Article 79

The Influence of Specialization-Specific Supervision on School Counselor Training

Reshelle C. Marino

Marino, Reshelle C., is an assistant professor of counseling and clinical coordinator of school counseling at Southeastern Louisiana University. She is a board-approved supervisor in Louisiana, nationally certified counselor, and certified school counselor. Her areas of expertise include: supervision, counseling children, adolescents, and families, grief/loss, trauma, behavior disorders, and anxiety and panic disorders.

Abstract

Results from a quantitative study designed to evaluate the influence of specialization-specific supervision on school counselor's perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness are reported. The *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (*SSSQ*) was created specifically for this study. Significant results were found and can be considered in school counselor training programs.

Keywords: supervision, specialization-specific supervision, school counselor training

Introduction

Supervision at the master's level is a significant factor and critical component in the professional training and development of counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Gazzola & Theriault, 2007; Nelson & Johnson, 1999). The goal of supervision is to ensure that no harm occurs and that useful and appropriate treatment is provided to the client (Milliren, Clemer, & Wingett, 2006). A vast amount of literature supports the contention that supervision is the main conduit for counseling trainees to develop a professional identity (e.g., Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; du Preez & Roos, 2008; Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss, 2010; Harris, 2009; Nelson & Jackson, 2003; Somody, Henderson, Cook, & Zambrano, 2008; Studer, 2006), ultimately leading to one's preparation and professional growth (Devlin, Smith, & Ward, 2009). Because school counseling programs have been undergoing transformations nationally as part of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) *National Model* (2012)*,* supervision should be conducted in a manner closely aligned with the transformed roles of 21st century school counselors in order to ensure a clear and consistent professional identity

for school counselors in training (Devlin, Smith, & Ward, 2009). "Professional identity is a nebulous concept, but vital to the long-term success of a profession" (Remley & Herlihy, 2010, p. 24) and is currently at the forefront of national awareness within the counseling profession (Gibson et al., 2010). However, school counseling professionals continue to struggle with their professional identity despite the many aforementioned changes that have occurred in their preparation within the last decade.

Despite the importance of supervision models and supervisor experience in the training of counselors, oftentimes school counselors in training receive supervision from supervisors who lack school counseling experience (Herlihy, Gray, & McCollum, 2002; Paisley & Borders, 1995). Specifically, being unfamiliar with the professional school culture can hinder trainees' experiences (Peterson & Deuschle, 2006; Somody et al., 2008). Within a school, the systems of parents, students, teachers, and administration could become overlooked in supervisory discussions, and the traditional focus on therapeutic skills might not provide the holistic and system strategies that facilitate a professional school counseling identity (Luke & Bernard, 2006). The cookie-cutter approach (i.e., treating all supervisees the same) could lead to narrowing the experiences of counselor trainees (Gazzola & Theriault, 2007). While the ASCA *National Model* (2012) was developed to address the role of the transformed school counselor in assisting all students' academic, career, and social/emotional needs in the 21st century, a lack of qualified supervisors still remains a concern for school counselors in training (Blakely, Underwood, & Rehfuss, 2009) both at the university and field placement level. Additionally, little research has been conducted to examine the effect of the specific experiential setting on the supervisory experience and its impact on school counselors in training.

Conceptual Framework

"Competencies required of different professions vary greatly from discipline to discipline, and differences abound regarding models of change, conceptualization of problems, intervention methods, and skills required in each particular setting" (Campbell, 2000, p. 251). However, Bernard's discrimination model for supervisors is a widely accepted model that has been utilized in the supervision of mental health professionals, and school counselors alike (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Ascribing to Bernard's model would entail acting as a teacher, consultant, and counselor throughout different phases of the supervision process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Because supervisors tend to begin supervision from a teaching role (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), it appears it would be beneficial if supervisors had experience in the school counseling profession to teach the multiple roles and levels of complexity involved in school cultures that extend far beyond the traditional counseling skills.

