory direction. "Defining the school counselor's role within a school, aligning with current trends in education, and becoming visible among stakeholders as an

essential component of a student's education are all effective tools in advocating for the school counselor profession" (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2010, p. 54).

However, many changes have occurred in the preparation of school counselors within the last decade (Guiffrida, 2005); thus, being unfamiliar with the professional school culture can hinder trainees' experiences (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Somody et al., 2008). For instance, Paisley and Borders (1995) have suggested that school counseling is an evolving specialty and continues to evolve as a result of social, educational, political, and economic trends. They suggested that the first school guidance programs appeared in the late 1800s and closely resembled vocational education. Similarly, Paisley and McMahon (2001) summarized that school counseling preparation was originally shaped by the social reform movement during the late 19th century and has evolved from a career focus and moral development into a comprehensive, developmental, and collaborative program. "The focus and scope of school counseling programs have changed from vocational and educational decision making, to personal growth, to responsive services for special at risk populations, to developmental programs available for all students" (Paisley & Borders, 1995, p. 150).

Since then, school counselors have been asked to pay special attention to the academic domain by considering their contribution to educational experiences and outcomes for all students and to align counseling initiatives to the overall mission of the school (Paisley & Hayes, 2003). Most recently, the *National Standards for School Counseling Programs* (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) adopted by ASCA have outlined a balanced approach to school counseling, including support for student development in three domains: academic, career, and personal/social. Paisley and McMahon (2001) stated the following:

Programs based on the National Standards employ several intervention strategies, including individual counseling; small group counseling; classroom interventions; consultation with parents, teachers, and outside agencies; and coordination of certain related whole school activities; build partnerships and teams within and outside of the school; be a member of school leadership and policy-making groups; provide individualized, focused, and intensive interventions for at-risk students; be the developmental specialist in the school setting; be the mental health specialist in the school setting; provide family counseling interventions; coordinate school-wide programs including peer helping, peer mediation, conflict resolution, violence prevention, character education, and teacher advisory programs; prevent suicides, pregnancies, dropouts, drug use, and general moral decay; and maintain the necessary levels of expertise in all of the above areas to ensure quality in all interventions and programs (p. 2).

Due to the aforementioned historical changes and numerous duties within the school counseling specialty, school counselors have assumed varied roles and have consequently adopted an ambiguous role definition (Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Hence, within a school, the systems of parents, students, teachers, and administration could become overlooked in supervisory discussions, and the traditional focus on therapeutic skills might not provide the holistic and system strategies that facilitate a professional school counseling identity (Luke & Bernard, 2006). The cookie-cutter approach (i.e., treating all supervisees the same) could lead to narrowing experiences of counselor training (Gazzola & Theriault, 2007). Paisley and McMahon (2001) have suggested that school counselors face a complexity of issues related to role definition -- increasingly diverse student populations, an increasing reliance on technology, calls for accountability within educational systems, and school counselors are neither being

prepared nor utilized in ways that best meet the needs of all students. Therefore, without adequate supervision of advanced needs of 21st century school counselors, individuals may enter their first position as a professional school counselor without a sense of focus or identity (Devlin et al., 2009).

Historically, several debates have occurred regarding the central identity of professional school counselors (Paisley, Ziomek-Daigle, Getch, & Bailey, 2007). In fact, ASCA recently has made a paradigm shift to more sharply define the professional identity of school counselors. This shift has led to the creation of the ASCA *National Model*, which is a comprehensive and developmental model that focuses on the entire school to assist all students academically, socially, and emotionally (Blakely, Underwood, & Rehfuss, 2009). The ASCA *National Model* (2005) was developed to address the role of the transformed school counselor in assisting all students' needs in the 21st century. The four components of the ASCA *National Model* (2005) are foundation, delivery, management, and accountability. "The model provides a mechanism with which school counselors and school counseling teams will design, coordinate, implement, manage, and evaluate their programs for students' success" (Paisley & Hayes, 2003, p. 202). Lambie and Williamson (2004) further suggested that ASCA's initiative of developing a model has provided the school counseling profession with development strategies, research, resources, and advocacy promoting the profession's identity. However, for school counselors in training, a lack of qualified supervisors has been a concern (Herlihy et al., 2002), and still remains a concern (Blakely et al., 2009) both at the university and field placement level (Studer, 2005).

Conceptual Framework

Supervision at the master's level is a significant element and central component in the professional training and development of counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Despite the

vast array of research evidence supporting supervision as a necessary constituent of the professional identity development of counselors, many counselors in training do not receive adequate supervision (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001). "Competencies required of different professions vary greatly from discipline to discipline, and differences abound regarding models of change, conceptualization of problems, intervention methods, and skills required in each particular setting" (Campbell, 2000, p. 251). However, Bernard's (2008) discrimination model for supervisors is a widely accepted model that has been utilized in the supervision of mental health professionals, and school counselors alike (Luke & Bernard, 2006). Ascribing to Bernard's model would entail acting as a teacher, consultant, and counselor throughout different phases of the supervision process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Because supervisors tend to begin supervision from a teaching role (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), providing high support and high direction (Hart & Nance, 2003), it appears it would be beneficial if supervisors had experience in the school counseling profession to teach the multiple roles and levels of complexity involved in school cultures that extend far beyond the traditional counseling skills. It has been a topic discussed in the literature (Paisley & Borders, 1995) that there are supervisors in the field of counseling who do not have experience as a school counselor, yet they supervise school counselors in training. Campbell (2000) has been one of the only authors who have referenced setting-specific supervision. Research is lacking to support or refute the need for specialization-specific experience prior to acting in a supervisory role. Thus, this study will fill the gap in the literature by exploring -- Is school counselor supervision less adequate if the supervisor has not had experience in school settings?

However, in order to further develop a conceptual framework within which to understand the importance of adequate preparedness, identity, and supervision for the professional

development of school counselors in training, it is essential to explore in further detail the following: individual and collective tenets of the Council for Accreditation in Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), school counselor supervision, professional identity, ASCA, ASCA *National Model,* ethical considerations for school counseling supervisors, and the transformed identity of 21st century systemic school counselors. The aforementioned topics interrelate to conceptually frame the importance of this study.

Training

The accrediting body most closely associated with the counseling profession and most reflective of the knowledge and skills related to school counseling is CACREP (Paisley & Borders, 1995). CACREP standards represent the most thorough regulating parameters for school counseling preparation programs and distinguish school counseling as a specialty area of the profession (Paisley & Borders, 1995). Graduate students in school counseling programs are expected to be knowledgeable in the following core counseling areas associated with CACREP accreditation: (a) professional identity and orientation; (b) social and cultural diversity; (c) human growth and development; (d) career development; (e) helping relationships; (f) group work; (g) assessment and evaluation; and (h) research and program evaluation (Paisley et al., 2007). Content areas and course work specifically outlined by CACREP "provide the foundational knowledge base for the counseling portion of the dual roles associated with school counselor identity development" (Paisley et al., 2007, p. 4).

According to CACREP (2009), master's level school counseling trainees must complete a 100-hour practicum and a 600-hour internship in a school setting. The main purpose of the practicum experience is to develop and refine counseling skills (Studer, 2005), while the internship experience provides the school counselor in training with the opportunity to perform a

variety of school counselor-related activities intended to reflect the comprehensive work experience of a professional school counselor (CACREP, 2009). CACREP has also noted that both the practicum and the internship are avenues for the counselor in training to develop a heightened sense of professional identity. A component of practicum/internship is supervision, which aims to improve direct service delivery and provide specific intervention services and counseling skills in the area of guidance curricula, counseling, consultation, and referral (Studer, 2005).

For school counseling trainees to successfully navigate through the required clinical hours and be endorsed into the professional field of counseling, they must receive two and one half hours of supervision per week consisting of: (a) weekly interaction that averages one hour per week of individual and/or triadic supervision throughout the practicum by a program faculty member, a doctoral student supervisor, or a site supervisor who is working in bi-weekly consultation with a program faculty member in accordance with the supervision contract; and (b) an average of one and one-half hours per week of group supervision that is provided on a regular schedule throughout the practicum by a program faculty member or a student supervisor. It is significant to note that when counseling programs offer the doctorate degree, the individual and group university level supervisors are most often doctoral-level students training to become counselor educators (e.g., University of New Orleans).

Regarding supervisors, CACREP (2009) standards require that students serving as individual or group practicum student supervisors must meet the following requirements: (a) have completed a master's degree, as well as counseling practicum and internship experiences equivalent to those in a CACREP-accredited entry-level program; (b) have completed or are receiving preparation in counseling supervision; and (c) be supervised by program faculty with a

faculty-student ratio that does not exceed 1:6. Most doctoral students are paired with master's students according to the availability of schedules (Hart & Nance, 2003), and not necessarily according to their program specialization (i.e., mental health, school counseling, etc.). The university-level individual supervisor, whether a faculty member or doctoral student supervisor, typically assumes responsibility for the supervisee, and is a critical factor in the students' overall learning experience in practicum/ internship (Kaufman & Schwartz, 2003).

CACREP (2009) further requires that site supervisors have the following qualifications: (a) a minimum of a master's degree in counseling or a related profession with equivalent qualifications, including appropriate certifications and/or licenses; (b) a minimum of two years of pertinent professional experience in the program area in which the student is enrolled; (c) knowledge of the program's expectations, requirements, and evaluation procedures for students; and (d) relevant training in counseling supervision. If a professional school counselor is not available to supervise the school counselor in training, then supervision is commonly provided by another mental health professional, such as a school psychologist or social worker, who lacks specific training in the role and competencies of a transformed school counselor (Studer, 2005).

Supervision

Bernard and Goodyear (2008) defined supervision as,

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession (p. 8).

Britton, Goodman, and Rak (2002) suggested that effective delivery of useful supervision training remains complex and difficult to deliver. However, supervisors who feel confident in their warmth, friendliness, and supportiveness are likely to view the supervisory relationship as mutual and trusting, and have a positive agreement with trainees on the specific tasks and goals of the supervision process (Bradley, 1989; Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). Supervision is viewed as a developmental process, in which supervisees have different needs at different developmental levels (Jordan, 2006). Several authors (e.g., Borders & Leddick, 1987; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Gazzola & Theriault, 2007; Hart & Nance, 2003) have studied how a supervisor's style or approach affects the supervisory relationship. It could benefit supervisors to adopt varied (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005) and flexible supervision styles (Milne & Oliver, 2000) to meet the needs of all counselors in training.

The professional literature suggests that the supervisees' developmental level of experience as a counselor is a factor that can influence the supervisory experience for both the supervisor and supervisee (e.g., Chagnon & Russell, 1995; Gazzola & Theriault, 2007; Jordan, 2006; Ladany et al., 2001; Walsh, Gillespie, Greer, & Eanes, 2002). Additionally, Jordan (2006) found that clinical and supervisory experience was key in a novice supervisee's professional identity, especially the supervisor's willingness to take risks in supervision. Furthermore, the supervisees in Jordan's study believed that the supervisor's amount of experience was significant in their ability to provide quality supervision. The participants stated, "I believe experience is important when dealing with the challenges of working with a diverse client population;" "I could never trust somebody's clinical judgment if they have not done therapy for some time;" and "Not just for training but also liability purposes do I not trust a supervisor who has only limited experience" (Jordan, 2006, p. 48).

While style, experience, supervisory working alliance (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990; Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999; Ladany & Friedlander, 1995; Mena & Bailey, 2007; Shulman, 2005; Sterner, 2009), and supervisors' theoretical orientation (Milliren et al., 2006; Putney, Worthington, & McCullough, 1992; Walsh et al., 2002) have been noted to have an impact on the supervisory experience, little research has been conducted to examine the effect of specific experiential settings on the supervisory experience.

Bernard and Goodyear (2008) presented several supervision models in their textbook, including those grounded in psychotherapy theory, developmental approaches to supervision, and social role models. All of the models they presented exist, independent of specialization-specific knowledge and experience. They deemed that "The supervisory relationship is a product of the uniqueness of two individuals, embedded within the process of supervision and modified by the demands of the various contexts within which supervision occurs" (p. 101). Similarly, Bradley (1989) identified behavioral models, integrative models, systems models, and person-process models of supervision, all of which are designed to work with supervisees regardless of specialization-specific experience. In a similar vein, Britton et al. (2002) developed a didactic-theoretical-experiential model of supervision training to be used in a workshop format, again without specialization-specific experience of the supervisor. Moreover, Milliren et al. (2006) discussed supervision in the style of Alfred Adler, whereby supervisees meaningfully reconstruct counseling experiences so that problem-solving interventions can be generated, and strengths can be encouraged. These authors did not mention any importance of specialization-specific experience as a factor in providing supervision.

All of the aforementioned authors posited supervision models that can be viewed as effective methods for supervisors; however, none of the models mentioned schools as a variable

in the development of the models. Few proposed school counselor supervision models exist (Luke & Bernard, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Wood & Rayle, 2006), however, none have been tested empirically or widely ascribed to in the school counseling field.

Professional Identity

Professional identity has been defined as encompassing the following themes: (a) self-labeling as a professional; (b) integration of skills and attitudes as a professional; and (c) a perception of context in a professional community (Gibson et al., 2010). One's professional identity is a framework wherein one carries out a professional role, makes significant professional decisions, and develops into a competent professional (Brott & Myers, 1999). According to Remley and Herlihy (2010),

> Individuals who have a clear sense of their professional identity can easily explain the philosophy that underlies the activities of their professional group, describe the services their profession renders to the public, describe the training programs that prepare them to practice their profession, explain their qualifications and the credentials they possess, and articulate the similarities and differences between members of their own profession and other similar groups (p. 24).

"Professional identity is a nebulous concept, but vital to the long-term success of a profession" (Remley & Herlihy, 2010, p. 24), and is currently at the forefront of national awareness within the counseling profession (Gibson et al., 2010).

According to Busacca and Wester's (2006) study on career concerns of master's-level community and school counselor trainees, nearly 83% of participants reported that their professional development was a concern and was of considerable importance to their training. Several authors (Harris, 2009; Studer, 2006; Wiley & Ray, 1986) have suggested that the

development of one's professional identity is not constant, rather, "It is a dynamic process, and one in which personal experiences of role, relationships and structure are storied in a larger narrative of individuals' lives within a specific situation" (Harris, 2009, p. 178), informed by graduate-level training (Nelson & Jackson, 2003), and then tested throughout work experiences (Henderson et al., 2007). In light of the literature, it could be argued that it would be difficult for non-school counselor supervisors to truly understand the professional identity of professional school counselors in the 21st century and, that therefore, they would have difficulty when supervising school counselor interns on issues of professional identity.

Noteworthy in counseling literature has been the concept of students developing a professional identity through the training process (du Preez & Roos, 2008). However, to clearly conceptualize school counselor professional identity, it is vital to review the historical changes that the school counseling profession has experienced, and the discrepancies between their own and others' perceptions of the school counselor's role (Henderson et al., 2007).

Lambie and Williamson (2004) described the historical changes of the school counseling profession and suggested that during the early 1900s, the focus of the school counselor's role was on vocational guidance, assessment, and academic placement. Around 1950, the main focus was on providing personal and social counseling services while promoting students' holistic development. About 1975, the focus changed to special education services, consultation, coordination, and accountability duties. Currently, the focus is addressing all students' academic, personal/social and career development (ASCA, 2005). Due to the many aforementioned historical changes, it seems realistic to expect that professional school counselors struggle with the concept of professional identity. In fact, in a recent study on the duties performed by school counselors, Perera-Diltz and Mason (2008) found that school

counselors at all building levels engage in both profession endorsed and non-endorsed duties with some variation existing among the building levels. Moreover, Dollarhide and Miller (2006) have suggested that school counseling is undergoing a paradigm shift with respect to the initiatives of ASCA and the professional school counselor identity movement in order to enhance the clarity of school counselor roles and functions.

American School Counselor Association (ASCA)

The professional identity of school counselors has further been informed by ethical and professional standards established by ASCA and the ASCA *National Model* (2005). ASCA (2009) defined the role of the professional school counselors as,

> Certified/licensed educators with a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling, making them uniquely qualified to address all students' academic, personal/social and career development needs by designing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes and enhances student success. Professional school counselors are employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools; in district supervisory positions; and in counselor education positions (http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=240).

ASCA *National Model*

The ASCA *National Model: A Framework for School Counseling Programs* (2005) is a document that addresses current education reform efforts and was written to reflect a comprehensive approach to program foundation, delivery, management and accountability with which school counseling teams could design, coordinate, implement, manage, and evaluate their programs for students' success. The model aims to answer the questions, "What do school counselors do, and, how are students different as a result of what school counselors do?"(p. 9).

The model outlines the framework for the development of a school counseling program that is comprehensive in scope, preventive in design, developmental in nature, an integral part of the total educational program, designed as a delivery system, implemented by a state-credentialed school counselor, conducted in collaboration, monitors student progress, is driven by data, seeks improvement, and shares successes (ASCA, 2005). In an effort to clarify the scope and eliminate confusion of the ASCA *National Model* (2005), the exact wording according to ASCA (2009) has been replicated below regarding the four elements of the model: foundation, delivery, management and accountability.

Foundation

Professional school counselors identify a philosophy based on school counseling theory and research/evidence-based practice that recognizes the need for all students to benefit from the school counseling program. Professional school counselors act on these philosophies to guide the development, implementation and evaluation of a culturally relevant and comprehensive school counseling programs. Professional school counselors create a mission statement supporting the school's mission and collaborate with other individuals and organizations to promote all students' academic, career and personal/social development (http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/).

Delivery

Professional school counselors provide culturally competent services to students, parents/guardians, school staff and the community in the following areas: school guidance curriculum; individual student planning; responsive services; and system support. School guidance curriculum consists of structured lessons designed to help students achieve the desired competencies and to provide all students with the knowledge

15

and skills appropriate for their developmental level. The school guidance curriculum is delivered throughout the school's overall curriculum and is systematically presented by professional school counselors in collaboration with other professional educators in K-12 classroom and group activities. Individual student planning includes professional school counselors coordinate ongoing systemic activities designed to help students establish personal goals and develop future plans. Responsive services consist of prevention and/or intervention activities to meet students' immediate and future needs. These needs can be necessitated by events and conditions in students' lives and the school climate and culture, and may require any of the following: individual or group counseling; consultation with parents; teachers and other educators; referrals to other school support services or community resources; peer helping; psycho-education; intervention and advocacy at the systemic level. Professional school counselors develop confidential relationships with students to help them resolve and/or cope with problems and developmental concerns. System support consists of management activities establishing, maintaining, and enhancing the total school counseling program. These activities include professional development, consultation, collaboration, supervision, program management and operations. Professional school counselors are committed to continual personal and professional development and are proactively involved in professional organizations promoting school counseling at the local, state and national levels (http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/).

Management

Professional school counselors incorporate organizational processes and tools that are concrete, clearly delineated, and reflective of the school's needs. Processes and tools

include: agreements developed with and approved by administrators for each school year

addressing how the school counseling program is organized and what goals will be

accomplished. Advisory councils include: students, parents/guardians, teachers,

counselors, administrators and community members to review school counseling program

goals and results and to make recommendations; the use of student data to effect systemic

change within the school system so every student receives the benefit of the school

counseling program; action plans for prevention and intervention services defining the

desired student competencies and achievement results allotment of the professional

school counselor's time in direct service with students as recommended in the ASCA

National Model; the use of annual and weekly calendars to keep students,

parents/guardians, teachers, administrators, and community stakeholders informed and to

encourage active participation in the school counseling program

(http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/).

Accountability

Professional school counselors develop and implement data/needs-driven, standards-

based and research-supported programs, and engage in continuous program evaluation

activities. They also create results reports that demonstrate immediate, intermediate, and

long-range effectiveness of comprehensive school counseling programs. Professional

school counselors analyze outcome data to guide future action and improve future results

for all students. The performance of the professional school counselor is evaluated using

an instrument based on the School Counselor Performance Standards found in the ASCA

National Model, and the ASCA School Counselor Competencies. These standards of

practice are expected of professional school counselors when implementing a school counseling program (http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/).

While school counselors in training are taught leadership skills in a comprehensive, developmental model as described above, the reality is that they are often supervised under a traditional guidance model (Studer, 2005). Even with ASCA's intentions to clarify and unify the school counselor's professional identity, it seems as if most school counselors are continuing to work within a historical and traditional program that focuses on intervention, leaving them fraught with confusion, uncertainty, and frustration about their role (Studer, 2006). School counselor trainees have expressed frustration when they learn about the benefits of the transformed model for school counseling, but receive supervision in a school counseling setting that has not transformed into utilizing the framework of the ASCA model (Studer & Oberman, 2006). "It is imperative that supervision is at least as effective as the preparation received during master's level programs" (Blakely et al., 2009, p. 5).

Ethical Considerations for School Counseling Supervisors

According to the research, it seems pertinent that supervisors are knowledgeable about several ethical issues that school counselors face on a daily basis. It is imperative that they are well informed of these concerns when working with children and adolescents at a school site (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Remley & Herlihy, 2010). Some ethical concerns involve various issues related to counseling children, confidentiality and privileged communication, counseling families and groups, professional identity of school counselors, and competency (Bradley, 1989; Remley & Herlihy, 2010).

Although not an exhaustive list, several ethical issues/concerns could impact the supervision a school counselor in training receives when being supervised by someone who lacks

18

the knowledge of many school-related issues (Remley & Herlihy, 2010). Some of these concerns are the following: the release of records under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA); responsibilities as a consultant to other educators in the school system; knowledge of state laws regarding mandated reporting of child abuse or neglect; prevention, reporting of, and intervention into bullying behavior; child and adolescent development (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006); dual or multiple relationships; concerns related to local cultural norms (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006); gender role development, racial identity development (Carter & Helms, 1992; Helms, 1994), racism (Bullard, 2005; Conroy, 2007; Macey, 1999); and sexual identity development (Hopton,1995); systems theories; sexual harassment and violence (Remley & Herlihy, 2010); and the development of data driven programs (Hatch, 2008; Perusse & Goodnough, 2005) to close the achievement gap (Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Alren, 2010; Bruce, Getch, & Ziomek-Daigle, 2009; Campbell & Brigg, 2005; Edwards, Thornton, & Holiday-Driver, 2010).

Additional concerns may arise when supervisors without school counseling experience do not have information concerning the legal rights of parents and guardians (Remley & Herlihy, 2010), even though the student is considered the client in a school setting. Furthermore, supervisors may not have information concerning state laws regarding informed consent of minor clients receiving counseling services in the school setting (Remley & Herlihy, 2010), particularly as it relates to obtaining consent from parents or guardians and assent from the student.

Systemic School Counselor

It is vital that a counselor supervisor have insight into the system, organization or community within which a supervisee might perform as an intern (Wood & Rayle, 2006). A

19

school is an example of a system. Gladding (2007) defined a system as "a set of elements standing in interaction. Each element in the system is affected by whatever happens to any other element. Thus, the system is only as strong as its weakest part. Likewise, the system is greater than the sum of its parts" (p. 455). Each school is different from other schools, uniquely comprised of multiple constituents such as students, teachers, administrators, school board members, stakeholder views, and individual perspectives of each party. Each of these different cohorts come to the school with different expectations and anticipations and are likely to disagree on what constitutes a successful day, week, or year in the school (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977). Counselor supervisors should view the school culture as a culture in and of itself (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006), with specific norms and unspoken rules. It is not monolithic; rather, it varies according to the cultural groups (Gladding, 2007). Learning to navigate within a school system can be a challenging endeavor, one that requires insights into the system. Counselor supervisors should aim to understand school politics, the chain of command (Hatch, 2008), its functionality, and ultimately how to operate as a professional within the school.

In order for counselor supervisors to effectively understand a school system, they should have knowledge of systems theory (CACREP, 2009). A school district has been compared to a mega system, the individual schools as systems, and the individual classrooms as subsystems into which each child brings his or her interactional patterns and ways of relating to others in his or her own family system (Carns & Carns, 1997). Gladding (2007) suggested that systems theory focuses on the interconnectedness of elements within all living organisms; systems. Each school is a unique system, and a counselor supervisor should explore the historical, societal, economic, and governmental factors (Gladding, 2007) that have had an impact on a school over the course of time, including the systemic interaction of personalities, communities, and events.

In other words, many related forces can affect how a school system functions, and all forces should be considered to fully understand the nature of a school system.

Supervisors should encourage their supervisees to view the entire system as their client, and much like a family counselor, school counselors could use a systems perspective to work with their student clients where the school system provides the context for understanding its individual members and their problems (Remley & Herlihy, 2010).

Professional Association Standards for Supervisors

Although CACREP has been referenced as the professional association most closely modeled after with respect to the school counseling profession (Paisley & Borders, 1995), it is significant to note that specific supervisory guidelines were written in 1993 by the Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors (ACES), and thus far have not been officially updated. Instead, the guidelines were incorporated into the code of ethics. Nevertheless, ACES guidelines for supervisors recommend that a supervisor have specialization-specific experience prior to supervising an intern. However ACA, ASCA, and CACREP do not mention specialization-specific experience as a necessary and sufficient factor in supervising interns. Consequently, a lack of supervisor experience concomitant with inconsistent school counseling supervision models may create confusion and frustration for supervisors and interns. Thus, this study intends to fill the gap in the literature to explore whether or not having experienced school counselor supervisors will help to effectively prepare trainees for an entry-level school counseling position, foster a solid professional identity, and improve supervisor effectiveness for school counselors in training.

