Montclair State University

Montclair State University Digital Commons

Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects

5-2013

The Relationship Between Aspects of Supervision and School Counselor Self-efficacy

Daniel Cinotti

Montclair State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd

Part of the Counseling Commons, and the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation

Cinotti, Daniel, "The Relationship Between Aspects of Supervision and School Counselor Self-efficacy" (2013). *Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects.* 28.

https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd/28

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASPECTS OF SUPERVISION AND SCHOOL

COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of

Montclair State University in partial fulfillment

of the requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

DANIEL CINOTTI

Montclair State University

Upper Montclair, NJ

2013

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Larry D. Burlew

MONTCLAIR STATE UNIVERSITY

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

We hereby approve the Dissertation

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASPECTS OF SUPERVISION AND SCHOOL

COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY

of

Daniel Cinotti

Candidate for the Degree:

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation Committee:

Department of Counseling &
Educational Leadership

Dr. Larry D. Burlew
Dissertation Chair

Certified by:

Dr. Joan C. Ficke
Dean of The Graduate School

Dr. Catherine Roland

_4/4/13_
Date

Dr. Dana Heller Levitt

Dr. Brian V. Carolan

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASPECTS OF SUPERVISION AND SCHOOL

COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY

by Daniel Cinotti

The purpose of this study of school counselors was to examine the relationship between aspects of supervision and self-efficacy. Satisfaction with supervision, the presence of noncounseling supervisors, role conflict, and role ambiguity were examined in relation to school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy. The study also included previously established individual factors related to school counselor self-efficacy including gender, years of experience, teaching experience, and training and use of the ASCA National Model. A multiple regression was used to create a predictor model for school counselor self-efficacy using these supervisory and individual factors. Supplemental analysis examined factors that predicted use of the ASCA National Model. Implications for practice and suggestions for future research are included.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my mentor, advisor and friend, Dr. Larry Burlew…you warned me you would have high expectations and you held me to them. Thank you for sharing your wisdom and experience and for guiding me through even difficult times. Personally and professionally I learned so much from being around you. Your time and tutelage, and your friendship, were always appreciated.

To my mentor and friend, Dr. Catherine Roland…you recognized potential in me that made me believe in myself. Your strength and compassion are inspiring. Thank you for sharing them with me. This program was your vision and without your hard work I would not have the honor of being amongst its first graduates. I dedicate this work to you.

To Dr. Dana Levitt and Dr. Brian Carolan, my committee members…thank you for your time and your support. Your expertise was invaluable. Thank you for challenging me when necessary and supporting me always. To the faculty of the Department of Counseling & Educational Leadership who supported the program and were my teachers…thank you for giving me your time and passing on your knowledge. Thank you to Dr. Angela Sheely-Moore for your collegiality and to Dr. Harriet Glosoff for your warmth and leadership. I would especially like to acknowledge Dr. Gloria Pierce whose passion and positive energy are inspiring and Mary Andreoli whose kindness and humor are always appreciated.

To the students of the Ph.D. in Counselor Education program…thank you all for your friendship, your immense talent, your encouraging words, and your shining examples. To the students of the first cohort: Rick Brown, Anthony Cannella, Megan

Delaney, Franco Gordillo, Dawn Norman, Nicole Pacheco, Alyson Pompeo, Kim Tassinari, Sarah Vandermark, Vinny Viglione, and Claire Wooloff…I especially want to thank you all. You are the trailblazers and you set the bar extremely high. You are a ridiculously talented, intelligent, and driven group and I am proud to call you all friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One

The Relationship between Aspects of Supervision and School Counselor Self-Efficacy

Introduction

Professional supervision is the most effective means of enhancing practicing school counselors' growth and development (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). Likewise, providing consistent and appropriate supervision is a key factor in preventing legal and ethical violations, stress, and burnout (Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002; Moyer, 2011). Supervision is a complex relationship involving both personal and professional behaviors of supervisors and those they supervise (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Of the many aspects of supervision discussed in counseling literature, only a few have been linked to outcomes such as anxiety level (Daniels & Larson, 2001), job satisfaction (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), and burnout (Moyer, 2011). In this study, four aspects of supervision, (1) satisfaction with supervision, (2) role conflict, (3) role ambiguity, and (4) the presence of a noncounseling supervisor, were examined in relation to an important outcome linked to school counselor performance: self-efficacy.

Although the benefits and protections of providing consistent supervision are addressed in the counseling literature many, if not most, counselors continue to receive inadequate supervision (Cashwell, & Dooley, 2001; Oberman, 2005; Somody, Henderson, Cook, & Zambrano, 2008). Borders and Usher (1992) found that many counselors receive inadequate supervision even upon entering the profession; a critical time period for gatekeeping and support. Within the profession, school counselors receive less consistent supervision than most. A national survey by Borders and Usher

(1992) involving 260 school counselors revealed that only 13% of participants received

individual clinical supervision with another 10% participating in group supervision.

Other studies utilizing samples of school counselors have produced similar outcomes,

finding that from 20% to 37% received clinical supervision (Roberts & Borders, 1994;

Sutton & Page, 1994). The factors contributing to this seemingly low rate of supervision

can be summarized as both a lack of available supervision for those who want it and a

lack of appreciation of supervision from those who do not (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006).

It seems that many school counselors are receiving little to no supervision while

others receive inadequate supervision from individuals with little understanding of their

appropriate roles (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). This is particularly dangerous given the

growing number of complex personal/social issues and crises faced by students today

(Herlihy et al., 2002). Cashwell and Dooley (2001) concluded, "Now, more than ever,

continued clinical supervision is vital for professional school counselors and all

practicing professional counselors" (p.46). Therefore, a closer look at the impact of

supervision to professional development and practice is warranted.

The implications of these findings for current school counselors are alarming

given the depth and variety of student issues they are called upon to address (Gysbers &

Henderson, 2006). The benefits of supervision to knowledge and skill development,

career satisfaction, and most importantly to the performance of school counselors in their

work with students are not being accessed by the majority of practicing professionals

(Herlihy, et al., 2002; Moyer, 2011). Given the dichotomy between school counselor best

practices and actual functioning inherent in the profession (e.g., Burnham & Jackson,

2000; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008), the goals for school

counselors can be conceptualized as a "moving target." Depending upon the individual

providing direct supervision, the roles and responsibilities of the counselor are different.

Conflicting messages about the roles and functions of the counselor lead to higher levels

of role stress and burnout (Culbreth, Scarborough, Banks-Johnson, & Solomon, 2005),

and lower levels of job satisfaction (Pyne, 2011).

      While the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) has created a model

of comprehensive school counseling in the National Model (ASCA, 2003), as well as

standards for best practice in the profession (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), research

continues to provide evidence that these resources are not necessarily being utilized (e.g.,

Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008; Scarborough & Culbreth,

2008). Historically, the role of the school counselor has been both misunderstood and

misrepresented by administrators, teachers, and practicing counselors alike (Lambie &

Williamson, 2004). As a result, many school counselors experience confusion in the

form of role conflict and ambiguity (Coll & Freeman, 1997; Lieberman, 2004; Olk &

Friedlander, 1992; Pyne, 2011). Culbreth et al. (2005) asserted that a significant

mediator of these forms of role stress is participation in supervision. Participating in

supervision could mitigate role conflict and role ambiguity.

      Several studies have focused on the effects of supervision on the concept of self-

efficacy. Results seem to implicate a complex inter-play of supervisory factors and

supervisee traits. However, evidence of a relationship between supervision and self-

efficacy exists. In a study of practicing counselors in an agency setting, Cashwell and

Dooley (2001) found clinical supervision was significantly related to higher levels of self-efficacy. The researchers concluded that, "Providing clinical supervision to the field-based counselor might promote professional growth for the therapist and ensure better care for the client" (p.45). Sutton and Fall (1995) utilized practicing school counselors in their study relating school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. Their findings provided evidence that administrator support for the counselor and the school counseling program influenced counselor's feelings of self-efficacy and empowerment. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) found evidence that supervisory style influenced counselor trainees' feelings of self-efficacy. Other studies have indicated a relationship between clinical supervision (Tang et al., 2004) or aspects of supervision such as working alliance (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), and performance feedback (Daniels & Larson, 2001) and counselor self-efficacy. The current study provides information that could be useful in clarifying the answer to the question "What is the relationship between supervision and school counselor self-efficacy?"

Background Research

Many school counselors may be receiving inappropriate and dissatisfying supervision. Research has consistently provided evidence that most school counselors see a need for more clinical supervision especially with the goal of developing their clinical skills and assisting in decision making processes with difficult cases (Page, Pietrzak, & Sutton, 2001; Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 2004). Perhaps the root of the problem is a lack of supervision utilizing comprehensive models like the National Model leading to dissatisfying experiences in supervision. Fernando and Hulse-

Killacky (2005) suggested a need for future research to focus on the influence of satisfaction with supervision on important counselor and client outcomes.

During their training, school counselors are presented with a clear, defined set of roles as described in the National Standards (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) and the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003). Beginning in practicum and internship fieldwork, many counseling trainees experience frustration and confusion because of the lack of comprehensive, developmental school counseling programming at their sites (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Studer and Oberman (2006) found that school counselors working within a comprehensive developmental model "reported that their principals had little understanding of their program" (p. 86). Counselors working within a more traditional model did not report the same feelings. However the authors theorized that school counselors in traditional models may simply be matching their practice to their administrators' expectations. A large amount of research on school counselor practice has consistently revealed a discrepancy between preferred and actual functioning and between actual functioning and best practice as advocated for in The National Model (ASCA, 2012; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Among many factors including grade level, time of service and membership in a professional association, the extent to which administrative supervisors dictate functioning has been offered as an explanation for this discrepancy (Moyer, 2011).

A cycle of role confusion persists when administrators assign non-counseling related tasks. It seems this trend continues because of two different and distinct reasons. Many principals and other school administrators are unaware of best practices and current

models of school counseling practice because their training background and professional

identity are in educational leadership (Herlihy, et al., 2002). Others, although aware of

the movement from traditional "guidance" models to comprehensive approaches such as

the ASCA National Model, continue to rely on school counselors to fill these roles

simply because the roles are necessary and the tasks need to be accomplished by someone

(Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005).

A large amount of research has focused on school counselors' feelings of stress,

role conflict, role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and burnout. According to Olk and

Friedlander (1992), role conflict occurs when a counselor is faced with a dilemma

requiring action based on conflicting or opposing expectations. Role ambiguity differs in

that it is defined as "a lack of clarity regarding the expectations for one's roles, the

methods for fulfilling those expectations, and the consequences for effective or

ineffective performance" (Olk & Friedlander, 1992, p. 390). Culbreth et al. (2005)

asserted that role conflict and role ambiguity are part of the larger construct of *role stress*

or stress brought about as a result of the expectations placed on an individual by an

organization. Principals and other administrators are less likely to understand the

activities of school counselors working within a comprehensive model (Studer &

Oberman, 2006). However, school counselors who are implementing the National Model

in their practice are more likely to be practicing as they prefer (Scarborough & Culbreth,

2008). This gap between administrators' and counselors' perceptions of the role of the

school counselor results in a dilemma for the counselor that slowly impacts professional

identity development. It is possible that the conflicting messages many school counselors

receive about their roles and responsibilities impact their feelings of professional self-efficacy. Culbreth et al. (2005) referred to this conflict as role stress, meaning stress brought about due to role conflict, ambiguity, and incongruence. Olk and Friedlander (1992) linked role conflict and role ambiguity to supervision, concluding that "in the future…it may be possible to determine precisely how serious role difficulties affect the process and outcome of supervision" (p. 393).

Practicing school counselors can receive three distinct types of supervision: administrative, program, and clinical. Administrative supervision is likely to occur as it is provided by an assigned individual; usually a principal, vice principal or other administrator (Lambie & Sias, 2009). Program supervision, because it is related to comprehensive school counseling, is often only present if the district, school or counseling department adopts a comprehensive programmatic approach (Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008). Clinical supervision is perhaps the most rare of the three (Somody et al., 2008) and the most necessary (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Lambie & Sias, 2009). Evidence as to why school counselors do not receive as much clinical supervision as they do administrative supervision mostly surrounds the perceptions of administrators as it being less necessary (Herlihy et al., 2002; Kirchner & Setchfield, 2005). Administrators are less likely to have counseling backgrounds including training in appropriate roles, responsibilities, and techniques than other available supervisors with counselor training. As Dollarhide and Saginak (2008) described, school counselors are constantly encountering evaluation of practice, but rarely participating in what could be considered clinical supervision.

Many school administrators are acting on the perception that school counselors do not require consistent clinical supervision. The perception of principals, vice-principals, and district level administrators that school counselors' roles are primarily focused on academic advising, scheduling, and other noncounseling related activities is common (Herlihy, et al., 2002). Traditional "guidance" programs rely on reactive, remedial approaches and focus on counselor functions over student outcomes (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; Studer & Oberman, 2006). Several studies have focused on the impact of administrators' misperceptions of appropriate school counselor roles and responsibilities. Matthes (1992) found that beginning school counselors often practice in isolation from other practicing school counselors, leaving teachers and administrators as their primary referent group. As a result, they have little support when asked to perform inappropriate or non-counseling related duties by their administrator. Culbreth et al. (2005) concluded that the continued gap between actual functioning and best practices is due in part "to the influence of noncounseling individuals within the school system to whom school counselors are directly accountable" (p. 58). Therefore it seems that the presence of noncounseling supervisors could have a significant impact on school counselor self-efficacy. Lambie and Williamson (2004) summarized the problem:

> A lack of standard expectations for counselor supervision may be an
> obstacle to effective school counseling programs. [Practicing school
> counselor]s are frequently supervised and evaluated by principals who
> have little or no training in counseling theory and practice. Most principals
> do not have counseling backgrounds and have received little training in

counselor education and supervision. As a result, principals frequently attempt to provide counselor supervision using existing models of teacher supervision. This, coupled with a general lack of training for principals in the proper role and use of the [practicing school counselor], results in counselors not receiving much substantive feedback about their clinical skills. (p. 124)

To date no study has examined the relationship between supervision and practicing school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy. Few variables have received as much attention or support for their impact on work performance as the concept of self-efficacy. Since the term was introduced by Bandura (1977a, 1977b, 1986), evidence that feelings of self-efficacy impact performance, motivation, effort, and perseverance in the face of hardship has mounted. In the field of counseling, self-efficacy has been linked to lowered anxiety levels, adaptation to transition (Daniels, & Larson, 2001), and skill development (Halverson, Miars, & Livneh, 2006; Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982).

Self-efficacy has been shown to have significant impact on counselors' perceptions of their own skills and abilities, as well as their commitment, motivation, perseverance, and resilience in achieving their goals (Bandura, 1986). Loganbill et al. (1982) found that a counselor's perceptions of her/his own ability is a critical factor in skill development. Self-efficacy has significant impact on counselor behavior, affecting not only their decision-making but their ability to cope with stress and difficulty in their work (Bandura, 1986). Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) asserted, "Counselor self-efficacy is a new area for theory and research, and although the theoretical constructs seem to fit,

there are no definitive studies at this time on how counseling self-efficacy affects

counselor performance" (p. 14). However, in the past decade, the concept has been

repeatedly and consistently linked to performance in a variety of settings. As Stajkovic

and Luthans (1998) summarized from their findings, "overall, self-efficacy was found to

be positively and strongly related to work-related performance. Given the scope of this

meta-analysis, and the extensive theoretical foundation of the whole research stream, the

above findings represent something that usually skeptical practicing professionals may

rely on with a reasonable amount of confidence" (p. 255).

   The single most influential factor impacting self-efficacy is experience (Bandura,

1977b, 1986). Counselors who have faced a given task and successfully completed it are

more likely to believe in their own ability to repeat this success. Developmental level is

therefore a key component of self-efficacy. Leach and Stoltenberg (1997) concluded that

counseling experience with various types of clients leading to a better understanding of

personal biases, skills, and differences contributed to higher levels of self-efficacy in

counselor trainees. Other researchers have noted similar findings supporting the notion

that training and clinical experience contribute to higher levels of self-efficacy

(Halverson, Miars, & Livneh, 2006; Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolochek, 1996; Tang

et al., 2004). Bandura (1977a) postulated that experience allows for the expectation of

future success, but also the opportunity to receive performance feedback; a necessary part

of self-efficacy development because it provides information for accurate self-

assessment. Performance feedback allows the counselor to determine if the experience

was indeed a success and what areas are in need of improvement (Johnson, Perlow, &

Pieper, 1993). Without accurate and specific feedback, there is a risk of faulty self-assessment (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Therefore a critical component of self-efficacy development is not only training and experience, but accurate and positive performance feedback (Daniels & Larson, 2001). The activity during which this kind of feedback is most likely to occur is clinical supervision.

Problem Statement

Despite the evidence to suggest the importance of consistent, appropriate supervision the counseling literature suggests that the supervision of school counselors remains dissatisfying and/or inadequate. However, few counselor outcomes have been linked to this dearth of appropriate supervision. To date there is a lack of evidence-based knowledge about the effects of supervision on one such outcome: school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy. This study examined the relationship between practicing school counselors' experiences in supervision and their feelings of self-efficacy.

Purpose of the Study

The prevalence of confusing and inadequate supervision within the profession of school counseling has been established through several national and local studies. However, to date no studies have examined the impact of this fact on practicing school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy; a critical factor in work performance (Bandura, 1977a, 1977b; Stajkovic & Luthans 1998). The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between several aspects of supervision including (1) satisfaction with supervision, (2) role conflict, (3) role ambiguity, and (4) the presence of a noncounseling supervisor, and school counselor self-efficacy, as well as the factors contributing to this

relationship. The significance of supervision was explored with respect to individual

factors previously established to impact self-efficacy including gender, years of

experience, previous teaching experience, and training in and use of the ASCA National

Model.

Significance of the Study

More research has been called for regarding school counselor supervision and

self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Cashwell and Dooley (2001) indicated that

"Further research should concentrate on issues surrounding clinical supervision of

professional school counselors" (p. 46). Sutton and Fall (1995) wrote "Relationships

between environmental variables and counselor efficacy should be explored" (p. 335). In

the current study, several previously unexamined factors of supervision were explored in

relation to school counselor self-efficacy.

Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) created a scale for the purpose of measuring school

counselor self-assessment. During their development and analysis of the instrument, they

found significant differences in self-efficacy based on personal characteristics. School

counselors who were female had generally higher self-efficacy scores than did males.

Those who had previous experience as a certified teacher similarly exhibited higher

scores than did non-teachers. School counselors with 3 or more years of experience had

significantly higher scores than those with less than 3 years. And lastly, school

counselors who were trained and utilizing the ASCA National Model had higher scores

than those who were not. The current study explored those relationships to determine if

practicing school counselors exhibited similar trends.

Most research linking counselor supervision to self-efficacy has been focused on

counselor trainees (Daniels & Larson, 2001; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Ladany

et al., 1999; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997). The current study used a sample of practicing

school counselors to examine the relationship of factors within supervisory experiences

to their level of self-efficacy. Findings from this study provide information on the

experiences of current school counselors, their supervisors' background, their satisfaction

with supervision, their feelings of role conflict and ambiguity within supervision, and

their scores on a measure of self-efficacy. This information was used to examine the

relationship between these aspects of supervision and the counselors' feelings of self-

efficacy. Given the consistently supported importance of the concept of self-efficacy to

professional development and effectiveness, it seems important for schools to provide

effective and appropriate supervision whenever possible. The results of this study are

significant because they add to the knowledge base on effective school counseling

supervisory practices.

Definition of Terms

Supervision

The most widely utilized definition of the term *supervision* is Bernard and

Goodyear's (2009). The activity begins with a relationship in which a more experienced

member of a profession transmits "skills, knowledge, and attitudes" (p. 6) to a less

experienced member. The relationship extends over a period of time and includes

evaluation of the junior member's ability to meet two goals: (1) improving and enhancing

professional functioning and (2) offering quality services to those they are working with.

In this way, the supervisor is acting as a "gatekeeper" for those who wish to obtain professional status. Through this relationship supervisees develop competencies and necessary skills as well as the ability to critically examine their own practice.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura's (1977a, 1977b) social cognitive theory defines *self-efficacy* as beliefs about one's own ability to successfully perform a given task. The strengths of these beliefs influence the decision to attempt the task, and determine the level of effort expelled and the persistence of the individual in successfully completing it (Bandura, 1977a).

Aspects of Supervision

Throughout this dissertation, the term *aspects of supervision* will be used to refer to four factors within a supervisory relationship: satisfaction with supervision, role conflict, role ambiguity, and the presence of a noncounseling supervisor. These four aspects were the primary factors of supervision examined in this study.

Satisfaction with supervision. Ladany, Hill, and Nutt (as cited in Bernard & Goodyear, 2006) define *satisfaction with supervision* as a measure of supervisees' perceptions of the quality and outcomes of supervision.

Role conflict. According to Olk and Friedlander (1992), *role conflict* occurs when a counselor is faced with a dilemma requiring action based on conflicting or opposing expectations from their supervisor.

Role ambiguity. Olk and Freidlander (1992) defined *role ambiguity* as "a lack of clarity regarding the expectations for one's roles, the methods for fulfilling those expectations, and the consequences for effective or ineffective performance" (p. 390).

Noncounseling supervisors. Culbreth et al. (2005) referred to *noncounseling supervisors* as individuals within the school system who do not have a training background in counseling such as principals, vice principals, and other administrative or teaching staff.

Comprehensive School Counseling Models

According to Gysbers and Henderson (2006), *comprehensive school counseling models* are programmatic, proactive, and include a full-range of interventions and services. Comprehensive models have articulated goals, an organizational framework and delineated activities, defined use of resources and personnel, and accountability measures.

The ASCA National Model. *The ASCA National Model*, an example of a comprehensive, data-driven school counseling program, was created by the school counseling professional association. The National Model includes the four quadrants or components of Foundation, Delivery Systems, Management, and Accountability (ASCA, 2012). Created in 2003 and revised in 2005, and again in 2012, the National Model is the most widely used example of a comprehensive school counseling model (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006).

Traditional Guidance Model

Gysbers and Henderson (2006) describe a *traditional guidance model* as based in the pupil personnel services orientation popular within the profession in 1950s and '60s. Focusing heavily on the activities and functions of the counselor rather than a programmatic approach, guidance models emphasize a remedial-reactive orientation to counseling (Studer & Oberman, 2006).

Individual Factors

Throughout this dissertation, the term *individual factors* will be used to refer to factors that are individual characteristics or experiences and have been found to significantly impact school counselor self-efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The individual factors included in this study are: gender, years of experience as a school counselor, experience as a certified teacher, training on the ASCA National Model, and use of the National Model in practice.

Gender. For the purposes of this study *gender* was considered the counselor's self-identified biological sex. Participants were given the choice of identifying as either male or female.

Years of experience. The number of *years of experience* as a school counselor included the current year and years in all other school districts or at different levels in the same district.