Since Campbell (2000) has been one of the only authors who have referenced setting-specific supervision, research is lacking to support or refute the need for specialization-specific experience prior to acting in a supervisory role. Thus, this study will fill the gap in the literature by exploring: Does having experienced school counselor supervisors help to effectively prepare trainees for an entry-level school counseling position, foster a solid professional identity, and improve supervisor effectiveness for school counselors in training? The overarching question for this study was: Are there

differences between school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision and those who did not, with respect to their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness?

Research Questions

1–3.   Are there differences between school counselors who received university-level (1) individual, (2) group, and (3) on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not receive specialization-specific supervision on the following:

        a. feeling more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position?
        b. having a stronger sense of their professional identity?
        c. having more positive perceptions of supervisor effectiveness?

4.   To what extent do school counselors think that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard?
5.   Is there a difference in school counselors' perception of knowledge between their individual, group, and on-site supervisory experiences?

Method

An IRB was obtained prior to the conduct of the study. The sample was drawn from members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), in the southern region, which contained approximately 7,900 members' e-mail addresses. The e-mail addressees were entered into a generic electronic mailing list titled *Specialization-Specific Supervision Questionnaire* (*SSSQ*) and then they were deleted to uphold confidentiality. Participants were contacted directly and solely through e-mail via a mass e-mail message of the ASCA listserv. To serve as an incentive to participate, two random drawings were held, each for a $50 gift certificate to Amazon.com. Once all participants completed the survey and the research was completed, the winners were notified by e-mail and provided with a gift certificate code. Of the 7,913 e-mail addresses listed in ASCA's southern region, 730 were returned as undeliverable. An additional 22 ASCA members e-mailed the researcher stating they were not working as a school counselor and were not eligible for the research; thus, yielding a population of 7,161 potential participants. Surveys were returned by 555 participants, representing a return rate of 7.8%.

If the response rate is determined according to the ratio of approximate total invited (N = 7,161) to the eligible participants (*n* = 555), the response rate was 7.8%, which limits the generalizability of results. However, no consensus exists among researchers on a required response rate (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). Some researchers (Kline & Farrell, 2005) suggested at least a 50% response rate to increase the chances of publication. However, this sample (*n* = 555) exceeds the sample size recommendation of Krejcie and Morgan (1970), who recommended 364 participants for a population of 7,000. Therefore, it can be assumed that the demographics and results can be representative of the school counseling population.

Instrument

No other study has concomitantly examined the differences in school counselors' perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness related to specialization-specific supervision. Previous studies examined school counselor professional identity (Henderson, Cook, Libby, & Zambrano, 2007), the types of supervisory activities provided to school counselor trainees (Studer & Oberman, 2006), and the differences in the supervision of school counselors in traditional school counseling programs versus recognized ASCA Model Programs (Blakely et al., 2009), but the instruments developed for those studies were not appropriate for this study. Specifically, the previous instruments did not take into consideration the key variable in this examination related to specialization-specific supervision. The dependent variables in this research are based on the general conceptualization of school counselor training -- whereby school counselors are trained at the master's level and adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position, with a defined professional identity from their graduate coursework, supervision, and practicum/internship experiences.

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

The *SSSQ* is a 33-item survey divided into five sections. Section I, Background Information, included sex, ethnicity, graduate student status, years working post-master's graduation, education level, graduate program accreditation status, present employment or practicum/internship setting, years of teaching experience, type of supervisor(s) assigned in a master's program, professional licensure and certification, and professional associations. Section II, University-Level Individual Supervisory Experiences, asked participants to focus on their university-level individual supervisor. This section was designed to capture perceptions regarding their university-level individual supervisor's school counseling experience and the extent to which the university-level individual supervisor influenced their perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. Section III, University-Level Group Supervisory Experiences, asked participants to focus on their university-level group supervisor. Section IV, On-Site Supervisory Experiences, asked participants to focus on their on-site supervisor. In Section V, Overall Supervisory Experiences, participants were asked to comment about what they would have changed about their supervisory experiences.