In light of the research, it seems pertinent to pair a school counselor in training with a supervisor who has school counseling experience. Because supervisors tend to begin supervision

from a teaching role (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), providing high support and high direction (Hart & Nance, 2003), it would be beneficial if supervisors had experience in the school counseling profession to teach the multiple roles and levels of complexity involved in school cultures that extend far beyond the traditional counseling skills. Ultimately, the competence of the supervisor greatly affects the competence of the supervisee (Getz, 1999). According to the literature discussed above, school counseling is a unique setting in which unique supervisors are needed to fulfill the ever-changing duties and role expectations. It has been suggested that future research could include studies to focus on professional identity within counseling specialties (Gibson et al., 2010). This recommendation was taken into consideration and my research concomitantly examined perceptions of preparedness and professional identity, as well as perceived supervisor effectiveness.

Definition of Terms

Bernard and Goodyear (2008) have defined supervision as

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession (p. 8).

Professional identity was defined as encompassing the following themes: (a) self-labeling as a professional; (b) integration of skills and attitudes as a professional; and (c) a perception of context in a professional community (Gibson et al., 2010). One's professional identity is a framework in which one carries out a professional role, makes significant professional decisions,

22

and develops into a competent professional (Brott & Myers, 1999). According to Remley and

Herlihy (2010),

> Individuals who have a clear sense of their professional identity can easily explain the
>
> philosophy that underlies the activities of their professional group, describe the services
>
> their profession renders to the public, describe the training programs that prepare them to
>
> practice their profession, explain their qualifications and the credentials they possess, and
>
> articulate the similarities and differences between members of their own profession and
>
> other similar groups (p. 24).

Adapted from Remley and Herlihy's (2010) definition of professional identity, a school

counselor's professional identity is defined in this study as: when school counselors can easily

explain the philosophy that underlies the activities of their professional group, describe the

services their profession renders to the public, describe the training programs that prepare them

to practice their profession, explain their qualifications and the credentials they possess, and

articulate the similarities and differences between members of their own profession and other

similar groups.

Specialization-specific supervision is defined as supervision in which a supervisor has

specialization-specific experience in the setting in which the counselor in training is completing

fieldwork/practicum/internship, or professional work experiences.

Purpose of Study

Despite the importance of supervision models and supervisor experience in the training of

counselors, oftentimes school counselors in training receive supervision from supervisors who

lack school counseling experience (Herlihy et al., 2002). Although there are many supervision

models provided in the counseling literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008), there are no

23

consistently agreed-upon supervision models specific to the training of school counselors. Stemming from the few proposed school counseling supervision models, role confusion and professional identity continue to remain problematic in the school counseling profession (Brott & Myers, 1999). The purpose of this research was to evaluate the influence of specialization-specific supervision (SSS) on school counselors' perceptions of their preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The knowledge gained from this study may provide the counseling profession insight into school counselor training, supervision research, and suggestions for training standards. It is important to note than an assumption of the study was having knowledgeable and experienced school counselor supervisors could better prepare school counselors in training to begin an entry-level school counseling position, help them to foster a solid professional identity, and increase overall supervisor effectiveness. Hence, the main goal of this research was to determine how specialization-specific supervision influences the perceptions of school counselors to enhance and standardize school counselor preparedness, professional identity, and supervisor effectiveness while advancing school counseling research, theory, and practice as an avenue for enhanced preparation of school counseling trainees and practitioners.

General Research Question

The general research question that served as the overarching question for this study was: Are there differences between school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision and those who did not, with respect to their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness?

Research Questions

1. Are there differences between school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision on the following:

    a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?

    b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?

    c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

2. Are there differences between school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision on the following:

    a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?

    b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?

    c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

3.   Are there differences between school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision on the following:

    a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?

    b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?

    c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

4. To what extent do school counselors think that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard?

5. Is there a difference in school counselors' perception of knowledge between their individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences?

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses in this study were derived from the general research question. They include the following:

1a.   School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

1b.   School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

1c.   School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

2a.   School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

2b.   School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

2c.   School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

3a.   School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

3b.   School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

3c.   School counselors who received on-site specialization specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

4.   School counselors will agree more than disagree that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard.

5.   There will be a significant difference in school counselors' perception of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences.

<center>**Chapter 2**</center>

<center>**Review of the Literature**</center>

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the research and literature related to supervision and the professional identity of school counselors. This chapter is organized into three major sections that build a conceptual framework for examining the linkage of supervision, professional identity, and the preparation of school counselors. Each section includes subsections that further examine each topic. The first section includes a definition of supervision, offers an overview of the supervisory relationship, and examines school counselor supervision. The second section defines professional identity, examines school counselor professional identity, and outlines the tenets of a systemic school counselor, and how these tenets relate to a school counselor's professional identity. The third section analyzes supervision models and school counselor supervision models. The fourth section reviews the standards of professional associations for supervisors and ethical considerations for school counseling supervision. A summary concludes this chapter.

<center>**Supervision**</center>

Supervisory Relationship

Bernard and Goodyear (2008) have defined supervision as,

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession (p. 8).

Supervisors should be qualified by training, experience, or credentials in order to provide competent supervisory services to supervisees (Remley & Herlihy, 2010). Supervisors have several roles, but ultimately they should aim to create safe and supportive environments conducive to trainees' growth and developmental process (Walsh et al., 2002). According to Remley and Herlihy (2010), supervision can be a complex concept because it occurs at multiple levels and involves a number of parties including a client, a counselor/supervisee, and one or more supervisors. The researchers also noted that it is crucial to understand how the various parties work together in a dynamic interplay for the services provided to the client, as well as the supervisee's learning experience. Additionally, supervision can be viewed as an invaluable component of training that can foster personal and professional growth while allowing supervisees a forum to receive feedback on their clinical counseling skills (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Each supervisor brings something unique to the supervision process and may choose to adopt a variety of styles to influence the supervision process and outcome (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001b).

A central theme of the supervision process is the development of the supervisory relationship, which has been viewed as the approach that the supervisor takes to work with the supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Several authors (e.g., Borders & Leddick, 1987; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Hart & Nance, 2003; Ladany et al., 2001b; Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001c) have studied how a supervisor's style or approach affects the supervisory relationship. Specifically, Ladany et al., (2001c) investigated trainees' developmental differences in relation to preferences for supervisor style. The authors surveyed 37 counselor supervisors, and they found that the supervisors' perceptions of their style were related to their perceptions of the supervisory relationship. They concluded that the supervisors perceived their

29

trainees preferred supervisors who were attractive (e.g., warm), interpersonally sensitive (e.g., therapeutic), and task-oriented (e.g., agreement on goals). Since each supervisory style contributes in a unique way to the supervisory relationship, the authors suggested that it might be important to present a mixture of styles and an overall flexible supervisory approach to the supervision process. Even though the questionnaire included self-reported perceptions of their trainees' preferences, their conclusions support the importance of the supervisors' style on the supervisory relationship.

Similarly, in another study by Hart and Nance (2003), they evaluated the preferred supervision styles of supervisors and supervisees according to the supervisees' needs and context of the supervision experience. They modeled the types of supervision styles from the framework of Bernard's (1979) discrimination model in which the functions of the supervisory relationship were categorized into three roles: teacher, counselor, and consultant. All of the participants were doctoral student supervisors at a large urban university, and fourth semester master's-degree student supervisees. Each doctoral supervisor was paired, according to availability of schedules, with two master's-degree students in counseling at the same university. The authors found that supervisors and supervisees had some similarities in their preferences for styles of supervision reflected by the developmental level of preparedness on the part of the supervisees, as the styles were compared prior to beginning supervision and at another time after supervision was completed. It was found that supervisors preferred using either a counseling style that would provide high support and low direction, or a supportive teacher style that would provide both high support and high direction. Accordingly, supervisees stated a preference for being supervised by the supportive teacher style that would provide both high support and high direction. This study did not mention whether or not specialization-specific supervision (SSS)

might serve as a relevant factor in the preferred supervision styles of supervisors and supervisees.

Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) conducted a study to determine whether supervisors' supervisory styles were related to master's-level counseling students' satisfaction with supervision and their perceived self-efficacy. Earlier in the literature, the impact of supervisors' unique styles on their supervisees' perceived self-efficacy had not been examined. Participants included 82 counseling students from six master's-degree counselor education programs in public and private universities in Florida, Iowa, Louisiana, North Carolina, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, all of which were accredited by CACREP. They concluded that supervisory styles could influence supervisees' satisfaction with supervision and the supervisees' perceived self-efficacy. The interpersonally sensitive style had a statistically significant contribution to supervisees' perceived self-efficacy. However, supervisor attractive-style and task-oriented style were not found to be statistically significant. Regarding self-efficacy, the task-oriented style had a statistically significant contribution and was the only statistically significant predictor variable in predicting supervisees' perceived self-efficacy. Whereas the authors solicited doctoral students and faculty members as the supervisor participants, they controlled for supervisor type to control for variations in the experience and expertise of supervisors and simply focused on style. Although the goal of their research was to understand individual differences in supervisors and how their specific style influence the perceived self-efficacy of counseling students, this study did not mention how specialization-specific supervision (SSS) might serve as a relevant factor in perceptions of self-efficacy.

A recent article published in *Studies in Higher Education* focused on the relationships between areas of academic concentration, supervisory style, students' needs and best practices

(Egan, Stockley, Brouwer, Tripp, & Stechyson, 2009). The authors were interested in the exit surveys of 1,335 graduate students from a mid-sized university in Canada. The research examined two key dimensions: the international/domestic status of students and discipline categories. They concluded that the amount of time supervisors devote to students is a basis of satisfaction for all students in all academic disciplines. This was the first time that a concept similar to SSS surfaced in empirical research, as the authors recognized and acknowledged a need for supervision specific to areas of academic concentration. The authors noted the benefit of pairing a supervisee with a supervisor who had actual experience in the specific area that the supervisee was involved.

However, Walsh et al. (2002) asserts that the supervisor's theoretical orientation and level of experience, both in counseling and supervising, were perceived to be relevant to the supervisory relationship. They surmised that the relevance of the orientation and experience level contributed to the trainees' willingness to disclose mistakes in clinical supervision. The supervisor's understanding of the dynamics of client sessions is paramount to the learning process of the supervisee, and the supervisor must be honest and open regarding their mistakes for this understanding to take place (Walsh et al.). The findings support previous research regarding the influence of the supervisory relationship on the supervision process.

In sum, the supervisory relationship between a supervisor and a counselor intern has been noted to be one of the most important aspects for ensuring a successful internship and an effective mentoring process (Lazovsky & Shimon, 2005).

Supervision of School Counselors

Supervision is a medium through which support for school counselors increases their skills for dealing with the complex issues they face on a regular basis (Page et al., 2001).

Roberts (2001) asserts that the purpose of school counselor supervision is to foster the professional growth and effectiveness of the counselor in training. Similarly, Somody et al. (2008) surmised that supervision provides school counselors with specific feedback to assist with the enhancement of their professionalism. However, Matthes (1992) has boldly contended that, "Novice counselors in the schools are confronted with a sink-or-swim situation regardless of the focus of their counselor training program" (p. 29). Many recognize that it is becoming increasingly difficult for 21st century school counselors to remain updated and competent in providing adequate prevention and intervention services for the myriad of challenges youth experience, along with the problems they present within the schools today (Crutchfield & Borders, 2006; Henderson et al., 2007).

In a study conducted by Roberts and Borders (1994) with the North Carolina School Counselors' Association (NCSCA), they studied the differences between administrative, program, and counseling supervision of school counselors. Results indicated that most counselors received administrative and program supervision from principals during annual review conferences. Participants did report, however, spending most of their time in counseling and consultation, but received the least amount of supervision on these issues from qualified counseling supervisors. They reported seeking out this type of counseling supervision for the purpose of professional development. Interestingly, the school counselors believed that they needed less administrative supervision but desired additional program and counseling supervision, with a strong preference for a counseling supervisor at the doctoral level rather than at the master's level. The main barrier to school counselors actually receiving qualified supervision was the fact that the only available supervisors were those with degrees in areas

other than counseling. The results of this survey indicated that school counselors' supervision

preferences are not the same as their on-the-job reality (Roberts & Borders, 1994).

In response to school counseling's limited formulation of supervision practices, there is

an abundance of articles in the literature. For instance, Nelson and Johnson (1999) recognized

the need for research on the supervision of school counselors in training, as most research deals

with supervision of professional school counselors. In their article, they describe an integrative

approach for supervising school counseling interns that integrates supervisor roles, intern skills,

and stages of the supervision process. However, their descriptions were not supported with

empirical research. They examined the length of the internship; the skill level and specific needs

of each trainee, and the pace at which the trainee progresses through the orientation, working,

transition, and integration stages (Nelson & Johnson). In particular, the authors concluded that it

is imperative for university faculty to gain a better understanding of the training needs of school

counselor supervisors to address the types of issues that appear most in supervision, how

supervision is actually conducted, and what models are employed.

Another aspect of school counselor supervision involving the on-site supervisor had not

been well supported in the research when Kahn (1999) investigated the allocation of on-site

supervision time of school counseling practicum students on counseling function. The

participants were 197 public school counselors in Pennsylvania who indicated that they spent

slightly more than half of their supervision time on the functions of individual and group

counseling (34.1%) and consultation (21.9%). The remainder of time was divided amongst

developmental and career guidance (17.3%), coordination (15%), and evaluation and assessment

(11.2%). It is critical to note that the purposive sample might not generalize to a larger national

sample of site supervisors, and the reliance on their self-reports might not accurately reflect the

reality of supervision topics mentioned (Kahn). Furthermore, almost three-quarters of the

sample had no formal supervision training, and most provided supervision for the same

university that trained them (Kahn). Despite the limitations, the author's results highlight the

fact that field supervisors are supervising interns based less on administrative supervision and

more on actual school counseling practices.

Supervision of School Counselors in Training

Most of the literature on supervision is devoted to clinical supervision rather than

university-level supervision of school counselors. Likewise, it was noted that the supervision of

master's students is sometimes performed by doctoral candidates enrolled in university doctoral

programs (Roberts, 2001).

Perusse et al. (2001) surveyed school counselor preparation programs nationally,

focusing on screening methods, faculty experiences, curricular content, and fieldwork. Of the

189 participants, 63 identified their program as CACREP accredited. Overall, a little more than

one-half (52%) of the faculty members had previous work as a school counselor. This result

means that some programs had no faculty with previous work experience in a school setting. It

is important to note the limitations inherent in the findings -- the programs were all master's-

level graduate programs, and the results were based on a self-report questionnaire. Additionally,

this examination was performed ten years ago, and the total number of faculty employed with

school counseling experience might be higher today (Perusse et al.). The fact that some of the

programs did not have faculty with previous experience in a school setting, and were still

providing supervision to school counseling master's students, is a major issue that seems worthy

of further examination. As it stands, current training programs might be doing an injustice to the

school counselors in training and, subsequently, to children in schools (Perusse et al.) The

authors suggested that future replications of their study should examine how school counselor preparation programs evolve to meet the developing needs of professional school counselors.

Several authors (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Studer, 2005) have examined the dilemmas presented with the on-site supervision of school counselors. In particular, Herlihy et al. (2002) suggested that most practicing school counselors are not trained to provide supervision and, therefore, supervisors are essentially practicing out of their scope of practice. Herlihy et al. (2002) stated that,

> The cycle of inadequate clinical supervision in school counseling can be perpetuated when universities place interns in schools, and these interns receive their on-site supervision from school counselors who have had little or no formal education in supervision. These students are unlikely to receive the guidance that they need to maximize their performance and strengthen their professional development. Eventually, these inadequately supervised students become school counseling supervisors (p. 57).

Studer (2005) later suggested that a consistent set of expectations is needed to guide school supervisors as they struggle with what constitutes appropriate training for the trainee, while providing quality assistance without negatively affecting K-12 students. In light of the research, it seems that an even greater problem could occur if a university-level supervisor, as well as the site supervisor, were novice supervisors with no experience in school settings; hence, compromising the preparation of school counselors in training (Herlihy et al., 2002).

Jordan (2006) studied beginning supervisees' identity and the importance of relationship variables and experience versus gender matches in the supervisee/supervisor interplay. She found that most beginning supervisees did not believe gender was an important variable that influenced risk taking. The participants did, however, focus on the years of experience both as supervisor

and a clinician. Some specific statements included the following: "I believe experience is important when dealing with the challenges of working with a diverse client population;" "I could never trust somebody's clinical judgment if they have not done therapy for some time;" and "not just for training but also liability purposes do I not trust a supervisor who has only limited experience."(p. 48). Ninety-two percent of supervisees reported that the supervisor's amount of experience is important in their ability to provide quality supervision, and 95% of the supervisees indicated as important that supervisors have more than five years of therapy experience.

A supervised school counseling experience is an important and rewarding component of a trainee's preparation (Lazovsky & Shimon, 2005), and because the duties and role of school counselors are numerous and varied, supervisees need supervision models that are comprehensible, concise, realistic, and provide concrete direction in the supervision process (Nelson & Johnson, 1999). Many changes have occurred in school counselor preparation within the last decade (Guiffrida, 2005), and being unfamiliar with the professional school culture can hinder trainees' experiences (Peterson & Deuschle 2006; Somody et al., 2008). It appears from a review of the literature that within a school, the systems of parents, students, teachers, and administration are often overlooked in the supervisory discussions, and the traditional focus on therapeutic skills does not provide the holistic and system strategies that will facilitate a professional school counseling identity. According to Gazzola and Theriault (2007), the cookie-cutter approach (i.e., treating all supervisees the same) could lead to narrowing experiences of counselor training. Supervision is a means by which skills are refined, theory and practice are integrated, and trainees explore their new professional identities (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Without adequate supervision of the advanced needs of 21st century school counselors,

individuals may enter their first position as a professional school counselor without a sense of focus or identity (Devlin, Smith, & Ward, 2009).

The aforementioned literature presented in this section on supervision suggests that the supervisory relationship, specifically supervisor style, is a critical factor in the effective training of counselors (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005). School counselor supervision, in particular, has been conceptualized as a vague and loosely formatted structure in the literature (Nelson & Johnson, 1999). Principals supervising school counselors, non-trained supervisors supervising school counselors, and supervisors without any school counseling experience supervising school counselors have been referenced in the literature (Roberts & Borders, 1994). It seems relevant to note that the lack of formal supervisory practices for school counselors might be part of the issue that school counselors continue to face when solidifying a uniform professional identity within the counseling field that is different than other disciplines (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Inadequate university supervision concomitant with inexperienced on-site supervision results in a poor induction into the profession and poor professional identity development (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). Ultimately, supervisors have been viewed as gatekeepers to the counseling profession, and they are instrumental links between the educational program and real work settings (Studer, 2005). It can be summarized from the literature that it is incumbent upon school counselor supervisors to remain cognizant of the unique needs of school counselors in training so that school counselors receive the adequate training that the profession deserves.

Professional Identity

Professional identity has been defined as encompassing the following themes: self-labeling as a professional; integration of skills and attitudes as a professional; and a perception of context in a professional community (Gibson et al., 2010). One's professional identity is a

framework in which one carries out a professional role, makes significant professional decisions, and develops into a competent professional (Brott & Myers, 1999). According to Remley and Herlihy (2010),

> Individuals who have a clear sense of their professional identity can easily explain the philosophy that underlies the activities of their professional group, describe the services their profession renders to the public, describe the training programs that prepare them to practice their profession, explain their qualifications and the credentials they possess, and articulate the similarities and differences between members of their own profession and other similar groups (p. 24).

Prior to directly addressing the prevailing supervision models for school counselors and assessing their applicability to the university setting, it is noteworthy to review the literature on professional identity.

CACREP (2009) does not identify a specific definition of professional counseling, but it does identify a vision, mission, and values that provide a context in which to understand counselor professional identity. CACREP describes its purpose as a means to promote professional training and competence, while aiming to enhance the counseling profession. Within the school counseling specialization, students must demonstrate knowledge and skill in the following four areas: foundations of school counseling; contextual dimensions of school counseling; knowledge and skills for the practice of school counseling (program development, implementation and evaluation, counseling and guidance, consultation); and clinical instruction. It is seemingly apparent that CACREP defines specifically what school counseling students should be able to do prior to obtaining a master's degree, thereby developing a context within

which to identity oneself as a school counselor. However, school counselors continue to struggle with forming and advocating for a unified professional identity (Brott & Myers, 1999).

In a unique approach, using a developmental theory, Auxier, Hughes, and Kline (2003) explored the identity development experiences of master's degree counselor education students. They used a grounded theory approach to develop a theory of counselor identity development. They illustrated how counselors in training used a recycling identity formation process that involved conceptual and experiential learning experience to identify, clarify, and re-clarify their identity as counselors. The process reflected the meaning the participants contributed to their experiences, the context within which they acted, and how the processes occurred over time (Auxier et al.). Their arguments support the idea that identity development is indeed a growth process. However, supervision and its influences on one's professional identity were not mentioned as factors in their conclusions.

Nelson and Jackson (2003) employed a qualitative phenomenological approach to explore professional identity development. These authors interviewed eight Hispanic counseling student interns who were enrolled in a regional university. The participants told their stories of their professional identity development. The general themes that emerged from the interviews were knowledge, personal growth, experiential learning, relationships, accomplishment, costs, and perceptions of the counseling profession. Professors, peers, and site supervisors were mentioned as those with whom they shared relationships, but individual supervisors were not mentioned. In particular, doctoral student supervisors were not mentioned, thus, this aspect could serve as an interceding factor of school counselors fostering a clear sense of professional identity in the training process (Nelson & Jackson, 2003). The participants specifically noted that a respectful and accepting teaching supervisory style was central in the development of their

professional identities. Even though supervisor experience was not mentioned with respect to their teaching style, the participants agreed that the internship experience served as a strong catalyst for their professional identity.

In another qualitative article, Gibson et al. (2010) examined the lived experiences of counselors in training using a grounded theory approach to describe the transformational tasks that were required for professional identity development. The authors suggested that the tasks included finding a personal definition of counseling, internalizing responsibility for professional growth, and developing a systemic identity. The first phase of the professional identity development cycle was described as when the new professionals rely on external authority figures and experts, such as faculty members for conceptual learning, experiential learning, and external evaluation during their graduate programs. In the second phase, new professionals encounter authorities, such as supervisors, and receive feedback on professional skills they learned during their graduate training. In the final phase, the new professional is able to self-evaluate and able to integrate experience with theory to merge personal and professional identities (Gibson et al.).

As professional identity emerged as a result of the training experiences, the results indicated that the participants' transformation progressed from external validation, or reliance on others, to internal validation, or self-reliance. More specifically, internal validation was achieved when the participants gained a sense of fit within the profession, within their professional community, and within one's responsibility to the profession. The authors found that one's professional identity was developed by the final stages of one's counselor education program. Their findings disputed the findings reported by Auxier et al. (2003), as they did not observe a recycling identity formation process with the new or pre-practicum counselors in training. They

41

attributed their differing findings to other influencing factors of expert knowledge, personal

values, professional values, and membership in the professional community. In the study,

neither the area of specialty nor the specific supervision factors were accounted for as influences

on professional identity development.

School Counselor Professional Identity

Brott and Myers (1999) studied the development of a professional school counselor

identity. The authors mentioned that research has not supported counselor identity development

as an identical process for professionals in various specialties of counseling. Specifically, they

contended that a school counseling professional identity is a different process than the process of

other mental health professionals. They used a grounded theory approach to describe the

context, conditions, and phases for a process identified as the professional identity development

for school counselors. Ten school counselors from elementary/middle school settings in the

United States and the Caribbean participated in the study, and interviews were conducted to elicit

data. The authors examined a blending of influences on school counselor development of a

professional identity, and found the influences were considered to be their graduate training,

work experience, the number of service providers available in their setting, and the needs of the

particular setting to be influential. When examining how a school counselor develops a

professional identity, they did not view the identity as a final outcome, but rather as a

consequence of the conditions and phases of the blending of influences (Brott & Myers). While

the findings support the contention that school counselor professional identity is an evolving

process, the authors strongly suggested that the structural perspective of professional identity

development is formed during one's graduate training. They suggested that consideration should

be given to developing guidelines for the supervision of internship experiences in school settings

by both the on-site and university supervisors because the internship experience serves as a bridge between training and practice of professional school counseling. However, a lack of available research supports their suggestion.

Studer (2006) applied Erik Erikson's (1980/1984) psychosocial stages to supervision as it related to the professional identity development of school counselors. The author related each psychosocial stage to the school counselor supervisees' development throughout the supervision process. She suggested that Erikson's stages (i.e., trust versus mistrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, industry versus inferiority, identity versus identity confusion, intimacy versus isolation, generativity versus stagnation, and integrity versus despair) could explain how professional identity emerges as a component of personal self-identity. For example, within the industry versus inferiority stage, a greater sense of one's fit within the profession occurs when one can self-reflect on decision-making, skill development, and obtaining a greater awareness of one's professional identity (Studer). Moreover, within the identity versus identity confusion stage, the author posited that many school counselors get stuck in this stage by continuing to operate within a traditional counseling program despite the transformed role of school counselors that ASCA suggests. Studer specifically stated that, "Professional identity is compromised when there is no exposure to a leadership role in this framework, and because identity confusion occurs when the individual expresses uncertainty about self and purpose, practicing school counselors engage in additional opportunities to self-reflect and to acquire more knowledge and skill" (p. 6). This research supports the fact that school counselors historically have struggled with role certainty and role confusion. Furthermore the author suggests that supervisors can be role models for providing clarity of appropriate roles and breaking the cycle of role confusion, while providing a clear sense

regarding school counselors' professional identity that is reflective of the 21st century. Further she suggested that as school counseling is a profession with an evolving identity, it is imperative that clinical supervision is reflective of a 21st century school counseling role and addresses clear identity developmental tasks specific to school counselors.