Teaching experience. The term *teaching experience* referred to having been certified by the state and having worked as a classroom teacher at any level of public or private school. Many states have required school counselors to have teaching experience

in the past, however only three states currently require this experience for school

counselor certification (ASCA, 2012). The state utilized in this study does not require

teaching experience for school counselor certification.

Training on the ASCA National Model. *Training on the ASCA National Model*

can be part of a counselor's education, experience, or professional development. Many

counselors received training in their counselor education programs, while others are

trained by peers upon entering the profession. Professional development experiences

such as attending conferences, workshops, or visiting other schools increase awareness

and knowledge of the National Model.

Use of the ASCA National Model in practice. *Use of the National Model in*

practice requires knowledge and awareness of the National Model and understanding of

how to implement parts of it into a school counseling program. School counselors who

indicated the use of the National Model are also indicating that they are aware of the

Model and have knowledge of this example of a comprehensive school counseling

approach.

Limitations

School counselors in a northeast state were the target sample for this study. The

generalizability of the results of this study is limited by the use of counselors in a single

state. The perceptions of the participants as to what constitutes supervision may also

have impacted the results of the study. Although a definition of supervision was

provided to all participants, individual perceptions of what is or is not supervision might

vary within the sample. This study was an observational study with the goal of describing current school counselors' supervisory experiences. This observational study did not attempt to control for the impact of environmental variables on school counselor self-efficacy. However to limit the impact of individual factors, previously established variables such as gender, years of experience, teaching experience, and training and use of the ASCA National Model were controlled for (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011).

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation study is presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 included an introduction and background literature on school counselor supervision and self-efficacy, a statement of the purpose of the study, definition of key terms, possible significance of the findings, and limitations of the planned study. Chapter 2 includes an in-depth literature review of the key concepts being examined. Chapter 3 describes the methodology, sample of the population of school counselors who were invited to participate, instruments used to gather data, data collection methods, statistical analysis procedures and design, and hypotheses being tested. Chapter 4 is a presentation of the results from the statistical analyses performed on the data. Lastly, Chapter 5 is a discussion and interpretation of the results and their implications to school counselor supervisory practices and areas of future research.

Chapter Two

Introduction

For the more than 100 years in which the profession of school counseling has existed, there have been competing professional identity constructs impacting the roles, responsibilities and supervision of the counselor. Since the inception of the profession when it was known as "vocational guidance," confusion has existed on how best to use and manage the resource that is the school counselor (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; Pope, 2009). Although the focus of the profession has changed from vocational guidance to the current concept of comprehensive school counseling, problems surrounding the use and supervision of school counselors persist. Today, although the profession has identified a National Model which provides an example of a comprehensive programmatic approach, many practicing school counselors and administrators continue to work in outdated service models and continue to provide less than best practice (ASCA, 2005; Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). A look at the historical roots of the use of the school counselor provides insight into the lasting problems in school counselor supervision and its possible impact on school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy.

Historical Context of School Counseling Supervision

Supervision and administrative support have impacted the profession of school counseling since its inception. At the outset of the profession the role of vocational guidance slowly became recognized as an integral ingredient in effective vocational placement and training. With the creation of the National Vocational Guidance Association in 1913, and the proliferation of programs in cities like Boston and New

York, the profession rapidly expanded (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). Concerns over the

lack of standardized duties and centralized supervision and evaluation of services soon

followed. As Myers (1923) pointed out in an article entitled "A Critical Review of

Present Developments in Vocational Guidance with Special Reference to Future

Prospects," vocational guidance was quickly being recognized as a "specialized

educational function requiring special natural qualifications and special training" (p.

139). However, vocational guidance was mostly being performed by teachers in addition

to their other duties, with very few districts hiring specific personnel. A standardized list

of the duties of a vocational counselor was introduced which included "to gather and

keep on file occupational information," "to consult records of intelligence tests when

advising children," and "to interview and check cards of all children leaving school,

making clear to them the requirements of obtaining work certificates" (Ginn, 1924, p. 5-

7). Interestingly, the list of 15 duties first published by the Director of the Department of

Vocational Guidance in Boston also included duties which could be considered more

academic service oriented than career service. Several such as, "to urge children to

remain in school," "to recommend conferences with parents of children who are failing or

leaving school," and "to make use of the cumulative record card when advising students,"

(Ginn, 1924, p. 5-7) are directly related to students' academic development.

      Although Myers (1923) and others expressed concerns over the lack of training

and supervision, educators and administrators were slow to recognize the consequences

of asking teachers to perform such vital duties in addition to their teaching

responsibilities without proper training and extra compensation. Additionally, districts in

which specific individuals were hired as vocational guidance counselors soon overloaded

their personnel with administrative and clerical duties which inhibited their effectiveness,

as Myers (1923) confirmed:

> Another tendency dangerous to the cause of vocational guidance is the
>
> tendency to load the vocational counselor with so many duties foreign to
>
> the office that little real counseling can be done. If well chosen, he [or
>
> she] has administrative ability. It is perfectly natural, therefore, for the
>
> principal to assign one administrative duty after another to the counselor
>
> until he [or she] becomes practically assistant principal, with little time for
>
> the real work of a counselor. In order to prevent this tendency from
>
> crippling seriously the vocational guidance program it is important that the
>
> counselor should be well trained, that the principal shall understand more
>
> clearly what counseling involves, and that there shall be efficient
>
> supervision from central office. (p. 140)

Beginning in the early 1930s, vocational counseling began to expand to include

more responsibility related to the educational and personal development of students. The

perspective of community members that the failure of workers was due to a lack of

education and vocational training was replaced by the understanding that personal issues

and adjustment played a role in job success. Influenced by the movements in mental

health and psychological assessment, vocational guidance began a slow transition

towards personal adjustment and away from strictly career services (Dollarhide &

Saginak, 2008).

In 1913, Jesse B. Davis introduced a vocational guidance curriculum to be infused into English classes in middle and high schools, an idea which he presented at the first national conference on vocational guidance (Pope, 2009). It was summarily rejected by his colleagues who could not embrace the idea of a guidance curriculum. Slowly, however, as the profession grew and Davis and others gained respect and notoriety throughout the country, his "Grand Rapids Plan" gained support. Davis worked with English teachers to infuse his career curriculum while creating programs to enhance the knowledge and skills of his students (Pope, 2009). Unknowingly, Davis' model sparked debate between those who envisioned the expansion of counselor responsibilities and those who wished to maintain their primary duty as vocational guidance (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). Ultimately, the heart of this debate was the separation of vocational from educational guidance, or to use the current vernacular, career counseling from academic counseling. Although no definitive answer was agreed upon at the time, the current consensus that academic factors influence career choice and vice versa has helped to move the profession from a systemic approach of strictly vocational guidance to a comprehensive approach, in which career, academic, and personal/social development are all addressed (ASCA, 2003).

Competing Professional Identity Models

Throughout the history of the profession two competing professional identity models have influenced its growth and development. Even from the time of vocational guidance during which the profession's singular purpose was to prepare students for the world of work, disagreement over the best way to perform this function existed. As the

profession began to define itself during the 1930s and '40s, school administrators heavily determined the professional responsibilities of the counselor (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). When the profession expanded to include "personal adjustment" counseling as a reaction to the growing popularity of psychology, administrators reacted by expanding vocational guidance to include a more educational focus. During the 1950s, school counselors were placed under the umbrella term "pupil personnel services" along with the school psychologist, social worker, nurse or health officer, and attendance officer. Although the primary function of the school counselor throughout the decades of the '60s and '70s was counseling services, concerns over the position-oriented focus of the profession existed. As a result of the lack of defined school counselor roles and responsibilities, the position was seen as an ancillary support service to the teacher and administrator. It was therefore extremely easy for administrators to continue to add duties to the counselor as they saw fit, aligning their functioning with their own identity as educators (Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

The 1970s brought about the beginning of conceptualizing school counseling as a comprehensive, developmental program. Many throughout the profession attempted to create comprehensive approaches which included in some forms goals and objectives, activities or interventions to address them, planning and implementation strategies, and evaluative measures. It was the first time that school counseling was defined in terms of developmentally appropriate, measurable student outcomes (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). Slowing the proliferation of this new concept were environmental and economic factors. The 1970s was a decade of decreasing student enrollment and budgetary

reductions leading to cutbacks in counselor positions (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). As

a result, counselors began to take on more administrative duties either out of necessity or

a desire to become more visible to increase the perception of the position as necessary.

The primary function of the position as counselor was lost amongst other responsibilities

more aligned with those of an educator.

In 1983, the National Commission of Excellence in Education published "A

Nation at Risk," a report examining the quality of education in the United States (Lambie

& Williamson, 2004). Amongst other initiatives the report jumpstarted the testing and

accountability movement in education. Standardized testing coordination duties were

almost immediately assigned to the counselor. In fact, over the course of the last century

in the profession of school counseling, the list of duties and responsibilities has steadily

grown. As Lambie and Williamson (2004) stated, "… based on the historical narrative,

school counseling roles have been vast and ever-changing, making it understandable that

many school counselors struggle with role ambiguity and incongruence while feeling

overwhelmed" (p. 124). While the inclusion of many responsibilities has been a result of

the natural expansion of the profession from vocational guidance to guidance and

counseling to comprehensive school counseling, the influence of administrators has

directly led to the assignment of many inappropriate duties. From the outset of the

profession an essential question has involved these two competing identity models,

"Should school counselors be acting as *educators* or *counselors*?" In response to the

ever-growing and expanding role of the counselor and in an attempt to articulate the

appropriate responsibilities of the counselor, the concept of comprehensive school

counseling programming was established (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; Mitchell & Gysbers, 1978).

Comprehensive School Counseling Programs

What separates comprehensive school counseling from traditional guidance models is a focus on the program and not the position (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). The pupil personnel services models of the '60s and '70s listed the types of services offered but lacked an articulated, systemic approach and therefore allowed for constant assignment of "other" duties. The concept of comprehensive programming was created in response to this problem (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006).

Gysbers and Henderson (2006) offered five foundational premises on which comprehensive school counseling programs are based. First, school counseling is a program and includes characteristics of other programs in education including standards, activities and interventions that assist students to reach these standards, professionally certificated personnel, management of materials and resources, and accountability measures. Second, school counseling programs are developmental and comprehensive. They are developmental in that the activities and interventions are designed to facilitate student growth in the three areas of student development: academic, personal/social, and career development (ASCA, 2003). They are comprehensive in that a wide range of services are provided to meet the needs of all students, not just those with the most need. The third premise is that school counseling programs utilize a team approach. Although professional school counselors are the heart of a comprehensive program, Mitchell and Gysbers (1978) established that the entire school staff needs to be committed and

involved in order for the program to successfully take root. The fourth premise is that

school counseling programs are developed through a process of systematic planning,

designing, implementing, and evaluating (Gysbers & Henderson, 2006). This process has

been described in different ways but often using the same or similar terminology

(Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008). Lastly, the fifth premise offered by Gysbers and

Henderson (2006) was that comprehensive school counseling programs have established

leadership. A growing message in the school counseling literature is the need for school

counselors to provide leadership and advocacy for systemic change (Curry & DeVoss,

2009; McMahon, Mason, & Paisley, 2009; Sink, 2009). Without the knowledge and

expertise of school counseling leaders, comprehensive programs will not take hold.

The ASCA National Model. Only within the last decade has the school

counseling profession as a whole embraced the concept of comprehensive programs

(Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008), a movement which was spurred by ASCA's creation of a

National Model (ASCA, 2003). In 2001 ASCA created the first iteration of its National

Model. Intended as a change agent, it is a framework for states, districts and counseling

departments towards the creation of comprehensive developmental school counseling

programs. The National Model contains four elements or quadrants to creating and

maintaining effective comprehensive programs (ASCA, 2012). The quadrants are the

tools school counselors utilize to address the academic, personal/social and career needs

of their students. The first, Foundation, is the philosophy and mission upon which the

program is built. The second, Delivery System, is made up of the proactive and

responsive services included in the program. These services can be focused individually,

in small-groups or school-wide and are delivered from or at least influenced by the

program's Foundation and mission statement. The third, Management, is organization

and utilization of resources. A comprehensive program uses data to drive its Delivery

System. The fourth element is Accountability which incorporates results based data and

intervention outcomes to create short and long-term goals for the program (ASCA, 2012;

Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008).

The National Model is the most widely accepted conceptualization of a

comprehensive school counseling program (Burnham, Dahir, Stone, & Hooper, 2008). It

was created out of a movement toward comprehensive programs born out of school

counselors' need to clarify their roles and responsibilities. Beginning with The Education

Trust's "Transforming School Counseling Initiative" and continuing with the creation of

National Standards for Student Academic, Career and Personal/Social Development the

National Model has been built upon the concepts of social advocacy, leadership,

collaboration and systemic change which are slowly but profoundly shaping the

profession (Burnham et al., 2008; Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dollarhide & Saginak,

2008). Since its release however the movement towards comprehensive school

counseling programs remains slow (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). This inhibits school

counselors from standardizing or "professionalizing" their roles and responsibilities

(Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008). Simultaneously it is inhibiting the standardization of

supervision for the profession.

Supervision of School Counselors

Although disagreement over the most effective models (Goodyear & Bernard,

1998), strategies, and styles (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Ladany, Ellis, &

Friedlander, 1999) of supervision persists within counseling literature, one fact is

consistently supported through research: supervision is a critical factor in counselor

development. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) defined supervision as "an intervention that

is provided by a senior member of a profession to a junior member or members of that

same profession" (p. 7). This relationship extends over a period of time and includes the

agreed upon goals of enhancing the junior member's functioning, monitoring the quality

of services given, and gatekeeping on the part of the profession. The positive effects of

supervision include performance improvements, knowledge and skill enhancement, and

increased career satisfaction (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008;

Herlihy et al., 2002; Lambie & Sias, 2009). Negative consequences of receiving little to

no supervision include professional identity problems, poor performance, decreased

competence, and a resulting increased likelihood in unethical practices and malpractice

(Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Somody et al., 2008).

The American Counseling Association (ACA), the Association for Counselor

Education and Supervision (ACES) and American School Counselor Association

(ASCA) consistently state the importance of supervision and, in some cases, establish

requirements for the preparation and training of supervisors (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006;

Herlihy et al., 2002). The ACA (2005) Code of Ethics articulated standards for

supervisors in the demonstration of knowledge of supervisory methods and techniques.

ACES (1995), in its *Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors*, identified training in

supervisory methods and techniques as a necessary prerequisite to supervision and

encouraged counselors to seek avenues of continuing education in regards to not only

clinical skills but supervisory skills as well (Dollarhide & Miller, 2006). According to

ACES (1995), a supervisor's responsibilities include monitoring client welfare,

monitoring compliance with relevant ethical, legal, and professional standards for clinical

practice, monitoring performance and professional development, evaluating and

certifying potential of supervisees for academic, screening, selection, placement, and/or

credentialing purposes (Lambie & Sias, 2009).

In its release on best practices in supervision, ACES (2011) described the

necessary training and skills to be a clinical supervisor. Among other characteristics, the

clinical supervisor should be: (1) trained in clinical supervision, (2) knowledgeable

regarding a wide range of theories and techniques, (3) experienced with diverse client

caseloads, (4) aware of state and national credentialing and licensure laws, (5)

demonstrative of ethically and legally sound practices, and (6) skilled in multiculturally

competent supervision (Section 11). Also according to ACES (2011), the training

received by clinical supervisors should be based in a developmental approach, include

appropriate application of the teaching, counseling, and consulting roles of supervision,

emphasize the importance of the supervisory relationship, and address different

approaches to building supervisees' knowledge, skills, and self-awareness (Section 12).

In short, the effective clinical supervisor who is providing best practice is well-trained

and possesses specialized skills and knowledge that most practicing counselors and

noncounseling school staff do not have.

Defining Supervision of School Counselors

Bernard and Goodyear (2009) 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" (p. 7) although they noted that most professionals will at some point receive

supervision from someone in a related profession. However, they also noted that most

state licensure laws stipulate that applicants for licensure receive supervision hours from

supervisors of a like profession. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) asserted that professional

identity development is best enhanced through supervision by a professional in the same

discipline. Some school counselors are receiving clinical supervision from

noncounseling staff members such as principals, vice principals, or directors of special

services, despite evidence that this practice is less effective (Lambie & Williamson,

2004). Oberman (2005) asserted that even when school counselors receive supervision

from a professional with the title Director of School Counseling or "Director of

Guidance" they may not be receiving appropriate clinical supervision. The author

insisted that directors of school counseling usually do not have a background in

counseling; rather they usually possess a degree in educational administration,

curriculum, instruction, school administration, or other educational areas. ASCA (2012b)

contradicted this assertion, stating that directors/coordinators of school counseling

services possess at least a master's degree in school counseling or at least the equivalent

degree necessary for certification as defined by the state. In addition, many states require

that Directors/Coordinators of School Counseling Services possess an administrative

certification or counseling license in addition to school counseling certification (ASCA,

2012).

ACES (2011) addressed the issue of clinical supervisors' training and professional

identity in its release on best practices in clinical supervision. According to ACES, the

professional association for counselor education and supervision, clinical supervisors

should possess a "strong professional identity as a counselor and supervisor" (Section

11.a.iv). Throughout its best practices, ACES (2011) emphasized the need for clinical

supervisors to possess knowledge and skills in counseling techniques and theories

(Section 11.a.i; 12.i), ethical counseling practices (Section 11.a.ii; 11.a.vi),

multiculturally competent counseling and supervision (Section 11.a.vi), models of

counselor development (Section 12.c), counselor assessment (Section 12.c), and

application of teaching, counseling and consulting skills (Section 12.e). Clearly,

according to its best practices, ACES supports the idea that the clinical supervision of

counselors requires knowledge and experience in the profession.

Others agree with the notion that school counselors would best be served through

supervision by counseling professionals. Gysbers and Henderson (2006) wrote

"Supervisors certified as school counselors should perform clinical supervision if it is to

be effective" (p. 287). Lambie and Williamson (2004) pointed out the consequence of

noncounseling staff solely providing supervision for school counselors. The authors

wrote "Most principals do not have counseling backgrounds and have received little

training in counselor education and supervision. As a result, principals frequently

attempt to provide counselor supervision using existing models of teacher supervision. This… results in counselors not receiving much substantive feedback about their clinical skills" (p. 130). It seems that school counselors' unique needs require effective supervisors with strong counseling skills and professional identities.

Supervision and School Counselor Practice

School counselors are increasingly facing complex personal/social issues in their work with students (Page, Pietrzak, & Sutton, 2001; Somody et al., 2008). Although there is limited research on outcomes of supervision for school counselors, it is clear that supervision is an integral part of skill acquisition, professional identity development, and job satisfaction (Herlihy et al., 2002). Lambie and Williamson (2004) posited that professional school counselors need supervision "to help them refine counseling skills, learn how to deal with difficult student issues, practice ethically, and perform their many and varied functions" (p. 129). Herlihy et al. highlighted the importance of supervision to maintain competence, ensure ethical practice, and mitigate against stress. Moyer (2011) found that the amount of supervision a school counselor receives is a significant predictor of burnout. Over the past decade, researchers consistently provided evidence for the impact of supervision on school counselor practice.

Aspects of Supervision

Satisfaction with supervision. Recent work to create models of school counselor supervision concentrates on the benefits to professional school counselors and to the profession as a whole. But do school counselors themselves desire and seek out on-going supervision? Although many school counselors recognize the benefit of supervision,

others, perhaps a significant amount, do not. Several studies have focused on school

counselors' response to and desire for supervision.

Sutton and Page (1994) found that only 20% of school counselors in Maine

received individual supervision, although 40% received what they characterized as peer

supervision. Despite these low numbers, 63% of participants expressed a desire for

supervision. The main reasons they desired supervision were assistance with client

problems and developing skills and techniques. Roberts and Borders (1994) surveyed

school counselors in North Carolina and found that 85% were receiving administrative

supervision but only 37% indicated receiving on-going clinical supervision. Despite this

number, 79% of school counselors surveyed indicated that they would like to receive

clinical supervision. Interestingly, most school counselors wanted their supervisor to

have a counseling background as opposed to an administrative (noncounseling)

background. Although school counselors in this survey were satisfied with the amount of

administrative supervision they were receiving, most indicated a desire for more clinical

supervision and more than half indicated a desire for clinical supervision at least once per

month (Roberts & Borders, 1994).

In a national survey Page et al. (2001) found that only 13% of participants

indicated receiving individual clinical supervision, with another 11% receiving group

supervision. Seventy percent of the counselors surveyed expressed that their ideal

supervisor would be another school counselor with specific training in supervision. In

this survey 57% of school counselors wanted to receive supervision in the future and 10%

wanted to continue receiving clinical supervision. Conversely 33% of school counselors

believed they had "no need for supervision." Coupled with the data from the previous

two studies conducted in 1994, between 63% and 79% of school counselors desired on-

going clinical supervision to enhance their knowledge and skills. Although this

represents the majority of counselors, it is clear that there are a significant number of

school counselors who see no need for supervision.

One of the reasons school counselors may not desire or see a need for supervision

is because of previously dissatisfying experiences. Most school counselors are receiving

a majority of their supervision from noncounseling staff such as principals (Lambie &

Sias, 2009), and yet school counselors consistently point to a desire for more clinical

supervision to enhance their skills and assist with taking appropriate action with clients

(Page et al., 2001; Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 2004). Additionally, the

majority of school counselors in Page et al.'s (2001) study preferred counselor-trained

supervisors, a fact that corroborated the findings of earlier studies (e.g., Roberts &

Borders, 1994). Couple this with the idea that many principals are attempting to use

existing models of teacher supervision to supervise school counselors (Lambie &

Williamson, 2004) and it is clear that many school counselors may be receiving

inappropriate and generally dissatisfying supervision from administrators.

Another possibility is that school counselors may be receiving dissatisfying

supervision from other school counselors. Studer and Oberman (2006) found that the

majority of school counselors did not have training in supervision. It is possible that

many school counselors are providing peer supervision without the necessary skills and

training. Likewise, many school counselors are practicing without knowledge and skills

regarding comprehensive school counseling programs. Walsh et al. (2007) found that newly-hired school counselors are capable of engaging in best practices as advocated by the ASCA National Model. It is possible that experienced school counselors are providing unsatisfying peer supervision and are contributing to higher levels of role conflict and role ambiguity amongst their supervisees by modeling traditional guidance practices and not supporting the use of current best practices.

Role conflict and role ambiguity. A large amount of research has established that (1) school counselors encounter role conflict and role ambiguity more regularly than most school staff members (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011), (2) relationships with school administrators, especially the principal, significantly contribute to defining school counselors' roles (Clemens, Milson, & Cashwell, 2009), (3) the match between preferred functioning and actual functioning significantly predicts role stress (Culbreth et al., 2005), and (4) participation in clinical supervision has a moderating effect on these feelings (Culbreth et al., 2005: Moyer, 2011; Olk & Friedlander, 1992).