To acquire data regarding supervisory experiences related to perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness, 7-point Likert scales with anchored responses at each point were used (Creswell, 2009). The possible responses for perceptions of preparedness included: exceptionally prepared (7), very prepared (6), somewhat prepared (5), somewhat unprepared (4), very unprepared (3), not prepared at all (2), and not applicable (1). The possible responses for perceptions of

professional identity, and about knowledge of school-related issues and perceptions of training standards related to their supervisory experiences included: strongly agree (7), moderately agree (6), somewhat agree (5), somewhat disagree (4), moderately disagree (3), strongly disagree (2), and not applicable (1). The possible responses for perceptions of supervisor effectiveness included: exceptionally effective (7), very effective (6), somewhat effective (5), somewhat ineffective (4), very ineffective (3), not effective at all (2), and not applicable (1).

The items included in the *SSSQ* were developed based on guidelines from the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES; 1990), the American Counseling Association (ACA; 2005), ASCA (2012), and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2009), as well as current published research regarding school counselor supervision and professional identity. The approach to item development is research and literature based, and provides initial content validity for the *SSSQ* (Evans, Burnett, Kendric, & Macrina, 2009). Moreover, expert panels were utilized since they have been noted to be of great influence in a study to determine the face validity of a survey (Belafsky et al., 2008; Nakazawa et al., 2009).

An expert panel consisted of four counselor educators who had school counseling experience in an inner city and had provided specialization-specific supervision to school counselors in training. They screened survey items for content validity, as well as for ease of understanding. A pool of the best items was determined by panel recommendations and selected for final item inclusion. The most valuable expertise gained from the expert panel was the fact that these tasks were specific to those encountered in supervision sessions with supervisors. The tasks were noted as those more likely to be discussed in supervision than to be simply learned about theoretically in a school counseling course. As a result, the tasks were considered to be valid items of the *SSSQ*. A second expert panel consisted of six practicing school counselors in an inner city area, and all provided on-site specialization-specific supervision to school counselors in training. They screened actual survey items entered into Qualtrics™ software for ease of administration, style, format, and time allotment of the survey. All members of both expert panels were excluded as potential respondents for the research study.

Data Collection

Data were collected anonymously via Qualtrics™ (http://www.qualtrics.com), an online survey and data collection service. Potential participants for the *SSSQ* were contacted by a generic mass electronic message requesting voluntary participation. The electronic message included a brief description of the study, a statement regarding participant anonymity, a statement that agreeing to participate served as consent for study, and a statement that IRB approval had been obtained. The message provided a link for accessing the *SSSQ*. After the initial e-mail invitation was sent to solicit survey participants, second and third follow-up e-mail reminders were sent at weeks 2 and 4 of the study, which helped increase response rates (i.e., 3.4% to 4.6% to 7.8%). After participants completed the survey, they were automatically sent a final e-mail message that thanked them for completing the survey.

Data Management and Analysis

All data collected with the electronic questionnaire were kept securely online through a password-protected account with Qualtrics™ software (Qualtrics Lab Inc., 2010). Data were loaded electronically from Qualtrics software into SAS v. 9.2 (SAS Institute, Inc., 2008), and calculations for hypotheses were performed.

To identify variables that could influence school counselors' perceptions, data analysis for this study included descriptive statistics, ANOVA, and MANOVA. Due to the large number of comparisons in all the analyses, a conservative alpha level of $p \leq .001$ was employed to control for Type 1 errors (Huck, 2009). Multivariate normality was assumed for all analyses (Huck, 2009). To assess the strength of the relationship (Trusty, Thompson, & Petrocelli, 2004) and to determine practical significance (Thompson, 2002), eta squared effect sizes were reported for all multivariate analyses. With a single independent variable used for MANOVA, the regular multivariate eta-squared was reported. The interpretation of the effect size was based on Cohen's (1992) criteria for effect size interpretation ($\eta^2 = .10$ as small; $\eta^2 = .25$ as moderate; and $\eta^2 = .40$ as large) with caution (Robinson, Whittaker, Williams, & Beretvas, 2003), because Cohen's criteria were based on univariate analysis.