School counselors' roles have expanded with every decade (Paisley et al., 2007) making it understandable that many school counselors struggle with their professional identity (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Regarding roles and duties performed by school counselors, Perera-Diltz and Mason (2008) conducted a nationwide study of school counselors to determine if the duties they performed were aligned with the duties prescribed by the school counseling profession since the inception of the ASCA *National Model* in 2003. The authors utilized a survey instrument to gather the nationwide data and found that school counselors at all building levels (i.e., elementary, middle and high school, and mixed group) engage in both profession endorsed and non-endorsed duties with some variation existing among building levels. Endorsed duties were those indicated by the ASCA *National Model* (2005) including guidance curriculum, individual student planning, responsive services, and system support. ASCA non-endorsed duties included the following responses: scheduling; bus, front door, cross walk, recess, breakfast and lunch room duties; test administration; individualized education plans; hall monitoring; performing new student intakes; substituting; aiding classroom teachers; testing related activities, including driving students to tests; coaching for various sports; and performing principal duties. The authors concluded that great variations in duties still exist among school counselors across building levels, and suggested that school counselor interns could engage in the delivery system components during internship to experience the benefits of engaging in ASCA endorsed duties. Perera-Diltz and Mason (2008) contended that,

Research on the practicum and supervision expectations of school counselors need to be

conducted to determine if school counselors are being provided the opportunity to

practice the various delivery system components of the ASCA *National Model* instead of

engaging in an experience consisting of only individual and group counseling similar to

community counselors. An understanding of such can create a pathway to facilitating a

strong school counselor role thus stabilizing the profession (p. 31).

The professional identity of school counselors has been informed by ethical and

professional standards established by ASCA and the ASCA *National Model*. ASCA has

advocated that school counselors establish their identity in promoting student achievement and

educational success of all students (Dahir, 2001). ASCA (2009) defined professional school

counselors as

Certified/licensed educators with a minimum of a master's degree in school counseling

making them uniquely qualified to address all students' academic, personal/social and

career development needs by designing, implementing, evaluating and enhancing a

comprehensive school counseling program that promotes and enhances student success.

Professional school counselors are employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high

schools; in district supervisory positions; and in counselor education positions

(http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=240).

 Currently, 43 states require school counselors to possess a teaching degree prior to serving as a

professional school counselor (Erford, 2011).

In collaboration with the National Center for Transforming School Counseling, the

Education Trust (2004) created a new vision for rethinking the role and professional identity of

the school counselor. The vision of the Education Trust is to promote high academic

achievement for all students at all levels -- pre-kindergarten through college. They posited that school counselors could help close the achievement gap that separates low-income students and students of color from their white and more affluent peers by ensuring that every student graduates from high school ready for success in both college and a career. They encouraged school counselors to embrace the tenets of leadership, advocacy, counseling, teaming and collaboration, and using data to spur change.

Despite the initiatives of professional organizations advocating for a unified professional identity, Akos and Scarborough (2004) examined pedagogical practice for clinical preparation of school counselors in a purposeful sample of 59 school counseling internship syllabi, and found that many school counseling programs do not specify any, or only a limited number of, required on-site counseling activities. The authors also found that very few syllabi mentioned ASCA national standards, the ASCA *National Model*, or items like advocacy and leadership emanating from the *Transforming School Counseling Initiative* of the Education Trust. They concluded that, although national guidelines for school counselors have been outlined in the literature, it seemed that clinical training was not reflective of the national trends. The authors stated, "Although it is somewhat of a chicken-egg argument, if internship mirrors the variation and perhaps inadequate practice in the field of school counseling, how is it possible to frame a strong professional identity?" (p. 106). Although a limitation of the study is data was only ascertained from internship syllabi, it sheds light on the lack of unified training requirements endorsed by the profession.

Henderson et al. (2007) conducted a qualitative study on the dimensions and stages of development of the professional identity of school counselors over the span of their careers. Four dimensions were found to be essential to having a strong school counselor professional

identity: (a) commitment to the services school counselors provide; (b) an understanding of the appropriate role of school counselors; (c) the natural and acquired competencies necessary to function in that role; and (d) a selected community of professional supporters and mentors. They contended that school counselors do not begin their careers with a complete understanding of their professional identities. Rather, they believe it is an evolutionary process in which the school counselors learn who they are in the profession, believe in their identity, and live and act authentically as professional school counselors. "As our professional and personal identities became more congruent, we became more comfortable and genuine as school counselors" (p. 8).

Henderson et al. (2007) also differentiated school counselors from agency and private practice counselors. Their finding supports the contention that school counselors require differing training methods, including supervision factors, in order to foster a differing professional identity within the counseling profession. A hallmark finding of this research was that the quality of supervision received in their practicum settings varied greatly; that is, only one participant reported having a good supervision experience. There were several limitations to the research. There were only four participants, and they all worked together in the same school district over a span of 10 to 41 years, and they all began as teachers. Because the school counselors in this study graduated many years prior to the vision of the ASCA *National Model* (2005), their professional identity development more than likely differs from school counselors who were trained on the model.

Literature supports the fact that supervision has a direct impact on one's professional identity (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). However, school counselor professional identity as it relates to supervision has been mentioned only vaguely within the literature. More specifically, scant research on the supervisor's experience influencing a school counselor's preparation and

professional identity, and the level of supervisor experience as an influence in supervisor effectiveness exists within the literature. Ultimately, the development of and appreciation for a professional identity are principal factors that counselor educators must be aware of and foster within the university learning experience for counselors in training, beginning when students enter a graduate program (Gibson et al., 2010).

Systemic School Counselor

Lambie and Williamson (2004) reported a challenge for school counselors to transform their role and unify their professional identity. The challenge exists due to the fact that institutional systems are notorious for resisting change, and schools are no exception. The authors suggested that educating principals, abolishing the teaching requirement for counseling licensure, providing supervision in schools, and reassigning inappropriate duties would be instrumental in changing outdated views of the professional identity of school counselors.

Moreover, it is important that school counselors have knowledge of systems theory to use as a framework for analysis, while portraying a systemic view of thinking to foster full understanding of how and why people function the way they do in a school system (Cobia & Henderson, 2007). Social systems theory examines people in organizations in terms of the ways in which they meet the expectations other significant people have for their job performance (Gaynor, 1998). Gaynor also suggested that systems theory seeks to understand and explain human behavior in work roles according to the interaction of cultural, organizational, psychological, and physiological factors. The dynamics of the relationship between an individual and a social system help one to understand the behavior of the individual in that social system (Gaynor, 1998). Moreover, being able to analyze the presenting problems from a

systems perspective could assist a supervisee in understanding the behavior of individuals in schools while striving to serve as change agents (Freire, 1985).

Schools operate under a hierarchical structure (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Remley & Herlihy, 2010), or a bureaucratic structure in which there is an inequality in power and decision-making (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977). When a supervisor works with a supervisee interning at a school site, he or she must remain cognizant that the hierarchical nature can hinder the performance of prevention duties or advocating for change. A social system or organization (Gaynor, 1998), such as a school, reflects individualistic values, is fearful, and resists a system that could advance a different kind of power structure (Clarke, 2000). Attempting to change school counselor roles in a school can be a challenging process, as it would disturb well-established habits, including attitudes, practices and schedules (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977).

Only after understanding the hierarchical distribution of power and responsibility within the school system (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977) should supervisors encourage their supervisees to take risks while working within the system. Clarke (2000) stated it best: "Our school system does not like risk, although, paradoxically, it is at the very heart of learning" (p. 137). People oftentimes will not confront what they really believe for fear of creating a scene or establishing an atmosphere of unease and tension (Clarke, 2000). It is essential that a supervisor stay abreast of the perplexing dynamics involved within a school system to maintain an effective comprehensive school counseling program, which encourages challenging outdated views and taking risks. These views conflict with the resistant powers of a school system and, therefore, could potentially inhibit school counselors to advocate for change, especially when changes are needed in the system to benefit student clients (Corwin & Edelfelt, 1977).

Supervision Models

Bernard and Goodyear (2008) discussed several supervision models, including those grounded in psychotherapy theory, developmental approaches to supervision, and social role models. All of the models exist, regardless of setting-specific knowledge and experience. They believe that the supervisory relationship is a product of the uniqueness of two individuals, embedded within the process of supervision and modified by the demands of the various contexts within which supervision occurs. Bradley (1989) similarly discussed behavioral models, integrative models, systems models, and person-process models of supervision, all of which are designed to work with supervisees without regard for specialization-specific experience.

In a similar vein, Britton et al. (2002) suggested a didactic-theoretical-experiential model of supervision training to be used in a workshop format, again without consideration of specialization-specific experience of the supervisor. Stoltenberg (1981) approached supervision from a developmental perspective. He presented a model of counselor supervision that conceptualized the training process as a sequence of identifiable stages through which the trainee progresses. His main focus was on the appropriate supervision environments that encouraged development from level to level. Milliren et al. (2006) discussed supervision in the style of Alfred Adler, whereby supervisees meaningfully reconstruct counseling experiences so that problem-solving interventions can be generated, and strengths can be encouraged. These authors did not mention importance of specialization-specific experience as a factor in providing supervision. All of the aforementioned authors posited supervision models that can be viewed as effective methods for supervisors; however, none of the models mentioned schools as a variable in the development of the models.

Supervision Models for School Counselors

Shechtman and Wirtzberger (1999) assert that school counselors require supervision, which is reflective of their specific needs and preferred style. They studied Israeli school counselors at different stages of professional development. Results indicated that the novice counselors expressed a high need for supervision when working with teachers and resistant parents; innovations in counseling; developing preventive programs; working with learning disabilities, suicide prevention programs, eating disorders, and sex education and life skills. The less experienced and novice school counselors wanted the supervision to be more structured and teaching-oriented.

Peterson and Deuschle (2006) published a model for supervising school counseling students without teaching experience. The authors suggested that counseling trainees without teaching experience should have supervisors who guide them intentionally and systematically into the complex school culture. They suggested that to obtain credibility and competency in field experiences and in future employment, school counselors in training should experience a certain number of hours in a school beginning shortly after entering a graduate program. For example, they could immerse themselves into the complex school culture to address issues related to time management, guidance models, classroom management strategies, special education terms and laws, and local cultural norms (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). The authors also recognized that changes in the way supervision is conducted at the graduate level are crucial in preparing non-teachers to enter the school counseling field as competent and well-informed professional school counselor, especially given the creation of the ASCA *National Model* (2005).

Some authors (e.g., Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman, 2006) have suggested the relevance of the ASCA *National Model* in supervision for counselors in training.

Studer and Oberman's (2006) purpose was to determine the amount of training that practicing school counselors have received in the ASCA framework for school counseling programs, and whether this training was reflected in the supervision provided to trainees. Those authors investigated the types of supervisory activities provided to school counselor trainees. They examined the responses of 73 practicing school counselors from the southern region who were members of ASCA. The supervisory activities provided to trainees working in a traditional school counseling program were compared with those of trainees performing in a developmental program as recommended in the ASCA *National Model* (2005). They also examined if the years of experience as a school counselor differed between the two.

Even though this research did not take into account the university-level supervisor, the issue of supervisor experience was key. Findings indicated that individuals who have been school counselors for six or less years were significantly more likely to have had a course in the ASCA *National Model* than were school counselors in the field for seven or more years. An implication of the study was the vast amount of supervisees who received on-site supervision from supervisors who likely had little or no training in the ASCA *National* Model (Studer & Oberman, 2006). The authors suggested that additional research is needed to gain knowledge of clinical collaboration practices between counselor education programs and practicing school counselors.

As ASCA does not explicitly include a supervision element within its four basic components of leadership, advocacy, collaboration and teaming, and systemic change, Murphy and Kaffenberger's (2007) rationale provided a conceptual model of school counselor supervision to include a unique supervision format and training model specifically developed within the framework of the *National Model.* Their conceptual article focused only on the on-

site supervisors as being competent professionals knowledgeable of the ASCA *National Model* for the effective training of supervisees. They did not take into consideration the university-level individual supervisors' knowledge of ASCA. It was presumed that the university-supervisor was knowledgeable of the *National Model*. The overarching goal of the research was to advocate for and exemplify how universities could offer on-going supervision training to on-site supervisors regarding up-to-date supervision models formatted with the ASCA *National Model* at its forefront (Murphy & Kaffenberger).

Additionally, Blakely et al. (2009) conducted a study to determine if differences existed in the supervision of school counselors in traditional school counseling programs versus Recognized ASCA Model Programs (RAMP). The findings indicated that there were significant differences between traditional counseling supervisors and RAMP counseling supervisors across all supervisory activities. The authors stipulated that although ASCA has instituted guidelines to frame school counseling programs, not all schools are ready to embrace the model. Thus, a discrepancy remains between supervisor readiness and supervisory activities of school counselors.

In the Blakely et al. (2009) study, participants included 68 school counselors from RAMP programs, and 113 school counselors from traditional school counseling programs who were members of ASCA. The major findings of the study were that there were no significant differences between RAMP and traditional counselors in regards to supervisor readiness, but RAMP programs performed significantly better with supervisory activities than traditional programs. The researchers also found that school counselors with more years of work experience in the profession utilize the ASCA model with trainees. This finding was contrary to their hypotheses even though all of the school counselors considered were RAMP school

counsels (Blakely et al.). This finding suggests that even though the participants had more years of experience and they were trained in a RAMP model, they had more knowledge of the ASCA *National Model* (2005). The authors concluded that RAMP school counseling programs were better able to provide supervision effectiveness with 2005 ASCA *National Model* guidelines. Whereas this research was the most recent and first of its kind in the literature, no reliability or validity studies were performed on the tools, and the questionnaire utilized was not intended for supervisors. Thus, additional studies are needed to replicate the findings.

Luke and Bernard (2006) highlighted the fact that there is a lack of fit between current supervision models that emphasize the supervision of individual counseling and the multiple roles of school counselors. They proposed a supervision model for school counselors that is an extension of Bernard's (1979, 1997) discrimination model. The discrimination model was noted as a beneficial model for supervisors to use in selecting and determining a focus for supervision. It was noted that the most effective interventions took place when supervisors took a teaching, counseling, and consulting role while guiding the supervisee in the development of a comprehensive counseling program. The authors expanded the discrimination model into a 3 x 3 x 4 matrix for a school counseling supervision model (SCSM). There were three supervisor roles (teacher, counselor, consultant), three foci of supervision (intervention, conceptualization, and personalization), and four points of entry (large group intervention, counseling and consultation, individual and group advisement, and planning coordination and advising). Each of the comprehensive school counseling program domains is a point of entry for clinical supervision of school counselors. The model has been designed to ultimately address the lack of fit issue described above for current supervision models for school counselors (Luke & Bernard).

According to Luke and Bernard (2006), the school counseling supervision model is based on the following premises: (a) all four domains of comprehensive school counseling programs are amenable to clinical supervision; (b) school counselor supervisors must attend to the supervision of functions outside of individual and group counseling; (c) the technical eclecticism of the discrimination model is beneficial for working with school counseling supervisees; (d) each of the four domains requires skills that are reflected in the discrimination model; and (e) the social role postures that are helpful in the supervision of individual counseling are relevant to all comprehensive school counseling program domains. Additional skills are built into the model to include the following: conducting classroom lessons, conducting needs assessments, collaborating with teachers to determine effective interventions, planning a school-wide function, planning for a career day, evaluating services, choosing an appropriate classroom intervention, and personalization skills for assertiveness in advocacy situations. The authors contended that this model addresses not only clinical counseling skills but also takes a comprehensive approach that reflects all aspects of school counseling. Furthermore, they suggested the model required exploratory investigation to determine whether the supervisor roles and foci are replicated when extended across the four identified areas of school counselor function within comprehensive school counseling programs. Additional findings may be helpful to support, refute or refine the SCSM. Although this model did not take into account supervisor experience in the implementation of the model with supervisees, it is implied that a supervisor would have specialization-specific school counseling experience in order to supervise students. Empirical research is also needed to validate the SCSM with counselor trainees, supervisors, and practicing school counselors.

Wood and Rayle (2006) proposed a school counseling supervision model that focused on school counselors in training called the Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems Model (GFRS). The authors shared the thought similar to the thoughts of many others, that clinical/mental health models of supervision are inadequate for the supervision of school counselors in training. In their theoretical model they added a systems component that had not been seen previously in literature that focuses on systems within school counseling settings that can influence supervision goals and interactions; hence, the uniqueness of school counselor supervision. The GFRS is specific to the needs of school counselors, but it is designed for site supervisors. It was primarily theoretical in nature. Therefore, future research would be needed to determine if the roles and functions are, in fact, functions and roles of supervision in school counseling (Wood & Rayle, 2006). Supervisor experience was not factored into the model.

Devlin (2009) proposed an adlerian alliance supervisory model for school counseling that took into account the systems perspective, but added a psychotheoretical stance. "The adlerian alliance supervisory model is an inclusive model which provides a framework for supervisors to enhance school counselors' professional development and support the utilization of the ASCA National School Counseling Standards" (p. 4). According to the author, the goal of adlerian supervision is to facilitate the development of new viewpoints held by the supervisee. The model is comprised of three components: adlerian bonds, collaborative goals, and task agreement. Regarding adlerian bonds, they believe that school counselors will benefit from the adlerian alliance school counseling model because the model supports the supervisors' and supervisees' insight into the cultural and systemic properties inherent within school settings. Collaborative goal setting is thought to lead to professional growth and a heightened sense of professional identity (Devlin). "The area of global and systemic interest within the supervisory

relationship enhances the school counselor's identity as an advocate, agent of change, leader, and collaborator" (p. 14). Task agreement was suggested to promote the forming of the supervisee's identity as a professional school counselor. A fictional case study was depicted to illustrate how the adlerian alliance school counseling model for school counseling was created to foster the professional growth of school counselors in training. A part of the case study focused on university supervision, but did not specify the credentials or experience of the fictitious supervisor.

Professional Association Standards for Supervisors

Guidelines for supervisors are found in relevant codes of ethics (e.g., American Counseling Association (ACA, 2005), ASCA (2010), Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009), and the Association for Counselor Educators and Supervisors (ACES, 1990). However, setting-specific information is mentioned in only one code listed above, ACES. Standards C.2.a., b., and c. of ACA discussed professional responsibility, boundaries of competence, new specialty areas of practice, and qualifications for employment. The only standard that ACA mentioned related to supervisor preparation is stated in standard F.2.a. However, this standard does not mention anything related to specialization-specific knowledge as an important factor. Standard F.5.a. is related to the evaluation of supervisees. Thus is it possible that a non-school counselor effectively evaluate a school counselor intern without having experience in schools?"

ASCA's (2010) preamble for the ethical standards for school counselors states that school counselor educators should know the ethical standards, teach them to their students, and provide support for school counseling candidates to uphold them; however, no information is offered about doctoral students. ASCA (2010) standard C.1.d. states that professional school counselors,

the school counseling program director, site supervisor, and the school counselor educator are aware of and utilize related professionals, organizations, and other resources to which the student may be referred. Yet, there is no mention of doctoral student supervisors. Hence is it possible that if an intern is supervised by a non-school counselor supervisor, he or she will be able to convey knowledge about professionals and resources in the school setting, and be able to share the role of the school counseling program in ensuring data-driven academic, career/college and personal/social success competencies for every student, resulting in specific outcomes/indicators with all stakeholders, as stated in ASCA (2010) standard C.3.a. Standard F.3 focuses on the supervision of school counselor candidates pursuing practicum and internship experiences, but does not mention the factor of specialization-specific knowledge or experience. Furthermore, standard F.3.e. states that a site visit should be completed by a school counselor education faculty member for each practicum or internship student, but does not mention doctoral student supervisors completing site visits.

CACREP (2009) discusses doctoral learning outcomes, and that doctoral students should demonstrate knowledge, skills, and practices regarding supervision. Students who plan to work as school counselors should demonstrate the professional knowledge, skills, and practices necessary to promote the academic, career, and personal/social development of all K-12 students, especially in the following domains: foundations; counseling, prevention, and intervention; diversity and advocacy; assessment; research and evaluation; academic development; collaboration and consultation; and leadership (Sec. 2.G.). CACREP outlines in detail the competencies for doctoral student school counselors in training, but does not place the same importance on the training of master's level school counselor interns. Despite the major focus on the guidelines for doctoral students preparing to work as school counselors, the qualifications for

doctoral student supervisors stated in section IV do not specify specialization-specific experience. "The CACREP credential does distinguish counselors as having completed a preparation program that meets the standards of excellence for the profession" (Remley & Herlihy, 2010, p. 10); however is it possible a non-school counselor/doctoral student who does not have experience in schools while supervising school counseling interns are actually training to standards of excellence?

ACES (1990) offers the only code mentioning that the level of preparation, experience of the counselor, and the particular work setting of the supervisor could influence the relative emphasis of each competency in practice. Standard 1.4 stated that supervisors demonstrate skill in the application of counseling theory and methods that are appropriate for the supervisory setting. Standard 6.3 stated that supervisors understand the counselor's roles and functions in particular work settings. Standard 7.6 stated that the supervisor assists the counselor in planning effective client goals and objectives. Thus, is it possible that a non-school counselor would have the knowledge of academic goals and objectives without relevant school counseling experience? Remley and Herlihy (2010) asserts the importance that, "Supervisors must decide whether they have the necessary skills to adequately supervise, and should be clear about the kinds of settings that are outside their scope of expertise (e.g., an agency counselor who works with adults not feeling competent to supervise an elementary school counselor)" (p. 341).

Summary

Supervision as a means of professional identity development could enhance the clarity of school counseling roles and functions (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). In light of the research, school counseling is a unique setting in which unique supervisors are needed to fulfill the ever-changing duties and role expectations. It is important to focus on supervision practices that are

59

specifically designed for school counselors and the setting in which they practice (Gibson et al., 2010). Gibson et al. (2010) suggested that future research focus on professional identity development within counseling specialties, hence, the purpose of my study. Clear school counselor professional identities could allow for collaborative function to sustain job satisfaction, agency commitment, and effectiveness over a long term to enhance the inclusive service in which every child, every teacher, and every professional matters (Harris, 2009).

Chapter 3

Methodology

This chapter describes the methodology that was used in the study. Organization of this chapter incorporates subsections that detail the purpose of the study, general research question, research questions, research hypotheses, participant selection criteria, instrumentation and instrument development, data collection plan, methods of data analysis, limitations and delimitations, and the summary.

Purpose of the Study

Despite the importance of supervision models and supervisor experience in the training of counselors, oftentimes school counselors in training receive supervision from supervisors who lack school counseling experience (Herlihy et al., 2002). Although there are many supervision models provided in the counseling literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008), there are no consistently agreed-upon supervision models specific to the training of school counselors. Stemming from the few proposed school counseling supervision models, role confusion and professional identity continue to remain problematic in the school counseling profession (Brott & Myers, 1999). The purpose of this research was to evaluate the influence of specialization-specific supervision (SSS) on school counselors' perceptions of their preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The knowledge gained from this study may provide the counseling profession insight into school counselor training, supervision research, and suggestions for training standards. A plausible explanation may be due to supervisors' lack of knowledge and experience in school settings; thus, an assumption of this study is having knowledgeable and experienced school counselor supervisors could better prepare school counselors in training to begin an entry-level school counseling position, help them to foster a

solid professional identity, and increase overall supervisor effectiveness. Hence, the main goal

of this research was to determine how specialization-specific supervision influences the

perceptions of school counselors to enhance and standardize school counselor preparedness,

professional identity, and supervisor effectiveness while advancing school counseling research,

theory, and practice as an avenue for enhanced preparation of school counseling trainees and

practitioners.

General Research Question

The general research question that served as the overarching question for this study was:

Are there differences between school counselors who received specialization-specific

supervision and those who did not, with respect to their perceptions of preparedness, professional

identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness?

Research Questions

1. Are there differences between school counselors who received university-level individual

    specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive specialization-specific

    supervision on the following:

    a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?

    b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?

    c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

2. Are there differences between school counselors who received university-level group

    specialization-specific supervision than those who did not receive specialization-specific

    supervision on the following:

    a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?

    b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?

c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

3. Are there differences between school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision than those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision on the following:

    a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?

    b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?

    c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

4. To what extent do school counselors think specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard?

5. Is there a difference in perception of knowledge amongst individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences?

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses in this study were derived from the research questions above. They include the following:

1a. School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

1b. School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

1c. School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school

counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

2a. School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

2b. School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

2c. School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

3a. School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

3b. School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

3c. School counselors who received on-site specialization specific supervision have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

4. School counselors will agree more than disagree that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard.

5.   There will be a significant difference in the perception of knowledge between individual,

group, and on-site supervisory experiences.

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample for this research was drawn from members of the American School

Counselor Association (ASCA). As modeled in the previous work of Studer and Oberman

(2006), and Romano (2006), participants were identified from the ASCA membership directory,

in the southern region, which contains approximately 7,900 members' email addresses. Only

members of ASCA can access the membership directory on the ASCA website. The email

addressees were entered into a generic electronic mailing list titled *Specialization-Specific*

Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ). After the email addresses were entered into the electronic

mailing list, they were deleted. Participants were contacted directly and solely through email via

a mass email message. After allowing for non-respondents and inaccurate email addresses, the

approximate number of participants in the study was 555. Two random drawings were held,

each for a $50 gift certificate to Amazon.com. Once all participants completed the survey and

the research was completed, the winners were notified by email and provided with a gift

certificate code.