The historically relevant and often opposing sets of expectations for school counselors come from both counselor educators during training and school administrators, such as principals, upon entering the profession. Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) established that many school counselors are practicing in ways that contradict their training and the professions' conceptualization of best practices. Several studies provide evidence that school counselors are not practicing as the profession indicates they should, both in terms of the ASCA National Model and the Education Trust's Transformed School Counselor Initiative (Clemens et al., 2009; Hatch & Chen-

Hayes, 2008; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). Therefore a common source of role

conflict and role ambiguity is the school administrators' perceptions of school counselor

functioning, a concern that Myers (1923) established and Lambie and Williamson (2004)

reiterated. The concern that school counselors are being used as quasi-administrators

instead of counseling and mental health experts continues to persist and contributed to the

establishment of comprehensive school counseling programs (Gysbers & Henderson,

2006).

        According to ASCA (2003), school counselors are responsible for activities that

foster the academic, career, and personal/social development of students. The primary

role of the school counselor therefore is in direct service and contact with students.

Among the activities ASCA (2005) listed as appropriate for school counselors are

individual student academic planning, direct counseling to students with personal/social

issues impacting success, interpreting data and student records, collaborating with

teachers and administrators, and advocating for students when necessary. Among the

activities listed as inappropriate are the following: registration and scheduling,

coordinating and administering standardized testing, performing disciplinary actions,

covering classes, hallways, and cafeterias, clerical record keeping, and data entry. In

terms of role conflict, when faced with a task, school counselors often wish to respond in

a manner that is congruent with their counselor identity but are told to apply another

professional identity: that of an educator. For example, when a school counselor is asked

to provide services to a student who has bullied while also informing the student of the

consequence that they have been suspended for that behavior, the counselor may

experience role conflict. Role ambiguity occurs when the expectations that some of the duties listed as inappropriate are included as part of the counselors' responsibilities. As an example, if a school counselor is asked to coordinate and proctor state standardized aptitude tests, they experience role ambiguity as this duty is noncounseling related (Culbreth et al., 2005; Olk & Friedlander, 1992).

The two most commonly linked outcomes of role conflict and role ambiguity are job dissatisfaction and burnout. Earlier research measured the impact of role stress on school counselor job satisfaction. Baggerly and Osborn (2006) concluded that school counselors' job satisfaction was significantly lowered by their participation in noncounseling duties, a lack of on-going supervision, and stress. Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) concluded that higher levels of role conflict and role ambiguity contributed to lower levels of job satisfaction in high school counselors. Pyne (2011) found that school counselors operating in a school in which they perceive administrative support and participate in activities aligned with the ASCA National Model displayed higher levels of job satisfaction. Several studies established the effect of role conflict and role ambiguity on counselor burnout. Wilkerson (2006) stated that "school counselors need to be savvy about the way organizations function. Without this trait, they may be faced with chronically confusing job expectations, and this study indicated strong associations between this issue and outcomes on burnout" (p. 436). Moyer (2011) measured the impact of supervision on school counselor burnout and found a significant relationship between the amount of supervision received by practicing school counselors and their feelings of burnout. Interestingly, 77% of the respondents in the study indicated that they

receive 0-1 hour of supervision per month, a commentary on the lack of on-going

supervision contributing to higher than usual levels of burnout in the profession

(Wilkerson, 2006).

      Role conflict and role ambiguity have not been studied in direct impact to the self-

efficacy of school counselors. Sutton and Fall (1995) found that school counselor self-

efficacy was directly impacted by administrative support. One of the problems with

supervisory relationships featuring high role conflict and role ambiguity is the perception

of a lack of perceived support. For example, Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) found

that supervisees experiencing high role conflict generally felt dissatisfied with their

supervision. Daniels and Larson (2001) found that accurate performance feedback

significantly impacted counselor self-efficacy. Supervisees who experience higher levels

of role conflict and role ambiguity are less likely to receive performance feedback on

tasks that they consider appropriate. Lastly, Tang et al. (2004) provided evidence that

counselor self-efficacy is significantly impacted by counseling experience. It is likely

that school counselors experiencing role conflict and role ambiguity are not practicing as

they would prefer (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). If the role stress these counselors are

experiencing is caused by participation in noncounseling and inappropriate duties, as

Baggerly and Osborn (2006) and others have concluded, they are not practicing and

receiving consistent feedback on their clinical skills and abilities. Without this

experience and performance feedback, these school counselors would likely experience a

drop in self-efficacy.

The impact of noncounseling supervisors. Gysbers and Henderson (2006) asserted that "Professional supervision is the most effective means of assisting another's growth and development" (p. 286). School counselors should receive three distinct forms of supervision: administrative, clinical, and program (Herlihy, et al., 2002). Research suggests that most school counselors are only receiving administrative supervision, usually from noncounseling staff such as a principal or vice principal (Lambie & Sias, 2009; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Oberman, 2005). Very few school counselors receive clinical supervision, a fact that may be putting many school counselors at risk for ethical and legal violations, skill erosion, job stress, and burnout (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Herlihy et al., 2002; Moyer, 2011; Pyne, 2011).

Complicating the issue of school counselor supervision by noncounseling staff is the use of the term *clinical supervision* in the teaching literature. Confusion exists amongst educators regarding the term because clinical supervision has been synonymous with the observation and evaluation process of evaluating teacher pedagogy. Whereas Bernard and Goodyear (2009) clearly defined clinical supervision in terms of an on-going relationship that includes, among other goals, the evaluation of the supervisee's skills, teaching literature tends to use the terms *supervision* and *observation* synonymously (e.g., Danielson & McGreal, 2000). Ironically, the beginnings of the clinical supervision of teachers stemmed from a desire to legitimize the profession. Morris Cogan, a teacher educator during the 1950s, is credited with terming the supervision of teachers *clinical supervision* because of his conceptualization of the "classroom as clinic" (Garman, 1986, p. 4). Cogan envisioned an on-going supervisory relationship much like that of the

Bernard and Goodyear's (2009) definition of the term, with a member of the profession of teaching providing feedback and processing classroom events. From his writings, he seemed to agree that only a teaching professional who has spent much of their time "'in classrooms observing teachers…can provide the dedication, understanding, and knowledge base for addressing certain in-service concerns" (Garman, 1986, p. 6). In an article describing the roots of the clinical supervision of teachers, Garman (1986) described the importance of the opportunity for reflection in a successful supervisory relationship:

> Personal empowerment is the essential ingredient for a professional orientation. This is the major assumption guiding the practice of clinical supervision. The teacher who maintains a reflective approach towards his or her practice continues to develop a mature professional identity. By understanding and articulating the rationale one holds for action, and then acting in reasonably consistent ways, the professional gains a power and control over his or her own destiny. (p. 18)

This is exactly the type of reflection on intentionality that is lacking for school counselors when they are not provided clinical supervision of their own. By utilizing teacher supervision models and offering clinical supervision from noncounseling personnel, school districts are depriving school counselors from the type of professional identity development and growth that Garman described; the type of professional identity development that Bernard and Goodyear (2009) suggested can only be effectively enhanced by a member of the same profession. Cogan recognized the need for

appropriate clinical supervision by a teaching professional to enhance teacher pedagogy and legitimize his profession. When professional school counselors practice without clinical supervision of their own, the profession is effected much the same way the profession of teaching was in the 1950s and '60s.

Models of supervision. In addition to individual outcomes, one important outcome of supervision is program support and development. Although many school counseling programs have shifted in the past decade from traditional guidance services to comprehensive approaches (Studer & Oberman, 2006), many other programs are in transition. Miller and Dollarhide (2006) noted the degree of transformation of a school's counseling program might impact the need for supervision and the type of supervision being offered. In schools or districts in which the program has aligned itself more fully with the ASCA National Model, the themes of leadership, advocacy, collaboration and systemic change can be emphasized. These concepts are aligned with the Education Trust's view of the Transformed School Counselor (Burnham et al., 2008). In schools or districts that are less congruent with the National Model, these concepts should be tabled in favor of program implementation strategies and teaching of the National Model itself. Miller and Dollarhide (2006) suggested that different models of supervision should be used intentionally to address the needs of the program.

Models of supervision are frameworks through which supervisors conceptualize the dynamics of these relationships (Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007). Bernard and Goodyear (2009) outlined three distinct categories of supervision models: psychotherapy-based, developmental, and social role models. The choice of which category of model or

specific model used by a supervisor is effected by personal and professional traits of both

the supervisor and supervisee. The integration of several theories at once or the blending

of models is perhaps inevitable and could be an indication of advanced practice (Bernard

& Goodyear, 2009).

Recently, several supervision models have been created to incorporate the unique

needs of school counselors. Luke and Bernard (2006) created the School Counseling

Supervision Model as an extension of Bernard's (1979) Discrimination Model (DM); a

well-known and widely used social role model. The DM proposes three roles of the

supervisor which are assumed at different times throughout supervision. The supervisor

will act as *teacher*, *counselor*, or *consultant* throughout the supervisory relationship

depending on the needs of the supervisee at a given time. The supervisor as teacher

provides instruction, modeling, feedback, and evaluation in a structured manner. The

supervisor as counselor encourages awareness and personal reflection by encouraging the

supervisee to focus on their own thoughts and feelings. The supervisor as consultant

empowers the supervisee to take responsibility for their own development while acting as

a resource and offering support (Bernard, 1979).

In addition to the social role of the supervisor, the DM proposes three areas of

focus for supervisee development. Supervisors' focus on their supervisees' *intervention*,

conceptualization, and *personalization* skills at different points throughout the

relationship. Intervention skills encompass a wide range of counseling behaviors which

infer intentionality and distinguish the work of the counselor. Conceptualization skills

describe the counselor's ability to understand the client's issues, establish treatment

goals, and create a plan to achieve those goals through intervention. Lastly,

personalization skills describe the skills needed to establish and maintain a working

relationship with clients including warmth, positive regard, and self-awareness.

According to the DM, the supervisor seamlessly switches between roles (teacher,

counselor, and consultant) to attend to these three areas of supervisee development which

is represented by a 3 x 3 matrix (Bernard, 1979).

The School Counseling Supervision Model (SCSM) extends the DM to a 3 x 3 x 4

matrix with the addition of four "point of entry" domains (Luke & Bernard, 2006). These

domains represent areas within a comprehensive school counseling program, thus linking

the previously established DM of supervision to current best practices in the profession of

school counseling (ASCA, 2005). According to Luke and Bernard (2006) the point of

entry to the conversation is established by the domain being addressed within a given

session. School counselor supervisees working within a comprehensive school

counseling program perform tasks within all four domains of the SCSM: *large group

intervention*, *counseling and consultation*, *individual and group advisement*, and

planning, coordination, and evaluation. Once a point of entry is established, a supervisor

utilizing this model determines the skills needed to successfully perform the task being

discussed. The necessary skills within each area of development (intervention,

conceptualization, and personalization) are broadened to include those appropriate for a

school counselor working with a comprehensive program. Lastly, the supervisor assumes

an appropriate role to address the skills needed to perform the given task. In fact, as

supervisory roles may be inadequate in isolation, the supervisor may move between roles

to address the skill area of focus within the session. A skilled supervisor moves intentionally from role to role while addressing the necessary skills involved in the supervisees' task to be completed (Luke & Bernard, 2006).

The creation of school counselor specific supervisory models within the past decade is in response to the growing literature on the diversity of issues school counselors encounter daily (Herlihy et al., 2002; Oberman, 2005; Walsh, Barrett, & DePaul, 2007). Wood and Rayle (2006) created The Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems (GFRS) Model of school counselor supervision. The authors wrote, "School counseling-specific supervision remains a neglected issue in counselor training despite empirical evidence that supervision results in school counselors' increased effectiveness and accountability…" (p. 253). The GFRS Model, which was developed with school counselors-in-training in mind, attempts to incorporate concepts of a comprehensive school counseling program such as the ASCA National Model and promote the leadership and advocacy roles of the counselor as proposed by the Education Trust's "Transforming School Counseling Initiative" (Burnham et al., 2008).

Lambie and Sias (2009) developed the Integrative Psychological Developmental Supervision Model (IPDSM) also for school counselors-in-training. The IPDSM focuses on increases in psychological maturity through growth. Because research suggests that increased psychological maturity contributes to increased empathy, tolerance for ambiguity, personal awareness, adaptivity, integrity, and flexibility, the goal of supervision should be psychological growth and development as defined by Loevinger's ego development theory (Lambie & Sias, 2009). Both the GFRS and the IPDSM, having

been created for school counselor trainees, require supervisory training and skills, as the

authors of both models agree. Unfortunately, as several researchers have noted, school

counselors are not usually trained in supervision and it is not a requirement for

certification (Herlihy et al., 2002; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer & Oberman,

2006). Although these models are specific to school counselors and based on a

comprehensive school counseling approach (even going so far as to incorporate ASCA

National Model concepts), the need for specialized training to effectively utilize each is

one barrier to their implementation.

   Multicultural competence in school counselor supervision. The importance of

establishing clear expectations and defined roles is relevant to all supervisory

relationships regardless of the ethnic or racial background of the parties involved.

However, as Nilsson and Duan (2007) found, the importance becomes magnified in a

cross-cultural supervisory dyad. The results of their study of racial and ethnic minority

counselors-in-training revealed an association between role ambiguity and decreased

efficacy. The findings support the importance of clear expectations within cross-cultural

dyads as well as the consequences of ineffective role establishment. Role ambiguity

affected counselors-in-training's feelings of effectiveness and confidence negatively in

these relationships and could also damage the necessary bond between supervisor and

supervisee.

   Inman (2006) described the concept of multicultural competence as obtained

knowledge, enhanced awareness and demonstrated skill dealing with issues surrounding

culturally diverse supervisees. The results of her study involving counselors-in-training

showed the positive effects of supervisors' multicultural competence on working alliance

and supervisees' satisfaction. As several authors noted (e.g., Dressel, Consoli, Kim, &

Atkinson, 2007; Inman, 2006) successful supervisors initiate conversations on cultural

differences and possible misunderstandings early in the relationship. However, the

appropriateness of the conversation in terms of exact timing, tone and content require

careful planning, astute awareness and, above all, practice. Supervisors with the

intentions of addressing cultural differences and introducing race to the supervisory

conversation need to be well-trained and practiced or face incidents of misunderstanding

and worse, unintentional racism. Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, and Pope-Davis (2004)

noted several studies, including one from Fukuyama (1994) in which initiating discussion

of race and culture early on in the relationship was deemed important but potentially

sabotaged by low multicultural competence, low racial identity status, unintentional

racism or poor timing on the part of the supervisor. These findings seem to support that

supervisors need as much diversity training as possible.

        Multicultural competence is considered part of ethical supervisory training (ACA,

2005; ACES, 1995) and can therefore be considered part of competent supervisory

practice. Training standards set forth by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and

Related Educational Programs (CACREP) direct school counselors who supervise

practicum or internship students to have relevant training in counseling supervision

(CACREP, 2009). ACES (2011) consistently supported the need for culturally

competent supervision in its statement on best practices. Section 6 of ACES Best

Practices in Clinical Supervision pertains to "Diversity and Advocacy Considerations,"

and among other statements, declares that "The supervisor recognizes that all supervision is multicultural supervision and infuses multicultural considerations into his/her approach to supervision" (ACES, 2011, Section 6.a).

Providing quality supervision according to the standards set forth by ACES, CACREP, and ACA, involves specialized skills and training including culturally competent supervisory practices. There is evidence to suggest that effective supervisors of school counselors should have (1) strong counseling identities, (2) training in supervisory models that are appropriate for counselors, and (3) knowledge of current practices in school counseling, such as developmental comprehensive programs, and the appropriate role of the counselor. Concurrently, there is evidence to suggest that currently school counselors are not receiving effective supervision and that perhaps this is leading to role stress, dissatisfaction, and burnout.

The Relationship of Supervision to Self-Efficacy

One important outcome of school counselor supervision which has not been sufficiently studied is self-efficacy. The need for more research on this important outcome is highlighted by Cashwell and Dooley (2001) who established a predictive relationship between participation in clinical supervision and higher levels of self-efficacy. In their study utilizing counselors in a community agency setting, the researchers found a significant difference in self-efficacy scores between counselors receiving clinical supervision and those not receiving clinical supervision. The authors suggested that an extension of their research to include school counselors was the next step noting, "Further research should concentrate on issues surrounding clinical

supervision of professional school counselors. Now, more than ever, continued clinical

supervision is vital for professional school counselors and all practicing professional

counselors" (p. 46).   To date no study has focused on the self-efficacy development of

practicing school counselors with regard to their unique needs in supervision.

Daniels and Larson (2001) found a relationship between performance feedback

and counselor self-efficacy. Performance feedback acted as a cue to counselor

supervisees as to their performance level resulting in a change in self-efficacy. Positive

feedback increased self-efficacy while negative feedback decreased it, providing

evidence to validate Stajkovic and Luthan's (1998) suggestion that supervisors' clearly

defined standards of performance are the easiest and most accurate information

supervisees utilize to assess their performance level. Daniels and Larson (2001)

suggested that accurate, specific performance feedback including areas of mastery and

areas in need of improvement is the key to enhanced growth and self-efficacy

development. Barnes (2004) utilized the concept of self-efficacy to present two

approaches to self-efficacy development in counselor trainees. The author asserted that

using self-efficacy developmental models could increase skill development, self-concept,

and expectations of counseling outcomes. As she noted, "Because [counselor self-

efficacy] is closely associated with important counselor training variables, interventions

grounded in self-efficacy theory show great promise for effectively promoting trainee

development" (p. 57).

This conclusion highlights the importance of supervision in developing counselor

self-efficacy. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) asserted that an important goal of

supervision is increased levels of competence, skill, and self-efficacy. Several

researchers have studied the impact of supervision and supervisory factors on this

important outcome. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) found that supervisory style as

measured by the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) influenced both supervisees'

satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy levels. Supervisors who were perceived to

have a more "task-oriented" style, or who were described as more "structured," "goal

oriented," and "evaluative," produced increased self-efficacy levels in their supervisees.

This data reinforces the importance of accurate and evaluative performance feedback in a

structured supervisory relationship. Additionally, Ladany et al. (1999) found an increase

in counselor self-efficacy over time in a supervisory relationship but found no evidence

that a working alliance significantly impacted the change. The authors suggested that

performance feedback from a multitude of sources such as peers and clients contributes

to this increase. It could certainly be concluded from these findings that supervision

plays an important role in many ways to self-efficacy development, both in counselor

trainees and practitioners.

Self-Efficacy

Bandura's (1977a, 1977b) social cognitive theory defined *self-efficacy* as beliefs

about one's own ability to successfully perform a given task. The strengths of these

beliefs influence ones' decision to attempt the task, and determine the level of effort

expelled and the persistence of the individual to successfully complete the task.

Counselors with high levels of self-efficacy consider themselves highly capable

professionals (Barnes, 2004).

The concept of self-efficacy has a long history of empirical support for its impact on work performance and satisfaction. Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) performed a meta-analysis on self-efficacy studies done over a 20-year period. The study included participants from various disciplines and sought to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance. The authors found evidence that a significant relationship exists between self-efficacy levels and work performance. Furthermore, their findings suggested that the complexity of the tasks being completed had a moderating effect on this relationship such that higher task complexity within the work setting weakens the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. Among the suggestions included by the authors in this study were for managers (supervisors) to include specific and accurate descriptions of employee roles and tasks to be completed. According to Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) "Unless the definitions of the task and task circumstances are provided in a clear and concise manner, employees may not be able to accurately assess the complex task demands,…and thus will lack accurate information for regulating their effort" (p. 255).

Additionally, the authors suggested that managers (supervisors) need to provide accurate and apparent standards on which employees should gauge their level of success. Without this information, employees are forced to seek other ways to assess their performance and usually those ways are less accurate and harder to find. Gardner and Pierce (1998) corroborated those suggestions noting that organizations should provide employees with clear role definitions, support, and professional development opportunities to enhance self-efficacy. Gardner and Pierce (1998) suggested,

"Employees who have strong task-based self-efficacy contribute greater effort and more persistence, resulting in successful performance" (p. 68).

Self-efficacy can be conceptualized as a level of confidence that emerges from skill development and experience (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001). Within the counseling profession, a lot of attention has been paid to self-efficacy development in counselor trainees as well as practicing professionals. Several studies have highlighted the importance of experience, both in terms of training and with diverse and complex caseloads during practice, as an important predictor of self-efficacy (Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Tang et al., 2004). Melchert et al. (1996) provided evidence that extended graduate training, for example at the doctoral level, increased counselor self-efficacy perhaps more than clinical experience. Halvorsen et al. (2006) found that self-efficacy in counselor trainees experiencing fieldwork in the form of a practicum developed faster than that of trainees in academic coursework only. It seems from this data that the experience of clinical work coupled with knowledge, skill, and awareness development (as provided in graduate level training) is essential for self-efficacy growth and development.

School counselors face unique demands and work environments, even as compared to other counselors (Herlihy et al., 2002). Therefore the factors that influence their feelings of self-efficacy are often different and unique. Sutton and Fall (1995) found evidence that school climate factors significantly impacted school counselor self-efficacy. Support from colleagues and administrative support and understanding of the counseling program were significant predictors of self-efficacy levels. Their study also

provided evidence that the appropriateness of duties assigned to a school counselor, as

delineated by comprehensive school counseling programs such as the ASCA National

Model, significantly impacted self-efficacy. This finding is reinforced by Moyer (2011)

who found that higher levels of noncounseling duties increased the symptoms of burnout

displayed by school counselors.

Individual Factors Contributing to the Relationship between Supervision and

School Counselor Self-Efficacy

Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) created a scale used to measure the self-efficacy of

school counselors. Previous research examining the self-efficacy of school counselors

mostly utilized the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory, a scale designed for counselors

but not specifically school counselors (e.g., Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Daniels & Larson,

2001; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005). During the development of the School

Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found significant

differences in scores based on individual characteristics. These characteristics can be

viewed as contributing factors to school counselor self-efficacy.

Gender. The researchers found significant differences in self-efficacy scores

between men and women. Female participants displayed higher self-efficacy than their

male colleagues. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) offered the explanation that the amount

of school counselors who are women provide ample role models for female school

counselors, while male counselors perhaps do not have the same resources for role

modeling. When given to school counselor trainees, the SCSE scale did not produce

significant differences based on gender.

Years of experience. School counselors with three or more years of experience were found to have higher self-efficacy scores than counselors with less than three years. This finding validated the data from previous studies that indicated experience was a significant predictor of self-efficacy (e.g., Halvorson et al., 2006; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997). Bandura (1986) posited that experience contributed to self-efficacy because of the opportunity to receive feedback from various places (supervisors, peers, clients, etc.). The development of the SCSE scale seems to corroborate the evidence that school counseling experience enhances self-efficacy.

Experience as a certified teacher. School counselors with experience as classroom teachers reported higher levels of self-efficacy than those without teaching experience. Most states currently do not have a requirement of teaching experience to be certified as a school counselor, with many ending that practice in only the past decade. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) concluded that more self-efficacy for school counseling was gained from teaching experience than from previous counseling experience. These findings highlight the unique qualities of working in a school as opposed to another counseling setting and reinforce the conclusion that school counselors have unique challenges working in such an environment (Herlihy et al., 2002).