Frequencies, means, and standard deviations were employed for demographic questions of the background information of Section I. A MANOVA was used for research questions 1, 2, and 3. To minimize the potential of an inflated error rate resulting from multiple variables, a Bonferroni correction was utilized to adjust the alpha level to $p \leq .001$ (Huck, 2009). If statistical significance (multivariate F) was found, univariate ANOVAs were used as post hoc tests to determine which items contributed to the significant multivariate F.

A difference in proportion test was performed to analyze the differences between individual, group, and on-site for research question 4. For research question 5, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to analyze the differences between the mean answers. Post hoc least significant difference (LSD) tests were used to test for significance.

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

Results

To test research questions 1a, 1b, 1c, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, and 3c, a one-way MANOVA was conducted to compare the results of the items for counselors who received university-level individual, group, and on-site specialization-specific supervision and those who did not in the questions related to perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The results are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

MANOVA Results for School Counselors Who Had Received Individual, Group, and On-Site Specialization-Specific Supervision (SSS) and Those That Did Not with Respect to Preparedness, Professional Identity, and Perceived Supervisor Effectiveness for Hypotheses 1a – 3c

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	df	F	p	η^2
Preparedness Items	0.83	8/460	12.14	<.0001	0.17
13, 20, 27 (a–h)	0.71	8/422	22.03		0.29
	0.89	8/477	7.71		0.11
Professional	0.87	4/ 474	17.43	<.0001	0.13
Identity	0.81	4/434	25.66		0.19
Items 14, 21, 28 (a–	0.93	4/496	9.86		0.07
c), 15, 22, 29					
Perceived	0.83	3/467	31.97	<.0001	0.17
Supervisor	0.74	3/429	51.24		0.26
Effectiveness Items	0.94	3/494	10.82		0.06
16, 23, 30 (a–c)					

* Individual specialization-specific supervision is reported as the first value, second is group, and third is on-site.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for question 1a: university-level individual supervision and preparedness (Wilks' Λ = 0.83, F (8, 460) = 12.14; p < .0001, η^2 = 0.17); question 1b: university-level individual supervision and professional identity (Wilks' Λ = 0.87, F (4, 474) = 17.43; p < .0001, η^2 = 0.13); and question 1c: university-level individual supervision and perceived supervisor effectiveness (Wilks' Λ = 0.83, F (3, 467) = 31.97; p < .0001, η^2 = 0.17), an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Fifteen ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there was a strong effect size (η^2 = 0.17) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 1a, nearly a medium effect size (η^2 = 0.13) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 1b, and a strong effect size (η^2 = 0.17) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 1c.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for question 2a: university-level group supervision and preparedness (Wilks' Λ = 0.71, F (8, 422) = 22.03; p < .0001, η^2 = 0.29); question 2b: university-level group supervision and professional identity (Wilks' Λ = 0.81, F (4, 434) = 25.66; p < .0001, η^2 = 0.19); and question 2c: university-level group supervision and perceived supervisor effectiveness (Wilks' Λ = 0.74, F (3, 429) = 51.24; p < .0001, η^2 = .26), an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Fifteen ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there was a large effect size (η^2 = 0.29) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 2a, a medium to large effect size (η^2 = 0.19) and practical

significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 2b, and a large effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.26$), and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 2c.

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA for question 3a: on-site supervision and preparedness (Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.89$, $F(8, 477) = 7.71$; $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .11$); question 3b: on-site supervision and professional identity (Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.93$, $F(4, 496) = 9.86$; $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .07$); and question 3c: on-site supervision and perceived supervisor effectiveness (Wilks' $\Lambda = 0.94$, $F(3, 494) = 10.82$; $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .06$), an ANOVA was conducted on each item as a follow-up test. Fifteen ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences for all items. According to the effect size interpretation suggestions for social science data presented in Cohen (1992), there was a medium to small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.11$ and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 3a, medium to small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.07$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 3b, and a small effect size ($\eta^2 = 0.06$) and practical significance (Ferguson, 2009) for question 3c.