Of the 7,913 email addresses listed in ASCA's southern region, 730 were returned as

undeliverable. An additional 22 ASCA members emailed the researcher stating they were not

working as a school counselor and were not eligible for my research; thus, yielding a population

of 7,161 potential participants. Surveys were returned by 555 participants; thus, representing a

return rate of 7.8%. Descriptive information was gathered to identify characteristics of the

sample and to aid future researchers conducting related investigations. Participants were asked

to identify their sex. The majority of participants were female (87%), compared to male (13%).

These results are consistent with the demographics for school counselors in general. The

frequency of participants' sex appears in Table 1.

Table 1
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Sex

Sex	*n*	*%*
Male	74	13
Female	481	87
Total	555	100

Participants were asked to identify their race/ethnicity. Most of the participants identified

themselves as White (75%). Blacks or African Americans made up the second largest race

category, representing 18% of the sample. Of the remaining categories, 1% of the sample

identified themselves as Asian Indian, 1% self-identified as Korean, and 5% represented other.

These results are similar to the national statistics (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Therefore, the

sample can be viewed as similar to the national population (i.e., socio-racially and by gender).

The frequency of their responses is listed in Table 2.

Table 2
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	*n*	*%*
White	418	75
Black/African American	98	18
American Indian/Alaska Native	1	0
Asian Indian	4	1
Other Asian	2	0
Korean	5	1
Other	27	5
Total	555	100

Respondents were asked to select whether or not they were enrolled in a master's counseling graduate program. The majority of respondents were not enrolled in a master's counseling graduate program (79%); the remaining participants (21%) were enrolled. The frequency of their responses is listed in Table 3.

Table 3
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Enrollment in Master's Counseling Graduate Program

Response	*n*	*%*
Yes	115	21
No	440	79
Total	555	100

Participants were asked to indicate how many years has passed since they graduated from their counseling program. Participants with less than one year since their graduation comprised 34% of the population, while those with ten or more years since they graduated made up 23%. The percentage of participants who graduated between one to three years was 19%; those who graduated between four to five years was 10%; six to seven years was 8%; and eight to nine years was 6%. The frequency of the participant response is listed in Table 4.

Table 4
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Years Post Counseling Program Graduation

Years	*n*	*%*
0	187	34
1-3	103	19
4-5	56	10
6-7	45	8
8-9	34	6
10 or more	127	23
Total	552	100

Level of education was a characteristic for which participants were asked to respond. The responses appear in Table 5. The vast majority of participants held master's degrees (68%). Respondents holding doctoral degrees comprised only 7% of the sample. Approximately 14% of the sample consisted of individuals whose highest earned degree was at the bachelor level. The advanced specialist or certification accounted for 10% of the sample, while the category other accounted for 1% of the sample.

Table 5
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Levels of Education

Education Level	n	%
B.S./B.A.	80	14
M.A., M.S., M.Ed.	378	68
Ph.D., Ed. D.	38	7
Advanced Specialist/Cert.	55	10
Other	4	1
Total	555	100

Participants were asked to indicate if their graduate program was CACREP accredited. The majority of respondents indicated that their program was CACREP accredited (71%), while the remaining participants (16%) indicated that their program was not CACREP accredited. Thirteen percent of the population indicated that they were unsure if their program was CACREP accredited. The frequency of their responses is listed in Table 6.

Table 6
Frequency Distribution of Participants by CACREP Accreditation

Accreditation	n	%
Yes	394	71
No	91	16
Unsure	70	13
Total	555	100

Respondents were asked to indicate their current school employment setting, or setting in which they were completing fieldwork, practicum, or internship by the school levels of elementary, middle or junior high, high, K-12, or other. The number of participants working at the middle or junior high and high school level were the same with approximately 26% each. Thirty percent of the respondents held positions at the elementary level. Exactly 8% indicated that they held positions at the K-12 setting, and 7% selected other as their current work setting. The frequency of their responses is listed in Table 7.

Table 7

Frequency Distribution of Participants by Work/Fieldwork/Practicum/Internship Setting

Setting	*n*	*%*
Elementary	180	32
Middle/Junior High School	144	26
High School	147	26
K-12	43	8
Other	41	7
Total	555	100

Another characteristic of current work setting about which participants were asked to respond was type of school system. The overwhelming majority of respondents (85%) were from public (non-charter) school systems. The respondents from public (charter) comprised 6% of the sample. The respondents from private and parochial systems together comprised less than 10% of the sample, with approximately 3% and 3%, respectively. Four percent of the sample selected the category "other" as the type of school in which they were primarily employed or in which they were completing fieldwork, practicum, or internship. The frequency of the participant responses is listed in Table 8.

Table 8

Frequency Distribution of Participants by Type of School System

School System	n	%
Public (Non-Charter)	470	85
Public (Charter)	36	6
Private	15	3
Parochial	14	3
Other	20	4
Total	555	100

Participants were asked to indicate the number of years of teaching experience they had acquired. Forty percent of the sample indicated that they had zero years of teaching experience, while the second largest response (27%) of the sample indicated that they had ten or more years of teaching experience. Participants with one to three years of teaching experience made up 16%. The percentage of the sample that indicated four to five years was 8%; those with six to seven years was 6%; and those with eight to nine years was 3%. Descriptive data for participants' responses appear in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequency Distribution of Participants by Years of Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	n	%
0	221	40
1-3	88	16
4-5	43	8
6-7	33	6
8-9	18	3
10 or more	149	27
Total	555	100

Type of supervisors assigned was a characteristic about which participants were asked to respond. As it is common for members of the counseling profession to be assigned multiple supervisors, totals for frequencies of responses exceeded the total number of respondents.

The percentage of participants who were assigned a university-level individual supervisor who was a doctoral student (7%) was less than those respondents who were assigned a university-level individual supervisor who was a faculty member (31%). The percentage of participants who had been assigned a university-level group supervisor who was a doctoral student (4%) was less than those respondents who were assigned a university-level group supervisor who was a faculty member (13%). A large percentage of the sample (38%) was assigned an on-site supervisor who was a school counselor, while 3% was assigned an on-site supervisor who was another type of mental health professional. Only 3% of the sample indicated that they were assigned an on-site supervisor who was a principal, and 1% indicated they were assigned another type of on-site supervisor. The frequency of the participants' responses based on the type of supervisor they were assigned in their counseling graduate program during practicum/internship is presented in Table 10.

Table 10
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Type of Supervisor Assigned

Type of Supervisor	*n*	*%*
University Individual (Doctoral Student)	74	7
University Individual (Faculty Member)	340	31
University Group (Doctoral Student)	42	4
University Group (Faculty Member)	141	13
On-site (School Couns.)	418	38
On-site (Other Mental Health Professional)	37	3
On-site (Principal)	29	3
On-site (Other)	15	1
Total	1096	100

Respondents were asked to select all currently held professional licenses and/or certifications. As it is common for members of the counseling profession to hold multiple certifications, totals for frequencies of responses exceeded the total number of respondents. The category representing no professional licenses and/or certifications had the highest representation among the respondents (53%). The category representing other professional licenses and/or certifications had the second highest representation among the respondents (18%). Fifteen percent of the participants were nationally certified counselors (NCC), while licensed professional counselors (LPC) comprised only 10%. Licensed marriage and family therapist (LMFT) and nationally certified school counselor (NCSC) represented 1% and 4%, respectively. The areas of professional license and/or certification appear in Table 11.

Table 11
Frequency Distribution of Participants by Professional License/Certification

License/Certification	*n*	%
LPC	63	10
LMFT	4	1
LCSW	0	0
LMHPC	1	0
Licensed Psychologist	0	0
NCC	92	15
NCSC	22	4
None	327	53
Other	108	18
Total	617	100

Instrument Development

No other study has examined the differences in school counselors' perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness related to specialization-specific supervision. Previous studies examined school counselor professional identity (Henderson et al., 2007), the types of supervisory activities provided to school counselor

trainees (Studer & Oberman, 2006), and the differences in the supervision of school counselors in traditional school counseling programs versus recognized ASCA Model Programs (Blakely et al., 2009), but the instruments developed for those studies were not appropriate for my study. Specifically, the previous instruments did not take into consideration the key variable in this examination related to specialization-specific supervision. Moreover, the previous instruments did not examine these specific dependent variables concomitantly -- school counselors' perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The dependent variables in this research are based on the general conceptualization of school counselor training -- whereby school counselors are trained at the master's level and adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position, with a defined professional identity from their graduate coursework, supervision, and practicum/internship experiences.

The *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ) was created specifically for this study with the purpose of: (a) determining if there are differences in school counselors' perceptions of preparedness and the school counselor receiving university-level individual, group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision, (b) determining if there are differences in school counselors' perceptions of professional identity and receiving university-level individual, group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision, (c) determining if there are differences in school counselors' perceptions of supervisor effectiveness and receiving university-level individual, group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision, (d) determining the extent to which school counselors believe specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard counselor education programs, and (e) determining if there is a significant difference in school counselors' perceptions of knowledge regarding school related issues between individual, group, and on-site supervisors.

The SSSQ is a 33-item survey divided into five sections (see Appendix A). Section I, Background Information, is comprised of items related to personal information about participants including sex, ethnicity, graduate student status, years working post-master's graduation, education level, graduate program accreditation status, present employment or practicum/internship setting, years of teaching experience, type of supervisor(s) assigned in a master's program, professional licensure and certification, and professional associations.

Section II, University-Level Individual Supervisory Experiences, asked participants to focus on their university-level individual supervisor. This section was designed to capture perceptions regarding their university-level individual supervisor's school counseling experience, and the extent to which the university-level individual supervisor influenced their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness.

Section III, University-Level Group Supervisory Experiences, asked participants to focus on their university-level group supervisor. This section was designed to capture perceptions regarding their group supervisor's school counseling experience, and to the extent to which the group supervisor influenced their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness.

Section IV, On-Site Supervisory Experiences, asked participants to focus on their on-site supervisor. This section was designed to capture perceptions regarding their on-site supervisor's school counseling experience, and to the extent to which the on-site supervisor influenced their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness.

In Section V, Overall Supervisory Experiences, participants were asked to comment about what they would have changed about their supervisory experiences.

To acquire data regarding supervisory experiences related to perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness, seven-point Likert scales with anchored responses at each point were used. The possible responses for perceptions of preparedness included: exceptionally prepared (7), very prepared (6), somewhat prepared (5), somewhat unprepared (4), very unprepared (3), not prepared at all (2), and not applicable (1). The possible responses for perceptions of professional identity related to their supervisory experiences included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree (6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2), and not applicable (1). The possible responses for the extent to which participants rate the development level of their professional identity related to their supervisory experiences included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree (6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2), and not applicable (1). The possible responses for perceptions of supervisor effectiveness included: exceptionally effective (7), very effective (6), somewhat effective (5), somewhat ineffective (4), very ineffective (3), not effective at all (2), and not applicable (1). The possible responses for the perceptions about knowledge of school-related issues and perceptions of training standards included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree (6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2), and not applicable (1).

The items included in the SSSQ were developed based on guidelines from ACES (1990), ACA (2005), ASCA (2010) and CACREP (2009), as well as current published research regarding school counselor supervision and professional identity. A detailed account of the literature that supports inclusion of each item is presented in Table 12, and indicates that the items were developed from themes and concepts provided in the referenced literature. The

approach to item development is research and literature based, and provides initial content

validity for the SSSQ (Evans, Burnett, Kendric, & Macrina, 2009).

Table 12

Instrument Development: Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)

Item Number	Guidelines and Published Literature Reference
1-11	Participant demographic information
12	ACA (2005); ACES (1990, 2011); Bernard & Goodyear (2004); CACREP (2009); Perusse et al. (2001); Thompson & Moffett (2010)
13	The ASCA National Model (2005); Belafsky et al., 2008; Campbell & Dahir (1997); Carns & Carns (1997); Corwin & Edelfelt (1977); Education Trust (2004); Gladding (2007); Peterson & Deuschle (2006); Remley & Herlihy (2010); Studer (2005); Wood & Rayle (2006)
14	Akos & Scarborough (2004); Blakely et al. (2009); Devlin et al. (2009); Studer (2006); Kaufman & Schwartz (2003); Lambie & Williamson (2004); Studer & Oberman (2006)
15	Brott & Myers (1999); Dollarhide & Miller (2006); Lambie & Williamson (2004); Nelson & Jackson (2003); Remley & Herlihy (2010); Studer (2006)
16	Bernard (1979); Bernard & Goodyear (2004); Hart & Nance (2003); Koltz (2008); Luke & Bernard (2006); Murphy & Kaffenberger (2007); Nelson & Johnson (1999)
17	Hatch (2008); Jordan (2006); Remley & Herlihy (2010)
18	Bradley & Fiorini (1999); Borders (1991); Thompson & Moffett (2010); CACREP (2009); Herlihy et al. (2002); Prieto (1998); Roberts (2001)
19	ACES (1990, 2011); Bernard & Goodyear (2004); CACREP (2009); Perusse et al. (2001); Thompson & Moffett (2010)

Table 12 (continued)
Instrument Development: Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)

Item Number	Guidelines and Published Literature Reference
20	The ASCA *National Model* (2005); Belafsky et al., 2008; Campbell & Dahir (1997); Carns & Carns (1997); Corwin & Edelfelt (1977); Education Trust (2004); Gladding (2007); Peterson & Deuschle (2006); Remley & Herlihy (2010); Studer (2005); Wood & Rayle (2006)
21	Akos & Scarborough (2004); Blakely et al. (2009); Devlin et al. (2009); Studer (2006); Kaufman & Schwartz (2003); Lambie & Williamson (2004); Studer & Oberman (2006)
22	Brott & Myers (1999); Dollarhide & Miller (2006); Lambie & Williamson (2004); Nelson & Jackson (2003); Remley & Herlihy (2010); Studer (2006)
23	Bernard (1979); Bernard & Goodyear (2004); Hart & Nance (2003); Koltz (2008); Luke & Bernard (2006); Murphy & Kaffenberger (2007); Nelson & Johnson (1999)
24	Hatch (2008); Jordan (2006); Remley & Herlihy (2010)
25	Bradley & Fiorini (1999); Borders (1991); Thompson & Moffett (2010); CACREP (2009); Herlihy et al. (2002); Prieto (1998); Roberts (2001)
26	ACES (1990, 2011); Bernard & Goodyear (2004); CACREP (2009); Perusse et al. (2001); Thompson & Moffett (2010)
27	The ASCA *National Model* (2005); Belafsky et al., 2008; Campbell & Dahir (1997); Carns & Carns (1997); Corwin & Edelfelt (1977); Education Trust (2004); Gladding (2007); Peterson & Deuschle (2006); Remley & Herlihy (2010); Studer (2005); Wood & Rayle (2006)
28	Akos & Scarborough (2004); Blakely et al. (2009); Devlin et al. (2009); Studer (2006); Kaufman & Schwartz (2003); Lambie & Williamson (2004); Studer & Oberman (2006)

Table 12 (continued)
Instrument Development: Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)

Item Number	Guidelines and Published Literature Reference
29	Brott & Myers (1999); Dollarhide & Miller (2006); Lambie & Williamson (2004); Nelson & Jackson (2003); Remley & Herlihy (2010); Studer (2006)
30	Bernard (1979); Bernard & Goodyear (2004); Hart & Nance (2003); Koltz (2008); Luke & Bernard (2006); Murphy & Kaffenberger (2007); Nelson & Johnson (1999)
31	Hatch (2008); Jordan (2006); Remley & Herlihy (2010)
32	Bradley & Fiorini (1999); Borders (1991); Thompson & Moffett (2010); CACREP (2009); Herlihy et al. (2002); Prieto (1998); Roberts (2001)
33	Open-ended comment question

Content Validation

Validity is the level at which a survey instrument measures what it is designed to measure (Evans et al., 2009). The core essence of validity can be summed up by the word "accuracy," or the extent that an instrument measures what it purports to measure (Huck, 2009). It is critical that the items on the survey measure the content it was intended to measure or the results could be considered invalid. Items on the survey were developed based on the current published literature regarding content domain of interest: school counselor preparation, professional identity, and supervision (see Table 12).

Content validity is oftentimes determined by having experts form subjective opinions by carefully comparing the content of the test against a syllabus or outline that specifies the instrument's claimed domain (Huck, 2009). Experts can provide an accessible source of information that can be quickly harnessed to gain an opinion, and they often provide insight into topics that have not been published (Baker, Lovell, & Harris, 2006). Utilizing expert panels can

be of great influence in a study to determine the face validity of a survey (Belafsky et al., 2008; Nakazawa, 2009).

Expert Panels

An expert panel of four counselor educators in the greater New Orleans area with school counseling experience, and who have provided specialization-specific supervision to school counselors in training, screened survey items for content validity, as well as for ease of understanding. Three members of the expert panel also taught school counseling courses at the master's level. The fourth member of the expert panel currently worked as a school counselor. All of the counselor educators were excluded as potential respondents to the proposed research study. A pool of the best items were determined by panel recommendations and identified for final item inclusion. Each member offered his or her expertise on specific tasks that school counselors face that are realistic with the role that 21st century school counselors are confronted with on the job. The most valuable expertise gained from the expert panel was the fact that these tasks were specific to those encountered in supervision sessions with supervisors. The tasks were noted as those more likely to be discussed in supervision than to be simply learned about theoretically in a school counseling course. As a result, the tasks were considered to be valid items of the SSSQ.

A second expert panel screened actual survey items entered into Qualtrics™ software for ease of administration. This second expert panel consisted of six practicing school counselors in the greater New Orleans area who have provided on-site specialization-specific supervision to school counselors in training. All of the members of the second expert panel have received master's degrees in counseling with a specialization in school counseling. All of the practicing school counselors were excluded as potential respondents to the proposed research. The panel's

feedback and recommendations regarding the style, format, and time allotment of the survey were taken into consideration when constructing the final survey instrument.

Data Collection

All procedures and protocols related to data collection were reviewed and approved by the University of New Orleans Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB). After receiving approval (see Appendix E), data were collected from school counselors listed in the American School Counselors Association (ASCA) online membership directory.

Data were collected anonymously via Qualtrics™ (http://www.qualtrics.com), which is an on-line survey and data collection service. The *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ) was developed for use as an on-line survey through Qualtrics.com. The creation tools and secure electronic link were created for respondents to access the survey. Although the total population of potential participants was identified via a membership directory before data collection, the SSSQ did not contain questions that could reveal the identity of individual respondents. More specifically, the data collection tool, Qualtrics™, did not provide any possibility for identifying participants.

School counselors from ASCA's southern region were included. After the southern region list of school counselors was identified, email addresses of the members were entered into a generic mailing list titled SSSQ. The electronic mailing list contained only email addresses of ASCA school counselors, and no other identifying information was collected.

Potential participants for the SSSQ were contacted by means of a generic mass electronic message requesting voluntary participation. The electronic message included a brief description of the study, a statement regarding participant anonymity, a statement that agreeing to participate served as consent for study, and a statement that IRB approval had been obtained. The message

provided a link for accessing the SSSQ. Participation in the study was completely voluntary and anonymous. No identifying data were collected from the participants, nor did their responses reveal identifying information. After completing the survey, participants elected to be included in a random drawing for a $50.00 gift certificate to Amazon.com. To do so, participants had to click a link that took them to another page in which they included their email address to be included in the drawing. There were a total of two winners, and both winners were contacted via email after the research was completed.

After the participants accessed the on-line version of the *SSSQ*, they were requested to complete the 33-item survey *(SSSQ)*. All potential participants were sent three generic mass electronic messages (see Appendices B, C, and D). After the initial email was sent to solicit survey participants, second and third follow-up email reminders were sent at weeks 2 and 4 of the study, which helped increase response rates (i.e., 3.4% to 4.6% to 7.8%). After participants completed the survey, they were automatically sent a final email message that thanked them for completing the survey.

Data Management

All data collected with the electronic questionnaire were kept securely on-line through a password-protected account with Qualtrics™ software (Qualtrics Lab Inc., 2010). In accordance with APA regulations, data will be kept confidentially for at least three years after the study is complete. Frequencies, means, and standard deviations for demographic questions 1-11 were extrapolated from the Qualtrics™ (2010) software program. Data were loaded electronically from Qualtrics software into SAS v. 9.2 (2008), and calculations for hypotheses were performed.

Data Analysis

To identify variables that can influence school counselors' perceptions, data analysis for this proposed study included descriptive statistics, ANOVA, and MANOVA. Due to the large number of comparisons in all the analyses, a conservative alpha level of $p \leq .001$ was employed to control for Type 1 errors (Huck, 2009).

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data on questions 1-11 of the background information in Section I. Frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations were employed to address questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

<u>Hypothesis 1a</u>

School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 12 and 13 (a-h) of Section II of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a Bonferroni correction was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance (multivariate *F*) was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

<u>Hypothesis 1b</u>

School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from question questions 12, 14 (a-c), and 15 of Section II of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance (multivariate *F*) was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

<u>Hypothesis 1c</u>

School counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 12, 16 (a-c) of Section II of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-

specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. A more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

<u>Hypothesis 2a</u>

School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 19 and 20 (a-h) of Section III of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

<u>Hypothesis 2b</u>

School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 19, 21 (a-c), and 22 of Section III of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance (multivariate F) is found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

Hypothesis 2c

School counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 19, and 23 (a-c) of Section III of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. A more stringent alpha level was utilized to control the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

<u>Hypothesis 3a</u>

School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 26 and 27 (a-h) of Section IV of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

<u>Hypothesis 3b</u>

School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 26, and 28 (a-c), and 29 of Section IV of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting

from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq$ .001 (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

Hypothesis 3c

School counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

Data Analysis

Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 26, and 30 (a-c) of Section IV of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. A more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contribute to the significant multivariate F.

Hypothesis 4

All school counselors will agree more than disagree that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard.

Data Analysis

Data from this hypothesis were gathered from question 18 of Section II, question 25 of Section III, and question 32 of Section IV with percent agreement (responses 5, 6, and 7) being significantly greater (random chance at 50-50%) than lack of agreement (responses 1, 2, 3, and

4). A difference in proportion test was performed to analyze the differences between individual, group, and on-site.

Hypothesis 5

There will be a significant difference in the perception of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences.

Data Analysis

Data from this hypothesis were gathered from question 17 of Section II, question 24 of Section III, and question 31 of Section IV. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to analyze the differences between the mean answers. Post hoc least significant difference (LSD) tests were used to test for significance.

Post Hoc

A post hoc procedure was employed to analyze the qualitative data collected from the free form field included on the survey, question 33 of section IV. Data were analyzed using content and thematic analyses according to procedures suggested by Creswell (2009). Statements were divided into themes and perspectives, then coded using *in vivo* and open codes. Codes were then grouped into thematic categories, and linked to survey items as a method of providing more depth to the quantitative data.

Assumptions of the Study

A basic assumption of this study was that the instrument designed to survey school counselors about their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness related to specialization-specific supervision is valid and accurately measured these items. In all survey and questionnaire research, a basic assumption is that the instrument will validly and reliably measure the content it purports to measure (Creswell, 2009).

Summary

This chapter contained a description of the methodology that was used in this study, including subsections that detailed the purpose of the study, general research question, research questions, research hypotheses, participant selection criteria, instrumentation and instrument development, data collection plan, methods of data analysis, limitations and delimitations. The methodology for this study was designed to examine the relationship between school counselors' perceptions of preparedness, perceptions of their professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness related to specialization-specific supervision.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the influence of specialization-specific supervision (SSS) on school counselors' perceptions of their preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The main goal of this research study was to determine how specialization-specific supervision influences the perceptions of school counselors to enhance and standardize school counselor preparedness, professional identity, and supervisor effectiveness while advancing school counseling research, theory, and practice as an avenue for enhanced preparation of school counseling trainees and practitioners. In this chapter, results of the data analyses are reported.

Test of Hypotheses

To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a Bonferroni correction was employed to control for Type 1 error (Huck, 2009). All tests of hypotheses used a conservative alpha level of $p \leq .001$ to control the Type I error rate (Huck, 2009). Multivariate normality was assumed for all analyses (Huck, 2009). To assess the strength of the relationship (Trusty, Thompson, & Petrocelli, 2004) and to determine practical significance (Thompson, 2002), eta squared effect sizes are reported for all multivariate analyses. Tibachnick and Fidell (2007) pointed out that regular multivariate eta-squared (η^2) has a disadvantage of possible overestimation: (a) when multiple independent variables are involved, rather than a single independent variable and/or (b) when compared with univariate eta-squared (η^2). Instead, they recommended using multivariate partial eta-squared as a less biased measure. However, in this study, a single independent variable was used for MANOVA, and multivariate partial eta-squared was unable to be calculated. Therefore, the regular multivariate eta-squared

was reported. The interpretation of the effect size was based on Cohen's (1992) criteria for

effect size interpretation (^{2}= .10 as small; ^{2}= .25 as moderate; and ^{2}= .40 as large) with

caution (Robinson, Whittaker, Williams, & Beretvas, 2003), because Cohen's criteria were based

on univariate analysis.

Research Question

The general research question that served as the overarching question for this study was:

Are there differences between school counselors who received specialization-specific

supervision and those who did not with respect to their perceptions of preparedness, professional

identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness?

Instrumentation

The *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ) was created specifically

for this study with the purpose of: (a) determining if there are differences in school counselors'

perceptions of preparedness and the school counselor receiving university-level individual,

group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision, (b) determining if there are differences in

school counselors' perceptions of professional identity and receiving university-level individual,

group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision, (c) determining if there are differences in

school counselors' perceptions of supervisor effectiveness and receiving university-level

individual, group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision, (d) determining the extent to

which school counselors believe specialization-specific supervision should be a required training

standard counselor education programs, and (e) determining if there is a significant difference in

school counselors' perceptions of knowledge regarding school related issues between individual,

group, and on-site supervisors.