Training on and use of the ASCA National Model. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) also found evidence that school counselors who have been trained in the National Standards and who utilize the National Standards in practice displayed higher levels of self-efficacy. This finding can be linked to the SCSE scale itself which incorporates the National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997). The authors

utilized this document, among others, as the basis for many of the questions in the scale. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) recognized the National Standards and the ASCA National Model as standards of best practice in school counselor activity.

For the purpose of this study, training and use of the ASCA National Model have replaced training and use of the National Standards. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) wrote "The formats of the National Standards and ASCA model lend themselves directly to studies using self-efficacy" (p. 15). The ASCA National Model has become the most widely used comprehensive school counseling approach in the profession (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008; Studer & Oberman, 2006). Although the National Standards remain the standard for student outcomes in the profession, the ASCA model has become the most widely known standard of practice.

Conclusions

These individual factors were previously established to have an impact on school counselor self-efficacy. This study sought to establish the relationship of other factors to school counselor self-efficacy. From the literature it seems that satisfaction with supervision, noncounseling supervisors, role conflict, and role ambiguity are important factors as well. A lack of research leaves questions as to the impact of aspects on school counselor self-efficacy. Although there is evidence that supervision and self-efficacy are related, even within the counseling profession, there is still doubt as to whether those relationships translate to school counselors who are uniquely influenced by competing professional identities as both counselor and educator. A review of changes within the profession reveals the effects of these competing models on the historical roles and

ASPECTS OF SUPERVISION AND SELF-EFFICACY

responsibilities within the profession. Therefore addressing the impact of school

counselor supervision specifically on an important outcome such as self-efficacy might

significantly contribute to the manner in which school counselors and their supervisors

view supervision.

Chapter Three

Introduction

Understanding the relationship of satisfaction with supervision, noncounseling supervisors, role conflict, and role ambiguity to school counselor self-efficacy has implications for school counselors, school counselor supervisors, and counselor educators. Supervision that is unsatisfying, inappropriate, confusing, or insufficient has been consistently shown to impact counselors' ethical practice, skill development, job satisfaction, adherence to best practices, implementation of the ASCA National Model, and feelings of anxiety, comfort with difficult cases, role conflict, and burnout (Coll & Freeman, 1997; Crutchfield & Borders, 1997; Daniels & Larson, 2001; Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008; Herlihy et al., 2002; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Miller & Dollarhide, 2006; Moyer, 2011; Pyne, 2011). In addition to these outcomes, there is sufficient evidence to believe that several aspects of supervision impact school counselor self-efficacy. The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between four aspects of supervision: (1) satisfaction with supervision, (2) role conflict, (3) role ambiguity, and (4) the presence of a noncounseling supervisor and school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy.

The primary research question investigated was: What is the relationship of aspects of supervision to school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy? A secondary research question incorporating factors with previously established relation to school counselor self-efficacy was: To what extent can school counselor self-efficacy be predicted using these aspects of supervision and previously established factors?

Research Hypotheses

The primary research question was divided into four exploratory questions for hypothesis testing. These four questions are based on the aspects of school counselor supervision being examined: satisfaction with supervision, noncounseling supervisors, role conflict, and role ambiguity. The sub questions for this study were as follows: (1) Is there a significant relationship between satisfaction with supervision and school counselor self-efficacy?, (2) is there a significant relationship between role conflict and school counselor self-efficacy?, (3) is there a significant relationship between role ambiguity and school counselor self-efficacy?, and (4) is there a significant relationship between noncounseling supervisors and school counselor self-efficacy?

Using these questions, the following hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1. Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who receive supervision with which they are satisfied.

Hypothesis 2. Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who experience less role conflict in their supervisory relationships.

Hypothesis 3. Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who experience less role ambiguity in their supervisory relationships.

Hypothesis 4. Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for those supervised by counseling staff.

Hypothesis 5. Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who are satisfied with supervision and who experience less role conflict and ambiguity.

Hypothesis 6. Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who are satisfied with supervision, experience less role conflict and role ambiguity, and are supervised by counseling staff.

The secondary research question of this study was dependent on the outcome of testing of the first set of hypotheses. Significant relationships were established between some of the variables of interest; therefore a multiple regression was performed utilizing previously established individual factors impacting school counselor self-efficacy. This statistical analysis technique yielded a model with some predictive value of school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy (Remler, & Van Ryzin, 2011). The goal of the secondary research question was to measure the predictive value of each independent variable while controlling for the impact of previously established factors. Only aspects of supervision that were established to significantly relate to school counselor self-efficacy were utilized. Individual factors that have been previously established were considered confounding variables or variables that systematically vary with the independent variables while impacting the dependent variable (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Factors previously established to impact school counselor self-efficacy were controlled for during multiple regression analysis to limit their differential influence.

Type of Study

The current study is an observational study utilizing previously established groups; school counselors in their current schools. The study is considered *nonexperimental* because the independent variable was not manipulated (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). The strength of an observational study such as this is the use of its

outcomes in describing current practices. In this case, the results describe school

counselor supervision in relation to the outcome of self-efficacy. This type of study also

has limitations (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). For example, the variables in this study are

endogenous because they influence each other and are influenced by many other

variables outside of those being measured. To limit the impact of this endogeneity,

several variables that have been established to impact school counselor self-efficacy (age,

gender, years of experience as a school counselor, certified teaching experience, and

training in and use of the ASCA National Model) were included as control variables.

This is a correlational study with four independent variables (satisfaction with

supervision, noncounseling supervisors, role conflict, and role ambiguity) and one

dependent variable (self-efficacy). This study is both descriptive and predictive in that it

sought to describe the relationships between the variables of interest but also explored a

model for predicting self-efficacy in school counselors based on supervisory and

individual factors (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Lastly, this study could be considered

exploratory because although there is evidence to suggest that relationships between

these four aspects of supervision and school counselor self-efficacy exist, there have been

no previous studies to confirm this.

Sample

The goal of this study was to examine the relationship between school counselor

self-efficacy and aspects of supervision. To meet this goal a population of practicing

school counselors in a northeastern state were invited to participate. The population

consisted of school counselors within a northeastern state who met several professional

criteria which were established by the information in the directory published by the

state's school counselor association. For the purposes of the study, only counselors

working in public schools in this state were invited to participate. All school counselors

listed in the directory as school or "guidance" counselors were eligible to participate, and

made up the sampling frame of approximately 2,700 counselors. School counselors in

private schools in this state, or those listed in the directory as "Substance Abuse

Counselor," "Student Assistance Counselor," "SAC," "Director of School Counseling,"

"Director of Guidance," or any title other than school or "guidance" counselor were not

invited to participate.

A convenience sample of school counselors was used because the sample was

comprised of school counselors within the target population who were willing to

participate in an online study (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). Although this sampling

method limits the generalizability of the study, the method was chosen because it would

potentially yield the largest number of participants in this population (Johnson &

Christensen, 2012). Information about the school counselors at each school was obtained

from the directory including their names and e-mail addresses. This information was

used to establish contact through e-mail.

Online survey methods such as this inherently limit the expected response rate.

Granello (2007) estimated the average response rate of such a survey technique at 10-

15%. Several strategies were employed and yielded a response rate of 7.8%. First, the

topic of the study and the goal of the measure being used were likely of interest to those

being solicited to participate. Second, the measurement tool and the survey were made as

easy to complete as possible, given the number of variables being measured. Third, an

initial e-mail invitation was sent prior to the survey and measure being sent. And lastly,

three solicitations were sent to each counselor; an introduction, an invitation, and a

follow-up. These methods have been established to increase the likelihood that those

solicited choose to complete an online survey (Granello, 2007; Sills & Song, 2002).

A total of 210 completed surveys were collected online from practicing school

counselors. Eighty percent of the participants were female (n=168), and 20% were male

(n=42). The sample included 83.8% Caucasian, 6.7% African-American, 5.7% Latino,

2.4% Asian, and 0.5% Native American (one participant did not answer). The majority

of participants had previously worked as a certified teacher (66.2%). Ten percent of the

sample had 1-3 years of experience as a school counselor, 21.4% reported 3-6 years of

experience, and 68.6% reported working for more than 6 years. The highest level of

education attained by most participants was a master's degree (95.7%), however, 3.3%

reported an earned doctorate while 1.0% reported having only a bachelor's degree.   All

of the participants worked in a public school setting and were listed as school or

"guidance" counselors in their state school counseling association's directory.

Instrument

Participants were asked to complete a total of 92 questions on the survey

instrument (Appendix A). A demographic questionnaire consisting of 12 items contained

questions such as "To what extent have you received training on the American School

Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model?" and "What is the title of the person

who provides you the most direct supervision?" The items in this section also inquired

about the participant's gender, race, educational background, caseload, and experience. The next section was the 8-item Satisfaction with Supervision Questionnaire (Ladany, Hill, & Nutt, as cited in Bernard & Goodyear, 2006) which measured the counselor's satisfaction with the quality of the current supervision they are receiving. The 43-item School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) was used to measure the participant's feelings of self-efficacy. Lastly, the 29-item Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (Olk & Friedlander, 1992) was utilized to measure role stress within the participant's current supervisory relationship.

Measures

      Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). The Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ) was created by Ladany, Hill, and Nutt (as cited in Bernard & Goodyear, 2006) for the purpose of measuring supervisees' satisfaction with various aspects of supervision. Examples of questions on the SSQ include "How would you rate the quality of supervision you received?" and "To what extent has this supervision fit your needs?" (Bernard & Goodyear, 2006, p. 316). Participants are asked to respond to their satisfaction level with current supervision on a 4-point Likert scale. Higher scores on the scale indicate more satisfaction with current supervision.

      The SSQ was created as a modification of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ) created by Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, and Nguyen (1979). Two words (*counseling* and *services*) from the CSQ were replaced with the word *supervision* in the SSQ. Several studies have utilized the SSQ to measure satisfaction with supervision. Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, and Wolgast (1999) found that scores on the

SSQ were negatively correlated to supervisees' perception of the frequency of ethical

violations by their supervisors. Ladany, Hill, and Nutt (as cited in Bernard & Goodyear,

2006) found less nondisclosure of negative reactions to the supervisor in more satisfied

supervisees. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) noted that supervisory style

significantly impacted satisfaction with supervision as measured by the SSQ. These

studies provided empirical evidence of internal consistency ranging from $\alpha= .96$ to $\alpha=$

.97. Factor analyses in these studies revealed that internal consistency of the one factor

of satisfaction with supervision ranged from $\alpha=.84$ to $\alpha=.97$ (Fernando & Hulse-

Killacky, 2005). Cronbach's alpha for the SSQ in this study was .97.

   The School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale. The School Counselor Self-

Efficacy (SCSE) scale developed by Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) was designed to

measure school counselors' confidence in their abilities to carry out identified tasks and

responsibilities (e.g. "Consult and collaborate with teachers, staff, administrators and

parents to promote student success") and follow professional guidelines (e.g. "Follow

ethical and legal obligations designed for school counselors") (See Appendix A).

Participants indicate their level of confidence in each item on a Likert scale of 1 (not

confident) to 5 (highly confident).

   During the scale's development its reliability was tested three times.   The test

was first given to practicing school counselors who attended the 2000 ASCA national

conference. The reliability co-efficient alpha obtained from this sample of 582 was .95.

The second reliability co-efficient was obtained from a sample of 116 master's level

school counseling students. The co-efficient alpha for this sample was .96. The last

sample was 342 practicing school counselors and master's level students and was broken down by question topic. Each question was assigned one of five topic headings which were Personal and Social Development ($\alpha=.91$), Leadership and Assessment ($\alpha=.90$), Career and Academic Development ($\alpha=.85$), Collaboration ($\alpha=.87$) and Cultural Acceptance ($\alpha=.72$). The researchers demonstrated both test-retest reliability and internal consistency through these methods. Cronbach's alpha for the SCSE scale in this study utilizing 210 school counselors was .96.

The SCSE scale was examined by a panel of experts in the field of school counseling who were asked to create items detailing current school counseling practices and tasks. The panel represented ASCA and included individuals who authored the ASCA National Model, the most widely used practice model in the field. Through this method, the authors sought to establish content validity because the panel was asked to examine the relevancy of items to school counselor self-efficacy.

Construct validity of the SCSE scale is supported by correlation studies conducted between scores on this scale and four previously established measures. Twenty-eight master's level students took both the SCSE scale and the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE), a measure of self-efficacy used for counselors (not specifically school counselors). A positive correlation of .41 was established demonstrating a relationship between the SCSE scale and a previously established measure of self-efficacy. Twenty-five master's level students took the SCSE scale and the Social Desirability Scale (SDS) designed to "…measure one's attempts to describe oneself in favorable terms in order to achieve approval from others" (Bodenhorn, & Skaggs, 2005, p. 20). A correlation co-

efficient of .29 was established, not representing a significant relationship. This finding

is positive because it established there was no relationship between participants' scores

on the SCSE and their desire to project a positive image, indicating that participants

answered the items on the scale genuinely. Thirty-eight master's level students took both

the SCSE and the State-Trait Anxiety Index (STAI), a well-established measure of

anxiety. A correlation co-efficient of -.42 was established between state anxiety scores

and SCSE scale scores establishing a significant negative relationship between SCSE

scores and anxiety. Lastly, 28 master's level students took both the SCSE and the

Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS), an established measure of general self-

confidence. The correlation co-efficient of .16 established no relationship. However,

construct validity was established by correlating scores on the SCSE to that of other

measures such as the Counselor Self-Estimate (COSE) Inventory (Bodenhorn & Skaggs,

2005).

   The Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI). The Role

Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) was developed by Olk and Friedlander

(1992) and was designed to measure supervisees' feelings of role conflict and ambiguity

in counseling supervisory relationships. The RCRAI was created using a sample of

counselor trainees. Participants indicate the extent to which they have experienced

specific role difficulties on a Likert scale of 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much so). The

RCRAI contains two subscales which measure role conflict (RC) and role ambiguity

(RA) respectively. Scores are obtained by summing the raw scores and dividing by the

number of items in each subsection. Higher scores on each subscale indicate higher

levels of role conflict and ambiguity.

During the scale's development it was tested twice; the first a factor analysis of

the 29-item scale and the second a test of construct validity of both subsections of the

scale. According to Olk and Friedlander (1992) results of a maximum likelihood

confirmatory analysis supported the validity of the inventory. During factor analysis the

inventory was trimmed to 29 items; a 16-item RA scale and a 13-item RC scale.

Reliability measures for each subscale were reported as Cronbach's alphas with the RA

subscale at .91 and the RC subscale at .89. Nilsson and Duan (2007) later validated these

data during their study of racial and ethnic minority supervisees by reporting Cronbach's

alphas of .91for both subscales. Cronbach's alphas were calculated in this study for both

the RA subscale (α= .94) and the RC subscale (α= .93).

Construct validity for both subscales was demonstrated using multivariate tests of

unique contributions. When role ambiguity was held constant, role conflict was

associated with higher levels of anxiety and lower satisfaction with work and with

supervision. When role conflict was held constant, role ambiguity was associated with

higher levels of anxiety and lower levels of satisfaction with work and supervision. Role

ambiguity was significantly related to less counseling experience. Olk and Friedlander

(1992) summarized their opinion that this scale is a reliable and valid measure of

experiences of role conflict and role ambiguity in supervision:

The development and validation of this instrument address three common

problems that plague supervision research: the lack of nationwide

sampling, the lack of attention paid to the experiences of highly advanced

trainees, and the lack of psychometrically sound instruments developed

specifically for the supervision context. (p. 396)

Several studies have utilized the RCRAI to measure role conflict and ambiguity.

Higher scores on the RCRAI have been linked to a weaker supervisory working alliance

(Ladany & Friedlander, 1995). Nilsson and Anderson (2004) found RA subscale scores

significantly predicted supervisory working alliance. Nelson and Friedlander (2001)

found that dual relationships and power struggles with supervisors were reported more

often by counselor trainees with high RC subscale scores. Nilsson and Duan (2007)

found that scores on both scales of the RCRAI predicted perceived prejudice in racial and

ethnic minority supervisees. Their study also provided evidence for the relationship

between role ambiguity and counselor self-efficacy.

Procedures

The survey instrument used in this study was first given to a panel of practicing

school counselors to complete and submit feedback. The instrument was created online

using the website *SurveyMonkey*. Twelve demographic questions were created by the

researcher to capture information such as the participants' gender, race, number of years

of experience as a school counselor, teaching experience, and training on and use of the

ASCA National Model. The panel was asked to focus on questions such as:

"Approximately how long did the survey take to complete?," "Were you comfortable

answering all of the questions," and "Was it easy to navigate and answer the questions

using the multiple choice format?" The members were asked to specifically give

attention to the amount of time and number of questions in the instrument.

The survey was completed by a total of seven practicing school counselors and

one retired school counselor. Feedback from this panel was generally positive about the

ease and length of the instrument, although some feedback was used to modify the

instrument. For example, the original survey instrument asked the panel members to

identify the district they currently worked in. According to their feedback, the panel was

not comfortable providing that information and believed that other practicing school

counselors would also hesitate to answer that question. That particular item was not

included in the final survey instrument. The final instrument included four sections and a

total of 92 items (see Appendix A).

Data Collection

An initial contact e-mail (Appendix B) was composed to inform the invited school

counselors about the purpose and procedures of the study and alert them to an upcoming

e-mail containing a link to the research instrument. Once the Institutional Review Board

(IRB) granted permission (Appendix C) for this study to occur, all eligible school

counselors in the state received the initial e-mail containing an explanation of purpose

and procedures of the study. The e-mail indicated that they were being asked to

participate in a study on the effects of supervision on school counselor self-efficacy.

Definitions of the terms *supervision* and s*elf-efficacy* were included. A second e-mail

(Appendix D) was sent 3 days later containing an informed consent form and a link to the

online instrument. School counselors were asked to complete a 92-item survey

instrument comprised of a demographic questionnaire, the SSQ, the SCSE scale, and the

RCRAI containing both RC and RA subscales.

The second contact was an e-mail containing a message of informed consent and

a link to the research instrument. After reading the message of informed consent, the

participants were notified that clicking on the link to the research instrument constituted

consent to participate. Once the counselors read and consented to participate by opening

the link, they were taken to the online research instrument. They were given general

directions for completing the survey, as well as specific directions for each of the four

sections of the survey instrument. In the informed consent, participants were told that the

survey instrument should take between 20-25 minutes to complete.

A follow-up e-mail (Appendix E) was sent one week after the second contact.

This follow-up simply reminded school counselors of their invitation to participate and

reiterated the informed consent information. A link to the online survey was included.

Only one follow-up e-mail was sent. The survey was open to all school counselors in a

northeast state for a total of four weeks and the total number of participants at the end of

this period was 210.

The timing of the e-mail contacts was an important factor in the number of school

counselors contacted to participate in this study. The initial e-mail invitation to

participate was sent to all school counselors in a northeast state during the second week

of June. Because of the delay between the initial contact and the second e-mail informed

consent and link to the study, participants received a link to the study during the third

week of June. Some e-mails were bounced back to the researcher with an "out of office"

message." Those school counselors who were not in school as evidenced by an "out of office" message were still sent the second and final e-mail solicitations because many counselors indicated that they would be checking their e-mails throughout the summer. The online survey was kept open until the end of the second week of July to allow for these counselors to possibly participate. These school counselors were still able to participate if they checked their e-mails from home or returned to school during the third week of June until the second week of July.

The accuracy of the information in the state school counselor directory was also a factor in the number of school counselors reached. A small proportion of the e-mail addresses were inaccurate. Some school counselors may have already left their positions prompting their districts to eliminate their e-mail addresses. Other addresses may simply have been listed inaccurately in the directory. In these cases, the sent e-mails bounced back with a message that the address "no longer exists." These addresses were eliminated from the study after the first and second e-mail contacts were sent. The total number of school counselors employed in this state in 2011 was 2,783, according to the state's department of education website. A total of 2,709 school counselors received all three e-mail contacts including the informed consent and link to participate in this study. A total of 210 school counselors completed the online survey, which constituted a response rate of 7.8%. The number of school counselors who started the online survey was 284. Because this study was voluntary, all of these school counselors self-selected into the sample.

Data Analysis

Once the data were collected they were transferred into SPSS. Participants' data with missing answers on any of the 3 measures included in the instrument were discarded. Categorical demographic data were coded using dummy variables. For example, answers to the question of "What is the title of the person who provides you the most direct supervision?" were coded using "0" for noncounseling supervisors such as Principal or Vice principal and "1" for Director of School Counseling Services. The results of the SSQ, the SCSE scale, and both the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity subscales of the RCRAI for 210 participants were scored. Of the 284 participants who started, 210 (73.94%) completed the 92-item instrument.

All data analysis procedures were performed directly in SPSS. Initial analysis sought to establish a relationship between each of the four independent variables of supervision and the dependent variable of self-efficacy by correlating them. First, each continuous independent variable was correlated to the dependent variable and each other. Analysis of the correlation coefficients revealed significant correlations existed between several independent variables and the dependent variable: self-efficacy scores. Next, a set of independent samples *t*-tests were used to measure the differences in scores on the SSQ, the RCRAI, and the SCSE scale between school counselors with noncounseling supervisors and those with counseling supervisors. This test was chosen because a dichotomous, categorical variable (noncounseling supervisor) was being compared to a continuous dependent variable (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). In this way the

hypotheses associated with the primary research question was addressed. Variables with significant correlations were included in the next step of analysis.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to address the secondary research question in an attempt to predict self-efficacy scores using significantly related variables. Because of the observational nature of this study, control variables were used to limit the endogeneity of the predictor variables (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011). The first step of the regression measured the contribution of these control variables. The control variables were (1) gender, (2) years of experience, (3) teaching experience, (4) training in the ASCA National Model, and (5) use of the ASCA National Model. These factors have previously been established as predictors of self-efficacy in school counselors and could have confounded the relationship between self-efficacy and aspects of supervision (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Bodenhorn, Wolfe, & Airen, 2010).

The next step of the regression model added the predictor variables one at a time. Role ambiguity was added first followed by role conflict and finally the presence of a noncounseling supervisor. This order was based on the evidence presented in the literature for these variables' impact on school counselor self-efficacy and the results of the initial analysis in this study. A multiple regression was used to identify both the unique contributions of each predictor variable given the variables controlled for as well as the overall predictive power of all of these aspects of supervision. The statistical analysis provided data on the impact of these aspects of supervision on school counselor self-efficacy (Remler & Van Ryzin, 2011).

Throughout the data analysis a significance level of .05 was used to determine significance. According to King and Minium (2003), the level of significance should be determined by the substantive logic of the study being conducted. Although there is evidence within the literature, the four aspects of supervision being measured have not been shown to significantly relate to school counselor self-efficacy through previous studies. The most widely used levels are .01 and .05. Because this study is exploratory with the goal of examining relationships and not determining causation, a slightly higher risk of error is acceptable. A significance level of .05 is the most commonly used, and was therefore chosen (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Results of the analysis described in this chapter are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter Four

Introduction

The focus of this study was on the experience of supervision and its impact on self-efficacy for practicing school counselors. It specifically examined the relationship of four aspects of supervision to school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy: (1) satisfaction with supervision, (2) role conflict, (3) role ambiguity, and (4) the presence of a noncounseling supervisor. These aspects of supervision were chosen because there is evidence within the counseling literature of their possible relationships to self-efficacy. Each aspect of supervision was measured through an online survey developed from three previously established measures and a question about who provided the most direct supervision. The survey also included demographic data that provided information about the sample. Overall, 210 of the approximately 2,700 practicing school counselors contacted responded to the survey (7.8% response rate), and data from their responses were used in the analysis upon which the results in this section are based.

