

8-1-2012

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN SUPERVISORY STYLES AND
COUNSELOR SKILL AND PERSONAL
DEVELOPMENT PERCEIVED BY THE
SUPERVISEE

Bruce Michael Meissner

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, meissner.bruce@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/dissertations>

Recommended Citation

Meissner, Bruce Michael, "EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPERVISORY STYLES AND COUNSELOR SKILL AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT PERCEIVED BY THE SUPERVISEE" (2012). *Dissertations*. Paper 562.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
SUPERVISORY STYLES AND
COUNSELOR SKILL AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
PERCEIVED BY THE SUPERVISEE

By

Bruce M. Meissner

A.A. Parkland College, 2005
B.S. University of Illinois, 2005
M.S. University of Illinois, 2007

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation Institute
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
August 2012

Copyright by Bruce Meissner, 2012
All Rights Reserved

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
SUPERVISORY STYLES AND
COUNSELOR SKILL AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT
PERCEIVED BY THE SUPERVISEE

By

Bruce M. Meissner

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of Rehabilitation

Approved by

Dr. Stacia Robertson, Chair

Dr. William Crimando

Dr. Thomas Upton

Dr. Kim Asner-Self

Dr. Donald Mullison

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 4, 2012

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

BRUCE M. MEISSNER for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Rehabilitation, presented on May 4th, 2012, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: EXAMINING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUPERVISORY STYLES AND COUNSELOR SKILL AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT PERCEIVED BY THE SUPERVISEE

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Stacia L. Robertson, Ph.D., CRC

This study replicates the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) study of supervisory styles and self-efficacy perceived by the supervisee. The Fernando and Hulse-Killacky study assessed general counseling students from Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) using the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) with a measure of self-efficacy, the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE; Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992). The present study used the SSI with a population of rehabilitation practicum counseling students from Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) accredited master level rehabilitation counseling training (RCT) programs to assess the relationship between supervisory styles, counseling skill, and personal developmental level perceived by supervisees during supervision using the Counselor Skill and Personal Development Rating Form (CSPD-RF; Wilbur, 1991). To obtain deeper understanding of the supervisory relationship demographic information including prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisees were collected.

The results from research question (RQ) one of the current study found that the task-oriented style subscale ($\beta = .477, p > .000$) was the only subscale determined to be statistically significant at an alpha level of .025. The interpersonally sensitive style ($\beta = .173, p < .323$) and the attractive style ($\beta = -.170, p < .221$) were not statistically significant. RQ2 results indicated that the task-oriented style ($\beta = .390, p < .000$) was the only subscale statistically significant at

the .025 alpha level. The interpersonally sensitive style ($\beta = .376, p > .035$) and the attractive style ($\beta = -.191, p < .173$) were insignificant.

DEDICATION

Dedicated in loving memory of my mother Therese E. Meissner, and dearest friend Michael T. Cain. Their lives full of challenges and triumphs continues to inspire and influence my life everyday.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their time and expertise in assisting me with this project. A special thanks to Dr. Stacia L. Robertson, my dissertation chair and advisor for her time and guidance throughout this entire process. I also wish to thank Dr. Marissa F. McKee for all her help and friendship. I could never thank her enough for her time and advice. Dr. Seamus Reilly, Dr. Mohan Pant, and the stat lab monitors, I thank them for the many hours of collaboration, support, and direction over the past few years. To my family, I thank my brothers, John H. Meissner and Mark S. Meissner for their love and support during some difficult times throughout my academic career. My Uncle Fred and Carol Hosmer for being my greatest and most supportive cheering section. Without the love and support of my family I am certain that I would not have achieved the success that I have today. To my other family, Daniel P. Hogan Sr., Daniel P. Hogan Jr., and sister Victoria Hogan-Recsendez for accepting me into their lives and supporting me throughout this process.

There have been many very special friendships that have aided me through some very trying times, unfortunately it is impossible to list them all, but I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge a few of these special relationships. One very special friend, Michael T. Lamont, whose supportive friendship beginning in my first days of college has meant so much to me. Gary and Carolyn Cain, Ken Truman, Leslie Truman-Hicks, Bryan MacMurry, Judith West, and the wonderful crew from PACE Center for Independent Living for the positive influences and guidance during my time at the University of Illinois-Champaign. Lastly, a very special thanks to Matthew B. Cohan, Sean G. Knoll, Morgan K. Delaney, Geoffrey R. Hickman, and Brian D. Petroski for always being in my corner supporting and encouraging me. The impact of these

special relationships has been an empowering experience and I thank you all for your positive influence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTERS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT.....	i
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER ONE - Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	9
Research Questions and Null Hypotheses.....	10
Definition of Terms.....	12
Summary.....	13
CHAPTER TWO - Literature Review.....	15
Supervisory Styles.....	17
Summary.....	24
Self-Efficacy and Counseling Skill.....	26
Developmental Model.....	30
Summary.....	35
Personal Development.....	36
Professional Obligation.....	36
Competency.....	36
Development.....	37
Counsel Skill and Personal Development Rating Form.....	41
Summary.....	43