For question 4, using the difference in proportion test, it was determined that there was not a significant difference in the proportion of agreement between the three levels of supervisory experience ($\chi^2 = 6.91$, $p = .03$). The proportion of subjects who agreed with the statement was different than those who disagreed with the statement, but not different enough between the three supervisory experiences to denote significance. All groups, however, clearly agreed more than disagreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. The results are reported in Table 2.

Table 2

Results for Difference in Proportions Test for Question 4

Question			
I think specialization specific supervision should be a required training standard			
Percent	Individual %	Group %	On-site %
% Agree	*n*= 487 92.41%	*n*=457 93.84%	*n*=504 96.18
% Disagree	*n*= 40 7.59%	*n*=30 6.16%	*n*=20 3.82%

For question 5, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to analyze the differences between the mean answers. Post hoc least significant difference (*LSD*) tests were used to test for significance. The ANOVA test determined that there was not a significant difference in the mean answers between the three supervisory experiences ($F(2, 1512) = 3.13$, $p = .04$). The results are reported in Table 3.

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

One of the most prominent themes to emerge from this question involved specialization-specific supervision. Of the 517 counselors who chose to answer this question, 15% (n = 79) wished they had specialization-specific supervision in their graduate training. A similar theme emerged regarding counselors' roles in which 10% of counselors (n = 51) reported a desire to have had more accurate training about the roles of school counselors. Other noteworthy themes included 13% (n = 66) reporting that they

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and ANOVA Results for Question 5

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

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

would have increased the amount of time they had with their supervisor, and 4% (n = 21) of the participants stated that they would have liked more individual supervision. Also of interest was that 3% (n = 16) of counselors reported that they would have liked more collaboration between their university and on-site supervisors. Of the remaining participants, 16% (n = 83) reported that they would have not changed anything about their supervisory experiences, and 43% (n = 220) reported varying statements not specific to any theme relevant to this review.

Discussion

The findings of this research are in accordance with the conceptual framework pertaining to Bernard's discrimination model (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Ascribing to Bernard's model would entail acting as a teacher, consultant, and counselor throughout different phases of the supervision process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). Because supervisors tend to begin supervision from a teaching role (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), providing high support and high direction (Hart & Nance, 2003), the results of my study indicate that it would be beneficial if supervisors had experience in the school counseling profession to teach the multiple roles and levels of complexity involved in school cultures that extend far beyond the traditional counseling skills.

This study examined the influence of specialization-specific supervision on school counselors' perceptions of preparedness, professional identity, and perceived supervisor effectiveness. The overall findings suggested that school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision felt more adequately prepared to begin an entry-level school counseling position, had a stronger sense of their professional identity, and expressed feeling more positive regarding their perceptions of supervisor effectiveness than those school counselors who did not receive specialization-specific

supervision across all supervisory experiences (university-level individual and group, and on-site). The results also showed that most participants agreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. However, the findings further suggested that school counselors did not recognize that they were more knowledgeable about school-related issues than their supervisors (university-level individual and group, and on-site).

Furthermore, school counselors in this research felt most prepared to address the personal/social needs of students from their individual, group, and on-site supervisors. School counselors who received university-level individual and group specialization-specific supervision reported feeling least prepared to demonstrate behavioral management strategies during classroom guidance lessons, while those who received on-site specialization-specific supervision felt least prepared to use data to drive decision-making for student achievement. Dealing with systemic challenges was another area in which school counselors did not feel as prepared in comparison to other competency areas from their supervisory experiences. Because ASCA (2012) maintains that school counselors demonstrate knowledge in the aforementioned areas, it seems desirable that supervisors strive to provide supervisees with knowledge in these specific areas.