The sample obtained for this study was consistent with samples used in other studies on practicing school counselors in both gender and ethnicity. Two recent studies on school counselor supervision are relevant for purposes of comparison. Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) utilized a sample of 175 high school counselors in their study on role conflict and role ambiguity as predictors of job satisfaction. The researchers reported a 73% female to 27% male participants. Additionally, 88.6% of participants were Caucasian, 6.9% African-American, and the remainder of the sample selected Latino(a)/Hispanic or other. Moyer (2012) collected data from 382 practicing school

counselors from all levels. Female participants made up 85.1% of the sample as opposed

to 13.6% male. A majority of the counselors in that study were Caucasian (89.8%), while

5.2% were African-American, 2.1% were Hispanic, 0.5% were Asian, and 2.4% did not

indicate their ethnicity. In the current study of 210 practicing school counselors in a

northeast state, 80% of the participants were female and 20% were male, including 83.8%

Caucasian, 6.7% African-American, 5.7% Latino, 2.4% Asian, and 0.5% Native

American. One participant did not report their ethnicity.

The sample obtained in this study was also consistent with the sample used during

item analysis of the School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale. Bodenhorn and

Skaggs (2005) utilized a sample of 226 practicing school counselors who were attendees

of the 2000 ASCA national conference. Again, the majority of school counselors in the

study were female (80.5%) as opposed to male (19.5%). Ethnicity in their study was split

into Caucasian (88%) and Non-Caucasian (12%). The researchers also reported rates of

experience in terms of years as a school counselor and of school counselors who reported

having teaching experience. Most school counselors in their study had at least one year

of experience, with 82.4% reporting having taught and 17.6% reporting no experience as

a teacher. Participants with more than 3 years of experience as a school counselor made

up 84.2% of the sample as opposed to 15.8% with less than 3 years in the profession. In

this study utilizing 210 practicing school counselors, 66.2% of participants reported

having worked as a classroom teacher while 33.8% had no experience. Also, 90% of the

sample in this study reported having more than 3 years of experience while 10% had less

than 3 years of experience as school counselors.

This chapter summarizes the results of the data analysis used to answer research

questions 1 (What is the relationship of aspects of supervision to school counselors'

feelings of self-efficacy?) and 2 (To what extent can school counselor self-efficacy be

predicted using these aspects of supervision and previously established factors?). First, a

description of the three previously established scales is included with mean scores and

standard deviations from the data provided by school counselors. Next, the primary

research question is examined using bivariate correlations and a *t*-test of independent

samples. Each of the six research hypothesis presented in Chapter 3 are examined using

the results of those analyses. A multiple regression analysis was used to measure the

predictive power of the independent variables in this study. A summary of the results of

this 4-step hierarchical regression analysis are described and will be used to answer the

secondary research question regarding predicting school counselor self-efficacy.

Results

Participants in this study completed a 92-item instrument comprised of a

demographic questionnaire and three previously established scales. The first scale, the

Satisfaction with Supervision Questionnaire (SSQ), is an 8-item satisfaction with

supervision measure requiring respondents to rate their satisfaction with various

dimensions of their current supervision on a 4-point scale. Possible scores range from 8

to 32 as participants are asked to rate their perceptions on these dimensions from 1 (low)

to 4 (high). Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction with supervision. SSQ scores in

the present study ranged from a low of 8 to a high of 24 (*M*= 20.30, *SD*= 7.35). Fernando

and Hulse-Killacky (2005) used the SSQ in their study of 82 counseling students. The

mean SSQ score of that sample was 24.95 (*SD*= 3.80) with scores ranging from a low of

14 to a high of 32.

The second scale was the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI),

used to measure role stress in supervisory relationships. The Role Conflict subscale of

the RCRAI contains 13 items and participants respond to questions regarding their

perception of conflicting expectations from their supervisors. Each item is answered on a

5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all conflicting) to 5 (very much conflicting). Scores

are obtained by summing the answer to each question and dividing by the number of

items in the subscale. Scores in this study on the Role Conflict subscale of the RCRAI

ranged from a low of 1.00 to a high of 5.00 with higher scores indicating higher levels of

role conflict (*M*= 1.88, *SD*= .95).

The Role Ambiguity subscale of the RCRAI contains 16 items and requires

participants answer questions regarding uncertainty about supervisors' expectations, the

methods for fulfilling those expectations, and evaluation procedures for their

performance. Each item on the Role Ambiguity subscale of the RCRAI is answered on a

5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all ambiguous) to 5 (very much ambiguous). Scores

are obtained by summing the answer to each question and dividing by the number of

items in the subscale. Scores on this subscale ranged from a low of 1.00 to a high of 4.75

(*M*= 1.80, *SD*= .87). Higher scores indicate higher levels of ambiguity within the school

counselors' supervisory relationship. Olk and Friedlander (1992) initially used a sample

of 240 doctoral-level counseling and clinical psychology students to validate the RCRAI.

Mean scores during initial validation can be used to compare scores on the RC subscale

(M= 1.57, SD= 0.62) and RA subscale (M= 2.04, SD= 0.73) to the mean scores obtained

in this study (see Table 1).

Self-efficacy was measured using the School Counselor Self-Efficacy (SCSE)

scale, a measure created specifically for school counselors. The 43-item scale requires

participants to indicate their level of confidence on tasks associated with current best

practices in school counseling as defined by the National Standards and aligned with the

ASCA National Model. Each item is answered on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not

confident) to 5 (highly confident) representing a possible range of 43 to 215 with higher

scores indicating higher levels of self-efficacy. The scores on the SCSE scale in this

study ranged from 106 to 210 with a mean score of 180.46 (SD= 20.25). Bodenhorn and

Skaggs (2005) used a sample of 226 responses from practicing school counselors in their

initial item analysis of the SCSE scale which produced a mean score of 180.97 (SD=

19.86).

School counselors in this study were asked to indicate the job title of the person

who provided them with the most direct supervision. They were provided with a

definition of the term *supervision* and indicated either a counseling supervisor (Director

of School Counseling Services or Director of "Guidance") or a noncounseling supervisor

(Principal, Vice Principal) provided them with the most direct supervision. Of the 210

school counselors in this study, 50.5% indicated they were being supervised most directly

by a noncounseling staff member such as a Principal or Vice Principal (n=106) and

45.5% indicated they were most directly supervised by a Director of School Counseling

or Director of "Guidance" (n=104).

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Independent Variables and Self-Efficacy

Instrument	Noncounseling Supervisor (n=106)		Counseling Supervisor (n= 104)		Total (N= 210)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
SSQ	21.19	7.36	19.39	7.25	20.30	7.35
RCRAI-RC	1.90	1.00	1.85	0.90	1.88	0.95
RCRAI-RA	1.79	0.90	1.81	0.84	1.80	0.87
SCSE	177.42	22.18	183.55	17.65	180.46	20.25

The Relationship between Aspects of Supervision and Self-Efficacy

The primary research question for this study was: What is the relationship of aspects of supervision to school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy? Four aspects of supervision were included in this study and were utilized to create four sub questions, which were: (1) Is there a significant relationship between satisfaction with supervision and school counselor self-efficacy?, (2) Is there a significant relationship between role conflict and school counselor self-efficacy?, (3) Is there a significant relationship between role ambiguity and school counselor self-efficacy?, and (4) Is there a significant relationship between noncounseling supervisors and school counselor self-efficacy? To examine the hypotheses created from these questions, correlation coefficients were calculated between each continuous predictor variable and scores on the SCSE scale and independent sample *t*-tests were performed between school counselors with noncounseling supervisors and those with counseling supervisors.

First, predictor variables were correlated to scores on the SCSE to establish their relationship to self-efficacy. Intercorrelations between predictor variables were also calculated. One-tailed tests of Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient were used because of the directional hypotheses. Results indicated significant negative

correlations between role conflict and role ambiguity and self-efficacy scores. However,

no significant relationship was established between satisfaction with supervision and self-

efficacy scores. Correlations between independent variables and self-efficacy and among

independent variables are reported in Table 2.

Table 2
Summary of Intercorrelations for Independent Variables and Self-Efficacy by Supervisor Type

Instrument	SSQ	RCRAI-RC	RCRAI-RA	SCSE
Noncounseling Supervisors				
SSQ	---			
RCRAI-RC	-0.70**	---		
RCRAI-RA	-0.70**	0.86**	---	
SCSE	0.04	-0.16	-0.19	---
Counseling Supervisors				
SSQ	---			
RCRAI-RC	-0.63**	---		
RCRAI-RA	-0.67**	0.82**	---	
SCSE	0.18	-0.20*	-0.29**	---
Total				
SSQ	---			
RCRAI-RC	-0.68**	---		
RCRAI-RA	-0.66**	0.84**	---	
SCSE	0.08	-0.18**	-0.23**	---

Note: N= 210. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

Next, a series of independent sample *t*-tests were conducted to compare the mean

scores on each of three predictor variables and the SCSE scale by supervisor type;

noncounseling (coded as 0), such as a Principal or Vice Principal, or *counseling* (coded as

1)*,* such as a Director of School Counseling Services. Results of these *t*-tests revealed a

significant difference between those who were mostly supervised by counseling staff (*M*=

183.55, *SD*= 17.65) and those who were mostly supervised by noncounseling staff (*M*=

177.42, *SD*= 22.18) in mean scores on the SCSE scale, *t*(199.58)= 2.22, *p* = .03. No

significant differences between groups were found in scores on the SSQ, $t(208)$= -1.78, p

= .77, the RCRAI-Role Conflict subscale, $t(208)$= -.40 , p = .68, or the RCRAI-Role

Ambiguity subscale, $t(208)$= .14, p = .88. A summary of the results of these t-tests is

included in Table 3.

Table 3
Results of Independent Samples t-tests by Supervisor Type

Instrument	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	95% CI
SSQ	-1.78	208	0.77	-3.78, 0.19
RCRAI-RC	-0.40	208	0.68	-0.31, 0.21
RCRAI-RA	0.14	208	0.88	-0.22, 0.25
SCSE	2.22	199.58	0.03	0.68, 11.57

Note: N= 210. Noncounseling supervisor coded as 0. Counseling supervisor coded as 1.

Hypothesis 1: Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher

for counselors who receive supervision with which they are satisfied. No such

relationship existed according to the results of a test of Pearson's product-moment

correlation coefficient (see Table 2). Amongst school counselors with noncounseling

supervisors, there was a very small negative correlation between SSQ and SCSE scores.

However, amongst school counselors with counseling supervisors, there was a small

positive correlation. Overall, there was no significant correlation between SSQ scores

and scores on the SCSE, $r(210)$= .08, p = n.s.. These results suggest that satisfaction with

supervision as measured by the SSQ does not significantly relate to scores on the SCSE

scale, and thus self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 2: Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher

for counselors who experience less role conflict in their supervisory relationships.

Results of a one-tailed test of Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient revealed a negative correlation between RCRAI-RC scores and SCSE scores (see Table 2). Overall, there was a significant negative correlation between RCRAI-RC scores and scores on the SCSE, $r(210)= -.18, p < .01$. These results support the hypothesis that school counselors who experience less role conflict in their supervisory relationships score higher on the SCSE scale.

Hypothesis 3: *Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who experience less role ambiguity in their supervisory relationships.* Again, results of a test of Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient revealed there was a significant negative correlation between scores on the RCRAI-RA and SCSE scores, $r(210)= -.23, p < .01$ (see Table 2). These results support the hypothesis that school counselors who experience less role ambiguity in their supervisory relationships score higher on the SCSE scale.

Hypothesis 4: *Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for those supervised by counseling staff.* A *t*-test of independent samples revealed a significant difference between groups in mean SCSE scores, $t(199.58)= 2.22, p = .03$ (see Table 3). These findings suggest a difference in mean scores on the SCSE scale between school counselors with noncounseling supervisors and those with counseling supervisors such that those with noncounseling supervisors have generally lower SCSE scores.

Hypotheses 5 and 6: *Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for counselors who are satisfied with supervision, experience less role conflict and role ambiguity; Scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy scale will be higher for*

counselors who are satisfied with supervision, experience less role conflict and role

ambiguity, and are supervised by counseling staff. Because no significant relationship

was found between SSQ scores and SCSE scores, there is evidence to reject both

hypotheses. However, results suggest that school counselors who experience less role

conflict and role ambiguity, and who are supervised by counseling staff, generally have

higher scores on the SCSE.

Of the six hypotheses presented in this research study, there was evidence that

three can be supported and should be examined further. There was no evidence to

suggest a relationship between satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy. However,

results of these data analyses suggest a relationship between role conflict, as measured by

the RCRAI-Role Conflict subscale, and scores on the SCSE such that lower levels of role

conflict correlate to higher scores on the SCSE scale. There was also evidence of a

relationship between scores on the RCRAI-Role Ambiguity scale such that lower levels

of role ambiguity correlate to higher scores on the SCSE scale. Lastly, there was

evidence of significant differences in mean scores on the SCSE between school

counselors who receive supervision primarily from noncounseling supervisors and those

who receive it from counseling supervisors.

Predicting School Counselor Self-Efficacy

A secondary research question of this study was: To what extent can we predict

school counselor self-efficacy using supervision and individual factors? To answer this

question, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationships

between role conflict, role ambiguity, and the presence of a noncounseling supervisor and

school counselor self-efficacy. It was determined that satisfaction with supervision would not be included in the second step of the analysis because no relationship was established during a test of Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient.

During initial creation of the SCSE scale, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) identified several variables that significantly related to higher self-efficacy scores. In that study gender, experience as a teacher, years of experience as a school counselor, training and use of the National Standards all produced significant differences in mean SCSE scores. The researchers found that women scored generally higher than their male colleagues, that school counselors with teaching experience scored generally higher than those without, that school counselors with 3 or more years of experience scored higher than those with less than 3, and that school counselors who received training in the National Standards and utilized them in practice scored higher than those without knowledge or use. To test these established variables, independent samples t-tests were used to examine differences in mean scores between groups in the current study. Training and use of the National Standards were changed to training and use of the ASCA National Model. The results of these tests are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4

Mean SCSE Scale Scores, Standard Deviations, and Results of Independent Samples t-tests for Established Variables

Variable	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	Sig. (2-tailed)	95% CI
Gender				.509	208	.62	-5.12, 8.68
Men	42	181.88	22.31				
Women	168	180.10	19.75				
Experience as a teacher				-3.64	208	.00	-16.10, -4.78
Yes	139	183.99	19.28				
No	71	173.55	20.45				
Experience as a school counselor				-4.39	208	.00	-28.42, -10.80
Less than 3 years	21	162.81	23.73				
3 or more years	189	182.42	18.90				
Training on the ASCA Model				.22	208	.28	-2.79, 9.53
Yes	152	179.53	19.26				
No	58	182.90	22.64				
Use of the ASCA Model				-1.83	78.32	.07	-13.70, .57
Yes	154	182.21	18.25				
No	56	175.64	24.48				

Note: Variables previously established related to SCSE scores (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

Although Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found that female school counselors scored significantly higher than their male colleagues, that result was not duplicated in this study. Male school counselors scored slightly higher than female school counselors on the SCSE scale. Experience as a certified teacher was related to higher scores on the SCSE. The results indicated that school counselors with at least one year of teaching experience scored significantly higher than those without any teaching experience. Likewise, school counselors with 3 or more years of experience in the profession scored

significantly higher than their colleagues with less than 3 years of experience. Training

on the ASCA National Model, an example of a comprehensive school counseling

program, did not relate to higher scores on the SCSE. School counselors who reported

having been trained on the National Model scored slightly lower than their colleagues

without any training. Lastly, there was a difference between school counselors utilizing

the National Model and those who reported not using it in their practice. School

counselors utilizing the National Model scored higher than those who did not. Variables

with significant differences in means were controlled for in the multiple regression

analysis.

      Results of Multiple Regression Analyses. A 4-step hierarchical multiple

regression was used to assess the contribution of aspects of supervision and individual

factors to school counselor self-efficacy. The first step controlled for previously

established individual factors that were found to be related to scores on the SCSE scale.

Three individual factors were utilized in this model: (1) years of experience as a school

counselor, (2) teaching experience, and (3) use of the ASCA National Model in practice.

Factors were loaded into the model based on the strength of their relationship to SCSE

scores (see Table 4). Next, three aspects of supervision were loaded separately: (1) role

ambiguity, (2) role conflict, and (3) the presence of a noncounseling supervisor. Role

ambiguity was added at step two and role conflict at step three because scores on the

RCRAI-Role Ambiguity scores were found to have a higher correlation to SCSE scores

than RCRAI-Role Conflict scores (see Table 3). At the last step, the presence of a

noncounseling supervisor was added. This factor was added last because of the strength

of the evidence previously linking role ambiguity and conflict to self-efficacy (Larson, 2001). Results of this 4-step regression model are illustrated in Table 5.

Multiple regression analysis revealed that three individual factors significantly predicted school counselors' self-efficacy scores: years of experience as a school counselor, teaching experience, and use of the ASCA National Model predicted 14% of the variance in scores (R^2= .14, $F(3, 206)$= 11.19, $p < .01$). Years of experience as a school counselor was the strongest predictor of SCSE scores (β= .25, p < .01), followed by teaching experience (β= .19, $p < .01$), and use of the ASCA National Model (β= .15, $p < .05$). After controlling for these three previously established individual factors, three aspects of supervision entered separately produced no significant change in the model (R^2= .16, $F(1, 203)$= 1.93, p = n.s.). None of the three aspects of supervision (role ambiguity, role conflict, and the presence of a noncounseling supervisor) significantly predicted self-efficacy. Results of these analyses are summarized in Table 5.

The findings in the current study suggest that aspects of supervision relate to school counselor self-efficacy, but are perhaps not as predictive as individual factors such as having more than 3 years of experience and previous classroom teaching experience. Satisfaction with supervision was not associated with self-efficacy scores while role conflict and role ambiguity added very little to the regression models. Although there were differences in self-efficacy scores between counselors based on the background of their supervisor, the presence of a noncounseling supervisor was also not predictive of self-efficacy.

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting School Counselor Self-Efficacy

Variable	Step 1			Step 2			Step 3			Step 4		
	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β	B	SE B	β
More than 3 years of experience	16.93	4.47	.25**	16.16	4.45	.24**	16.31	4.50	.24**	15.42	4.54	.23**
Teaching experience	*7.94*	*2.84*	*.19***	6.82	2.88	.16*	6.79	2.89	.16*	6.45	2.89	.16*
Use of the ASCA National Model	6.80	2.95	.15*	5.38	3.02	.12	5.44	3.04	.12	4.80	3.06	.11
Role ambiguity				-3.07	1.58	-.13	-2.54	2.86	-.11	-3.03	2.88	-.13
Role conflict							-.56	2.55	-.03	-.23	2.55	-.01
Noncounseling supervisor										-3.72	2.67	-.09
R^2		.14			.16			.16			.16	
F for change in R^2		11.19**			3.75			.08			1.93	

Note: N= 210. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$

Supplemental Analysis

Predicting ASCA National Model Use

Having more than 3 years of experience and previous teaching experience are fixed individual characteristics. Of the three predictors of school counselor self-efficacy found in this study, only one can be manipulated. School counselors' use of the ASCA National Model in practice can be controlled. It was established in Chapter 2 that the ASCA National Model is an example of a comprehensive approach advocated for by the professional association for school counselors. Bodenhorn et al. (2010) found evidence that school counselors with higher self-efficacy were more likely to be utilizing the ASCA National Model and those with lower self-efficacy were more likely not to

identify an approach or model. These findings coupled with those of the current study

seem to indicate a reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy and the use of the ASCA

National Model. Using the data collected for the current study it is possible to further

examine factors, both supervisory and individual, that might predict a school counselor's

use of the ASCA Model.

A binary logistic regression model was used to predict the categorical outcome of

ASCA National Model use. Individual control variables were again used because of the

possibility of confounding relationships to the outcome variable (Johnson & Christensen,

2012). The variables controlled for in this analysis were: (1) Training in the ASCA

National Model, (2) having 1-3 years of experience, (3) having more than 6 years of

experience, and (4) having previous teaching experience. These variables were entered

into the model first. Next, aspects of supervision were added to the model. The aspects

of supervision included in step 2 of the model were (1) the presence of a counseling

supervisor, (2) role ambiguity, and (3) role conflict. Self-efficacy was also added to the

model in step 2 because of the evidence of a reciprocal relationship to use of the ASCA

National Model. The results of this logistic regression analysis yielded data on the

factors which predict school counselors' use of the ASCA Model. Results are

summarized in Table 6.

Table 6
Summary of Hierarchical Binary Logistic Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Use of the ASCA National Model

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% CI
ASCA Training	2.04	.39	27.16	1	.00	7.68	3.57, 16.54
Less than 3 years of experience	.87	.77	1.27	1	.26	2.39	.52, 10.86
More than 6 years of experience	.06	.47	.02	1	.90	1.06	.42, 2.69
Teaching experience	-.20	.42	.23	1	.64	.82	.36, 1.88
Counseling supervisor	.93	.38	5.97	1	.02	2.52	1.29, 5.30
Role ambiguity	-1.04	.38	7.35	1	.01	.35	.17, .75
Role conflict	.48	.34	2.00	1	.16	1.62	.83, 3.15
Self-efficacy	.02	.01	4.02	1	.05	1.02	1.00, 1.04
Constant	-3.14	1.86	2.85	1	.09	.04	

Results of Supplemental Analysis. A 2-step hierarchical binary logistic regression analysis was used to determine factors that predict school counselors' use of the ASCA National Model. The Wald criterion demonstrated that training in the Model, the presence of a counseling supervisor, role ambiguity, and self-efficacy significantly contributed to predicting ASCA Model usage. The strongest predictor of ASCA Model use is training in the Model. Counselors who reported receiving training in the ASCA National Model, either during their graduate training or as part of professional development, were 7 times more likely to report using the Model. The next strongest

predictor was role ambiguity. Higher levels of role ambiguity as measured by scores on

the RCRAI-RA scale related to less likelihood of ASCA Model use. Receiving

supervision mostly from a counseling supervisor, such as a Director of School

Counseling Services, also significantly predicted use of the ASCA Model. School

counselors with counseling supervisors were 2.5 times more likely to report using the

National Model in their practice. Lastly, self-efficacy significantly predicted use of the

Model as well. This finding confirmed the results of Bodenhorn et al. (2010) who found

school counselors with higher self-efficacy were more likely to identify the use of the

ASCA Model in their practice.