The SSSQ is a 33-item survey divided into five sections (see Appendix A). Section I

elicited background information. Section II focused on the university-level individual

supervisory experiences. Section III focused on the university-level group supervisory

experiences. Section IV focused on the on-site supervisory experiences. Sections II, III, and IV

were designed to capture perceptions regarding their supervisors' school counseling experience,

and to the extent to which the specific supervisor influenced their perceptions of preparedness,

professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. Section V was devoted to the

overall supervisory experiences, and participants were asked to comment about what they would

have changed about their supervisory experiences.

To acquire data regarding supervisory experiences related to perceptions of preparedness,

professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness, seven-point Likert scales with

anchored responses at each point were used. The possible responses for perceptions of

preparedness included: exceptionally prepared (7), very prepared (6), somewhat prepared (5),

somewhat unprepared (4), very unprepared (3), not prepared at all (2), and not applicable (1).

The possible responses for perceptions of professional identity related to their supervisory

experiences included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree (6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat

disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2), and not applicable (1). The possible

responses for the extent to which participants rate the development level of their professional

identity related to their supervisory experiences included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree

(6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2),

and not applicable (1). The possible responses for perceptions of supervisor effectiveness

included: exceptionally effective (7), very effective (6), somewhat effective (5), somewhat

ineffective (4), very ineffective (3), not effective at all (2), and not applicable (1). The possible

responses for the perceptions about knowledge of school-related issues and perceptions of training standards included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree (6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2), and not applicable (1).

Hypotheses 1a-c refer to university-level individual specialization-specific supervision. Hypotheses 2a-c refer to university-level group specialization-specific supervision. Hypotheses 3a-c refer to on-site specialization-specific supervision.

Test of Hypothesis 1a

Research Hypothesis 1a stated that school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of preparedness between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 12 and 13 (a-h) of Section II of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ). To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a Bonferroni correction was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' = 0.83, $F (8, 460) = 12.14; p < .0001, {}^2 = 0.17$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate F (Huck, 2009). The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 1a are presented in Table 13.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 1a

Question	*n*	Variable Preparedness	*M*	*SD*
12. Individual	404	13.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	2.12	0.96
Specialization		13.b Deal with systemic challenges	2.28	1.01
Specific		13.c Identify obstacles to academic success	2.25	1.04
Supervision		13.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	2.68	1.22
		13.e Advocate for appropriate roles	1.95	1.02
		13.f Use data to drive decision-making	2.49	1.33
		13.g Provide career-related services	2.28	1.02
		13.h Address personal/social needs	1.74	0.83
12. No	97	13.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	3.20	1.17
Individual		13.b Deal with systemic challenges	3.40	1.16
Specialization		13.c Identify obstacles to academic success	3.28	1.26
Specific		13.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	3.54	1.43
Supervision		13.e Advocate for appropriate roles	2.88	1.41
		13.f Use data to drive decision-making	3.56	1.54
		13.g Provide career-related services	3.06	1.29
		13.h Address personal/social needs	2.32	1.10

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being exceptionally prepared and 6 being not prepared at all; therefore, a lower mean is better prepared.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt better prepared. A higher mean score indicates that school counselors felt less prepared. The results indicate that school counselors who received individual specialization-specific supervision felt better prepared than those who did not receive individual specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 1a, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness. The results are reported in Table 14. The findings

revealed significant differences between school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to preparedness. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' = 0.83, F (8, 460) = 12.14; $p < .0001$, ^{2} = 0.17). This means that there was a significant difference in perceived preparedness between those who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision felt more prepared than those who did not have specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a strong effect size (^{2} = 0.17) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Table 14
MANOVA Results for School Counselors Who Had Received Individual SSS and Those That Did Not with Respect to Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness for Hypotheses 1a – 1c

Subsets	*Wilks'*	*df*	*F*	*p*	^{2}
Preparedness Items 13(a-h)	0.83	8/ 460	12.14	<.0001	0.17
Professional Identity Items 14 (a-c), and 15	0.87	4/ 474	17.43	<.0001	0.13
Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness Items 16 (a-c)	0.83	3/ 467	31.97	<.0001	0.17

Note. Items are listed in Tables 12, 15, 17.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for preparedness, an ANOVA was conducted on each item of preparedness as a follow-up test. Eight ANOVA procedures were

conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses

are displayed in Table 15.

Table 15
ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 1a

	Univariate			Multivariate	
F Test Item	*df*	*F*	*p*	*F*	^{2}
13.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	1 / 467	81.73	< .0001	12.14	0.17
13.b Deal with systemic challenges	1 / 467	78.97	< .0001		
13.c Identify obstacles to academic success	1 / 467	70.49	< .0001		
13.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	1 / 467	32.48	< .0001		
13.e Advocate for appropriate roles	1 / 467	51.22	< .0001		
13.f Use data to drive decision-making	1 / 467	45.5	< .0001		
13.g Provide career-related services	1 / 467	38.52	< .0001		
13.h Address personal/social needs	1 / 467	35.51	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 1b

Research Hypothesis 1b stated that school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of professional identity between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 12, 14 (a-c), and 15 of Section II of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $= 0.87$, $F (4, 474) = 17.43$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 0.13$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 1b are presented in Table 16. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt a stronger sense of their professional identity. A higher mean score indicated that

school counselors felt less of a sense of their professional identity. The results indicate that school counselors who received individual specialization-specific supervision felt a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not receive individual specialization-specific supervision.

Table 16

Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 1b

Question	*n*	Variable Professional Identity	*M*	*SD*
12. Individual Specialization Specific Supervision	404	14.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	1.88	1.07
		14.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	1.93	1.12
		14.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	1.71	0.89
		15. Professional identity as a school counselor	1.67	0.87
12. No Individual Specialization Specific Supervision	97	14.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	2.98	1.49
		14.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	2.78	1.44
		14.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	2.29	1.31
		15. Professional identity as a school counselor	2.26	1.16

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being strongly agree and 6 being strongly disagree; therefore, a lower mean indicates a stronger sense of professional identity.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 1b, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. The results are reported in Table 13. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to professional identity. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' $= 0.87$, $F (4, 474) = 17.43$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 0.13$). This means that there was a significant difference in perceived professional identity between those who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision reported having a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not have individual specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is nearly a medium effect size ($^2 = 0.13$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for professional identity, an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Four ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in Table 17.

Table 17

ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 1b

F Test Item	Univariate			Multivariate	
	df	F	p	F	^{2}
14.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	1 / 477	65.59	< .0001	0.87	0.13
14.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	1 / 477	42.78	< .0001		
14.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	1 / 477	25.75	< .0001		
15. Professional identity as a school counselor	1 / 477	28.46	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 1c

Research Hypothesis 1c stated that school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of supervisor effectiveness between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 12, 16 (a-c) of Section II of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. A more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' = 0.83, F (3, 467) = 31.97; $p <$ .0001, $^2 = 0.17$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 1c are presented in Table 18. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. A higher mean score indicated that school counselors felt less positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. The results indicate that school counselors who received individual

101

specialization-specific supervision felt more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than those who did not receive individual specialization-specific supervision.

Table 18
Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 1c

Question	*n*	Variable Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness	*M*	*SD*
12. Individual Specialization Specific Supervision	404	16.a As a teacher of school related issues	2.23	0.94
		16.b. As a consultant of school related issues	2.04	0.90
		16.c. As a counselor of school related issues	1.93	0.90
12. No Individual Specialization Specific Supervision	97	16.a As a teacher of school related issues	3.31	1.27
		16.b. As a consultant of school related issues	3.14	1.27
		16.c. As a counselor of school related issues	2.93	1.25

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being exceptionally effective and 6 being not effective at all; therefore, a lower mean indicates feeling more positive regarding perceptions of supervisor effectiveness.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 1c, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. The results are reported in Table 14. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' $= 0.83$, $F (3, 467) = 31.97$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 0.17$). This means

that there was a significant difference in perceived supervisor effectiveness between those who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision reported feeling more positive than those who did not have individual specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a strong effect size (^{2} = 0.17) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for perceived supervisor effectiveness, an ANOVA was conducted on each item of supervisor effectiveness as a follow-up test. Three ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in Table 19.

Table 19
ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 1c

	Univariate			Multivariate	
F Test Item	*df*	*F*	*p*	*F*	^{2}
16.a As a teacher of school related issues	1 / 469	80.82	< .0001	0.83	0.17
16.b As a consultant of school related issues	1 / 469	88.00	< .0001		
16.c As a counselor of school related issues	1 / 469	74.66	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 2a

Hypothesis 2a stated that school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of preparedness between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 19 and 20 (a-h) of Section III of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a Bonferroni correction was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq$ .001 (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $= 0.71$, $F(8, 422) = 22.03$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 0.29$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*. The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 2a are presented in Table 20. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt better prepared. A higher mean score indicated that school counselors felt less prepared. The results indicate that school counselors who received group specialization-specific supervision felt better prepared than those who did not receive group specialization-specific supervision.

Table 20

Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 2a

Question	*n*	Variable Preparedness	*M*	*SD*
12. Group	360	20.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	2.11	0.88
Specialization		20.b Deal with systemic challenges	2.15	0.92
Specific		20.c Identify obstacles to academic success	2.13	0.91
Supervision		20.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	2.41	1.11
		20.e Advocate for appropriate roles	1.89	0.94
		20.f Use data to drive decision-making	2.29	1.11
		20.g Provide career-related services	2.19	0.97
		20.h Address personal/social needs	1.74	0.83
12. No Group	153	20.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	3.20	1.17
Specialization		20.b Deal with systemic challenges	3.40	1.16
Specific		20.c Identify obstacles to academic success	3.28	1.26
Supervision		20.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	3.54	1.43
		20.e Advocate for appropriate roles	2.88	1.41
		20.f Use data to drive decision-making	3.56	1.54
		20.g Provide career-related services	3.06	1.29
		20.h Address personal/social needs	2.32	1.10

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being exceptionally prepared and 6 being not prepared at all; therefore, a lower mean is better prepared.

[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 2a, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness. The results are reported in Table 21. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to perceived preparedness. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' $= 0.71$, $F (8, 422) = 22.03$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 0.29$). This means that there was a

significant difference in preparedness between those who received university-level group

specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall.

Those with specialization-specific supervision felt more prepared than those who did not have

specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for

social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a large effect size ($^2 = 0.29$) and practical

significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Table 21
MANOVA Results for School Counselors Who Had Received Group SSS and Those That Did Not with Respect to Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness for Hypotheses 2a – 2c

Subsets	*Wilks'*	*df*	*F*	*p*	^{2}
Preparedness Items 20(a-h)	0.71	8/ 422	22.03	<.0001	0.29
Professional Identity Items 21 (a-c), and 22	0.81	4/ 434	25.66	<.0001	0.19
Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness Items 23 (a-c)	0.74	3/ 429	51.24	<.0001	0.26

Note. Items are listed in Tables 19, 21, 24.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for preparedness, an ANOVA was

conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Eight ANOVA procedures were conducted and

resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in

Table 22.

Table 22

ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 2a

		Univariate		Multivariate	
F Test Item	*df*	*F*	*p*	*F*	^{2}
20.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	1 / 429	128.74	< .0001	22.03	0.29
20.b Deal with systemic challenges	1 / 429	135.55	< .0001		
20.c Identify obstacles to academic success	1 / 429	109.08	< .0001		
20.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	1 / 429	75.15	< .0001		
20.e Advocate for appropriate roles	1 / 429	125.96	< .0001		
20.f Use data to drive decision-making	1 / 429	100.08	< .0001		
20.g Provide career-related services	1 / 429	81.21	< .0001		
20.h Address personal/social needs	1 / 429	39.73	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 2b

Research Hypothesis 2b stated that school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of professional identity between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 19, 21 (a-c), and 22 of Section III of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.81$, $F(4, 434) = 25.66$; $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .19$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 2b are presented in Table 23. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt a stronger sense of their professional identity. A higher mean score indicated that

school counselors felt less of a sense of their professional identity. The results indicate that

school counselors who received group specialization-specific supervision felt a stronger sense of

their professional identity than those who did not receive group specialization-specific

supervision.

Table 23
Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 2b

Question	*n*	Variable Professional Identity	*M*	*SD*
19. Group Specialization Specific Supervision	404	21.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	1.86	0.98
		21.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	1.86	0.95
			1.77	0.88
		21.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	1.61	0.82
		22. Professional identity as a school counselor		
19. No Group Specialization Specific Supervision	97	21.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	2.99	1.29
		21.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	2.89	1.36
			2.32	1.25
		21.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	2.46	1.24
		22. Professional identity as a school counselor		

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being strongly agree and 6 being strongly disagree; therefore, a lower mean indicates a stronger sense of professional identity.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 2b, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. The results are reported in Table 21. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to professional identity. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' Λ = 0.81, $F(4, 434) = 25.66$; $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .19$). This means that there was a significant difference in perceived professional identity between those who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision reported having a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not have individual specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a medium to large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.19$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for professional identity, an ANOVA was conducted on each item of preparedness as a follow-up test. Four ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in Table 24.

Table 24

ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 2b

	Univariate			Multivariate	
F Test Item	*df*	*F*	*p*	*F*	^{2}
21.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	1 / 437	90.74	< .0001	25.66	0.19
21.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	1 / 437	77.17	< .0001		
21.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	1 / 437	24.13	< .0001		
22. Professional identity as a school counselor	1 / 437	67.96	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 2c

Research Hypothesis 2c stated that school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision will have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of supervisor effectiveness between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 19, and 23 (a-c) of Section III of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not had university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. A more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $= 0.74$, $F (3, 429) = 51.24$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = .26$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 2c are presented in Table 25. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. A higher mean score indicated that school counselors felt less positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. The results indicate that school counselors who received group

specialization-specific supervision felt more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than those who did not receive group specialization-specific supervision.

Table 25
Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 2c

Question	n	Variable Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness	M	SD
19. Group Specialization Specific Supervision	360	23.a As a teacher of school related issues	2.10	0.93
		23.b. As a consultant of school related issues	1.95	0.88
		23.c. As a counselor of school related issues	1.86	0.86
19. No Group Specialization Specific Supervision	153	23.a As a teacher of school related issues	3.35	1.06
		23.b. As a consultant of school related issues	2.99	1.11
		23.c. As a counselor of school related issues	3.11	1.06

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being exceptionally effective and 6 being not effective at all; therefore, a lower mean indicates feeling more positive regarding perceptions of supervisor effectiveness.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 2c, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. The results are reported in Table 21. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' $= 0.74$, $F (3, 429) = 51.24$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = .26$). This means that there was a

significant difference in perceived supervisor effectiveness between those who received

university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the

dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision reported feeling

more positive than those who did not have group specialization-specific supervision. According

to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992),

there is a strong effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.26$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for perceived supervisor effectiveness,

an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Three ANOVA procedures were

conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses

are displayed in Table 26.

Table 26
ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 2c

	Univariate			Multivariate	
F Test Item	*df*	*F*	*p*	*F*	η^2
23.a As a teacher of school related issues	1 / 431	119.54	< .0001	51.24	0.26
23.b As a consultant of school related issues	1 / 431	91.60	< .0001		
23.c As a counselor of school related issues	1 / 431	140.60	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 3a

Research Hypothesis 3a stated that school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of preparedness between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 26 and 27 (a-h) of Section IV of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire*. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a Bonferroni correction was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $= 0.89$, $F (8, 477) = 7.71$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = .11$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate F. The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 3a are presented in Table 27. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt better prepared. A higher mean score indicated that school counselors felt less prepared. The results indicate that school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision felt better prepared than those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

115

Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 3a

Question	*n*	Variable Preparedness	*M*	*SD*
26. On-Site	485	27.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	1.96	1.00
Specialization		27.b Deal with systemic challenges	2.11	1.06
Specific		27.c Identify obstacles to academic success	2.09	1.07
Supervision		27.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	2.30	1.23
		27.e Advocate for appropriate roles	2.20	1.20
		27.f Use data to drive decision-making	2.58	1.36
		27.g Provide career-related services	2.26	1.16
		27.h Address personal/social needs	1.78	0.93
26. No On-Site	51	27.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	3.35	1.02
Specialization		27.b Deal with systemic challenges	3.54	0.95
Specific		27.c Identify obstacles to academic success	3.31	1.19
Supervision		27.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	3.42	1.21
		27.e Advocate for appropriate roles	3.46	1.10
		27.f Use data to drive decision-making	3.42	1.45
		27.g Provide career-related services	3.63	1.28
		27.h Address personal/social needs	2.96	1.13

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being exceptionally prepared and 6 being not prepared at all; therefore, a lower mean is better prepared.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 3a, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness. The results are reported in Table 28. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to perceived preparedness. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' = 0.89, $F (8, 477) = 7.71$; $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .11$). This means that there was a significant difference in preparedness between those who received on-site

specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall.

Those with specialization-specific supervision felt more prepared than those who did not have

specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for

social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.11$) and practical

significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Table 28
MANOVA Results for School Counselors Who Had Received On-Site SSS and Those That Did Not with
Respect to Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness for Hypotheses
3a – 3c

Subsets	*Wilks'*	*df*	*F*	*p*	η^2
Preparedness Items 27(a-h)	0.89	8/ 477	7.71	<.0001	0.11
Professional Identity Items 28 (a-c), and 29	0.93	4/ 496	9.86	<.0001	0.07
Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness Items 30 (a-c)	0.94	3/ 494	10.82	<.0001	0.06

Note. Items are listed in Tables 26, 29, 31.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for preparedness, an ANOVA was

conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Eight ANOVA procedures were conducted and

resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in

Table 29.

Table 29

ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 3a

F Test Item	Univariate			Multivariate	
	df	F	p	F	2
27.a Resolve problems specific to school settings	1 / 484	48.06	< .0001	7.71	0.11
27.b Deal with systemic challenges	1 / 484	45.35	< .0001		
27.c Identify obstacles to academic success	1 / 484	31.93	< .0001		
27.d Demonstrate behavior management strategies	1 / 484	20.82	< .0001		
27.e Advocate for appropriate roles	1 / 484	28.56	< .0001		
27.f Use data to drive decision-making	1 / 484	9.59	< .0001		
27.g Provide career-related services	1 / 484	37.33	< .0001		
27.h Address personal/social needs	1 / 484	41.78	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 3b

Research Hypothesis 3b stated that school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of professional identity between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 26, and 28 (a-c), and 29 of Section IV of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $= 0.93$, $F(4, 496) = 9.86$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 07$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate *F*.

The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 3b are presented in Table 30. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt a stronger sense of their professional identity. A higher mean score indicated that school counselors felt less of a sense of their professional identity. The results indicate that school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision felt a stronger sense

of their professional identity than those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific

supervision.

Table 30
Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 3b

Question	n	Variable Professional Identity	M	SD
26. On-Site Specialization Specific Supervision	485	28.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	1.82	1.12
		28.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	1.80	1.10
		28.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	1.61	0.88
		29. Professional identity as a school counselor	1.61	0.84
26. No On-Site Specialization Specific Supervision	51	28.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	3.12	1.13
		28.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	2.77	0.88
		28.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	2.46	1.21
		29. Professional identity as a school counselor	2.00	1.31

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being strongly agree and 6 being strongly disagree; therefore, a lower mean indicates a stronger sense of professional identity.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 3b, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity. The results are reported in Table 28. The findings revealed significant differences between school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to professional identity. As indicated earlier, the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' = 0.93, F (4, 496) = 9.86; $p < .0001$, $^2 =$ 07). This means that there was a significant difference in perceived professional identity between those who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision reported having a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not have individual specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a medium to small effect size ($^2 = 0.07$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for professional identity, an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Four ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in Table 31.

121

Table 31

ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 3b

	Univariate			Multivariate	
F Test Item	*df*	*F*	*p*	*F*	^{2}
28.a Supervision experiences have been very helpful in development of professional identity	1 / 499	31.56	< .0001	9.86	0.07
28.b Supervision experiences have influenced professional identity	1 / 499	19.06	< .0001		
28.c Supervisor's experience in school counseling influences professional identity of school counselors	1 / 499	15.09	< .0001		
29. Professional identity as a school counselor	1 / 499	1.2	< .27		

Test of Hypothesis 3c

Research Hypothesis 3c stated that school counselors who received on-site specialization specific supervision have more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference in the perception of supervisor effectiveness between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision was tested using a MANOVA to compare the results of the items. Data for this hypothesis were gathered from questions 26, and 30 (a-c) of Section IV of the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire.* A MANOVA was used to compare the results of the items between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. A more stringent alpha level was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). Statistical significance (Wilks' $= 0.94$, $F(3, 494) = 10.82$; $p < .0001$, $^2 = 06$) was found, so post hoc univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to see which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

The comparisons of means and standard deviations for each item and statistical results for Hypothesis 3c are presented in Table 32. A lower mean score indicates that school counselors felt more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. A higher mean score indicated that school counselors felt less positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness. The results indicate that school counselors who received on-site

123

specialization-specific supervision felt more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor

effectiveness than those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision.

Table 32
Means and Standard Deviations for Hypothesis 3c

Question	*n*	Variable Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness	*M*	*SD*
26. On-Site Specialization Specific Supervision	485	30.a As a teacher of school related issues	2.03	1.10
		30.b. As a consultant of school related issues	1.94	1.03
		30.c. As a counselor of school related issues	1.86	1.04
26. No On-Site Specialization Specific Supervision	51	30.a As a teacher of school related issues	3.16	1.03
		30.b. As a consultant of school related issues	3.12	1.05
		30.c. As a counselor of school related issues	2.96	1.12

Note. Coded 1-6 with 1 being exceptionally effective and 6 being not effective at all; therefore, a lower mean indicates feeling more positive regarding perceptions of supervisor effectiveness.
[a] Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum). [b] Different *n*'s represent the number of participants that specified whether or not they received specialization-specific supervision.

To test Hypothesis 3c, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the

items for counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did

not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceived supervisor

effectiveness. The results are reported in Table 28. The findings revealed significant differences

between school counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those

who did not in the questions related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. As indicated earlier,

the Wilks' lambda criteria was statistically significant (Wilks' = 0.94, $F(3, 494) = 10.82$; $p <$

.0001, $^2 = 06$). This means that there was a significant difference in perceived supervisor

effectiveness between those who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not on the dependent variables overall. Those with specialization-specific supervision reported feeling more positive than those who did not have on-site specialization-specific supervision. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there is a small effect size ($^2 = 0.06$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) was found.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for perceived supervisor effectiveness, an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Three ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. Results of the ANOVA analyses are displayed in Table 33.

Table 33
ANOVA and MANOVA Results for Hypothesis 3c

F Test Item	Univariate			Multivariate	
	df	*F*	*p*	*F*	*ES*
30.a As a teacher of school related issues	1 / 496	26.48	< .0001	10.82	0.06
30.b As a teacher of school related issues	1 / 496	32.50	< .0001		
30.c As a teacher of school related issues	1 / 496	25.60	< .0001		

Test of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that all school counselors will agree more than disagree that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. Data from this hypothesis were gathered from question 18 of Section II, question 25 of Section III, and question 32 of Section IV with percent agreement (responses 5, 6, and 7) being significantly greater (random chance at 50-50%) than lack of agreement (responses 1, 2, 3, and 4). A difference in proportion test (χ^2) was performed to analyze the differences between individual, group, and on-site. The proportion test (Huck, 2009) was performed to analyze the differences between individual, group, and on-site supervision. The difference in proportion test determined that there was not a significant difference in the proportion of agreement between the three levels of supervisory experience ($\chi^2 = 6.91$, $p = .03$). The proportion of subjects who agreed with the statement was different than those who disagreed with the statement, but not different enough between the three supervisory experiences to denote significance. All groups, however, clearly agreed more than disagreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. Results from the proportion test are displayed in Table 34.

Table 34
Results for Difference in Proportions Test for Hypothesis 4

Question
I think specialization specific supervision should be a required training standard

	Individual	Group	On-site
Percent	%	%	%
% Agree	*n*= 487	*n*=457	*n*=504
	92.41%	93.84%	96.18
% Disagree	*n*= 40	*n*=30	*n*=20
	7.59%	6.16%	3.82%

Test of Hypothesis 5

There will be a significant difference in the perception of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences. Data from this hypothesis were gathered from question 17 of Section II, question 24 of Section III, and question 31 of Section IV. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to analyze the differences between the mean answers. The ANOVA test determined that there was not a significant difference in the mean answers between the three supervisory experiences (F (2, 1512) = 3.13, p = .04). The means, standard deviations, and statistical results are displayed in Table 35.

Table 35
Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Results for Hypothesis 5

Question
I think I was more knowledgeable about school-related issues than my supervisor.

Supervisor Type	*n*	*df*	*M*	*SD*	*F*	*p*
Individual (Item 17)	521	2/ 1512	4.00	1.72	3.13	< .05
Group (Item 24)	475	2/ 1512	4.03	1.69	3.13	< .05
On-Site (Item 31)	519	2/ 1512	4.24	1.72	3.13	< .05

Note. Scores range from 1 (minimum) to 6 (maximum).

Results of Responses to the Open-Ended Comment Question

A post hoc procedure was employed to analyze the qualitative data collected from the free form field included on the survey, question 33 of Section IV, and was analyzed using content and thematic analyses according to procedures suggested by Creswell (2009). Statements were divided into themes and perspectives, then coded using *in vivo* and open codes.

Codes were then grouped into thematic categories, and linked to survey items as a method of providing more depth to the quantitative data.

The *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)* concluded with an open-ended question inviting participants to finish the statement "If I could change anything about my supervisory experiences, I would change…" Of the 555 participants who completed and returned the *SSSQ,* 93% chose to respond to the open-ended question. The responses were analyzed resulting in the identification of six themes.