Sex of Supervisee.....	44
Summary	47
CHAPTER THREE - Methodology.....	50
Design of the Study.....	50
Research Questions.....	51
Sample.....	52
Procedures.....	53
Instruments.....	57
SSI.....	57
CSPD-RF	59
Demographic Questionnaire	60
Data Collection and Analysis.....	60
CHAPTER FOUR - Results.....	65
Data Preparation.....	66
Research Questions.....	68
CHAPTER FIVE - Discussion	72
Recommendations.....	79
Conclusions.....	80
Limitations and Delimitations.....	81
REFERENCES	84
APPENDICES	93
Appendix A - Correspondences	94
Appendix B – SSI-T.....	121
Appendix C - CSPD-RF.....	123
Appendix D - Demographic Questionnaire	126

VITA.....	138
-----------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 01 - Demographics: Age	127
Table 02 - Demographics: Hours of Supervision Per-Week	128
Table 03 - Demographic Characteristics.....	129
Table 04 - SSI Subscales with Gender & Prior Experience.....	130
Table 05 - Model Summary Skill Development = DV	132
Table 06 - Skill Development - Beta Coefficients.....	133
Table 07 - Skill Development Correlations	134
Table 08 - Model Summary Personal Development = DV	135
Table 09 - Personal Development - Beta Coefficients.....	136
Table 10 - Personal Development Correlations	137

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Replication studies are integral for rehabilitation research to move forward. Cross-validation and replication studies are an important (Herbert, Ward, and Hemlick, 1995; Schultz, Cople, & Ososkie, 1999), but often neglected area in research (Smith, 1970; Super & Crites, 1962). This void in research can be attributed to the lack of funding, new research interests, and scholarly journals reluctance to publish replication studies (Super & Crites, 1962). Herbert et al. (1995) recommended that there be a more systematic assessment and cross-validation of supervisory assessment tools with rehabilitation counselors.

Clinical supervision is a complex relationship where counseling supervisors need to monitor and evaluate supervisees while continuing to support and provide direction. Supervisors delicately balance being an authority figure while promoting supervisees' growth and development. The field of rehabilitation counseling supervision is considered an important component in developing supervisees' counseling skills, little research has been conducted specifically in rehabilitation counseling training (RCT) programs (Herbert & Trusty, 2006; Herbert & Ward, 1990; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Schultz, Ososkie, Fried, Nelson, & Bardos, 2002). This study was an investigation of supervisory behaviors in RCT programs gathering knowledge that will benefit rehabilitation counseling education and improve training important to counselors throughout their careers (Herbert & Ward, 1990; Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). The results of this research can aid rehabilitation counseling educators in rendering more effective supervisor and counselor training.

This research replicated the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky's (2005) study investigating the relationship between supervisory styles and the counseling students' satisfaction with supervision

and their perceived self-efficacy. The Fernando and Hulse-Killacky study assessed general counseling students from Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) using the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) with a measure of self-efficacy (COSE; Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory; Larson et al., 1992) and supervisee satisfaction with supervision (SSQ; Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire; Ladany, Hill, & Nutt, 1996). The current study used the SSI (Appendix B) in assessing rehabilitation counseling programs accredited by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) in an effort to identify differences in behaviors among CACREP and CORE accredited counseling students.

Fernando and Hulse-Killacky's (2005) study sought to improve supervisor training by identifying which supervisory styles were related to supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision and their perceived level of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is viewed as a determining factor in a counselor's capacity to enter the profession (Tang, 2004). Bandura's (1977b) self-efficacy theory asserts that an individual needs to have a sense of competency in their ability to successfully complete a task before advancing to more complex tasks. Bandura's theory purports that counselor self-efficacy will increase as the level of experience increases, causing their counseling skills to improve (Larson et al., 1992; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996). The present study differs from Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) in that a measure of counseling skill and personal development will be used in the assessment in place of self-efficacy. For a deeper understanding of the supervisees' personal characteristics data regarding the prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisees will be collected.