Chapter 5

Introduction

The roles and responsibilities of school counselors have broadened throughout the history of the profession and continue to expand today (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). At the same time, the depth and complexity of student issues encountered by current school counselors require knowledge of best practices, clinical skill, and a strong professional identity (Herlihy et. al, 2002). Competing professional identity models continue to polarize practice as many administrators and counselors utilize traditional guidance models aligned with the identity of an educator. Current standards and models of practice advocated for in the profession are comprehensive, developmental models aligned with the identity of a counselor (ASCA, 2012; Campbell & Dahir, 1997; Dollarhide & Saginak, 2008; Gysbers & Henderson, 2006; Lambie & Williamson, 2004).

Conflicting messages about the appropriate role of the school counselor clearly impact the profession and are associated with outcomes such as higher levels of anxiety, job dissatisfaction, and burnout (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Moyer, 2012). These messages are often transmitted through supervision and can cause stress in the form of role conflict and ambiguity (Olk & Friedlander, 1992). Ambiguous and inadequate supervision has been linked to decreased skill, weaker professional identity, and a higher likelihood of unethical practices (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Herlihy et al., 2002). In Chapters 1 and 2, evidence was presented that this type of supervision could impact self-efficacy; a key factor in motivation, perseverance, skill development, and adaptation to transition.

The purpose of this study was to examine four aspects of supervision and their

relationship to practicing school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy. A total of 210

school counselors provided data on their satisfaction with supervision, their experiences

of role conflict and role ambiguity in these relationships, and the title of their supervisor.

Participants completed a 92-item survey instrument including a demographic

questionnaire and three scales: the Satisfaction with Supervision Questionnaire (SSQ),

the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI), and the School Counselor

Self-Efficacy (SCSE) scale. The data collected through the use of this instrument were

used for comparisons between variables. Results of several data analysis procedures

were useful in examining the six hypotheses presented in the study. This chapter presents

a synopsis of the findings, interpretations of the results included in Chapter 4, and a

discussion of possible limitations. Implications for practicing school counselors and their

supervisors as well as for counselor educators are considered. Lastly, the results of this

study are utilized to suggest future research.

The primary research question examined in this study was: What is the

relationship of aspects of supervision to school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy?

Four aspects of supervision were included: (1) satisfaction with supervision, (2) role

conflict, (3) role ambiguity, and (4) the presence of a noncounseling supervisor. Four

exploratory sub questions drove the initial testing: (1) Is there a significant relationship

between satisfaction with supervision and school counselor self-efficacy?, (2) is there a

significant relationship between role conflict and school counselor self-efficacy?, (3) is

there a significant relationship between role ambiguity and school counselor self-

efficacy?, and (4) is there a significant relationship between noncounseling supervisors

and school counselor self-efficacy?

A secondary research question was: To what extent can school counselor self-

efficacy be predicted using these aspects of supervision and previously established

individual factors? Several factors served to significantly predict school counselor self-

efficacy as shown during a multiple regression analysis. A binary logistic regression

analysis revealed several predictors of school counselors' use of the ASCA National

Model. This test was added to the study because use of the ASCA Model was the only

predictor of self-efficacy which can be controlled by counselors and their supervisors.

Finding predictors for this variable provided information which can be used to

intentionally increase school counselor self-efficacy. In addition to findings suggesting

significant relationships between variables, several findings suggesting non-significant or

no relationship are of interest. These data, which were presented in Chapter 4, are

discussed and interpreted in this chapter.

Discussion

The sample of professional school counselors in this study was drawn from a

single state but is comparable to samples in similar studies. The majority of respondents

were female (80%), a statistic that has been consistent in research on the profession of

school counseling. Most participants in this study were Caucasian (83.8%), which is

consistent with other studies. Two recent studies on practicing school counselors yielded

similar samples, wherein the majority of respondents were Caucasian females (Cervoni &

DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Moyer, 2012). Secondly, more school counselors reported

receiving supervision mostly from a noncounseling supervisor (n= 106) than from a counseling supervisor (n=104). In this study, supervision was defined as a relationship between a junior member of a profession and a more senior member of that profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). However, it seems that the slight majority of school counselors received supervision from an individual from a different profession. Despite the evidence in the literature in both counseling and education that supervision should ideally be given from a member of one's own profession (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2009), this type of supervision was not predominant amongst school counselors in the current study.

Satisfaction with Supervision and Self-Efficacy

There was enough evidence in the counseling literature to connect satisfaction with supervision, or supervisee's perceptions of the quality and outcomes of supervision (Ladany, Hill, & Nutt as cited in Bernard & Goodyear, 2006), to feelings of self-efficacy. However, the initial data analysis in this study revealed no significant relationship between satisfaction and school counselor self-efficacy. This finding contradicts the assertion that generally satisfying supervision may contribute to higher levels of self-efficacy. Despite evidence in the literature that most school counselors are not receiving the type of supervision they would like to (Page et al., 2001; Roberts & Borders, 1994), this seems unrelated to their feelings of self-efficacy. Satisfaction may not be a reliable indicator that school counselors are receiving quality supervision that impacts their confidence level.

Noncounseling Supervisors and Self-Efficacy

Culbreth et al. (2005) referred to noncounseling supervisors as individuals within the school system without a training background in counseling, such as principals and vice principals, who are directly responsible for supervising school counselors. Despite evidence that administrative support and understanding are important factors in school counselor self-efficacy (Sutton & Fall, 1995), there have been no studies directly relating supervisor type to school counselor self-efficacy. The findings in this study suggest a relationship between a supervisor's title and training background and a supervisee's feelings of self-efficacy.

There were significant differences in self-efficacy between school counselors who received supervision mostly from a noncounseling supervisor and those who received it mostly from a counseling staff member. Results of independent samples *t*-tests revealed a significant difference between school counselors with counseling supervisors and noncounseling supervisors in self-efficacy score. This result suggests that sub question 4 of this study can be answered affirmatively; there is a relationship between supervisor type and self-efficacy such that receiving supervision mostly from noncounseling supervisors is associated with significantly lower self-efficacy.

Principals and vice principals often may not have an understanding of the appropriate role of the school counselor, especially when counselors are utilizing a comprehensive approach (Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008; Studer & Oberman, 2006). Despite this, these noncounseling supervisors are often the only professionals providing supervision to practicing school counselors. Ideally, counselors should be receiving three

types of supervision each with a different focus: administrative, clinical, and program.

Noncounseling supervisors are likely to be providing only administrative supervision

(Herlihy et al., 2002). Additionally, school counselors are much more likely to receive

administrative supervision than either of the other two types (Somody et al., 2008).

Administrative supervision focused on adherence to school policy, professional

behaviors, and performance in noncounseling duties is aligned with administrators'

training and professional identity. There is evidence to suggest that administrators often

consider clinical and program supervision less necessary (Herlihy et al., 2002; Kirchner

& Setchfield, 2005). The findings in this study suggest that school counselors who

receive most of their supervision from these noncounseling supervisors reported slightly

lower self-efficacy than colleagues with counseling supervisors.

Principals, vice principals, teachers, and school counselors share some goals and

responsibilities. Some professional identity constructs may also be shared by these

professionals or as Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) suggested, "School counseling can be

seen as a hybrid of teaching and counseling…" (p. 27). Indeed the findings in this study

suggest that previous teaching experience may predict self-efficacy as a school counselor.

However, school counselors are also mental health professionals within a school

responsible for preventing and addressing a variety of student issues.

Comprehensive models, such as the ASCA National Model, call for school

counselors to address not only students' academic development and college and career

readiness, but personal/social issues as well (ASCA, 2012). If the professional identity of

school counselors encompasses elements of both counselor and educator, then the

supervision provided for them should address the needs of both. Moyer (2012) wrote, "…counselors receiving adequate supervision feel more competent in their duties. It is a means of support that may lessen feelings of incompetence and increase empathy for students and their presenting issues" (p. 22). It seems that receiving solely administrative supervision can be considered inadequate if it is not accompanied by clinical supervision.

Clinical supervision, focused on increasing knowledge and enhancing counseling skills, is vital to counselor skill development, ethical practice, and self-efficacy (Herlihy et al., 2002). Daniels and Larson (2001) suggested that accurate performance feedback given during supervision is a significant factor in increasing counselor self-efficacy. Cashwell and Dooley (2001) established a relationship between participating in clinical supervision and increased self-efficacy in practicing counselors working in community settings. The findings in this study suggest that a similar relationship could exist in school counseling, where clinical supervision may be less likely but just as beneficial. Noncounseling supervisors who lack counselor training and clinical skill cannot adequately provide clinical supervision. Certainly more research on the impact of noncounseling supervisors on self-efficacy is needed. However, the relationship between self-efficacy and supervisor type established in this study could be due to the emphasis on administrative supervision and a resulting lack of clinical supervision.

Another possibility is that noncounseling supervisors' lack of knowledge of comprehensive programs such as the ASCA National Model is impacting school counselors' use of such models. Counselors who received supervision mostly from a noncounseling supervisor were far less likely to be using the National Model in their

practice. Despite the recent evidence that school counselors would prefer to practice

according to the National Standards and the ASCA National Model (Baggerly & Osborn,

2006; Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Clemens, Milsom, & Cashwell, 2009; Culbreth

et al., 2005; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008), the movement towards the proliferation of

these documents remains slow (Hatch & Chen-Hayes, 2008). The evidence presented in

this study suggests that noncounseling supervisors may not be encouraging counselors to

utilize a comprehensive approach. It is also possible that these messages are a main

source of role conflict and ambiguity between supervisors and school counselors.

Role Conflict, Role Ambiguity and Self-Efficacy

Messages from administrators certainly impact school counselor functioning and

may relate to job dissatisfaction and burnout when they conflict with preferred roles and

functioning (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011: Moyer, 2012: Pyne, 2011; Wilkerson,

2006). In Chapter 2, evidence was presented that confusing, conflicting, or ambiguous

messages are a source of role stress within supervisory relationships and could be

associated with other negative outcomes. Both role conflict and role ambiguity were

found to be negatively correlated to satisfaction with supervision. Higher levels of role

stress are related to less satisfaction in supervision. Role conflict and role ambiguity

were highly correlated to each other as well. Olk and Friedlander (1992) also found these

two variables to be correlated in their initial testing of the RCRAI, however they wrote

"…results of the factor analyses indicate that the scales are conceptually distinct" (p.

396). Role conflict and role ambiguity were treated as separate and distinct variables

throughout this study.

A test of Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient revealed a significant negative correlation between self-efficacy and role conflict, defined as a dilemma requiring action based on conflicting or opposing expectations from their supervisor (Olk & Friedlander, 1992). This suggests that higher levels of role conflict within a supervisory relationship are associated with slightly lower self-efficacy. Similarly, role ambiguity or "a lack of clarity regarding the expectations for one's roles, the methods for fulfilling those expectations, and the consequences for effective or ineffective performance" (Olk & Friedlander, p. 390), was found to have a significant negative correlation to self-efficacy. Higher levels of ambiguity within a supervisory relationship were associated with lower self-efficacy. These results suggest that sub questions 3 and 4 of this study can be answered affirmatively: significant relationships do exist between role conflict and role ambiguity and school counselor self-efficacy.

Perera-Diltz and Mason (2008) asserted that students, parents, administrators, teachers, and counselors all have different and often conflicting views of the appropriate role of the school counselor and, as a result, school counselors experience role ambiguity and conflict at higher levels than school psychologists, social workers, and teachers. A long history of role stress within the profession of school counseling is consistently reflected in the literature. As early as 1923 Myers asserted that administrative tasks were hindering the work of "real counseling." Corwin and Clarke (1969) established evidence that school counselors are often hindered from meeting their counseling objectives because of organizational and administrative influences. Koch (1972) found that quasi-administrative tasks overshadowed counseling activities in the role of the school

counselor. More recently, Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) found differences between the way school counselors were functioning and the ways in which they would prefer to function.

The creation of the ASCA National Standards for School Counseling Programs (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) and the ASCA National Model (ASCA, 2003) clearly defined the appropriate roles and functions of school counselors. There has been consistent empirical support that school counselors would prefer to practice according to the roles advocated for in these documents (Baggerly & Osborn, 2006; Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Clemens, Milsom, & Cashwell, 2009; Culbreth et al., 2005). However, messages about the role of the school counselor within the school often directly conflict or oppose these documents (Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Pyne, 2011; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008).

There was evidence within the school counseling literature that noncounseling supervisors might create more role stress due to a lack of understanding of the appropriate role of the school counselor as well as their evaluative responsibilities (Culbreth et al., 2005; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Lieberman, 2004). However, in this study there seemed to be no difference in the amount of role ambiguity and role conflict within supervision based on supervisor type. A particularly interesting finding was that role conflict and role ambiguity did not significantly relate to self-efficacy when supervision was mostly given by noncounseling staff. However both factors were related to self-efficacy in counselors receiving supervision mostly from someone with a counseling background. It seems that ambiguous or conflicting messages from principals

and vice principals may not relate to self-efficacy as much as ambiguous messages from counseling supervisors.

In part this finding may belie school counselors' ability to separate messages about professional functioning from counseling and noncounseling personnel. This is perhaps evidence to suggest that school counselors recognize several differences between counseling and noncounseling supervisors and therefore experience role stress differently from both. One apparent difference is the tendency for noncounseling supervisors to provide only administrative supervision (Herlihy et al., 2002). Although ambiguous and conflicting messages may be just as common in this form as in clinical supervision, the behaviors being discussed are quite different.

Herlihy et al. (2002) described administrative supervision as "usually provided by the building principal or other administrator and…focused on compliance with school requirements and accountability" (p. 56). Roberts (1994) listed typical topics of discussion in administrative supervision in terms of professional behaviors such as attendance, punctuality, relationships with staff, and attentiveness to parent needs. Comparatively, clinical supervision has been defined as having a focus on improving counseling skills, enhancing knowledge, and monitoring the quality of direct services offered to students (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). Typical topics within clinical supervision focus around conceptualizing student issues, creating and maintaining relationships with students and parents, and using appropriate intervention techniques.

The degree to which the topics discussed in supervision are central to a school counselor's identity may determine the impact these two very different types of

supervision have on self-efficacy. It is possible for a school counselor to receive

ambiguous or conflicting messages about their compliance to school policy, their dress,

or their punctuality to meetings without those messages impacting their feelings of self-

efficacy. It is less likely that a counselor would receive ambiguous or conflicting

messages about her/his handling of a student in crisis, her/his use of a specific counseling

technique, or their conceptualization of a student's issue without those messages

impacting their confidence in her/his ability to be a counselor. One possible explanation

for the difference in the relationship of role stress to self-efficacy by supervisor type is

that administrative supervision is less likely to address topics central to the counselors'

professional identity and therefore less associated with counselor's beliefs in their own

abilities. Future research focusing on the outcomes of administrative versus clinical

supervision could clarify this difference.

Another possibility is that school counselors react differently to messages from

administrators because of their perceived level of authority. Administrative supervisors

usually have direct control over the school counselors they supervise (Remley & Herlihy,

2006). Studer and Oberman (2006) surmised that counselors working within a traditional

guidance model were matching performance to meet administrators' beliefs. Clearly,

administrators have an impact on the actual role of the school counselor (Dodson, 2009:

Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Lieberman, 2004: Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008).

Perhaps school counselors are simply adapting to administrators' expectations for fear of

losing their jobs. School counselors may be more beholden to administrators'

expectations than to best practices as advocated for in the National Standards and the

ASCA National Model as administrators are likely to decide their professional fate. In

this way, noncounseling supervisors impact school counselor functioning but not

necessarily their feelings of self-efficacy while counseling supervisors' messages about

clinical skill and functioning may impact both.

Factors Predicting Self-Efficacy

There were significant differences in self-efficacy scores between school

counselors with 3 or less years of experience and those with more than 3 years in the

profession. Results of independent samples *t*-testing revealed significantly higher scores

in school counselors with more than 3 years of experience. Likewise, there was a

significant difference in self-efficacy between school counselors with previous classroom

teaching experience and those without. School counselors with teaching experience had

significantly higher self-efficacy than their colleagues without. Both of these findings are

consistent with Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005), who found significantly higher self-

efficacy in both school counselors with 3 or more years of experience and those with

teaching experience.

Counselors with more than 3 years of experience will have generally higher self-

efficacy, according to a hierarchical regression analysis. Having more than 3 years of

experience was consistently the strongest predictor of school counselor self-efficacy

throughout all 4 steps of the regression analysis. The next strongest predictor of self-

efficacy was teaching experience. School counselors with at least one year of classroom

teaching experience will have higher self-efficacy than those without. This finding was

also consistent throughout the regression analysis. Use of the ASCA National Model was

a predictor of school counselors' self-efficacy as well. Those who reported using the

ASCA National Model in the practice had higher self-efficacy than those who did not

utilize the Model. This finding was particularly interesting given that the use of a model

or approach is controllable and could therefore be a means of intentionally raising school

counselor self-efficacy.

The most consistent predictor of school counselors' self-efficacy in this study was

years of experience. Counselors with more than 3 years were likely to have significantly

higher self-efficacy than their novice colleagues. This finding is consistent with

Bandura's (1977a, 1977b) social cognitive theory which states that perceptions of one's

abilities are based on cognitive appraisals of past experiences. Not only have school

counselors with more than 3 years in the profession gathered more experiences to build

and learn from, but they have experienced enough success to continue in their positions.

Experienced counselors have received more and varied performance feedback.

Consequently, novice counselors are much more likely to have lower self-efficacy than

their colleagues. This finding is consistent with the myriad data supporting

developmental level as an important factor in self-efficacy (e.g. Bandura, 1986) and also

suggests that school counselors with 1 to 3 years of experience would benefit from

practices designed to increase self-efficacy.

Experience as a classroom teacher was also a significant predictor of school

counselor self-efficacy. Recent research focusing on teaching experience has provided

evidence that it has little impact on school counselor performance (Bringman & Sang

Min, 2008). However, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found evidence to suggest that

school counselor self-efficacy was impacted more by previous teaching experience than by counseling experience in a different setting. These findings highlight the importance of school culture factors. Sutton and Fall (1995) found collegial and administrative support to be strong predictors of school counselor self-efficacy; support was defined as social support, encouragement, and involvement in decision making. School counselors with teaching experience are probably more adept at creating and maintaining these supportive relationships with colleagues and administrators as they have likely done it in the past. Former teachers have experienced the culture of a school and have navigated the unique professional and personal demands of that environment.

Use of the ASCA National Model significantly predicted school counselor self-efficacy in this study. Seventy-three percent of school counselors in this study reported using the ASCA National Model to some extent in their practice and those counselors were more likely to have higher levels of self-efficacy than their colleagues who did not. This finding is important given the questions regarding adopting this model as a framework for practice. Supplemental analyses clarified the relationship between ASCA Model use and self-efficacy.

Factors Predicting ASCA National Model Use

A supplemental binary logistic regression was performed to examine the predictors of ASCA Model use. Training on the ASCA Model was added to the regression first and produced a significant contribution to predicting use of the National Model. This finding is logical given that training on the model is necessary for its use in practice. School counselors who received supervision mostly from a counseling

supervisor were significantly more likely to use the ASCA Model than their colleagues

with noncounseling supervisors. Role ambiguity also significantly predicted use of the

ASCA National Model. School counselors who reported higher levels of role ambiguity

were less likely to use the Model. Lastly, self-efficacy significantly predicted use of the

Model. As Bodenhorn et al. (2010) found, school counselors with higher self-efficacy

were more likely to use the ASCA Model in their practice.

Interestingly, there seems to be a reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy and

ASCA Model use. In this study, school counselors with higher self-efficacy were more

likely to utilize the ASCA Model in their practice. The ASCA Model is a structured,

developmental approach to counseling which was created in part to limit the amount of

non-counseling or "other" duties heaped upon the school counselor (ASCA, 2012;

Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Evidence within the counseling literature suggests that

school counselors prefer to function according to the ASCA Model and the National

Standards and are more satisfied with their jobs when they work with a comprehensive

approach (Pyne, 2011; Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008).

Bodenhorn et al. (2010) found evidence that school counselors with higher self-

efficacy were more likely to be utilizing the ASCA National Model than other

approaches. Results of the current study suggest a reciprocal relationship between ASCA

Model use and school counselor self-efficacy. As the authors noted "…the two most

direct ways to increase one's self-efficacy are through personal and vicarious

accomplishments. Thus, school counselors increase their self-efficacy by participating in

activities successfully or by observing or reading about others who have achieved" (p.

173). It seems that school counselors define success in ways more aligned with a

comprehensive approach such as the ASCA Model than with traditional guidance models

which more often include noncounseling or "other" duties.

       In this study role ambiguity was not predictive of self-efficacy although there was

some relationship between the two, while use of the ASCA Model was predictive of self-

efficacy. It is possible that messages from supervisors regarding the use of the ASCA

Model are a significant source of role ambiguity and that the connection between role

ambiguity and self-efficacy is through the use of a comprehensive model. School

counselors who do not receive support from supervisors on the use of the ASCA Model

or another comprehensive approach experience more role ambiguity. These messages

may lead the counselor to abandon their model in order to meet their supervisors'

expectations. Ultimately this decision contributes to lower self-efficacy as counselors

take on more and more noncounseling duties.

       School counselors who experienced more role ambiguity were less likely to be

utilizing the Model. The appropriate role of the school counselor as advocated for by the

ASCA Model is the preferred professional functioning for most school counselors

(Scarborough & Culbreth, 2008). As previously noted, many school counselors may

simply be fitting their practice to the expectations or perceived expectations of their

supervisor (Studer & Oberman, 2006). Therefore, many counselors may be abandoning

their preferred model of functioning in favor of a model that is more aligned with

messages they receive during supervision. In this way, role ambiguity experienced by

school counselors can be attributed to the discrepancy between their preferred

functioning and their supervisors' expectations.

Given these findings there seems to be some interplay between role ambiguity,

ASCA Model use, and self-efficacy. Another factor in this seems to be the background

of the individual providing supervision. A relationship was established such that

receiving supervision mostly from a noncounseling supervisor, such as a principal or vice

principal, was associated with lower self-efficacy. However, the presence of a

noncounseling supervisor was not predictive of self-efficacy when other factors,

including ASCA Model use, were controlled for. In this study, school counselors with

counseling supervisors, such as a Director of School Counseling Services, were more

likely to be using the ASCA Model. This finding might clarify the relationship between

supervisors' training background and self-efficacy.

Noncounseling supervisors often may not have an understanding of school

counselor roles, especially when counselors are utilizing a comprehensive approach such

as the ASCA Model (Studer & Oberman, 2006). As a result, they may be focusing their

supervision on administrative issues which is more aligned with their expertise. Either

implicitly or explicitly, administrative supervisors may not be encouraging the use of the

ASCA National Model which forces school counselors to choose between functioning as

they would prefer and as they likely have been trained or adapting to their supervisors'

expectations. The findings in this study may be due in part to school counselors choosing

to fit their practices to the expectations of their supervisors (Studer & Oberman, 2006).