One of the most prominent themes to emerge from this question involved specialization-specific supervision. Of the 517 counselors who chose to answer this question, 15% ($n = 79$) wished they had specialization-specific supervision in their graduate training. A similar theme emerged regarding counselors' roles in which 10% of counselors ($n = 51$) reported a desire to have had more accurate training about the roles of school counselors. Other noteworthy themes included 13% ($n = 66$) reporting that they would have increased the amount of time they had with their supervisor, and 4% ($n = 21$) of the participants stated that they would have liked more individual supervision. Also of interest was that 3% ($n = 16$) of counselors reported that they would have liked more collaboration between their university and on-site supervisors. Of the remaining participants, 16% ($n = 83$) reported that they would have not changed anything about their supervisory experiences, and 43% ($n = 220$) reported varying statements not specific to any theme relevant to my review. The themes and supporting quotes are listed in Table 36.

Table 36
Themes of Open-Ended Questions

Theme	*n*	Selected Supporting Quotes
Specialization Specific Supervision	79 (15%)	*"The fact that I had more educational experience in school counseling than my site supervisor. This lead to conflict in the beginning."*
		"I would have liked my individual university supervisor to have school counseling experiences."
		"I wish I had a individual supervisor with more school counseling knowledge."
		"University supervisors who had school counseling backgrounds."
		"I wish I could have had a supervisor at my university that had a clue about what school counselors do."
		"I feel their lack of experiences with elementary school counseling was a huge disservice to my educational experience in preparing me for the field of school counseling."
		"My supervisory experience seemed more appropriate for someone working as a mental health counselor, rather than meeting the needs of a school counselor."
		"Even though my training was 20 years ago, I am an on site supervisor for counseling interns at my school. Having a university supervisor who has been an elementary counselor is so much more effective."
		"Supervisor assignments. School counseling students should be supervised at the university level, by counselors who specialize in school counseling and have experienced the school setting."
		"I wish I had a individual supervisor with more school counseling knowledge."

Table 36 (continued)
Themes of Open-Ended Questions

Theme	*n*	Selected Supporting Quotes
Roles	51 (10%)	*"To be taught how to create lesson plans, teach guidance lessons, and learn classroom behavior management skills."*
		"I believe all counseling programs should address the general concept of scheduling, testing and other duties as assigned."
		"Give students a more accurate picture of what the REAL job of a school counselor is and less of the theories."
		"The need for exposure to S-team process, facilitation of standardized testing, other administrative duties that fall outside the realm of what we DESIRE school counselors to be, but preparing us for the REALITY of what school counselors should be."
		"I wish I was given more information on school and district policies, creating my own guidance plan, and the use of data to support my plan. I believe that my supervision focused heavily on individual, group, and classroom guidance of students, but failed to depict our additional roles and paperwork."
		"I would have included more actual roles of the counselor (SBLC training, RTI, Intervention). Those are the things that were least touched upon in my internship. It was a great experience, but there was no formal training in some of the things that counselors do on a daily basis."

Table 36 (continued)
Themes of Open-Ended Questions

Theme	*n*	Selected Supporting Quotes
Individual Supervision	21 (4%)	*"The group supervisory experiences by decreasing the amount of time and adding that to the individual supervisory experiences."*
		"My selection of on-site supervisor, who volunteered to take me on as an intern so that he would not have to do much work over the course of the year. I also would have made a point to get one-on-one supervision from my graduate program, which was not made available to me. The combination of bad on-site supervision couple with no individual supervision from my program contributed to an internship experience from which I learned very little."
		"Increase the amount of hands-on experience and direct 1-on-1 supervision with the on-site supervisors."
		"More individual supervisory contact with my university supervisor."
		"More individual supervision."
		"Increase individual supervision and case studies."
		"I would have liked more individual university supervision, rather than small groups."
		"I felt that more one on one contact would have helped empower me more in my practicum."

Table 36 (continued)
Themes of Open-Ended Questions

Theme	*n*	Selected Supporting Quotes
Time	66 (13%)	*"The time spent with my supervisor, which was very limited."*
		"The length of time I worked with her."
		"The amount of time that I was able to spend with my supervisor. I would have liked to spend more time."
		"I would make it a requirement for site supervisors to have weekly meetings with the supervises. And it should be reinforced from university supervisors."
		"I wish my group supervisor was a school counselor, and I wish my individual supervisor would have spent more time with me."
		"The extent of the supervision. It was pretty much "swim or drown" with little supervision. Thankfully the university courses had prepared me well, but the actual supervision during my internship was very limited."
		"I would be a requirement for the faculty member to meet with me on a regular basis."
		"The amount of time spent in individual consultation with site supervisor, as it was not nearly enough."

Table 36 (continued)
Themes of Open-Ended Questions

Theme	*n*	Selected Supporting Quotes
Collaboration	16 (3%)	*"University supervisors would visit and confer more with the on-site supervisor."*
		"Better communication between on-site supervisor and my university advisor. Living and working in rural Alaska while pursuing my counseling degree was a challenge and the principal had no counseling experiences."
		"There needed to be more on-site visits from my university supervisor."
		"Have more times when the university supervisor came to the site."
		"Have my on-site school supervisor meet with me and my university-based supervisor. I think it would be helpful to have all of the school supervisors meet with the students and our university supervisor more frequently."
		"Communication between school site administrators and university dept."
		"The communication between the different levels of supervision, i.e., on-site, university, individual, etc."
		"The communication between the university and the on-site supervisor so that standards were clear and meaningful."
		"I would have liked my University supervisor to actually come to my site to meet with my supervisor and me."

Table 36 (continued)
Themes of Open-Ended Questions

Theme	*n*	Selected Supporting Quotes
Nothing	83 (16%)	*"Nothing because I think my supervisory experiences were exceptional and allowed me to grow as a counselor."*
		"My supervisory experiences were exceptional, and I was fortunate to be supervised by experts in the field of school counseling and by a site supervisor who was one of the most amazing school counselors I have ever met, and I cannot think of anything I would have changed."
		"Nothing! I was very prepared!"
		"Nothing...I thought is was fantastic. I got experience at all 3 levels of public education from excellent school counselors in real settings."
		"Nothing, I felt that I had both a great supervisor from the university as well as on site supervision! I felt very prepared following my practicum experience!"
		"Nothing. I was lucky to have a great on-site supervisor who was very knowledgeable as well as great university level mentors and supervisors."
Other	220 (43%)	
Total	536	

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the study. The first research hypothesis (1a) that anticipated differences in the perception of preparedness between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to preparedness. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a large effect size were found on all of the eight dependent variables between counselors who had individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of preparedness.

The second research hypothesis (1b) that anticipated differences in the perception of professional identity between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to professional identity. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a small to medium effect size were found on all four dependent variables

between counselors who had individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of professional identity.

The third research hypothesis (1c) that anticipated differences in the perception of supervisor effectiveness between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level individual specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a strong effect size were found on all three dependent variables between counselors who had individual specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of perceived supervisor effectiveness.

The fourth research hypothesis (2a) that anticipated differences in the perception of preparedness between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to preparedness. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a large effect size were found on all of the eight dependent variables between counselors who had group

136

specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of preparedness.

The fifth research hypothesis (2b) that anticipated differences in the perception of professional identity between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to professional identity. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a strong effect size were found on all four dependent variables between counselors who had group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of professional identity.

The sixth research hypothesis (2c) that anticipated differences in the perception of supervisor effectiveness between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received university-level group specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive university-level group specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a strong effect size were found on all three dependent variables between counselors who had group specialization-specific

supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of perceived supervisor effectiveness.

The seventh research hypothesis (3a) that anticipated differences in the perception of preparedness between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of preparedness was supported in this research. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to preparedness. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a small effect size was found on all of the eight dependent variables between counselors who had on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of preparedness.

The eighth research hypothesis (3b) that anticipated differences in the perception of professional identity between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision related to perceptions of professional identity was supported in this research. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to professional identity. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a medium to low effect size was found on all but one dependent variable between counselors who had on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of professional identity. The variable

indicating no significant relationship was related to the participants' sense of their developed professional school counseling identity (question 29).

The ninth research hypothesis (3c) that anticipated differences in the perception of supervisor effectiveness between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision was supported in this study. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items related to perceived supervisor effectiveness. Items in this category resulted in significant differences between counselors who received on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive on-site specialization-specific supervision. Significant differences and a small effect size were found on all three dependent variables between counselors who had on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in follow-up tests with variables of perceived supervisor effectiveness.

The tenth research hypothesis (4) that anticipated that all school counselors will agree more than disagree that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard was supported in this review. Through the use of the responses of all 555 participants, comparisons were conducted on items between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences. Items in this category did not result in significant differences in the proportion of agreement between the three levels of supervisory experience. The proportion of subjects who agreed with the statement was different than those who disagreed with the statement, but not different enough between the three supervisory experiences to denote significance. All groups however agreed more than disagreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard.

The eleventh research hypothesis (5) that anticipated that there would be a significant difference in the perception of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences was not supported in this study. No significant differences were found with school counselors' perceptions of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences.

The results detailed in this chapter are discussed in Chapter 5. The relationship between the findings of this study and existing research is presented. Information pertaining to implications for school counselors and counselor educators, as well as future research is presented.

Chapter 5

Results

Included in Chapter Five is a summary and a discussion of the findings from this study. The results of the study are discussed in terms of prior research and limitations. Implications for the study for school counselors, counselor educators and supervisors, and for training and supervision are provided. This chapter concludes with recommendations for future research.

Purpose of the Study

Despite the importance of supervision models and supervisor experience in the training of counselors, oftentimes school counselors in training receive supervision from supervisors who lack school counseling experience (Herlihy et al., 2002). Although there are many supervision models provided in the counseling literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008), there are no consistently agreed-upon supervision models specific to the training of school counselors. Stemming from the few proposed school counseling supervision models, role confusion and professional identity continue to remain problematic in the school counseling profession (Brott & Myers, 1999). The purpose of this research was to evaluate the influence of specialization-specific supervision (SSS) on school counselors' perceptions of their preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The knowledge gained from this study may provide the counseling profession insight into school counselor training, supervision research, and suggestions for training standards. It is important to note than an assumption of the study was having knowledgeable and experienced school counselor supervisors could better prepare school counselors in training to begin an entry-level school counseling position, help them to foster a solid professional identity, and increase overall supervisor effectiveness. Hence, the

main goal of this research was to determine how specialization-specific supervision influences

the perceptions of school counselors to enhance and standardize school counselor preparedness,

professional identity, and supervisor effectiveness while advancing school counseling research,

theory, and practice as an avenue for enhanced preparation of school counseling trainees and

practitioners.

The findings of my research are in accordance with the conceptual framework of the

study pertaining to Bernard's discrimination model. Ascribing to Bernard's model would entail

acting as a teacher, consultant, and counselor throughout different phases of the supervision

process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Because supervisors tend to begin supervision from a

teaching role (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), providing high support and high direction (Hart &

Nance, 2003), the results of my study indicate that it would be beneficial if supervisors had

experience in the school counseling profession to teach the multiple roles and levels of

complexity involved in school cultures that extend far beyond the traditional counseling skills.

Discussion of Findings

Discussions of Findings for Hypothesis 1a, 2a, and 3a

The Preparation of School Counselors

A supervised school counseling experience is an important and rewarding component of a

trainee's preparation (Lazovsky & Shimon, 2005), as well as a solid stepping-stone to a

successful career as a school counselor (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Studer, 2005). Hypotheses

1a, 2a, and 3a all pertain to the preparation of school counselors. These hypotheses stated that

school counselors who received university-level individual, university-level group, and on-site

specialization-specific supervision will express feeling more adequately prepared to begin an

entry-level school counseling position than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual, group, or on-site specialization-specific supervision. The findings of my examination support the hypotheses pertaining to preparation and show significant differences between school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision and those who did not.

Several authors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008; Remley & Herlihy, 2010; Walsh et al., 2002) have discussed the training, experience, or credentials that qualify supervisors to provide competent supervisory services to supervisees. In particular, Studer and Oberman (2006) highlighted the importance of the supervisor's experience. However, it has been noted in the literature that supervisees oftentimes receive supervision from supervisors lacking experience (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001). Moreover, Campbell (2000) has contended that, "Competencies required of different professions vary greatly from discipline to discipline, and differences abound regarding models of change, conceptualization of problems, intervention methods, and skills required in each particular setting" (p. 251). Particularly, school counselors have been noted to receive supervision from supervisors without school knowledge (Remley & Herlihy, 2010).

According to the results of my research, 73% of the participants ($N = 555$) reported that they received university-level individual specialization-specific supervision, while 65% reported that they obtained university-level group specialization-specific supervision. A larger percentage (87%) reported that they received on-site specialization-specific supervision. Egan et al. (2009) concur that there is a need for supervision specific to areas of academic concentration. In particular, they emphasized the benefits of pairing a supervisee with a supervisor who had actual

experience in the specific area in which the supervisee was involved. Moreover, this is an

encouraging result considering it has been referenced in the literature (Roberts & Borders, 1994)

that school counselors in training receive on-site supervision from supervisors who are not

school counselors. In fact, only 6% of participants in this study reported receiving on-site

supervision from principals or other mental health professionals. These results are in accordance

with Kahn (1999) who found that field supervisors are supervising interns based less on

administrative supervision and more on actual school counseling practices. According to the

results of my open-ended comment question regarding what aspect of school counselors'

supervisory experiences they would change if they could, 15% of the participants referenced that

they would have desired their supervisor to have knowledge about school settings (i.e., "I wish I

could have had a supervisor at my university that had a clue about what school counselors do."

"My supervisory experience seemed more appropriate for someone working as a mental health

counselor, rather than meeting the needs of a school counselor." "Supervisor assignments.

School counseling students should be supervised at the university level, by counselors who

specialize in school counseling and have experience the school setting").

Jordan (2006) has emphasized the desire of counselors to have a supervisor with relevant

experience; yet, school counselors have been reported in the literature to receive supervision

from professors without relevant school counseling experience (Remley & Herlihy, 2010).

Results from this study indicate 31% of participants reported that they received supervision from

a faculty member in their graduate training. Seven percent of participants reported that they

were assigned a university-level individual doctoral student supervisor during their graduate

training, while only 4% were assigned to a university-level group doctoral student supervisor,

and 13% received group supervision from their professor. This finding suggests that the majority of the participants received supervision from their professors, which implies that professors should continue engaging in professional development opportunities within the school counseling specialty, whether or not they have experience in school setting, but notably if they do not have experience.

The majority of the participants reported that they received specialization-specific supervision from their individual, group, and on-site supervisors, and they felt more prepared in all eight competency areas included on the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)* than those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision. The competency areas included the following: (a) resolve problems specific to the school setting; (b) deal with systemic challenges school counselors encounter; (c) identify obstacles to academic success; (d) demonstrate behavioral management strategies during classroom guidance lessons; (e) advocate for appropriate roles of school counselors; (f) use data to drive decision-making for student achievement; (g) provide career-related services for students; and (h) address personal/social needs of students. Hence, it can be surmised from these results that there is a strong relationship between specialization-specific supervision and school counselors feeling better prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position. In particular, school counselors felt most prepared to address the personal/social needs of students from their individual, group, and on-site supervisors. School counselors who received university-level individual and group specialization-specific supervision reported feeling least prepared to demonstrate behavioral management strategies during classroom guidance lessons, while those who received on-site specialization-specific supervision felt least prepared to use data to drive decision-making for

student achievement. Because these two competency areas were the lowest reported for preparedness amongst all school counselors, it is recommended that supervisors could center on these topics within the supervisory experience, especially since the ASCA *National Model* (2005) strongly suggested using data to drive-decision making.

Additionally, several authors (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Perera-Diltz and Mason, 2008; Studer & Oberman, 2006) have emphasized the relevance of school counselors being trained in the ASCA *National Model*. Interestingly, 23% of the participants reported that it had been ten years or more since they graduated from their counseling program; therefore, their supervisor could not have been trained in the ASCA *National Model* (2005). This finding is supported by Studer and Oberman (2006) who determined that individuals who have been school counselors for six or less years were significantly more likely to have had a course in the ASCA *National Model* than were school counselors in the field for seven or more years. Still, school counselors reported feeling more prepared in the eight competency areas if their supervisor had experience in school counseling than those who did not have experience in school counseling, regardless of the amount of years since graduating from their training program in counseling. Furthermore, Blakely et al. (2009) emphasized that differences do indeed exist in the supervision of school counselors in traditional school counseling programs versus Recognized ASCA *Model* Programs (RAMP) across all supervisory activities. This result is supported by Dollarhide and Miller (2006) in that additional efforts within the counseling profession seem merited to target the on-going training of site supervisors for them to remain abreast of the continual developments within the school counseling specialty.

Overall, the results demonstrate that school counselors do not feel as prepared to handle systemic challenges as in other competency areas. This is not a new finding, as Corwin and Edelfelt (1977) have conveyed the importance of conceptualizing a school as a system. Recently, Wood and Rayle (2006) developed a school counseling supervision model that focuses on systems within school counseling settings that can influence supervision goals and interactions that are inherent within the unique dynamic of school counselor supervision. Similarly, Devlin et al. (2009) emphasized that an adlerian approach combined with the systemic focus is highly beneficial to school counselors in training, as the supervisory model supports the supervisor's and supervisee's insight into the cultural and systemic properties inherent within school settings.

Although school counselors felt better prepared overall from receiving specialization-specific supervision than those who did not, school counselors reported that they felt the most prepared from their experiences with their on-site supervisor. Several studies (e.g., Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Kahn, 1999; Studer, 2005) underscored the importance of school counselors in training receiving quality on-site supervision. Even though Akos and Scarborough (2004) contended that very few syllabi in their study acknowledged ASCA national standards as part of the requirements of on-site activities during the internship experience, the results of my study indicate that school counselors actually felt the most prepared from their experiences with their on-site supervisor. My findings are in accordance with the implications from Murphy and Kaffenberger's (2007) study which concluded that it is incumbent upon the future of the school counseling profession that we continue to support on-site supervisors, as they seem to play a large role in the successful preparation of school counselors in training.

Results also indicated that school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision feel better prepared than those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision across all supervisory experiences (university-level individual and group, and on-site). Although school counselors reported that they felt most prepared from their experiences with their on-site supervisor, results of the open-ended survey question indicated that 13% desired more time with their supervisor (i.e., "The extent of the supervision. It was pretty much swim or drown with little supervision. Thankfully the university courses had prepared me well, but the actual supervision during my internship was very limited"). Four percent of the participants noted they desired more time with their individual supervisor in particular (i.e., "I would have liked more individual university supervision, rather than small groups"). Also, 3% of the participants stated that they would have liked more collaboration between their university and on-site supervisors (i.e., "The communication between the university and the on-site supervisor so that standards were clear and meaningful"). The findings are supported by comments written in the open-ended survey question pertaining to what school counselors would change about their supervisory experience: 15% of the participants stated that they wished they had a supervisor who had school counseling experience. In addition, the findings of my study offer practical significance for training. And thus, future research seems justified in supervision, within the school counseling field in particular.

Discussions of Findings for Hypothesis 1b, 2b, and 3b

Professional Identity of School Counselors

School counselor professional identity is a nebulous concept that has been studied extensively (e.g., Brott & Myers, 1999; Devlin et al., 2009; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006;

Henderson et al., 2007; Nelson & Jackson, 2003; Paisley & McMahon, 2001) in the counseling literature. Hypotheses 1b, 2b, and 3b all pertain to the professional identity of school counselors. These hypotheses stated that school counselors who received university-level individual, university-level group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision will have a stronger sense of their professional identity than school counselors who did not receive university-level individual, group, or on-site specialization-specific supervision. Results from this study indicated school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision had a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not. Gibson et al. (2010) found that one's professional identity was developed by the final stages of one's counselor education program. The results of my study support those authors' discoveries. Most participants in this study indicated that they had a well-developed school counseling identity as a result of their experiences with their university-individual, group, and on-site supervisors. However, some participants indicated that they did not think that they had a well-developed professional identity as a result of their supervision experiences. This result is similar to the research concluded by Auxier et al. (2003) who suggested that counselors might experience a recycling identity formation process over the course of their careers, and their professional identity might be attributed to other factors other than their supervisory experiences.

Furthermore, the majority of the participants indicated that their individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences were helpful and influenced the development of their professional identity as a school counselor. These findings pertaining to school counselor professional identity are supported by the research of Brott and Myers (1999) who concluded that a school counseling professional identity is a different process than the process of other

mental health professions, and should be treated as such. Specifically, most participants reported that their supervisors' experience in school counseling influenced their professional identity as a school counselor.

Whereas school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision reported having a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not, on-site supervisors seemed to contribute the most effectively to the development of their professional identity as a school counselor. This finding is contradictory to the research conducted by Henderson et al. (2007), who suggested that school counselors do not begin their careers with a complete understanding of their professional identities. Rather, they believe it is an evolutionary process in which the school counselors learn who they are in the profession, believe in their identity, and live and act authentically as professional school counselors. However, Nelson and Jackson (2003) found that the internship experience serves as a strong catalyst in the development of participants' professional identities. Results also revealed the importance of supervisory experiences in the development of a solid sense of a professional school counseling identity obtained throughout one's graduate training.

Closely related to the concept of professional identity are the roles that school counselors undertake within their positions. School counselors' roles have expanded with every decade (Paisley et al., 2007) making it understandable that many school counselors struggle with their professional identity (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). In a similar fashion, Perera-Diltz and Mason (2008) acknowledged that school counselor roles are varied across school counseling settings. In fact, 10% of the participants who responded to the open-ended survey question pertaining to what they would change about their supervisory experiences referenced role

confusion (i.e., "I would have included more actual roles of the counselor (SBLC training, RTI,

Intervention. Those are the things that were least touched upon in my internship. It was a great

experience, but there was no formal training in some of the things that counselors do on a daily

basis." "The need for exposure to S-team process, facilitation of standardized testing, and other

administrative duties that fall outside the realm of what we DESIRE school counselors to be, but

preparing us for the REALITY of what school counselor should be." "I wish I was given more

information on school and district policies, creating my own guidance plan, and the use of data to

support my plan. I believe that my supervision focused heavily on individual, group, and

classroom guidance of students, but failed to depict our additional roles and paperwork.").

My findings are corroborated by Devlin et al. (2009) who determined that without

adequate supervision of the advanced needs of 21st century school counselors, and if supervisors

fail to highlight the varied roles school counselors espouse, individuals may enter their first

position as a professional school counselor without a sense of focus or identity. Even though

ASCA (2005) and the Education Trust (2004) have initiated efforts to unify the school

counseling professional identity, results of my research still indicate that confusion exists within

the school counseling profession, and future research is needed so that school counselors in

training receive the adequate training that they deserve (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

Discussions of Findings for Hypotheses 1c, 2c, and 3c

Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

Several researchers have examined the impact of supervisor style, theoretical orientation,

and working alliance on supervisor effectiveness (Hart & Nance, 2003; Hulse-Killacky, 2005;

Ladany et al., 2009; Walsh et al., 2002). In a similar fashion, Shechtman and Wirtzberger (1999)

151

determined that the needs and preferred style of supervision among school counselors were important factors. It can be summarized from the literature that supervisee's perceptions of their supervisor's effectiveness is a contributing factor to the overall supervisory experience, and is necessary for ensuring a successful internship and an effective mentoring process (Lazovsky & Shimon, 2005). However, the aforementioned studies did not consider whether or not the specific experience of the supervisor influenced the supervisee's perception of supervisor effectiveness. Results from this study indicate that school counselors who receive university-level individual, group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive specialization-specific supervision.

Noteworthy authors in the field of supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008) discussed several supervision models in their textbook. However, none of the models are specific to the supervision of school counselors. Luke and Bernard (2006) brought attention to the fact that there is a lack of fit between current supervision models that emphasize the supervision of individual counseling and the multiple roles of school counselors. Thus, they proposed a supervision model for school counselors that was an extension of Bernard's (1979, 1997) discrimination model. The findings of my research support the research of Luke and Bernard (2006) who concluded that the school counselor supervision model should address not only clinical counseling skills, but also take a comprehensive approach that reflects all aspects of school counseling when the supervisor espouses a teacher, counselor, and consultant role at different stages throughout a supervisory experience.

Hart and Nance (2003) emphasized that supervisees stated a preference for being supervised by the supportive teacher style that provided both high support and high direction. Interestingly, school counselors in this study reported that all of their supervisors (university-level individual and group, and on-site) were the least effective acting in the role as a teacher of school-related issues. It might be the case that the supervisors did not have school knowledge, thus, they were not as effective teaching about school-related issues in supervision, than acting as a consultant and counselor. In light of the aforementioned results, it seems necessary that counselor educators consider pairing a supervisee with a supervisor who has had school counseling experience so they can impart school-related knowledge while acting in the role of as a teacher during supervision sessions.

Overall, the findings indicate that school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive specialization-specific supervision. Consequently, it appears that supervisor effectiveness is closely related to the experience of the supervisor, and could potentially be perceived as ineffective when the supervisor does not have experience in school counseling and still supervises a counselor intern. The findings are corroborated by Nelson and Johnson (2003) who concluded the following -- it is imperative for university faculty to gain a better understanding of the training needs of school counselor supervisors to address the types of issues that appear most in supervision; how supervision is actually conducted; and what models are best employed in working with supervisees across training settings.