Background

The field of rehabilitation has adopted many theories, theory-based models, and assessment measures from other disciplines primarily psychology and social work. This presents a problem due to some distinct differences in the practice of rehabilitation counseling, and the counseling practices of other disciplines. This has resulted in the absence of uniform and specific strategies relevant in the field of rehabilitation counseling training (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz, 1999). Rehabilitation counselors engage in case management, program evaluation, environmental interventions, consultation, job analysis, job placement, and development along with many other tasks (Schultz et al., 1999). Herbert et al. (1995) and Schultz et al. (1999) state that the situational demands of rehabilitation practicum may differ from counseling programs in other disciplines. Rehabilitation counselors serve a widely diverse population of consumers requiring specialized training and methods of assessment. The many roles and functions of rehabilitation counselors emphasize the importance of more accurate and appropriate assessments of counselor training.

Herbert et al. (1995) recommended that there be a more systematic assessment and cross-validation of supervisory assessment tools. The researchers stated that future research assessing supervisory styles and behaviors should use multiple methods of assessment and cross-validation. Smith (1970) stated that researchers have ignored cross-validation and replication research and pointed out that the best examination of a tool's reliability can be found in replication or cross-validation studies. Super and Crites (1962) point to the lack of funds, time, available participants, new research interests and the need to publish with scholarly journals reluctant to publish replication studies as common deterrents in cross-validation and replication research. The specialized tasks and necessary knowledge base of rehabilitation practicum

students may differ from counseling programs from other disciplines (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz, et al., 1999) and underscores the importance of replicating and cross-validating research using participant populations of only rehabilitation counselors. Cross-validating tools and replicating studies that have been carried out using populations of general counseling students as participants with rehabilitation counseling students will help to better recognize and understand the unique differences in rehabilitation counseling supervision and general counseling programs (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz et al., 1999).

Supervisors use several commonly known approaches or styles along with their own personal way of interacting with supervisees at different developmental levels (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Falender, Erickson-Cornish, Goodyear, Hatcher, Kaslow, Leventhal, Shafranske, & Sigmon, 2004; Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Loganbill et al., 1982; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). The supervisory styles used not only have an impact on the development of counseling skills, but also function as a model of conduct and behavior that supervisees will remember throughout their careers (Herbert & Ward, 1990; Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). Both the supervisory style used and personality of the supervisor have a major impact on supervisees' development and the counseling relationship (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). The supervisor serves as a role model working to teach and train supervisees, but also ensure that consumers are receiving competent counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Hensley, Smith, & Thompson, 2003; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007; Nelson & Holloway, 1990). Dye and Borders (1990) asserted that supervisors need to be capable counselors with the ability to cultivate skills and pass on knowledge to supervisees.

Friedlander and Ward (1984) identified supervisory styles to be a supervisors' personal manner of interacting with supervisees and implementing supervision. The authors developed three supervisory styles of supervision (attractive/collaborator, interpersonally sensitive/counselor, task-oriented/teacher). The attractive style is associated with supervisors who demonstrate warmth, empathy, consideration, and support toward their supervisees. In the second interpersonally sensitive style, the supervisors are more inclined to be highly perceptive and committed to their supervisees often engaging in something that resembles a counseling session rather than supervision. The third style, task-oriented directs attention to specific goal-oriented tasks similar to that of a didactic teacher. Herbert and Ward (1990) and Ladany et al. (2001) stated that identifying which supervisory styles enhance or impede student development could benefit the trainees throughout their careers.

Although researchers (Falender et al., 2004; Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994) have asserted that the attractive or consultant style is most appropriate for supervising more experienced supervisees, Morgan and Sprenkle (2007) and Prieto (1998) found that many supervisors utilize the attractive or collaborator style with supervisees regardless of the level of course being taught or the supervisees' developmental level. Supervisors who employ the attractive/collaborator or the interpersonally sensitive/counselor style compared to the task-oriented/teacher style were preferred by beginning counselors. The researchers stated that the social acceptability of this style fit well with an encouraging supervision process (Usher & Borders, 1993).

Skovholt and Rønnestad (2003) found that the absence of professional confidence increases anxiety when complex situations surface in the counseling session. Anxiety prevents a counselor from attending to the consumer as they focus on their own anxiety and/or reactions. In research conducted by Melchert et al. (1996) investigating the developmental model of counseling and self-efficacy concluded that a counselors' level of experience contributed to higher levels of self-efficacy in their counseling skills. This study supported the developmental model of counseling supervision finding higher levels of self-efficacy consistent with the four advancing levels of counselors. The results are also consistent with Larson et al.'s (1992) conclusion that beginning practicum students had significantly lower scores of self-efficacy than both master level counselors and practicing psychologists.