Lastly training in the ASCA Model was the strongest predictor of its use. This finding seems logical given that school counselors must first be aware of the Model and trained to use it. Evidence within the counseling literature (e.g. Walsh et al., 2007) suggests a trend in counselor education towards training future school counselors in the Model's use. Either during their master's programs or later, as professional development perhaps, school counselors who received training on the ASCA Model are much more likely to be using it in their practice.

Non-Significant Findings

Overall both role conflict and role ambiguity were significantly negatively correlated with self-efficacy. When separated by supervisor type, role conflict and role ambiguity were not significantly related to self-efficacy scores when the supervision was given mostly by noncounseling staff, such as a principal or vice principal. Higher levels of both variables were significantly associated with lower levels of self-efficacy when supervision was mostly from counseling staff, such as a Director of School Counseling Services. This finding was particularly interesting given that supervision mostly from a noncounseling supervisor was associated with generally lower self-efficacy yet there was no difference in the amount of role conflict and role ambiguity from both supervisor types. Other factors within the noncounseling supervisor-school counselor relationship may be contributing to lower self-efficacy more than role stress.

Several factors which had previously been related to school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy were not found to be associated with that outcome in this study. Gender was one such factor. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found significant differences in

scores on the SCSE scales such that female school counselors displayed generally higher

self-efficacy than their male colleagues. The authors noted, however, that gender

differences were not displayed in master's-level school counselor trainees. Not only

were there no significant differences in SCSE scale scores found in this study, but male

counselors displayed slightly higher self-efficacy. The majority of participants in both

studies were female, which is representative of the profession as a whole.

Training on the ASCA National Standards was associated with higher self-

efficacy in practicing school counselors in Bodenhorn and Skaggs's (2005) initial study

on the SCSE scale. The National Standards established student outcomes and

benchmarks that could be used to measure the effectiveness of a comprehensive program

(Campbell & Dahir, 1997). Management strategies, counselor practices, and

accountability activities which could result in these outcomes were established in the first

edition of the ASCA National Model (2003) and continue to be refined (ASCA, 2012).

Both the National Standards and the ASCA Model were used in the creation of the SCSE

scale and the questions contained in the scale reflect confidence level in designing and

implementing interventions and in producing desired outcomes.   As Bodenhorn and

Skaggs (2005) stated, "The formats of the National Standards and ASCA model lend

themselves directly to studies using self-efficacy" (p. 15). Therefore, if training in the

National Standards was associated with higher self-efficacy as measured by the SCSE

scale, than training in the ASCA National Model could have a similar relationship.

However, there was no significant relationship between self-efficacy and training on the

ASCA National Model found in this study. It is possible that school counselors who were

trained in the ASCA National Model are performing very different tasks than those prescribed by the Model. Therefore whether they were trained has less impact on their self-efficacy than their actual use of the Model.

During supplemental analysis, several factors were not predictive of school counselors' use of the ASCA National Model. Years of experience did not significantly predict use of the Model. School counselors with 1 to 3 years of experience were no more likely to use the Model in their practice than those with more than 6 years. Teaching experience was also not a significant predictor of ASCA Model use. Lastly, role conflict was not predictive of ASCA Model use. Although higher levels of role ambiguity led to a lower likelihood of ASCA Model use, role conflict does not seem to have a similar relationship.

Limitations

There are several limitations of this study that impact the interpretation of the results. The sample of school counselors represents the population of only one state and contains a majority of Caucasian, female participants. Although comparable to samples in other studies, there was a lack of diversity in both gender and race in the sample. Therefore the results of this study have limited generalizability to all school counselors.

The participants in this study self-selected knowing the topic and goals of the research they were asked to participate in. As a result, school counselors with strong feelings, either positive or negative, regarding their supervisory experiences may have been more likely to self-select into the study. School counselors' perceptions of the supervision they received may be effected by bias or inaccurate reporting. It was

assumed that self-report data on scales such as the Satisfaction with Supervision

Questionnaire (SSQ) and the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) were

consistent with school counselors' actual experiences.

Lastly, the response rate of 7.8% was slightly lower than anticipated based on the

literature regarding online survey methods. Estimated response rates for typical online

survey methods are 10-15% (Granello, 2007). The timing of the survey was an important

factor. School counselors received their invitation to participate with a link to the study

during the third week of June. Some schools in the state in which this study occurred had

already closed for the summer. It is likely that some school counselors did not receive

the invitation to participate until after the study was closed in mid-July which likely

contributed to the response rate of 7.8%. However, the survey methods yielded a sample

size that allowed for data analysis with significant power.

Implications for Practice

The findings presented in this dissertation have implications for school counselor

supervision, training, and practice and can be utilized to foster self-efficacy and

encourage the use of a comprehensive programmatic approach such as the ASCA

National Model. One theme that was consistent throughout the literature and was evident

in this study is that school counselors have different needs based on their developmental

level. Experienced school counselors are likely to have higher self-efficacy; a result of

learning and incorporating feedback into successful practice. Beginning school

counselors (those with less than 3 years of experience in the profession) have not

received as much direct feedback nor achieved as many successes as their veteran

colleagues. Therefore, beginning school counselors should be given opportunities to receive performance feedback through increased attention from supervisors and/or peers.

The type of attention being paid to these new professionals is also vital. Administrative supervision is more likely to be present than supervision focusing on improving clinical skills, especially if the individual providing direct supervision is a principal or vice principal. The results of this study seem to indicate that a relationship with a counseling supervisor is related to higher school counselor self-efficacy. School counselors with less than 3 years of experience would benefit from supervision from a counseling supervisor such as a Director of School Counseling Services. This relationship may be supplemental to an administrative supervisory relationship with a principal or vice principal. However, providing clinical supervision from a counseling supervisor seems to be an effective means of enhancing new professionals' feelings of self-efficacy.

Ideally counseling professionals who are trained in supervision should be providing clinical supervision to beginning school counselors. However, many school districts do not employ Directors of School Counseling Services or other such trained supervisors. In this case, it is still possible for beginning counselors to receive clinical supervision from a more experienced professional within their field. Peer supervision is a viable and perhaps more cost-effective means for providing clinical supervision to new professionals (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997). Very little empirical data exists on the impact of peer supervision on school counselor self-efficacy. However, Benshoff and Paisley (1996) proposed a Structured Peer Consultation (SPC) Model for school

counselors which "…could be initiated by a state school counselor association, an individual school system, or even by two or more counselors working together independently" (p. 317). The researchers found qualitative evidence for the effectiveness of the Model in providing performance feedback and support; two important factors in counselor self-efficacy.

Crutchfield and Borders (1997) examined the impact of peer supervision, including the SPC Model, on school counselors. The researchers found evidence that peer supervision could produce positive gains in job satisfaction, effectiveness, and self-efficacy if given over time. Although peer supervision produced no significant changes in these outcomes over the short period of the study (2.5 months), the intervention produced small gains in all three outcomes. More research is needed to substantiate the impact of peer supervision on school counselors. However, given the importance of peer support (Sutton & Fall, 1995) and performance feedback (Daniels & Larson, 2001) to self-efficacy building, a peer supervision model such as the SPC Model is a viable alternative in the absence of a trained counseling supervisor.

Another interesting finding of this dissertation study was the reciprocal relationship between use of the ASCA National Model and self-efficacy. Perhaps, as Bodenhorn et al. (2010) suggested, developing goals and identifying proactive programs through the use of any programmatic approach leads to more successful outcomes. According to the authors, the particular type of program being used is less important than the identification of the intentionality and process of the program. Or perhaps, as Scarborough and Culbreth (2008) indicated, school counselors who utilize the National

Standards and the ASCA Model specifically are more likely to be practicing as they prefer. In either case it seems that utilizing the ASCA Model is an effective strategy for increasing school counselor self-efficacy.

An important implication for counselor educators is to not only teach school counselors-in-training the tenants and functions of the National Model, but to also focus on advocacy skills needed to help principals and supervisors understand its use. Specifically, school counselor educators should teach appropriate and effective ways to build relationships with administrators, engage colleagues in conversation, and use data to highlight the effectiveness of the school counseling program. Sutton and Fall (1995) suggested that administrative and collegial support are directly related to school counselor self-efficacy. However, how do school counselors learn to establish and maintain this support? Counselor educators should focus on honing these skills before trainees enter the field; a practice that could significantly reduce the gap in self-efficacy between school counselors with teaching experience and those without.

Several factors predicted school counselors' use of the ASCA National Model and could be used by counselors, supervisors, and counselor educators to encourage the Model's use. School counselors who experience more role ambiguity within their supervisory relationships are less likely to use the ASCA Model. Many supervisors are directly responsible for evaluating and making decisions about future employment of their school counselors. As a result, the messages they send, both implicitly and explicitly, impact the functioning of those counselors. The implication of this data for school counseling supervisors is that expectations for counselor roles, functioning, and

consequences for ineffective practice should be more clearly stated and that limiting role ambiguity may encourage school counselors to use the ASCA Model. Simultaneously the implementation of a comprehensive model can assist supervisors in creating more structured, counseling-specific approaches to performance evaluation.

Miller and Dollarhide (2006) indicated that using a model of supervision can be an effective strategy to assist school counselors in transitioning their programs from a traditional guidance approach to a comprehensive model. Perhaps the use of a structured model of supervision could be a means of limiting ambiguous messages. Recently, several models of school counselor supervision were created to address the need for increased clarity. The School Counseling Supervision Model (SCSM) is an extension of the Discrimination Model incorporating the main tasks for school counselors according to the Delivery System quadrant of the National Model (Luke & Bernard, 2006). The Goals, Functions, Roles, and Systems (GFRS) Model was created for school counselors-in-training (Wood & Rayle, 2006), but could be modified for practicing counselors and especially useful for beginning professionals. The Integrative Psychological Developmental Supervision Model (IPDSM) was also created for school counselors-in-training (Lambie & Sias, 2009), and was designed to facilitate psychological growth.

These models can all be used or modified by school counselor supervisors as structured approaches to clinical supervision. Supervisors of school counselors, especially noncounselors, should be given opportunities to be trained in the use of these models. Counselor educators are uniquely positioned to provide professional development to supervisors on comprehensive school counseling theories and models and

on the use of structured models of supervision.   Because noncounseling supervisors

seem to be providing the majority of the direct supervision to school counselors, these

counseling-specific models are exceptionally useful. Models such as the SCSM are

directly aligned with the ASCA National Model and can be utilized in performance

appraisals by noncounseling supervisors.

Participating in clinical supervision is an undervalued activity for many school

counselors and administrators perhaps due to messages from administrators that it is

unnecessary (Herlihy et al., 2002). Another possibility is that the demands of a job

whose list of responsibilities has grown with each decade leaves little time for ongoing

and consistent supervision. Of the 210 practicing school counselors who participated in

this study, 40% reported receiving no consistent supervision as defined in this study.

Another 37% reported receiving only 1 to 2 hours per month. These data represent an

increase in the number of counselors receiving clinical supervision from studies by

Roberts and Borders (1994) and Sutton and Fall (1994). However, there still seems to be

a significant number of school counselors working without the benefit of this important

activity.

Another finding which holds implications for the profession and counselor

education is the lack of diversity amongst participants in studies involving school

counselors. Cervoni and DeLucia-Waack (2011) utilized a sample of 175 high school

counselors where 88.6% of participants were Caucasian. Moyer (2012) collected data

from 382 practicing school counselors, the vast majority of which were Caucasian

(89.8%). In the current study of 210 practicing school counselors, 83.8% of participant

identified as Caucasian. The samples of these two recent studies, along with that of the current study, provide evidence that there may be a greater need for racial diversity in the profession. This finding may have particular meaning for counselor educators as it implies a need for increased focus on recruiting and training future counselors from diverse racial backgrounds. Additionally, counselor educators may need to emphasize cross cultural counseling skills in training master's-level school counselors because more cross cultural counseling is probably occurring than not. Similarly, counselor educators may need to emphasize cross cultural supervisor skills in training doctoral level students who are likely to be conducting supervision in schools, for the same reason.

The results of this dissertation study indicate that several aspects of supervision relate to school counselor self-efficacy and impact the use of a comprehensive approach to counseling such as the ASCA National Model. Perhaps an overarching implication of this data is the importance of clinical supervision for school counselors. Ideally, a counseling supervisor offering structured clinical supervision would benefit school counselors most by limiting role ambiguity and encouraging the use of a comprehensive programmatic approach; a strategy which seems to significantly impact self-efficacy. However, peer supervision can be a viable alternative, especially when experienced school counselors receive training in the use of structured peer supervision models.

Implications for Future Research

This dissertation study focused on the relationship of aspects of supervision to school counselor self-efficacy. Clearly there are other environmental and individual factors impacting self-efficacy and future research could incorporate them to create a

more extensive predictor model for school counselor self-efficacy. The environmental factors identified in the counseling literature include administrative and peer support, the amount of noncounseling duties assigned, grade level, and caseload (Sutton & Fall, 1995). Individual factors include age, aspects of training, and general self-efficacy levels. The factors in this study contributed to only 16% of the variance in self-efficacy scores. Environmental and individual factors contribute to the remaining variance and should be examined further.

This study yielded some information on the differences between counseling and noncounseling supervisors on school counselors' feelings of self-efficacy, experiences of role ambiguity, and use of the ASCA National Model. More data on the impact of supervisors' title and training background on school counseling outcomes would be beneficial. Future research should incorporate data directly from school counseling supervisors as it is often difficult to accurately assess supervisors' behavior from supervisees' reports. Furthermore, future inquiry into the outcomes of administrative versus clinical supervision could clarify the idea that clinical supervision impacts counselor self-efficacy more than administrative supervision.

More empirical evidence of the effectiveness of structured supervision models for school counselors is needed. The preliminary data on models of supervision such as the SCSM, the GFRS, and the IPDSM are promising but very little empirical evidence exists of outcomes such as increased self-efficacy. Peer supervision was cited as a viable alternative to supervision from a certified supervisor, however it too has very little empirical backing. Benshoff and Paisley (1996) presented qualitative data on the

experiences of school counselors in their Structured Peer Consultation Model. However, quantitative data demonstrating the outcomes of such a model are lacking.

The limited diversity of the sample in this study suggests the need for future research to focus on minority populations of school counselors. Different aspects of supervision could be more prevalent or impactful on the self-efficacy of male school counselors. Aspects of race and culture were not included in this study but could impact self-efficacy. Similarly, aspects of cross-cultural supervision were not included in this study but could have an impact on school counselors' self-efficacy. These elements of race and culture, which were not included in this study and have not been a focus of much research in the school counseling literature, are worthy of future research.

Cross-cultural supervision of school counselors has received little attention in the literature. However, from the limited research on cross-cultural supervision of counselors in general, it is clear that training and work on multicultural competence and racial identity status are important. Even supervisors who have the intention of discussing culture and processing cross-cultural supervisory dynamics risk alienating their supervisees with ill-timed or ambiguous interventions. The results of this study suggest that role ambiguity is associated with slightly lower self-efficacy. Nilsson and Duan (2007) found an even stronger relationship between role ambiguity and self-efficacy in cross-cultural supervisory dyads. These data imply that the dynamics of cross-cultural supervisory relationships are unique and deserve special attention in future research.

Lastly more outcome research on the ASCA National Model is necessary. Recent research on the use of comprehensive models has focused on student outcomes, however outcomes such as self-efficacy which impact school counselor functioning and performance are equally important. The findings of this study suggest that school counselors who have higher self-efficacy use the Model and those who use the Model have higher self-efficacy. Perhaps the Model is more aligned with school counselors' preferred practice or perhaps it allows more opportunities for successful experiences because of its structured, programmatic approach. More information on the Model's impact of school counselor outcomes is necessary.

Conclusion

The results of this study provide information on the experiences of supervision for practicing school counselors and highlighted factors that predict school counselor self-efficacy and use of the ASCA National Model. Of particular note was the reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy and the use of the ASCA National Model; the most widely accepted comprehensive school counseling model. These data imply that perhaps utilizing the National Model is a means by which school counselors, supervisors, and counselor educators can intentionally raise self-efficacy.

The concept of self-efficacy has a long history of empirical evidence suggesting its impact on work performance, commitment, motivation, perseverance, skill development, lowered anxiety levels, and adaptation to transition. An influx of recent research has established that school counselors experience role conflict, role ambiguity, and burnout more than counselors in other settings and that supervisors, especially

principals and vice principals, are contributors to this role stress (Cervoni & DeLucia-Waack, 2011; Moyer, 2011). Perhaps looking at this problem through another lens by examining the effect of using comprehensive school counseling models such as the ASCA National Model is the next step. The current study suggests that raising self-efficacy through the use of the ASCA Model is viable through improved systems of clinical supervision.

Supervision of practicing school counselors is often administrative and likely to be given by a noncounselor; however the findings in this study provide evidence that school districts should examine this practice and focus on increasing self-efficacy, especially in new professionals who have not experienced the unique working environment of a school. In places where a counseling supervisor or director is not employed, peer supervision is an option. The use of established models of supervision, such as the SCSM, can help structure clinical supervision and provide noncounseling supervisors with a framework for more appropriate performance appraisal.

Lastly, the findings of the current study highlight the complex nature of both supervision and self-efficacy. The aspects of supervision included in the current study accounted for only 16% of the variance in school counselor self-efficacy. Future research should build upon these aspects of supervision and include more environmental and individual factors, such as case load, previous self-efficacy level, and the impact of cross-cultural supervision.

References

Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. (2003). *Clinical supervision and teacher development: Preservice and inservice applications* (5th Ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

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

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

American School Counselor Association (2005). *The American School Counseling Association National Model: a framework for school counseling programs.* Alexandra, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association (2006). *The Professional School Counselor and Academic and Career Planning.* Retrieved from: http://asca2.timberlakepublishing.com//files/PS_Academic%20and%20Career%20Planning.pdf.

American School Counselor Association (2009). *The American School Counseling Association National Model: a framework for school counseling programs.* Retrieved from: http://www.ascanationalmodel.org/.

American School Counselor Association (2012a). *The American School Counseling Association National Model: a framework for school counseling programs.* Alexandra, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association (2012b). *Why school counseling*

directors/coordinators? Retrieved from

http://www.schoolcounselor.org/content.asp?contentid=389.

Association for Counseling Education and Supervision (1995). Ethical guidelines for

counseling supervisors. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *34*, 270-276.

Association for Counseling Education and Supervision (2011). *Best practices in clinical*

supervision. Retrieved from http://www.acesonline.net/wp-

content/uploads/2011/10/ACES-Best-Practices-in-clinical-supervision-document-

FINAL.pdf.

Baggerly, J., & Osborn, D. (2006). School counselors' career satisfaction and

commitment: Correlates and predictors. *Professional School Counseling*, *9*, 197-

205.

Bandura, A. (1977a). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman

& Company.

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

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive*

theory. Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barnes, K. L. (2004). Applying self-efficacy theory to counselor training and

supervision: A comparison of two approaches. *Counselor Education &*

Supervision, *44*, 56-69.

Benshoff, J.M., & Paisley, P.O. (1996). The structured peer consultation model for

school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 314-318.

Bernard, J.M. (1979). Supervisor training: A discrimination model. *Counselor*

    Education and Supervision, 19, 60-68.

Bernard, J., & Goodyear, R. (2006). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3th ed.).

    Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Bernard, J., & Goodyear, R. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4th ed.).

    Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Blackman, L., Hayes, R. L., Reeves, P. M., & Paisley, P. O. (2002). Building a bridge:

    Counselor educator-school counselor collaboration. *Counselor Education &*

    Supervision, *41*(3), 243-256.

Bodenhorn, N., & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy

    scale. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, *38*, 14-28.

Bodenhorn, N., Wolfe, E.W., & Airen, O.E. (2010). School counselor program choice

    and self-efficacy: Relationship to achievement gap and equity. *Professional*

    School Counseling, 13, 165-174.

Borders, L.D., & Usher, C.H. (1992). Post-degree supervision: Existing and preferred

    practices. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*, 594-599.

Bringman, N., & Sang Min, L. (2008). Middle school counselors' competence in

    conducting developmental classroom lessons: Is teaching experience necessary*?*

    Professional School Counseling, 11, 380-385.

Burnham, J., Dahir, C., Stone, C. & Hooper, L. (2008). The development and

    exploration of the psychometric properties of the assessment of school counselor

    needs for professional development survey. *Research in the Schools*, *15*, 51-63.

Burnham, J., & Jackson, C. (2000). School counselor roles: Discrepancies between

actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling*, *4*, 41-49.

Campbell, C., & Dahir, C. (1997). *The national standards for school counseling*

programs. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Cashwell, T.H., & Dooley, K. (2001). The impact of supervision on counselor self-

efficacy. The Clinical Supervisor, *20*(1), 39-47.

Cervoni, A., & DeLucia-Waack, J. (2011). Role conflict and ambiguity as predictors of

job satisfaction in high school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*(1).

Advance online publication.

Clemens, E. V., Milsom, A., & Cashwell, C. S. (2009). Using leader-member exchange

theory to examine principal-school counselor relationships, school counselors'

roles, job satisfaction, and turnover intentions. *Professional School Counseling*,

13(2), 75-85.

Coll, K., & Freeman, B. (1997). Role conflict among elementary school counselors: A

national comparison with middle and secondary. *Elementary School Guidance &*

Counseling, *31*, 251-262.

Corwin, R.G., & Clarke, A.C. (1969). Organizational conflicts and constraints:

Reflections on the counseling movement. In D.A. Hansen (Ed.) *Explorations in*

sociology and counseling, (pp. 200-236). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2009).

2009 Standards. Retrieved January 25, 2012, from

http://www.cacrep.org/2009standards.html.

Crutchfield, L. B., & Borders, L.D. (1997). Impact of two clinical peer supervision

   models on practicing school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*,

   75, 219-230.

Culbreth, J. R., Scarborough, J. L., Banks-Johnson, A., & Solomon, S. (2005). Role stress

   among practicing school counselors. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *45*, 58-

   71.

Curry, J., & DeVoss, A. (2009). Introduction to special issue: The school counselor as

   leader. *Professional School Counseling*, *13*(2), 64-67.

Dahir, C. A., & Stone, C. B. (2009). School counselor accountability: The path to social

   justice and systemic change. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *87*, 12-20.

Daniels, J., & Larson, L. (2001). The impact of performance feedback on counseling

   self-efficacy and counselor anxiety. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*,

   120-130.

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T.L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional

   practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service (ETS).

Dollarhide, C., & Miller, G. (2006). Supervision for preparation and practice of school

   counselors: Pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *45*,

   242-252.

Dollarhide, C., & Saginak, K. (2008). *Comprehensive school counseling programs: K-12

   delivery systems in action*. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Dressel, J., Consoli, A., Kim, B., & Atkinson, D. (2007). Successful and unsuccessful

multicultural supervisory behavior: A Delphi poll. *Journal of Multicultural*

Counseling & Development, *35*, 51-64.

Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to

satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of a master's-level

counseling students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *44*, 293-304.

Gardner, D.G., & Pierce, J.L. (1998). Self-esteem and self-efficacy within the

organizational context: An empirical examination. *Group & Organizational*

Management, *23*, 48-70.

Garman, N.B. (1986). Reflection, the heart of clinical supervision: A modern rationale

for professional practice. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, *2*, 1-24.