Because school counselors' roles have expanded with every decade (Paisley, Ziomek-Daigle, Getch, & Bailey, 2007), it is understandable that many school counselors struggle with their professional identity (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). While school counselors who received specialization-specific supervision reported having a stronger sense of their professional identity than those who did not, on-site supervisors seemed to contribute the most to the development of their professional identity as a school counselor. Counselor educators could continue to build partnerships with on-site supervisors and provide ongoing professional development to ensure that school counselors in training receive quality supervision. It seems incumbent upon the school counseling profession to continue searching for a unified professional identity to eliminate the confusion of roles that continue to change over the years, thus adding to the varied duties that are expected of school counselors in the 21st century.

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

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

associations consider aligning their standards to reflect the desired goals that school counselors expressed in this study.

Limitations

While this study surveyed members of ASCA, it should be noted that not all school counselors are members of that professional organization. Consequently, the research could have overlooked a considerable proportion of school counselors in the national population, creating what is known as coverage error (Ahern, 2005; Malhotra, 2008; Siah, 2005). However, the rather large sample size bolsters the generalizability of the study. The sample may be skewed in that participants who chose to complete the survey may have had strong ideas regarding school counselor training, and those who did not have strong ideas opted not to participate in the survey. It is also possible that many participants did not receive specialization-specific supervision and chose not to respond. In general, another key limitation of survey research is based on the assumption that participants who chose to complete the survey answered questions honestly (Siah, 2005). However, participants may have chosen to provide socially desirable responses to survey items regarding preparedness and professional identity. While these are typical problems that could be associated with all survey research, the anonymity of an electronic, online survey should have helped to minimize these limitations (Siah, 2005).

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

Implications for School Counselors, Counselor Educators, and Supervisors

By building on previous studies of school counselor supervision (e.g., Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; Herlihy et al., 2002; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Studer, 2006), findings from this study contribute to the knowledge base in school counselor training. Findings indicate that counselor education programs could benefit from examining the school counseling curriculum, particularly with regard to the supervision component of training, so that school counselors in training who do not have any teaching experience or specific knowledge of school settings prior to their practicum/internship experience could feel better prepared. Furthermore, counselor education programs could align their curriculum with the guidelines set forth by the ASCA *National Model* (2012) and the Education Trust (2004) to unify a professional identity that is reflective of school counselors in the 21st century (Paisley & McMahon, 2001).

Keeping in mind that specialization-specific supervision is not a required training standard (CACREP, 2009), it is interesting that over 90% of the participants strongly agreed that specialization-specific supervision should be a required training standard. Due to the fact that several professional organizations provide qualifications for school counselors, namely ACA, ASCA, CACREP, and ACES, there lacks uniformity

concerning supervision models specific to school counselors. In an effort to provide school counselors with adequate supervision, supervisors could build upon the supervision models provided by Bernard and Goodyear (2008), and models presented in the school counseling literature (Luke & Bernard, 2006; Murphy & Kaffenberger, 2007; Wood & Rayle (2006). Although CACREP has been referenced as the professional accreditation body most closely modeled after with respect to the school counseling profession (Paisley & Borders, 1995), "The ultimate mission of ACES, in accordance with the purpose of ACA, is to advance counselor education and supervision in order to improve the provision of counseling services in all settings in society" (Borders et al., 2011, p. 1; Borders et al., 2014).

Implications for Future Research

Findings from this study reiterate the importance that future research should be conducted on school counselor supervision and training. A replication of this study using a sample that includes current master's students and their supervisors would be beneficial. Other areas of future study include: examining the different training approaches provided by the university-level individual and group, and on-site supervisors, and exploring how the different approaches influence the preparation, professional identity development, and perceived supervisor effectiveness of school counselors; focusing on the supervisors' perceptions of providing supervision to school counselors in training, with and without having school counseling knowledge; investigating the views of counselor educators who do not have school experience but provide supervision to school counselors in training; and observing the specific challenges that prevent counselor educators from providing school counselors in training with specialization-specific supervision, as well as exploring ideas to address the concern.