Discussions of Findings for Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that school counselors will agree more than disagree that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. The findings of my study strongly supported the hypothesis, and showed that over 90% of participants ($n = 555$) agreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard for all types of supervisory experiences (university-level individual and group, and on-site supervision). Interestingly, CACREP (2009) is the accrediting body for counselor education, but the current standards do not require supervisors to have specialization-specific knowledge prior to supervising an intern. CACREP (2009) outlines in detail the competencies for doctoral student school counselors in training, but the accrediting body does not place equal importance on the training of master's level school counselor interns. Despite the major focus on the guidelines specified for doctoral students preparing to work as school counselors, the qualifications for doctoral student supervisors stated in Section IV do not specify specialization-specific experience. "The CACREP credential does distinguish counselors as having completed a preparation program that meets the standards of excellence for the profession" (Remley & Herlihy, 2010, p. 10); however, the results of my research indicate that school counselors desire specialization-specific supervision as a required training standard. Future research seems warranted since it appears as though the profession desires additional training standards. Hence, counselor educators could improve training to increase the standards of excellence for the profession.

Perusse et al. (2001) observed that of the 189 participants in their study, 63 identified their program as CACREP accredited. It was recognized that almost half of the programs had no

faculty with previous work experience in a school setting, but faculty were still providing supervision to school counseling master's students. Despite the vast array of research explicating the uniqueness of school counselor supervision (e.g., Blakely et al., 2009; Luke & Bernard, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Wood & Rayle, 2006), many supervisors are providing supervision to school counselor interns without experience in school counseling. Some have considered this issue an ethical concern (Remley & Herlihy, 2010). Moreover, Herlihy et al. (2002) suggested that most practicing school counselors are not trained to provide supervision and, therefore, are essentially practicing out of their scope of practice. My results indicate that further research could addresses specialization-specific supervision as a required training standard.

Discussions of Findings for Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that there will be a significant difference in school counselors' perception of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences. However, no significant differences were found when school counselors were asked whether or not they thought they were more knowledgeable than their individual, group, and on-site supervisors. A possible explanation as to why this trend was not large enough to be significant may be that school counselors in general found their supervisory experiences to be helpful. The results of the open-ended comment question revealed that 16% of participants ($n = 555$) viewed their supervisory experiences beneficial to their professional growth, and indicated that they would not change anything about their experiences.

Although there were no significant differences detected between school counselors' perceptions of knowledge between individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences, it is

155

relevant to note that this issue has been presented within the counseling literature. Hatch (2008) posited that an ethical dilemma presents itself when a student is more educated than the supervisor. In fact, an even greater problem has been referenced within the school counseling literature when neither the supervisor nor the supervisee has teaching experience (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006). A large percentage (40%) of participants in this study indicated that they did not have any years of teaching experience. It was suggested by Borders and Leddick (1987) that if supervisors had teaching experience, they would be able to use their abilities to identify a supervisee's learning needs and preferred learning style to create an effective learning environment for the supervision experience. Although 27% of the participants reported having ten or more years of teaching experience, it cannot be determined how many of these participants provided supervision to supervisees. Thus, future research seems necessary in this area to examine the influence of supervisors' teaching experience on school counselor training.

Limitations and Delimitations

Sampling error and generalizability (Ahern, 2005; Malhotra, 2008; Siah, 2005) are some challenges of web-based research, as this study employed. It is vital that researchers remain cognizant that Internet research is completed by those participants who have knowledge about technology and have access to computers (Lyons, Cude, Lawrence, & Gutter, 2005). As a result, these issues could potentially affect the generalizability of a study. This study in which members of ASCA were surveyed, it should be noted that not all school counselors are members of that professional organization. Consequently, the research could miss a considerable proportion of school counselors in the national population, creating what is known as coverage error (Siah, 2005). However, the rather large sample size bolsters the generalizability of the study.

Another issue that presents a challenge is the testing environment (Ahern, 2005; Lyons et al., 2005). It is difficult to ascertain in web-based research whether or not the participant is focusing solely on the survey or partaking in distracting events such as watching television or engaging in conversation. These events could have potentially affected the responses and, therefore, masked the perceptions of respondents. Another area of concern regarding survey research on the Internet is subject fraud in which participants would not be truthful about their demographic information, and this could have resulted in inaccurate generalization (Siah, 2005). Offering incentives is a widely used method in the field of research to motivate people to take and complete the survey (Goritz, 2006). In general, people enjoy receiving rewards for their efforts, and offering incentives could increase the intentions of people choosing to complete a survey (Wilson et al., 2010). Hence, offering the Amazon.com gift certificate incentive could have increased the response rate.

The sample may be skewed in that participants who chose to complete the survey may have had strong ideas regarding school counselor training, and those who did not have strong ideas opted not to participate in the survey. It is also possible that many participants did not receive specialization-specific supervision and chose not to respond. Perhaps school counselors did not respond to the survey because of the time demands of their job. The aforementioned sampling biases are limitations of this type of research in general; however, the minimal amount of time required to take the survey should have helped to minimize these limitations (Ahern, 2005).

In general, another key limitation of survey research is based on the assumption that participants who chose to complete the survey answered questions honestly (Siah, 2005).

However, participants may have chosen to provide socially desirable responses to survey items regarding preparedness and professional identity. While these are typical problems that could be associated with all survey research, the anonymity of an electronic, on-line survey should have helped to minimize these limitations (Siah, 2005).

A final limitation of this research study is that participants were answering retrospectively (Creswell, 2009). They were asked to answer questions about their university-level supervisor(s). Thus, if many years have passed since post-master's graduation, it seems relevant to consider that participants may have answered only to the best of their ability despite the time lapse. Also, the longer they were out of school, the participants could have acquired additional information on the job from people in school settings. Therefore, they may not have attributed the lack of school information to their supervision experiences.

A delimiting factor is that the survey was distributed only to members of ASCA. Therefore the findings are generalizable only to this membership population. To generalize the results of the study to the entire national school counselor population, including school counselors who are not members of ASCA, a high response rate is needed (Creswell, 2009). A response rate is the total percentage of questionnaires completed and returned to the researcher (Creswell, 2009). This research yielded a high response number of 555 participants. The entire southern region of the ASCA membership directory was invited to participate in this research study. If the response rate is determined according to the ratio of approximate total invited (N = 7,161) to the eligible participants ($n = 555$), the response rate was 7.8%, which limits the generalizability of results. However, no consensus exists among researchers on a required response rate (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Some researchers (Kline & Farrell, 2005) suggested at

158

least a 50% response rate to increase the chances of publication. However, this sample ($n = 555$)

exceeds the sample size recommendation of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) who recommended 364

participants for a population of 7,000. Therefore, it can be assumed that the demographics and

results can be representative of the school counseling population.

Implications for School Counselors, Counselor Educators, and Supervisors

The results of this study were intended to bring greater awareness to both the school

counseling community and counselor education programs regarding the preparation, professional

identity, and supervision guidelines of school counselors. By building on previous studies of

school counselor supervision (e.g., Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Murphy &

Kaffenberger, 2009; Studer, 2005), findings from this study contribute to the knowledge base in

school counselor training. Results indicated that most of the school counselors who responded to

the SSSQ and received specialization-specific supervision felt more adequately prepared to begin

an entry-level school counseling position, had a stronger sense of their professional identity, and

expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than

those school counselors who did not receive specialization-specific supervision across all

supervisory experiences (university-level individual and group, and on-site).

Thus, findings indicate that counselor education programs could benefit from examining

the school counseling curriculum particularly with regard to the supervision component of

training so that school counselors in training who do not have any teaching experience or

specific knowledge of school settings prior to their practicum/internship experience could feel

better prepared. Furthermore, counselor education programs could align their curriculum with

the guidelines set forth by the ASCA *National Model* (2005) and the Education Trust (2004) to

unify a professional identity that is reflective of school counselors in the 21st century (Paisley & McMahon, 2001).

Because it is becoming increasingly difficult for 21st century school counselors to remain updated and competent in providing adequate prevention and intervention services for the myriad of challenges youth experience, along with the problems they present within the schools today, (Crutchfield & Borders, 2006; Henderson & Gysbers, 2006), it is imperative that supervisors have knowledge regarding the school system and student issues to addresses these challenges with their supervisees. By collaborating on these initiatives, the issue of role confusion that school counselors face (Brott & Myers, 1999) could be rectified and potentially eliminated in the near future so that school counselor duties are not as varied across settings (Perera-Diltz & Mason, 2008). Simply stated, it seems that supervisor effectiveness could be improved overall if school counselors receive supervision that is specific to the school counseling field.

Keeping in mind that specialization-specific supervision is not a required training standard (CACREP, 2009), it is interesting that over 90% of the participants strongly agreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. Due to the fact that several professional organizations provide qualifications for school counselors, namely ACA, ASCA, CACREP, and ACES, there lacks uniformity concerning supervision models specific to school counselors. Furthermore, in light of studies which revealed that school counseling is a unique specialty that requires unique supervision practices (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006), it could benefit school counselors to be trained under supervision models that not only address the traditional counseling skills that encompass the counseling field in general, but also reflect the reality of what school counselors are confronted with on a daily basis. In an effort to provide

160

school counselors with adequate supervision, supervisors could build upon the supervision

models provided by Bernard and Goodyear (2008), as well as the models presented within the

school counseling literature (Luke & Bernard, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2009; Wood &

Rayle, 2006), to explore and solidify more specific models that reflect best practices for school

counselors in training.

Implications for Training and Supervision

Although CACREP has been referenced as the professional association most closely

modeled after with respect to the school counseling profession (Paisley & Borders, 1995), "The

ultimate mission of ACES, in accordance with the purpose of ACA, is to advance counselor

education and supervision in order to improve the provision counseling services in all settings in

society" (Borders, DeKruyf, Fernando, Glosoff, Hays, Page, & Welfare, 2011, p. 1). According

to the ACES Best Practices in Clinical Supervision Taskforce (2011), a document was created

that could offer more specific suggestions for supervisors regardless of work setting. The

authors of the taskforce mentioned that review and revision of the document should occur

approximately every eight to ten years, it appears that specialization-specific supervision will not

be included in the best practices of clinical supervision, unless others conduct additional research

in this significant topic in the near future.

While the taskforce noted that the document was written regardless of work setting, it

appears to be somewhat contradictory. For instance, under the section entitled "Ethical

Considerations" the taskforce stated that, "The supervisor continually monitors his/her own level

of competence in providing supervision and acts accordingly. The supervisor provides

supervision only for those supervisees and clients for whom the supervisor has adequate training

161

and experience" (Section 7.b.i). Furthermore, under the section entitled "The Supervisor" the taskforce stated that, "The supervisor is a competent and experience practitioner who has knowledge of a range of theoretical orientations and techniques and experience with diverse client populations, as relevant to their counseling setting" (Section 11.a.i). Additionally, under the section entitled "Supervisor Preparation: Supervision Training and Supervision of Supervision", it is stated that, "The supervisor's training includes recognition of the need for different approaches, formats, structures, and types of supervision for different supervision settings (e.g., universities, agencies, schools, privately contracted)" (Section 12.k). Therefore, it can be surmised from the aforementioned standards of the taskforce that specialization-specific supervision is a principal factor in the training and supervision of counselors. Clearly, additional research in this area is warranted so that training and supervision practices are in alignment with what the profession considers representative of best practice standards.

Implications for Future Research

Findings from this study reiterates the importance that future research should be conducted on school counselor supervision and training. A replication of this study using a sample that includes current master's students and their supervisors would be beneficial. The use of alternative survey methods would help to ensure that school counselors without Internet access would be included in the sample. In addition, selecting participants who are not members of ASCA might decrease the desire for participants to answer survey items regarding the ASCA *National Model* favorably.

Other areas of future study include: examining the different training approaches provided by the university-individual and group, and on-site supervisors, and exploring how the different

162

approaches influence the preparation, professional identity development, and perceived supervisor effectiveness of school counselors; focusing on the supervisors' perceptions of providing supervision to school counselors in training, with and without having school counseling knowledge; investigating the views of counselor educators who do not have school experience but provide supervision to school counselors in training; and observing the specific challenges that prevent counselor educators from providing school counselors in training with specialization-specific supervision, as well as exploring ideas to address the concern. In light of the recent efforts of the ASCA *National Model* (2005) and the Education Trust (2004), future studies could also focus on the challenges that counselor education programs face in providing supervision that is reflective of these national trends. Only 4% of the participants in this study reported having the National Certified School Counselor (NCSC) certification; future studies could investigate the reasons as to why school counselors do not seek to obtain the certification.

Additionally, responses to the open-ended comment question revealed a number of areas that merit further study, including the challenges and time provisions of providing adequate individual supervision, collaboration between the university and on-site supervisors, and the overall quality of supervision provided to school counselors in training. Qualitative studies relating to the experiences of supervisors and supervisees alike would also provide deeper insight into the particular needs of school counselors. In a similar sense, qualitative studies on the experiences of professional association board members would provide further insight as to why the various organizations are not in accordance with supervisory practices of school counselors, in particular. Moreover, since Luke, Ellis, and Bernard (2011) recently performed a study about the perceptions of the discrimination model of supervision; thus, future studies that build upon

163

the discrimination model of supervision (Bernard, 1979, 2008) and school counselor training would be beneficial.

Conclusions

This study examined the influence of specialization-specific supervision on school counselors' perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The main goal of my research was to determine how specialization-specific supervision influences the perceptions of school counselors to enhance and standardize school counselor preparedness, professional identity, and supervisor effectiveness while advancing school counseling research, theory, and practice as an avenue for enhanced preparation of school counseling trainees and practitioners.

The overall findings of my study suggested that school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision felt more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position, had a stronger sense of their professional identity, and expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than those school counselors who did not receive specialization-specific supervision across all supervisory experiences (university-level individual and group, and on-site). The results also revealed that most participants agreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. However, the findings further suggested that school counselors did not recognize that they were more knowledgeable about school-related issues than their supervisors (university-level individual and group, and on-site).

Furthermore, school counselors in this research felt most prepared to address the personal/social needs of students from their individual, group, and on-site supervisors. School

counselors who received university-level individual and group specialization-specific

supervision reported feeling least prepared to demonstrate behavioral management strategies

during classroom guidance lessons, while those who received on-site specialization-specific

supervision felt least prepared to use data to drive decision-making for student achievement.

Dealing with systemic challenges was another area in which school counselors did not feel as

prepared in compared to other competency areas from their supervisory experiences. Because

ASCA (2005) maintains that school counselors demonstrate knowledge in the aforementioned

areas, it seems desirable that supervisors strive to provide supervisees with knowledge in these

specific areas.

Because school counselors' roles have expanded with every decade (Paisley et al., 2007),

it is understandable that many school counselors struggle with their professional identity

(Lambie & Williamson, 2004). While school counselors who received specialization-specific

supervision reported having a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did

not, on-site supervisors seemed to contribute the most to the development of their professional

identity as a school counselor. Counselor educators could continue to build partnerships with

on-site supervisors and provide on-going professional development to ensure that school

counselors in training receive quality supervision. It seems incumbent upon the school

counseling profession to continue searching for a unified professional identity to eliminate the

confusion of roles that continue to change over the years, thus adding to the varied duties that are

expected of school counselors in the 21st century.

Another component of this study involved school counselors' perceptions of supervisor

effectiveness. The overall results indicated that school counselors who received specialization-

specific supervision expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than school counselors who did not receive specialization-specific supervision. Consequently, it appears that supervisor effectiveness is closely related to the experience of the supervisor, and supervisors could potentially be perceived as ineffective when they do not have experience in school counseling while continuing to supervise a counselor intern. Remley and Herlihy (2010) support these findings by contending that, "Supervisors must decide whether they have the necessary skills to adequately supervise, and should be clear about the kinds of settings that are outside their scope of expertise (e.g., an agency counselor who works with adults not feeling competent to supervise an elementary school counselor)" (p. 341).

Although CACREP (2009) standards do not require supervisors to have specialization-specific knowledge prior to supervising an intern, the majority of school counselors in this study indicated that they thought specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. Hence, it is recommended that professional associations consider aligning their standards to reflect the desired goals that school counselors expressed in this study.

School counseling is a unique setting in which unique supervisors are needed to fulfill the ever-changing duties and role expectations. In light of the research concomitant with the findings of this study, it seems desirable to pair a school counselor in training with a supervisor who has school counseling experience. Because supervisors tend to begin supervision from a teaching role (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), providing high support and high direction (Hart & Nance, 2003), it would be beneficial if supervisors had experience in the school counseling profession to teach the multiple roles and levels of complexity involved in school cultures that

extend far beyond the traditional counseling skills. Ultimately, the competence of the supervisor greatly affects the competence of the supervisee (Getz, 1999).

Additionally, counselor educators are encouraged to pair a school counselor in training with a faculty member or doctoral supervisor who espouses school counseling experience. School counselor interns are encouraged to develop a solid knowledge base prior to gaining employment as a professional school counselor. This knowledge base could begin with the school counseling course, be reinforced by the university-level individual and group supervisors, and be tailored to the specific needs of the school by the qualified on-site supervisor. Lastly, findings from this study reinforces the significance for preparation programs, professional counseling organizations, and accrediting bodies to consider specialization-specific supervision when training future 21st century school counselors.

References

Ahern, N. R. (2005). Using the internet to conduct research. *Nurse Researcher, 13*(2), 55-70.

Akos, P., & Scarborough, J. L. (2004). An examination of the clinical preparation of school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*(2), 96-107.

American Counseling Association. (2005). *Code of Ethics and standards of practice*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

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

American School Counselor Association (2010). *Ethical standards for school counselors. A*lexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association (2009). The role of the professional school counselor. Retrieved from: http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=240

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (1990). Standards for counseling supervisors. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *69,* 30-32.

Baker, J., Lovell, K., & Harris, N. (2006). How expert are the experts? An exploration of the concept of 'expert' within Delphi panel techniques. *Nurse Researcher, 14*(1), 59-70.

Belafsky, P. C., Mouadeb, D. A., Rees, C. J., Pryor, J. C., Postma, G. N., Allen, J., & Leonard, R.J. (2008). Validity and reliability of the eating assessment tool (EAT-10). Annals of Otology, *Rhinology & Laryngology, 117(*12), 919-924.

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

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2008). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.).

   Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Blakely, C., Underwood, L. A., & Rehfuss, M. (2009)**.** Effectiveness of school counselor

   supervision with trainees utilizing the ASCA Model. *Journal of*

   School Counseling, *7*(30), 1-26.

Bodenhorn, N., & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale.

   Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 38, 14-28.

Bodenhorn, N., Wolfe, E., & Alren, O. (2010). School counselor program choice and

   self-efficacy: Relationship to achievement gap and equity. *Professional School*

   Counseling, 13(3), 165-174.

Borders, D. L. (1991). Curriculum guide for training counseling supervisors: rationale,

   development, and implementation. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 31(*1),   58-80.

Borders, D. L., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., Glosoff, H. L., Hays, D. G., Page, B., & Welfare,

   L. E. (2011). *Best Practices in Clinical Supervision: ACES Task Force Report.*

   Manuscript submitted for publication.

Bradley, L. J. (1989). In *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, practice*. Muncie, IN:

   Accelerated Development Inc.

Bradey, C., & Fiorini, J. (1999). Evaluation of counseling practicum: National study of

   programs accredited by CACREP. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 39(*2), 110-119.

Britton, P. J., Goodman, J. M., & Rak, C. F. (2002). Presentation Workshops on

   Supervision: A Didactic- Experiential Format. *Counselor Education &*

   Supervision, *42*, 31-39.

Brott, P. E., & Myers, J. E. (1999). Development of a professional school counselor

identity: A grounded theory. *Professional School Counseling, 2*(5), 339-348.

Bruce, A., Getch, Y., & Ziomek- Daigle, J. (2009). Closing the gap: A group counseling

approach to improve test performance of African-American students. *Professional*

School Counseling, 12(6), 450-457.

Bullard, A. (2005). The critical impact of Frantz Fanon and Henri Collomb: Race, gender, and

personality testing of North and West Africans. J*ournal of the History of the Behavioral*

Sciences, 41(3), 225-248. doi: 10.1002/jhbs.20102

Busacca, L. A., & Wester, K. L. (2006). Career concerns of master's-level community and

school counselor trainees. *The Career Development Quarterly, 55,* 179-190.

Campbell, J. M. (2000). *Becoming an effective supervisor: A workbook for counselors and*

psychotherapists. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Accelerated Development.

Campbell, C., & Brigg, G. (2005). Closing the achievement gap: A structured

approach to group counseling. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 30(*1),

67-82.

Campbell, C.A., & Dahir, C. A., (1997). *Sharing the vision: The national standards for school*

counseling programs. Alexandria: VA: American School Counselor Association.

Carns, A. W., & Carns, M. R. (1997). A systems approach to school counseling. *School*

Counselor, 44(3), 218-223.

Carter, R. T., & Helms, J. E. (1992). The counseling process as defined by relationship types: A

test of Helms's interactional model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and*

Development, 20(4), 181-201.

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

Chagnon, J., & Russell, R. K. (1995). Assessment of supervisee developmental
level and supervision environment across supervisor experience. *Journal of
Counseling & Development*, *73*, 553-558.

Clarke, P. (2000). *School development: Learning schools, learning systems.* New York, NY:
Continuum.

Cobia, D. C., & Henderson, D. A. (2007). *Developing an effective and accountable school
counseling program* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin,
112*(1), 155-159.

Corwin, R. G., & Edelfelt, R. A. (1977). *Perspectives on organizations: The school as a social
organization.* Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher
Education.

Conroy, S. (2007). What color was the blood: Frantz Fanon and colonization from within.
Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, 5, 411-416.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009).
CACREP accreditation standards and procedures manual. Alexandria, VA:
Author.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods
approaches (3rd ed.).* Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA.

Crutchfield, L. B., & Borders, D. (1997). Impact of two clinical peer supervision models on

    practicing school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75,* 219-229.

Devlin, J. M., Smith, R. L., & Ward, C. A. (2009). An Adlerian alliance supervisory model for

    school counseling. *Journal of School Counseling, 42(7),* 1-23.

Dollarhide, C. T., & Miller, G. M. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school

    counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45,* 242-252.

The Education Trust. (2004). *National Center for Transforming School Counseling at The*

    Education Trust. Retrieved from

    http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Transforming+School+Counseling/main

Edwards, L, Thornton, P., & Holiday-Driver, N. (2010). Left behind but not forgotten:

    School counselors' ability to help improve reading achievement. *Alabama Counseling*

    Journal, 35(2), 35-39.

Egan, R., Stokley, D., Brouwer, B., Tripp, D., & Stechyson, N. (2009). Relationships

    between area of academic concentration, supervisory style, student needs and best

    practices. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*(3), 337-345.

Ellis, M. V. (1991). Critical incidents in clinical supervision and in supervisor supervision:

    Assessing supervisory issues. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(3),

    342-349.

Erford, B. (2011). *Transforming the school counseling profession.* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River,

    NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Erikson, E. H. (1980/1984). *Identity and the Life Cycle.* NY: Norton.

Evans, R. R., Burnett, D. O., Kendric, O. W., & Macrina, D. M. (2009). Developing valid

    and reliable online survey instruments using commercial software programs.

    Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet, 13(1), 42-52.

    doi: 10.1080/15398280802674743

Ferguson, C. J. (2009). An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and researchers.

    Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40(5), 532-538.

    doi: 10.1037/a0015808.

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 & Supervision,*

    44, 293-304.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation.*

    South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey Publishers, Inc.

Gaubatz, M. D., & Vera, E. M. (2006). Trainee competence in master's- level

    counseling programs: A comparison of counselor educators' and students'

    views. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 46*, 32-43.

Gaynor, A. K. (1998). Analyzing problems in schools and school systems: A theoretical

    approach. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gazzola, N., & Theriault, A. (2007). Super- (and not- so- super) vision of counsellors-

    in- training: supervisee perspectives on broadening and narrowing processes.

    British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, *35*, 189-204.

Getz, H. G. (1999). Assessment of clinical supervisor competencies. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77,* 491-497.

Gibson, D. M., Dollarhide, C. T., & Moss, J. M. (2010). Professional identity development: A grounded theory of transformational tasks of new counselors. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50,* 21-38.

Gladding, S. T. (2007). In *Family therapy: History, theory, and practice.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Goritz, A. S. (2006). Incentives in web studies: Methodological issues and a review. *International Journal of Internet Science, 1(*1), 58-70.

Guiffrida, D. A. (2005). The Emergence Model: An Alternative Pedagogy for Facilitating Self-Reflection and Theoretical Fit in Counseling Students. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*, 201-213.

Harris, B. (2009). 'Extra appendage' or integrated service? School counsellors' reflections on their professional identity in an era of education reform. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research, 9*(3), 174-181. doi: 10.1080/14733140903032208

Hart, G. M., & Nance, D. (2003). Styles of counselor supervision as perceived by supervisors and supervisees. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43,* 146-158.

Hatch, T. (2008). What happens when my student is more educated than the supervisor? In L. E., Tyson, J. R. Culbreth, & J. A. Harrington, *Critical incidents in clinical supervision: addictions, community, and school counseling* (pp. 205-216). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Hayes, R. L., & Paisley, P. O. (2002). Transforming School Counselor Preparation

    Programs. *Theory into Practice*, *41*, 169-176.

Helms, J.E. (1994). How multiculturalism obscures racial factors in the therapy process:

    Comment on Ridley et al. (1994), Sodowsky et al. (1994), Ottavi et al. (1994), and

    Thompson et al. (1994). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*(2), 162-165.

    doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.41.2.162

Henderson, P., Cook, K., Libby, M., & Zambrano, E. (2007). Today I feel like a professional

    school counsellor! *Guidance & Counseling, 21*(3), 128-142.