Ginn, S.J. (1924). Vocational guidance in Boston public schools. *The Vocational*

Guidance Magazine, *3*, 3-7.

Goodyear, R. K., & Bernard, J. M. (1998). Clinical supervision: Lessons from the

literature. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *38*, 6-23.

Granello, D. (2007). Publishing quantitative manuscripts in counselor education and

supervision: General guidelines and expectations. *Counselor Education &*

Supervision, *47*, 66-75.

Gysbers, N.C., & Henderson, P. (2006). *Developing & managing your school guidance*

and counseling program (4th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling

Association.

Halverson, S. E., Miars, R. D., & Livneh, H. (2006). An exploratory study of counselor

education students' moral reasoning, conceptual level, and counselor self-efficacy. *Counseling & Clinical Psychology Journal*, *3*, 17-30.

Hatch, T., & Chen-Hayes, S. (2008). School counselor beliefs about ASCA National Model school counseling program components using SCPCS. *Professional School Counseling, 12*, 34-42.

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

Inman, A. (2006). Supervisor multicultural competence and its relation to supervisory process and outcome. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, *32*, 73-85.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Johnson, D.S., Perlow, R., & Pieper, K.F. (1993). Differences in task performance as a function of type of feedback: Learning-oriented versus performance-oriented feedback. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *23*, 303-320.

King, B.M., & Minium, E.W. (2003). *Statistical reasoning in psychology and education* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kirchner, G.L., & Setchfield, M.S. (2005). School counselors' and school principals' perceptions of the school counselor's role. *Education*, *126*, 10-16.

Koch, J.H. (1972). The trouble with counseling. *The School Counselor, 19*, 173-179.

Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *77*, 447-456.

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*, 220-231.

Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D.E., Molinaro, M., Wolgast, B. (1999).

    Psychotherapy supervisor ethical practices: Adherence to guidelines, the

    supervisory working alliance, and supervisee satisfaction. *The Counseling*

    Psychologist, 27, 443-475.

Lambie, G., & Sias, S. (2009). An integrative psychological developmental model of

    supervision for professional school counselors-in-training. *Journal of Counseling*

    & Development, *87*, 349-356.

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*, 124-131.

Larsen, D.L., Attkisson, C.C., Hargreaves, W.A., & Nguyen, T.D. (1979). Assessment of

    client/patient satisfaction: Development of a general scale. *Evaluation and*

    Program Planning, 2, 197-207.

Leach, M. M., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (1997). Self-efficacy and counselor development:

    Testing the integrated developmental model. *Counselor Education & Supervision*,

    37, 115-125.

Lieberman, A. (2004). Confusion regarding school counselor functions: School

    leadership impacts role clarity. *Education*, *124*, 552-558.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The*

Counseling Psychologist, *10*, 3-42.

Luke, M., & Bernard, J. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An extension of the discrimination model. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *45*, 282-295.

Matthes, W. A. (1992). Induction of counselors into the profession. *School Counselor*, *39*, 245-251.

McMahon, H., Mason, E. M., & Paisley, P. O. (2009). School counselor educators as educational leaders promoting systemic change. *Professional School Counseling*, *13*, 116-124.

Melchert, T. K., Hays, V.L., Wiljanen, L.M., & Kolocek, A.K. (1996). Testing models of counselor development with a measure of counseling self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *74*, 640-644.

Miller, G. M., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2006). Supervision in schools: Building pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *45*(4), 296-303.

Mitchell, A.M., & Gysbers, N.C. (1978). Comprehensive school counseling programs. In *The status of guidance and counseling in the nation's schools* (pp. 23-39). Washington, DC: American Personnel and Guidance Association.

Moyer, M. (2011). Effects of non-guidance activities, supervision, and student-to-counselor ratios on school counselor burnout. *Journal of School Counseling*, *9*(5). Advance online publication.

Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA National Model: The foundation for Supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*, 289-296.

Myers, G.E. (1923). A critical review of present developments in vocational guidance \
    with special reference to future prospects. *The Vocational Guidance Magazine*, *2*,
    139-142.

Nelson, M.L., & Friedlander, M.L. (2001). A close look at conflictual supervisory
    relationships: The trainee's perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*,
    283-395.

Nilsson, J., & Anderson, M. (2004). Supervising international students: The role of
    acculturation, role ambiguity, and multicultural discussions. *Professional
    Psychology: Research and Practice, 35*(3), 306-312.

Nilsson, J., & Duan, C. (2007). Experiences of prejudice, role difficulties, and
    counseling self-efficacy among U.S. racial and ethnic minority supervisees
    working with white supervisors. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling &
    Development*, *35*, 219-229.

Oberman, A. (2005). Effective clinical supervision for professional school counsellors.
    Guidance & Counselling, *20*, 147-151.

Olk, M. E., & Friedlander, M. L. (1992). Trainees' experiences of role conflict and role
    ambiguity in supervisory relationships. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *39*,
    389-397.

Page, B. J., Pietrzak, D. R., & Sutton Jr., J. M. (2001). National survey of school
    counselor supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *41*, 142-150.

Perera-Diltz, D.M., & Mason, K.L. (2008). Ideal to real: Duties performed by school

counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 6*(26). Retrieved from

http://www.jsc.montana.edu/v6n26.pdf.

Pfeifer, D. (2011). Transforming staff through clinical supervision. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, *20*(2), 29-33.

Pierson-Hubeny, D., & Archambault, F.X. (1987). Role stress and perceived intensity of burnout among school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools, 24*, 244-253.

Pope, M. (2009). Jesse Buttrick Davis (1871-1955): Pioneer of vocational guidance in schools. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *57*, 248-258.

Pyne, J. R. (2011). Comprehensive school counseling programs, job satisfaction, and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling*, *15*, 88-97.

Remley, T. P., & Herlihy, B. (2006). *Ethical, legal, and professional issues in counseling* (3rd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Remler, D.K., & Van Ryzin, G.G. (2011). *Research methods in practice: Strategies for description and causation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Roberts, E., & Borders, L.D. (1994). Supervision of school counselors: Administrative, program, and counseling. *School Counselor*, *41*, 149-158.

Salkind, N.J. (2008). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Scarborough, J., & Culbreth, J. (2008). Examining discrepancies between actual and preferred practice of school counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*, 446-460.

Sills, S., & Song, C. (2002). Innovations in survey research: An application of web-based

Surveys. *Social Science Computer Review, 20*, 22-30.

Sink, C. A. (2009). School counselors as accountability leaders: Another call for action. *Professional School Counseling*, *13*(2), 68-74.

Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K. & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*, 22-33.

Stajkovic, A.D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 240-261.

Studer, J. (2005). Supervising school counselors-in-training. *Professional School Counseling*, *8*, 353-340.

Studer, J., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA National Model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*, 82-87.

Sutton, J., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *73*(3), 331-336.

Sutton, J., & Page, B. (1994). Post-degree clinical supervision of school counselors. *School Counselor*, *42*, 32-40.

Tang, M., Addison, K. D., LaSure-Bryant, D., Norman, R., O'Connell, W., & Stewart – Sicking, J. A. (2004). Factors that influence self-efficacy of counseling students: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *44*, 70-80.

Toporek, R., Ortega-Villalobos, L. & Pope-Davis, D. (2004). Critical incidents in multicultural supervision: Exploring supervisees' and supervisors' experiences. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, *32*, 66-83.

Walsh, M., Barrett, J., & DePaul, J. (2007). Day-to-day activities of school counselors:

Alignment with new directions in the field and the ASCA National Model. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*, 370-378.

Wilkerson, K. (2006). Peer supervision for the professional development of school counselors: Toward an understanding of terms and findings. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *46*, 59-67.

Wood, C., & Rayle, A. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals, functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *45*, 253-266.

Appendix A

Instrument

New Jersey School Counselor Self-Efficacy Survey

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If you are not sure of the answer to any of the items, you may approximate as best you can.

What is your gender?
 Female   Male

What is your race?
 African-American
 Latino/a
 Asian
 Caucasian
 Native American
 other

What is your current job title as listed by your school district?
 School Counselor
 Guidance Counselor
 other:

Prior to becoming a counselor, did you work as a certified teacher?
 Yes   No

How many years of experience as a school counselor do you have? Please include the current year and years in all other school districts or at other levels in your current district.
 1-3 years
 3-6 years
 more than 6 years

What certification(s) and/or licensure(s) do you currently hold (check all that apply)?
 Certified School Counselor
 Licensed Practicing Counselor (LPC) or Licensed Associate Counselor (LAC)
 Licensed Clinical Alcohol and Drug Counselor (LCADC) or Certified Alcohol and Drug Counselor (CADC)
 National Certified Counselor (NCC)

Please estimate the amount of students in your caseload. If you are responsible for students in different schools, please include the number from all schools.
 1-150
 151-250
 251-350
 351-450
 More than 450

To what extent have you received training on the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model?
 No training at all
 Some training during professional development
 Some training during graduate school
 Excellent training in both graduate school and professional development

To what extent do you utilize the ASCA National Model in your practice?
 Not at all
 Somewhat
 Our program is modeled after the National Model

The highest level of education you have completed is:
 Bachelor's degree
 Master's degree
 Doctorate
 other:

What is the title of the person who provides you the most direct supervision?
 Principal
 Vice Principal
 Director of School Counseling/Guidance
 other:

Approximately how many hours of supervision per month do you receive?
 I do not receive any supervision
 1-2 hours
 3-5 hours
 6 or more hours

INSTRUCTIONS: The next section of questions pertains to the supervision you have received in your current position. For the purposes of this study, the word "supervision" is describing a relationship that extends over time, includes some evaluation of your performance as a counselor, and has the simultaneous goals of improving your skills and monitoring the quality of services you provide to your

students. Using this definition, please answer the following questions on the supervision you have received to the best of your ability.

How would you rate the quality of supervision you have received?
 1-Poor
 2-Fair
 3-Good
 4-Excellent

Did you get the kind of supervision you wanted?
 1-No, definitely not
 2-No, not really
 3-Yes, generally
 4-Yes, definitely

To what extent has this supervision fit your needs?
 4-Almost all of my needs have been met
 3-Most of my needs have been met
 2-Only a few of my needs have been met
 1-None of my needs have been met

If a friend were in need of supervisor, would you recommend this supervision to him or her?
 1- No, definitely not
 2- No, I don't think so
 3- Yes, I think so
 4- Yes, definitely

How satisfied are you with the amount of supervision you have received?
 1- Quite dissatisfied
 2- Indifferent or mildly dissatisfied
 3- Mostly satisfied
 4- Very satisfied

Has the supervision you received helped you deal more effectively in your role as a school counselor?
 4- Yes, definitely
 3- Yes, generally
 2- No, not really
 1- No, definitely not

In a general sense, how satisfied are you with the supervision you have received?
 4- Very satisfied
 3- Mostly satisfied

2- Indifferent or mildly dissatisfied
1- Quite dissatisfied

If you were to seek supervision again, would you want this same experience?
1- No, definitely not
2- No, I don't think so
3- Yes, I think so
4- Yes, definitely

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

I can advocate for integration of student academic, career, and personal development into the mission of my school.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can recognize situations that impact (both negatively and positively) student learning and achievement.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can analyze data to identify patterns of achievement and behavior that contribute to school success.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can advocate for myself as a professional school counselor and articulate the purposes and goals of school counseling.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident

3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can develop measurable outcomes for a school counseling program which would demonstrate accountability.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can consult and collaborate with teachers, staff, administrators and parents to promote student success.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can establish rapport with a student for individual counseling.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can function successfully as a small group leader.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can effectively deliver suitable parts of the school counseling program through large group meetings such as in classrooms.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can conduct interventions with parents, guardians and families in order to resolve problems that impact students' effectiveness and success.

1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can teach students how to apply time and task management skills.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can foster understanding of the relationship between learning and work.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can offer appropriate explanations to students, parents and teachers of how learning styles affect school performance.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can deliver age-appropriate programs through which students acquire the skills needed to investigate the world of work.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can implement a program which enables all students to make informed career decisions.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can teach students to apply problem-solving skills toward their academic, personal and career success.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can evaluate commercially prepared materials designed for school counseling to establish their relevance to my school population.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can model and teach conflict resolution skills.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can ensure a safe environment for all students in my school.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can change situations in which an individual or group treats others in a disrespectful or harassing manner.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can teach students to use effective communication skills with peers, faculty, employers, family, etc.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident

5- highly confident

I can follow ethical and legal obligations designed for school counselors.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can guide students in techniques to cope with peer pressure.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can adjust my communication style appropriately to the age and developmental levels of various students.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can incorporate students' developmental stages in establishing and conducting the school counseling program.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can find some way of connecting and communicating with any student in my school.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can teach, develop and/or support students' coping mechanisms for dealing with crises in their lives – e.g., peer suicide, parent's death, abuse, etc.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident

3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can counsel effectively with students and families from different
social/economic statuses.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can understand the viewpoints and experiences of students and parents who are
from a different cultural background than myself.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can help teachers improve their effectiveness with students.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can discuss issues of sexuality and sexual orientation in an age appropriate
manner with students.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can speak in front of large groups such as faculty or parent meetings.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can use technology designed to support student successes and progress through
the educational process.

1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can communicate in writing with staff, parents, and the external community.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can help students identify and attain attitudes, behaviors, and skills which lead to successful learning.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can select and implement applicable strategies to assess school-wide issues.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community to enhance a positive school climate.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can develop school improvement plans based on interpreting school-wide assessment results.
1- not confident
2- slightly confident
3- moderately confident
4- generally confident
5- highly confident

I can identify aptitude, achievement, interest, values, and personality appraisal resources appropriate for specified situations and populations.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can implement a preventive approach to student problems.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can lead school-wide initiatives which focus on ensuring a positive learning environment.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can consult with external community agencies which provide support services for our students.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

I can provide resources and guidance to the school population in times of crisis.
 1- not confident
 2- slightly confident
 3- moderately confident
 4- generally confident
 5- highly confident

INSTRUCTIONS: The last section contains statements describing some problems that school counselors may experience during the course of their supervision. Please read each statement and then rate the extent to which you have experienced difficulty in supervision in your most recent experience.

For each of the following, indicate the most appropriate number, where 1= not at all, and 5= very much so.

I HAVE EXPERIENCED DIFFICULTY IN MY CURRENT OR MOST RECENT SUPERVISION BECAUSE:

I am not certain about what material to present to my supervisor.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I feel that my supervisor is incompetent or less competent than I.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I have wanted to challenge the appropriateness of my supervisor's recommendations for using a technique with one of my students, but I thought it better to keep my thoughts to myself.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I am not sure how best to use supervision as I become more experienced, although I am aware that I am undecided about whether to confront my supervisor.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I have believed that my supervisor's behavior in one or more situations was unethical or illegal and I was undecided about whether to confront him/her.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

My orientation to counseling is different from that of my supervisor. She/he wants me to work with students using her/his framework and I feel I should be allowed to use my own approach.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I have wanted to intervene with one of my clients in a particular way and my supervisor has wanted me to approach the student in a very different way.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

My supervisor expects me to come prepared for supervision, but I have no idea what or how to prepare.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I am unsure how autonomous I should be in my work with students.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

My supervisor told me to do something I perceived to be illegal or unethical and I was expected to comply.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

My supervisor's criteria for evaluating my work are not specific.
 1- not at all
 2

3
4
5- very much so

I was not sure that I had done what my supervisor expected me to do in a session with a client.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

The criteria for evaluating my performance in supervision are not clear.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I get mixed signals from my supervisor and I am unsure which signals to attend to.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

When using a new technique, I am unclear about the specific steps involved. As a result, I am unsure how my supervisor will evaluate my work.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I have disagreed with my supervisor about how to introduce a specific issue to a student, but I also want to do what the supervisor recommends.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

Part of me wants to rely on my instincts with students, but I always know that my supervisor will have the last word.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

The feedback I get from my supervisor does not help me know what is expected of me in my day to day work.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I was not comfortable using a technique recommended by my supervisor; however I felt that I should do what my supervisor recommends.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

Everything is new and I am not sure what is expected of me.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I am not sure if I should discuss my professional weaknesses in supervision because I am not sure how I will be evaluated.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I disagreed with my supervisor about implementing a specific technique, but I also wanted to do what the supervisor thought best.
 1- not at all
 2
 3

 4
 5- very much so

My supervisor gives me no feedback and I feel lost.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

My supervisor tells me what to do with a student, but does not give me very specific ideas on how to do it.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

My supervisor wanted me to use an assessment technique that I considered inappropriate for a particular student.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

There are no clear guidelines for my behavior in supervision.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

The supervisor gives me no constructive or negative feedback and as a result, I do not know how to address my weaknesses.
 1- not at all
 2
 3
 4
 5- very much so

I do not know how I am doing as a school counselor and as a result, I do not know how my supervisor will evaluate me.
 1- not at all

2
3
4
5- very much so

I am unsure of what to expect from my supervisor.
 1- not at all
2
3
4
5- very much so

Appendix B

Initial Contact E-mail

Hello,

You are receiving this e-mail as an invitation to participate in a study on school counselor supervision. In fact, all school counselors in the state of New Jersey are invited to participate in this doctoral dissertation study by a student at Montclair State University. In a few days, you will receive a second e-mail with a link to an online survey. We hope that you will take the 20-25 minutes it takes to complete the 93-item survey. We know that it is difficult to find even a few minutes in the busy schedule of a school counselor so we made the survey online, giving you the ability to complete it any time you can.

This study hopes to gather information on the impact of the supervision you currently receive on your confidence level in completing those tasks. The survey asks sensitive questions including participants' feelings about their current supervisor's effectiveness. We strongly advise that you do not use an employer issued device (laptop, smartphone etc.) to respond to this survey. Specifically, no guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third party (i.e. your employer).

As school counselors, we receive some form of supervision from a Principal, Vice Principal, Director of Guidance, or maybe even a veteran colleague. We are hoping to examine the impact of this supervision on "self-efficacy" or your confidence in your ability to do your job. By participating in this study you are providing information that can be used by your supervisor to give you supervision that increases your confidence level at work.

Thank you in advance for your time and please look for the survey e-mail in the coming days.

Sincerely,

Daniel Cinotti
Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education Ph.D. Program
Montclair State University

Dr. Larry Burlew
Faculty Sponsor
Montclair State University

Appendix C

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval

MONTCLAIR STATE
UNIVERSITY

Institutional Review Board
College Hall, Room 248
VOICE: 973-655-7583
FAX: 973-655-3022

June 4, 2012

Mr. Daniel Cinotti
100 Paterson Plank Rd. Apt. 527
Jersey City, NJ 07307

Re: IRB Number: **001205**
    Project Title: **The Relationship between Aspects of Supervision, Individual Factors, and School Counselor Self-Efficacy**

Dear Mr. Cinotti:

After a full 4 review, Montclair State University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this protocol on **May 30, 2012**. The study is valid for one year and will expire on **May 30, 2013**.

Before requesting amendments, extensions, or project closure, please reference MSU's IRB website and download the current forms.

Should you wish to make changes to the IRB-approved procedures, prior to the expiration of your approval, submit your requests using the Amendment form.

For Continuing Review, it is advised that you submit your form 60 days before the month of the expiration date above. If you have not received MSU's IRB approval by your study's expiration date, ALL research activities must STOP, including data analysis. If your research continues without MSU's IRB approval, you will be in violation of Federal and other regulations.

After your study is completed, submit your Project Completion form.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB requirements, please contact me at [973-655-4327, reviewboard@mail.montclair.edu,] or the Institutional Review Board.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Debra Zellner
IRB Chair

cc: Dr. Larry Burlew, Faculty Sponsor
       Ms. Amy Aiello, Graduate School

montclair.edu
1 Normal Avenue • Montclair, NJ 07043 • An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

Appendix D

Second E-mail with Informed Consent

Dear School Counselor,

Below is all the information you will need to know about this study on School
Counselor Supervision. Please take a few minutes to read it before you click on
the online survey link. The link to the online survey is:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/njschoolcounselor

Study's Title: The Relationship between Aspects of Supervision, Individual
Factors, and School Counselor Self-Efficacy.

Why is this study being done?: The purpose of this study is to look at the
relationship between the supervision you currently receive and your feelings of
"self-efficacy." In this study, "self-efficacy" means your own confidence in your
ability to perform your job duties. As a school counselor, you are asked to
accomplish a variety of tasks. This study hopes to gather information on the
impact of the supervision you currently receive on your confidence level in
completing those tasks.

What will happen while you are in the study?: If you choose to participate in
this study you will be asked to complete a survey containing questions about you,
your current supervisor, and your feelings about the supervision you currently
receive. The survey will be taken online and can be completed in less than 25
minutes. Once you have completed it, you will not be asked to do anything else.
You may stop at any time during the survey if you wish.

Time: This study will take about 20-25 minutes of your time.

Risks: This survey asks sensitive questions including your feelings about your
current supervisor's effectiveness. It is important to be truthful about your
experiences, both positive and negative. You may feel uncomfortable answering
questions about your supervisor's behavior, especially if they are nearby. We
strongly advise that you do not use an employer issued device (laptop,
smartphone etc.) to respond to this survey. Specifically, no guarantees can be
made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third party
(i.e. your employer).

Benefits: You may benefit from this study because some of this information may
be used to improve supervision practices. We are hoping to find out the best ways

for supervisors to increase your confidence and self-efficacy. By participating, you are helping us to find those ways and possibly helping school counselors everywhere.

Who will know that you are in this study?: No one will know you are participating in this study unless you tell them. Again, we strongly urge you to complete the survey outside of school. You will not be asked your name, school name, or any information that could be used to identify you. Once you submit your answers to the survey, they will be anonymous.

Do you have to be in the study?: You do not have to be in this study. You are a volunteer! It is okay if you want to stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Do you have any questions about this study?: If you have any questions regarding this study or what is expected of your voluntary participation, please feel free to contact Dan Cinotti at cinottid2@mail.montclair.edu. If you have any questions about your rights or problems with this survey, you may wish to phone or email the Montclair State University Institutional Review Board Chair, Dr. Debra Zellner (reviewboard@mail.montclair.edu or 973-655-4327).

Future Studies: The information you provide may also be used in future studies. You should only participate if you are comfortable with the information you give being used in the future.

Consent: Clicking on the following link will take you directly to the survey. Doing so will signify that you have read and understand this information and consent to participate. If this is true, you may begin the survey by going to:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/njschoolcounselor

Appendix E

Follow-up E-mail

Dear School Counselor,

Last week you received an e-mail invitation to participate in an online study. Many of you have already completed the survey and we thank you for your help and contribution to this study. If you have not yet participated, please consider taking 20-25 minutes of your time do so. The information from these surveys will shed light on the type of supervision school counselors are receiving across the state of New Jersey. The goal of this study is to examine the relationship between supervision and your feelings of confidence in your work. Please consider helping us in this endeavor by clicking on the link below:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/njschoolcounselor

Enjoy your summer and some much deserved time off!

Dan Cinotti
Doctoral Candidate
Montclair State University