Additionally, responses to the open-ended comment question revealed a number of areas that merit further study, including the challenges and time provisions of providing adequate individual supervision, collaboration between the university and on-site supervisors, and the overall quality of supervision provided to school counselors in training. Qualitative studies on the experiences of professional association board members would provide further insight as to why the various organizations are not in accordance with supervisory practices of school counselors, in particular.

References

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

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

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

American School Counselor Association (ASCA). (2012). *The ASCA national model: A framework for school counseling programs* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). (1990). Standards for counseling supervisors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *69*, 30–32.

Belafsky, P. C., Mouadeb, D. A., Rees, C. J., Pryor, J. C., Postma, G. N., Allen, J., & Leonard, R. J. (2008). Validity and reliability of the eating assessment tool (EAT-10). *Annals of Otology, Rhinology & Laryngology*, *117(*12), 919–924. doi:10.1177/000348940811701210

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2008). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Blakely, C., Underwood, L. A., & Rehfuss, M. (2009)**.** Effectiveness of school counselor supervision with trainees utilizing the ASCA Model. *Journal of School Counseling*, *7*(30), 1–26.

Borders, L. D., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., Glosoff, H. L., Hays, D. G., Page, B., & Welfare, L. E. (2011). Best practices in clinical supervision: ACES task force report*.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M., & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor*, *33*(1), 26–44. doi:10.1080/07325223.2014.905225

Campbell, J. M. (2000). *Becoming an effective supervisor: A workbook for counselors and psychotherapists*. Philadelphia, PA: Accelerated Development

Cohen, J. (1992). Quantitative methods in psychology: A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155–159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2009). *CACREP accreditation standards and procedures manual*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Devlin, J. M., Smith, R. L., & Ward, C. A. (2009). An Adlerian alliance supervisory model for school counseling. *Journal of School Counseling*, *42*(7), 1–23.

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

du Preez, E., & Roos, V. (2008). The development of counsellor identity—A visual expression. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *38*(4), 699–709. doi:10.1177/008124630803800409

The Education Trust. (2004). *National Center for Transforming School Counseling at The Education Trust.* Retrieved from http://edtrust.org/resource/the-new-vision-for-school-counselors-scope-of-the-work/

Evans, R. R., Burnett, D. O., Kendric, O. W., & Macrina, D. M. (2009). Developing valid and reliable online survey instruments using commercial software programs. *Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet*, *13*(1), 42–52. doi:10.1080/15398280802674743

Ferguson, C. J. (2009). An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *40*, 532–538. doi:10.1037/a0015808.

Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's level counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *44*, 293–304. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb01757.x

Gazzola, N., & Theriault, A. (2007). Super- (and not-so-super) vision of counsellors-in-training: Supervisee perspectives on broadening and narrowing processes. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *35*, 189–204. doi:10.1080/03069880701256601

Gibson, D. M., Dollarhide, C. T., & Moss, J. M. (2010). Professional identity development: A grounded theory of transformational tasks of new counselors. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, *50*, 21–38. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2010.tb00106.x

Guiffrida, D. A. (2005). The emergence model: An alternative pedagogy for facilitating self-reflection and theoretical fit in counseling students. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *44*, 201–213. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb01747.x

Harris, B. (2009). 'Extra appendage' or integrated service? School counsellors' reflections on their professional identity in an era of education reform. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research*, *9*(3), 174–181. doi:10.1080/14733140903032208

Hart, G. M., & Nance, D. (2003). Styles of counselor supervision as perceived by supervisors and supervisees. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *43*, 146–158. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2003.tb01838.x

Henderson, P., Cook, K., Libby, M., & Zambrano, E. (2007). Today I feel like a professional school counsellor! *Guidance & Counseling*, *21*(3), 128–142.

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

Huck, S. W. (2009). Reliability and validity. In A. Burvikovs, & E. Reilly (Eds.), *Reading statistics and research* (pp. 75–98). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Kline, W. B., & Farrell, C. A. (2005). Recurring manuscript problems: Recommendations for writing, training, and research. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *44*, 166–174. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb01744.x

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *30*, 607–610.