Herlihy, B., Gray, N., & McCollum, V. (2002). Legal and ethical issues in school counselor

    supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 6*(1), 55-60.

Hopton, J. (1995). The application of the ideas of Frantz Fanon to the practice of mental health

    nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 21*, 723-728.

Huck, S. W. (2009). Reliability and validity. In A. Burvikovs, & E. Reilly (6th ed.)

    Reading Statistics and Research (pp. 75-98). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Jordan, K. (2006). Beginning supervisees' identity: The importance of relationship

    variables and experience versus gender matches in the supervisee/ supervisor

    interplay. *The Clinical Supervisor, 25*, 43-51.

Kaufman, J., & Schwartz, T. (2003). Models of supervision: Shaping professional

    identity. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(1), 143-152.**.** doi: 10.1300/J001v22no1_10

Kline, W. B. & Farrell, C. A. (2005). Recurring manuscript problems: Recommendations for

    writing, training, and research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 166-174.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607-610.

Koltz, R. L. (2008). Integrating Creativity into supervision using Bernard's discrimination model. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 3*(4), 416-427.

Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77,* 447-454.

Ladany, N., & Friedlander, M. L. (1995). The relationship between the supervisory working alliance and trainees' experience of role conflict and role ambiguity. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34(*3), 220-231.

Ladany, N., Marotta, S., & Muse-Burke, J. L. (2001a). Counselor experience related to complexity of case conceptualization and supervision preference. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 40*, 203-219.

Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Ancis, J. R. (2001b). Psychotherapy trainees' experience of counterproductive events in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(4), 371-383.

Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001c). Supervisory style: It's relation to the supervisory working alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 40*, 263-275.

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.

Lazovsky, R., & Shimoni, A. (2005). The working contract between the on-site mentor

and school counseling students during internship—contents and processes.

Mentoring and Tutoring, 13, 367-382.

Luke, M., & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An extension of

the discrimination model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45,* 282-293.

Luke, M., Ellis, M. V., & Bernard, J. M. (2011). School counselors' perceptions of the

discrimination model of supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*(5), 328-

343.

Lyons, A. C., Cude, B., Lawrence, F. C., & Gutter, M. (2005). Conducting research online:

Challenges facing researchers in family and consumer sciences. *Family and Consumer

Sciences Research Journal, 33*(4), 341-356. doi: 10.1177/1077727X04274116

Malhotra, N. (2008). Completion time and response order effects in web surveys. *Public

Opinion Quarterly, 72*(5), 914-934.

Macey, D. (1999). The recall of the real: Frantz Fanon and psychoanalysis. *An International

Journal of Critical and Democratic Theory, 6(*1), 98-107.

Mathes, W. A. (1992). Induction of counselors into the profession. *The School Counselor, 39,*

245-250.

Mena, K. C., & Bailey, J. D. (2007). The effects of the supervisory working alliance on worker

outcomes. *Journal of Social Service Research, 34*(1), 55-65.

Miller, G. M., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2006). Supervision in schools: building pathways to

excellence. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45*, 296-303.

Milliren, A., Clemmer, F., & Wingett, W. (2006). Supervision: In the Style of Alfred Adler. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 62*, 89-105.

Milne, D., & Oliver, V. (2000). Flexible formats of clinical supervision: Description, evaluation and implementation. *Journal of Mental Health, 9*(3), 291-304.

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

Nakazawa, Y., Miyashita, M., Morita, T., Morita, T., Umeda, M., Oyagi, Y., & Ogasawara, T. (2009). The palliative care knowledge test: Reliability and validity of an instrument to measure palliative care knowledge among health professionals. *Palliative Medicine, 23*(8), 754-766. doi: 10.1177/0269216309106871

Nelson, M. D., & Johnson, P. (1999). School counselors as supervisors: An integrated approach for supervising school counseling interns. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 39*, 89-90.

Nelson, K. W., & Jackson, S. W. (2003). Professional counselor identity development: A qualitative study of Hispanic student interns. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 43*, 2-14.

Paisley, P. O., Bailey, D. F., Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Getch, Y. Q. (2006). Site supervision of graduate students in school counseling: A Georgia Perspective. *Georgia School Counselors Association Journal*, *13*, 71-79.

Paisley, P. O., & Borders, D. (1995). School Counseling: An evolving specialty. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *74*, 150-153.

Paisley, P. O.; & Hayes, R. L. (2003). School counseling in the academic domain: transformations in preparation and practice. *Professional School Counseling*, *6*(3), 198-204.

Paisley, P. O., & McMahon, H. G. (2001). School counseling for the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling*, *5*(2), 106-115.

Paisley, P. O., & Peace, S. D. (1995). Developmental principles: A framework for school counseling. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, *30*(2), 85-93.

Paisley, P. O., Ziomek-Daigle, J., Getch, Y. Q., & Bailey, D. F. (2007). Using state standards to develop professional school counsellor identity as both counsellors and educators. *Guidance & Counseling*, *21*(3), 143-151.

Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*(3), 322-329. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.37.3.322

Perera-Diltz, D. M., & Mason, K. L. (2008). Ideal to real: Duties performed by school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling*, *6*(26), 1-36.

Perera-Diltz, D. M., & Mason, K. L. (2010). An exploration of accountability practices of school counselors: A national study. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research*, *38*(1), 52-70.

Perusse, R., & Goodnough, G. E. (2005). Elementary and secondary school counselors' perceptions of graduate preparation programs: A national study. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45*, 109-118.

Peterson, J. S., & Deuschle, C. (2006). A model for supervising school counseling

    students without teaching experience. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45*(4), 267-

    281.

du Preez, E., & Roos, V. (2008). The development of counsellor identity- a visual expression.

    South African Journal of Psychology, 38(4), 699-709.

Prieto, L. R. (1998). Practicum class supervision in CACREP-accredited counselor

    training programs: A national study. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38(*2),

    113-123.

Putney, M. W., Worthington, E. L, Jr., & McCullough, M. E. (1992). Effects of supervisor

    and supervisee theoretical orientation and supervisor-supervisee matching interns'

    perceptions of supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*(2), 258-265.

Qualtrics Lab Inc. (2010). Version 12, 018. Provo, UT. http://www.qualtrics.com

Ramos-Sanchez, L., Esnil, E., Riggs, S, Wright, L. K., Goodwin, A., Touster, L. O.,

    Ratanasiripong, P., & Prodolfa, E. (2002). Negative supervisory events: Effects on

    supervision satisfaction and supervisory alliance. *Professional Psychology: Research &*

    Practice, 33(2), 197-202.

Remley, T. P., & Herlihy, B. (2010). *Ethical, legal, and professional issues in counseling*. Upper

    Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Robinson, D. H., Whittaker, T. A., Williams, N. J., & Beretvas, S. N. (2003). It's not effect size

    so much as comments about their magnitude that mislead readers. *The Journal of*

    Experimental Education, 71(1), 51-64.

Romano, D. M. (2006). The impact of preparation, field experience and personal awareness on counselors' attitudes toward providing services to section 504 students with learning disabilities. *UMI Dissertation Services*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Company.

Ronnestad, M. JH., & Skovholt, T. M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 71*(4), 396-405.

SAS Institute Inc. (2008). Version 9.2. Cary, NC.

Shechtman, Z., & Wirzberger, A. (1999). Needs and preferred style of supervision among Israeli counselors at different stages of professional development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *77*(4), 456-464.

Shulman, L. (2005). The clinical supervisor--practitioner working alliance: A parallel process. *The Clinical Supervisor, 24*(1-2), 23-47. doi: 10.1300/J001v24n01_03

Siah, C. Y. (2005). All that glitters is not gold: Examining the perils and obstacles in collecting data on the internet. *International Negotiation, 10*, 115-130.

Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K., & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling, 12,* 22-33.

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.

Stoltenberg, C. D., & Pierce, R. A. (1985). Supervisees' perceptions of their development: A test of the counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32*(4), 630-633. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.32.4.630

Studer, J. R. (2006). Erik Erikson's psychosocial stages applied to supervision. *Guidance & Counseling, 21*(3), 168-173.

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.

Thompson, B. (2002). 'Statistical', 'Practical', and 'Clinical': How many kinds of significance do counselors need to consider? *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*(1), 64-71.

Thompson, J. M., & Moffett, N. L. (2010). Clinical preparation and supervision of professional school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 8*(30), 1-24.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Trusty, J., Thompson, B., & Petrocelli, J. V. (2004). Practical guide for reporting effect size in quantitative research. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82*(1), 107-110.

U.S. Census Bureau (2011). Statistical abstracts. http://www.census.gov

Walsh, B. B., Gillespie, C. K., 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,* 83-98.

Watkins, E. E., Jr. (1995). Psychotherapy supervision in the 1990s: Some observations and reflections. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 49*(4), 568-581.

Watkins, E. E., Jr. (1993). Development of the psychotherapy supervisor: Concepts,

assumptions, and hypotheses of the supervisor complexity model. *American Journal of*

Psychotherapy, 47(1), 58-74.

Wiley, M. O., & Ray, P. B. (1986). Counseling supervision by developmental level. *Journal of*

Counseling Psychology, 33(4), 439-445.

Wilson, P. M., Petticrew, M., Calnan, M., & Nazareth, I. (2010). Effects of a financial

incentive on health researchers' response to an online survey: A randomized controlled

trial. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *12*(2), 6. doi: 10.2196/jmir.1251

Wood, C., & Rayle, A. D. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals,

functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 45,* 253-266.

Appendix A

Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)

Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ)

Part I: Background & Demographic Information

Q1 What is your sex?

    o Male

    o Female

Q2 What is your racial/ethnic background?

    o White

    o Black or African American

    o American Indian or Alaska Native

    o Asian Indian

    o Chinese

    o Filipino

    o Other Asian

    o Japanese

    o Korean

    o Vietnamese

    o Native Hawaiian

    o Samoan

    o Guamanian or Chamorro

    o Other Pacific Islander

    o Other

Q3 Are you currently enrolled in a master's counseling graduate program?

    o Yes

    o No

Q4 How many years has it been since you graduated from your counseling program?

    o 0

    o 1-3

    o 4-5

o 6-7

o 8-9

o 10 or more

Q5 What is your highest education level?

o B.S., B. A.

o M.A., M.S., M.Ed.

o Ph.D., Ed. D.

o Advanced Specialist or Certification

o Other

Q6 Was your graduate program a CACREP accredited program?

o Yes

o No

o Unsure

Q7 In which school setting are you primarily employed, or in which you are completing fieldwork/practicum/internship?

o Elementary

o Middle or Junior High School

o High School

o K-12

o Other

Q8 In which school setting are you primarily employed, or in which you are completing fieldwork/practicum/internship?

o Public (Non-Charter)

o Public (Charter)

o Private

o Parochial

o Other

186

Q9 How many years of teaching experience do you have?

- o 0

- o 1-3

- o 4-5

- o 6-7

- o 8-9

- o 10 or more

Q10 What type of supervisor(s) were you assigned in your counseling graduate program during practicum/internship? Please check all that apply. (*To select more than one response, hold down the control key*).

- o University-individual (doctoral student)

- o University-individual (faculty member)

- o University-group (doctoral student)

- o University-group (faculty member)

- o On-site (school counselor)

- o On-site (other mental health professional)

- o On-site (principal)

- o On-site (other)

Q11 Do you hold a professional license and/or certification? Please select all that apply. (*To select more than one response, hold down the control key*).

- o LPC

- o LMFT

- o LCSW

- o LMHPC

- o Licensed Psychologist

- o NCC

- o NCSC

- o None

o Other

Part II: University-Level Individual Supervisory Experiences

Please answer the following questions in this section regarding your university-level "individual" supervisory experiences.

For the purpose of this survey, "school counselor professional identity" will be defined as when a school counselor can easily explain the philosophy that underlies the activities of their professional group, describe the services their profession renders to the public, describe the training programs that prepare them to practice their profession, explain their qualifications and the credentials they possess, and articulate the similarities and differences between members of their own profession and other similar groups according to Remley and Herlihy (2010).

Specialization-specific supervision will be defined as supervision in which a supervisor has specialization-specific experience in the setting in which the counselor-in-training is completing fieldwork/practicum/internship, or professional work experiences. An example of specialization-specific supervision would occur if a university-level individual supervisor has experience working as a school counselor for several years and is supervising a school counselor in training while completing her practicum at a school site. A non-example of specialization-specific supervision would occur if a university-level individual supervisor has <u>never</u> had school counseling experience working as a school counselor and is supervising a school counselor in training while completing her practicum at a school site.

Q12 Were you assigned a university-level individual supervisor who had or has had school counseling experience? (specialization-specific supervision)

o Yes

o No

o Unsure

o Not applicable

Perceptions of Preparedness

Q13 To what extent do you feel your university-level individual supervisory experiences effectively prepared you to perform the following duties:

	Exception-ally Prepared	Very Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	omewhat Unprepared	Very Unprepared	Not Prepared At All	Not Applicable
Resolve problems specific to school settings							
Deal with systemic challenges school counselors encounter							
Identify obstacles to academic success							
Demonstrate behavioral management strategies during classroom guidance lessons							
Advocate for appropriate roles of school counselors							
Use data to drive decision-making for student achievement							
Provide career-related services for students							
Address personal/ social needs of students							

Perceptions of Professional Identity

Q14 Please rate the following statement regarding your perception of professional identity related to your university-level individual supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
My university-level individual supervision exper-iences have been very helpful in the develop-ment of my professional identity as a school counselor							
My university-level individual supervision experiences have influenced my profession-al identity as a school counselor							
I think a supervisor's experience in school counseling influences the profession-al identity of school counselors							

Q15 As a result of your university-level individual supervision experiences, please rate how you identify yourself as a school counselor.

	I Strongly See Myself as a Counselor	I See Myself as a Counselor	I Somewhat See Myself as a Counselor	I Somewhat Do Not See Myself as a Counselor	I Hardly See Myself as a Counselor	I Do Not See Myself as a Counselor	Not Applicable
To what extent do you rate your profession-al identity as a school counselor?							

Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

Q16 Please rate the following statement related to your perception of your university-level individual supervisor's effectiveness during supervision sessions:

	Exception-ally Effective	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Effective At All	Not Applicable
As a teacher of school-related issues							
As a consultant of school-related issues							
As a counselor of school-related issues							

Q17 Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statement regarding the perception of your knowledge about school-related issues during supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
I think I was more knowledge-able about school-related issues than my supervisor							

Training Standards

Q18 Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statement regarding your university-level individual supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
I think specialization-specific supervision should be a CACREP training standard							

Part III: University-Level Group Supervisory Experiences

Please only answer the following questions regarding your university-level "group" supervisory experiences.

Q19 Were you assigned a university-level group supervisor who had or has had school counseling experience? (specialization-specific supervision)

o Yes

o No

o Unsure

Perceptions of Preparedness

Q20 To what extent do you feel your university-level group supervisory experiences effectively prepared you to perform the following duties:

	Exception-ally Prepared	Very Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	Somewhat Unprepared	Very Unprepared	Not Prepared At All	Not Applicable
Resolve problems specific to school settings							
Deal with systemic challenges school counselors encounter							
Identify obstacles to academic success							
Demonstrate behavioral management strategies during classroom guidance lessons							
Advocate for appropriate roles of school counselors							
Use data to drive decision-making for student achievement							
Provide career-related services for students							
Address personal/ social needs of students							

Perceptions of Professional Identity

Q21 Please rate the following statement regarding your perception of professional identity related to your university-level group supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
My university-level group supervision experiences have been very helpful in the development of my professional identity as a school counselor							
My university-level group supervision experiences have influenced my professional identity as a school counselor							
I think a supervisor's experience in school counseling influences the professional identity of school counselors							

Q22 As a result of your university-level group supervision experiences, please rate how you identify yourself as a school counselor.

	I Strongly See Myself as a Counselor	I See Myself as a Counselor	I Somewhat See Myself as a Counselor	I Somewhat Do Not See Myself as a Counselor	I Hardly See Myself as a Counselor	I Do Not See Myself as a Counselor	Not Applicable
To what extent do you rate your profession-al identity as a school counselor?							

Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

Q23 Please rate the following statement related to your perception of your university-level group supervisor's effectiveness during supervision sessions:

	Exception-ally Effective	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Effective At All	Not Applicable
As a teacher of school-related issues							
As a consultant of school-related issues							
As a counselor of school-related issues							

Q24 Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statement regarding your perception of your university-level group supervisor's effectiveness during supervision sessions.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
I think I was more knowledge-able about school-related issues than my supervisor							

Training Standards

Q25 Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statement regarding your university-level group supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
I think specializati on-specific supervision should be a CACREP training standard							

Part IV: University-Level On-Site Supervisory Experiences

Please only answer the following questions regarding your university-level "on-site" supervisory experiences.

Q26 Were you assigned a university-level on-site supervisor who had or has had school counseling experience? (specialization-specific supervision)

o Yes

o No

o Unsure

Perceptions of Preparedness

Q27 To what extent do you feel your university-level on-site supervisory experiences effectively prepared you to perform the following duties:

	Exception- ally Prepared	Very Prepared	Somewhat Prepared	omewhat Unprepared	Very Unprepared	Not Prepared At All	Not Applicable
Resolve problems specific to school settings							
Deal with systemic challenges school counselors encounter							
Identify obstacles to academic success							
Demonstrate behavioral management strategies during classroom guidance lessons							
Advocate for appropriate roles of school counselors							
Use data to drive decision- making for student achievement							
Provide career-related services for students							
Address personal/ social needs of students							

Perceptions of Professional Identity

Q28 Please rate the following statement regarding your perception of professional identity related to your university-level on-site supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
My on-site supervision exper-iences have been very helpful in the develop-ment of my professiona l identity as a school counselor							
My on-site supervision experience s have influenced my profession-al identity as a school counselor							
I think a supervisor' s experience in school counseling influences the profession-al identity of school counselors							

Q29 As a result of your university-level on-site supervision experiences, please rate how you identify yourself as a school counselor.

	I Strongly See Myself as a Counselor	I See Myself as a Counselor	I Somewhat See Myself as a Counselor	I Somewhat Do Not See Myself as a Counselor	I Hardly See Myself as a Counselor	I Do Not See Myself as a Counselor	Not Applicable
To what extent do you rate your profession-al identity as a school counselor?							

Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness

Q30 Please rate the following statement related to your perception of your university-level on-site supervisor's effectiveness during supervision sessions:

	Exception-ally Effective	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Not Effective At All	Not Applicable
As a teacher of school-related issues							
As a consultant of school-related issues							
As a counselor of school-related issues							

Q31 Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statement regarding your perception of your university-level on-site supervisor's effectiveness during supervision sessions.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
I think I was more knowledge-able about school-related issues than my supervisor							

Training Standards

Q32 Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following statement regarding your university-level on-site supervisory experiences.

	Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
I think specializati on-specific supervision should be a CACREP training standard							

Part V: Overall Supervisory Experiences

Q33 Please finish the following statement. If I could change anything about my supervisory experiences, I would change:

_____

Appendix B
First Electronic Message

First Electronic Message

Dear School Counselor,

 I am conducting a study for my dissertation research entitled, The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselors' Perceptions of Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness.

I have developed a survey Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire (SSSQ) that is designed to measure perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness from school counseling supervision experiences. I plan to use the data collected from this survey to better understand best practices for school counselor supervision in counselor education formats. I intend to share the information through scholarly presentation and publication.

The survey is composed of 33 items and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All information provided is anonymous as there will be no way to identify you once you have submitted your answers. Your participation in this study in entirely voluntary and you may withdraw your consent and terminate participation without consequence at any time. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Once completed, you can elect to be placed in two random drawings, each for a $50 gift certificate to amazon.com. The winners will receive a gift certificate code by means of email when the study is completed.

Please click the following link to begin the survey. Completion and electronic submission of the SSSQ will indicate your consent for participation in this study. If you are not connected automatically, simply cut and paste the URL into your browser and press enter.

[Insert survey link]

Please direct any questions or concerns about this study to the principal investigator, Reshelle C. Marino (rcruiz@my.uno.edu), the faculty advisor, Dr. Louis V. Paradise (lparadis@uno.edu), or the Office of Human Subjects Research at the University of New Orleans (unoirb@uno.edu).

Thank you in advance for your participation. Your time is greatly appreciated.

Reshelle C. Marino, M.Ed., NCC, LPC
PhD Candidate
University of New Orleans
Bicentennial Education Building, Room 348
2000 Lakeshore Drive
New Orleans, LA 70148

Appendix C
Second Electronic Message

Dear School Counselor,

If you have already completed the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ), thank you again for your participation in this study. If you have not had the opportunity to participate, please take approximately 15 minutes to complete this brief 33-item survey.

I am conducting a study for my dissertation research entitled, *The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselors' Perceptions of Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness.* I have developed a survey *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ) that is designed to measure perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness from school counselor supervision experiences. I plan to use the data collected from this survey to better understand best practices for school counselor supervision in counselor education formats. I intend to share the information through scholarly presentation and publication.

All information provided is anonymous as there will be no way to identify you once you have submitted your answers. Your participation in this study in entirely voluntary and you may withdraw your consent and terminate participation without consequence at any time. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Once completed, you can elect to be placed in two random drawings, each for a $50 gift certificate to amazon.com. The winners will receive a gift certificate code by means of email when the study is completed.

Please click the following link to begin the survey. Completion and electronic submission of the SSSQ will indicate your consent for participation in this study. If you are not connected automatically, simply cut and paste the URL into your browser and press enter.

[Insert survey link]

Please direct any questions or concerns about this study to the principal investigator, Reshelle C. Marino (rcruiz@my.uno.edu), the faculty advisor, Dr. Louis V. Paradise (lparadis@uno.edu), or the Office of Human Subjects Research at the University of New Orleans (unoirb@uno.edu).

Thank you in advance for your participation. Your time is greatly appreciated.

Reshelle C. Marino, M.Ed., NCC, LPC
PhD Candidate
University of New Orleans
Bicentennial Education Building, Room 348
2000 Lakeshore Drive
New Orleans, LA 70148

Appendix D
Final Electronic Message

Final Electronic Message

Dear School Counselor,

This is a FINAL reminder for those of you who have not had the opportunity to participate in my dissertation research entitled, *The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselors' Perceptions of Preparedness, Perceptions of Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness.* If you have already completed the *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (SSSQ), thank you again for your participation in this study. If you have not had the opportunity to participate, please take approximately 15 minutes to complete this brief 33-item survey.

The survey is designed to measure perceptions of school counselor preparedness, perceptions of professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness from supervision experiences. I plan to use the data collected from this survey to better understand best practices for school counselor supervision in counselor education formats. I intend to share the information through scholarly presentation and publication.

All information provided is anonymous as there will be no way to identify you once you have submitted your answers. Your participation in this study in entirely voluntary and you may withdraw your consent and terminate participation without consequence at any time. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Once completed, you can elect to be placed in two random drawings, each for a $50 gift certificate to amazon.com. The winners will receive a gift certificate code by means of email when the study is completed.

Please click the following link to begin the survey. Completion and electronic submission of the SSSQ will indicate your consent for participation in this study. If you are not connected automatically, simply cut and paste the URL into your browser and press enter.

[Insert survey link]

Please direct any questions or concerns about this study to the principal investigator, Reshelle C. Marino (rcruiz@my.uno.edu), the faculty advisor, Dr. Louis V. Paradise (lparadis@uno.edu), or the Office of Human Subjects Research at the University of New Orleans (unoirb@uno.edu).

Thank you in advance for your participation. Your time is greatly appreciated.

Reshelle C. Marino, M.Ed., NCC, LPC
PhD Candidate
University of New Orleans
Bicentennial Education Building, Room 348
2000 Lakeshore Drive
New Orleans, LA 70148

Appendix E
IRB Approval Letter

University Committee for the Protection
 of Human Subjects in Research
University of New Orleans

Campus Correspondence

Principal Investigator: Louis V. Paradise

Co-Investigator: Reshelle C. Marino

Date: May 23, 2011

Protocol Title: "The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselor's Perceptions of Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness"

IRB#:   05May11

The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures described in this protocol application are exempt from federal regulations under 45 CFR 46.101category 2, due to the fact that the information obtained is not recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Exempt protocols do not have an expiration date; however, if there are any changes made to this protocol that may cause it to be no longer exempt from CFR 46, the IRB requires another standard application from the investigator(s) which should provide the same information that is in this application with changes that may have changed the exempt status.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event.

Best wishes on your project.
Sincerely,

Robert D. Laird, Ph.D., Chair
UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

Vita

Reshelle C. Marino earned a Bachelor of Science in Pre-Med from Southeastern Louisiana University in 2002. She earned a Master of Education degree in Counselor Education in 2008 from the University of New Orleans and completed the Doctor of Philosophy degree at the University of New Orleans in 2011.

She is a Licensed Professional Counselor (LPC) in the state of Louisiana and a National Certified Counselor (NCC). Reshelle is a member of the American Counseling Association (ACA), American School Counselor Association (ASCA), Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (SACES), Louisiana Counseling Association (LCA), the Louisiana School Counseling Association (LSCA), Chi Sigma Iota, and Phi Kappa Phi. She also held leadership positions as a board member of the Louisiana Counseling Association Executive Board, and of Chi Sigma Iota Honor Society.

Reshelle has experience as a school counselor, a licensed professional counselor for a private practice, and experience in an inpatient mental health setting working with children and adults who suffer with eating disorders, trauma, and other mental illnesses. She has presented at local, state, and national conferences on a wide array of counseling topics including test anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder, school counselor supervision, evience based practics, legal and ethical issues in counseling, as well as the advocacy of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender issues in school counselor training programs. Reshelle also has published an article on post-traumatic stress in ethnic youth post Katrina.