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

Luke, M., & Bernard, J. M. (2006). The school counseling supervision model: An extension of the discrimination model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *45*, 282–293. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00004.x

Malhotra, N. (2008). Completion time and response order effects in web surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *72*(5), 914–934. doi:10.1093/poq/nfn050

Mena, K. C., & Bailey, J. D. (2007). The effects of the supervisory working alliance on worker outcomes. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *34*(1), 55–65. doi:10.1300/J079v34n01_05

Miller, G. M., & Dollarhide, C. T. (2006). Supervision in schools: building pathways to excellence. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *45*, 296–303. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00005.x

Milliren, A., Clemmer, F., & Wingett, W. (2006). Supervision: In the style of Alfred Adler. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *62*, 89–105.

Murphy, S., & Kaffenberger, C. (2007). ASCA national model: The foundation for supervision of practicum and internship students. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*(3), 289–296.

Nakazawa, Y., Miyashita, M., Morita, T., Umeda, M., Oyagi, Y., & Ogasawara, T. (2009). The palliative care knowledge test: Reliability and validity of an instrument to measure palliative care knowledge among health professionals. *Palliative Medicine*, *23*(8), 754–766. doi:10.1177/0269216309106871

Nelson, K. W., & Jackson, S. W. (2003). Professional counselor identity development: A qualitative study of Hispanic student interns. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *43*, 2–14. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2003.tb01825.x

Nelson, M. D., & Johnson, P. (1999). School counselors as supervisors: An integrated approach for supervising school counseling interns. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *39*, 89–90. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.1999.tb01220.x

Paisley, P. O., & Borders, D. (1995). School counseling: An evolving specialty. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *74*, 150–153. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01840.x

Paisley, P. O., & McMahon, H. G. (2001). School counseling for the 21st century: Challenged and opportunities. *Professional School Counseling*, *5*(2), 106–115.

Paisley, P. O., Ziomek-Daigle, J., Getch, Y. Q., & Bailey, D. F. (2007). Using state standards to develop professional school counsellor identity as both counsellors and educators. *Guidance & Counseling*, *21*(3), 143–151.

Peterson, J. S., & Deuschle, C. (2006). A model for supervising school counseling students without teaching experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *45*(4), 267–281. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00003.x

Qualtrics Lab Inc. (2010). Version 12, 018. Provo, UT. http://www.qualtrics.com

Remley, T. P., & Herlihy, B. (2010). *Ethical, legal, and professional issues in counseling*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Robinson, D. H., Whittaker, T. A., Williams, N. J., & Beretvas, S. N. (2003). It's not effect size so much as comments about their magnitude that mislead readers. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *71*(1), 51–64. doi:10.1080/00220970309600879

SAS Institute Inc. (2008). Version 9.2. Cary, NC.

Siah, C. Y. (2005). All that glitters is not gold: Examining the perils and obstacles in collecting data on the internet. *International Negotiation*, *10*, 115–130. doi:10.1163/1571806054741155

Somody, C., Henderson, P., Cook, K., & Zambrano, E. (2008). A working system of school counselor supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, *12*, 22–33. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-12.22

Studer, J. R. (2006). Erik Erikson's psychosocial stages applied to supervision. *Guidance & Counseling*, *21*(3), 168–173.

Studer, J. R., & Oberman, A. (2006). The use of the ASCA national model in supervision. *Professional School Counseling*, *10*(1), 82–87.

Thompson, B. (2002). 'Statistical', 'Practical', and 'Clinical': How many kinds of significance do counselors need to consider? *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *80*(1), 64–71. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2002.tb00167.x

Trusty, J., Thompson, B., & Petrocelli, J. V. (2004). Practical guide for reporting effect size in quantitative research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *82*(1), 107–110. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2004.tb00291.x

Wood, C., & Rayle, A. D. (2006). A model of school counseling supervision: The goals, functions, roles, and systems model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *45*, 253–266. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00002.x