Leach and Stoltenberg (1997) found that the higher level-two counselors had higher scores of self-efficacy in the areas of micro-skills, understanding, processing issues and increased proficiency with the difficult consumer behaviors than level-one supervisees. The research also indicated that the higher-level supervisees had responded better to culturally diverse consumers than level-one supervisees. The authors claimed that understanding their own values more deeply in earlier stages of training could create higher levels of self-understanding and self-efficacy.

Counseling programs have an ethical obligation to monitor and assess the personal development of their students (CORE, Sec. D.1, 2010). Researchers have noted that there is minimal research and few assessment tools available to evaluate the personal development of counselors (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992, 2003; Hensley et al., 2003). Hensley et al. (2003) recommended the development of research-based standards and consensus on specific personal

developmental competencies and benchmarks in order to uphold the ethical obligations to monitor and assess counselor development.

Personal development has been identified as one of five factors essential to all aspects of the supervisory process (Falender et al., 2004). In formulating a stage model of counselor development, Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992) suggested 20 themes across four categories of counselor characteristics indicating that counselor development follows a path from a dependence on an extraneous monitoring process to a more personal internal function. This process takes place over time and as a result of interacting with many sources of influence such as supervisors, mentors, consumers and others.

Spruill and Benschhoff (2000) identified strategies of incorporating supervisee development and supervisee development of a personal theory of counseling. The researchers theorized that promoting students to evaluate their own personal values, and beliefs in early stages of development will assist students in choosing and understanding their own personal theoretical orientations. Spruill and Benschhoff suggested that strategies should begin with basic discussions of personal values and beliefs, and then proceed to more complex strategies of examining self in advanced stages of development using self-reflection and introspection. Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, and Garrett (2001) sought to investigate if promoting personal awareness can better advance the multicultural and general counseling skills of the supervisees. Results showed that higher levels of supervisee personal development are related to higher level of multicultural and general counseling skill development.

Nelson and Holloway (1990) and Granello, Beamish, and Davis (1997) described negative implications for female supervisees' development related to their sex. The research showed that supervisors asked for female supervisees' views and input less than male

supervisees. Female supervisees relinquish power more frequently than male supervisees and received more direction and less autonomy from supervisors than male supervisees. The research showed that supervisors of both sexes do not empower and support female supervisees in the same way that they do male supervisees, negatively impacting female supervisee development. Following a developmental model of supervision there should be less support and direction and increased autonomy as students advance. The increased autonomy was afforded to the male supervisees, but not to female supervisees. The negative implications for female supervisees' are that their interactions with supervisors are not only different from that of male supervisees, but they are also conducting themselves differently by relinquishing power that they would not normally do. The current study investigated these issues involving the sex of the supervisee.

Purpose of the Study

Cross-validating tools and replicating studies that have used students from CACREP accredited general counseling students as participants with CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling students will help to better recognize and understand some of the unique differences in rehabilitation counseling supervision (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz et al., 1999). The current study increases awareness of the important role replication and cross-validation has in rehabilitation research by exposing characteristic differences between the two populations of counselors. This research assesses the strength of the relationship between the supervisory styles, counseling skill, and personal development level perceived by the supervisee.

Achieving a greater understanding of what type of support and direction supervisors provide in RCT programs will aid counseling educators and supervisors in developing strategies and interventions that can produce more favorable results. The study will contribute to the body of

rehabilitation counseling research literature by using only CORE accredited master level RCT practicum students in the analysis.

The current study also examined demographic and other unique characteristic information associated with the practicum experience. This information included the supervisees' age, sex, race or ethnicity, type of supervision (group or individual), hours of supervision per-week, length of prior counseling experience and educational level. This information will be used to gain greater understanding of specific supervisory behaviors. Supervisors who utilize a rigid approach to supervision, not considering the students level of development, can limit how beginner counselors interact (Herbert & Trusty, 2006; Magnuson, Wilcoxon, & Norem, 2000). It is important to increase the understanding of supervisory behaviors and processes to identify which styles or behaviors work best with supervisees at varying levels of development.

Significance of the Study

This research examined the practicum experience for counselors-in-training and will provide educators with a deeper understanding of the supervisory behaviors and process. Additionally it contributes to the limited inquiry involving rehabilitation counseling training programs and specifically practicum course supervision. The present study begins to furnish information for supervisors and explain some common practices used in practicum course supervision. This study could benefit future counseling practicum supervisors by helping to determine the appropriate supervisory style to use with students at different levels of development.

The significance of this research is emphasized not only by the importance of gaining a better understanding of counseling skill acquisition, but also the personal growth and overall

development of the supervisee. Counseling regulatory entities mandate that graduate training programs monitor students' personal and professional growth. The Council on Rehabilitation and Education (CORE) requires that

students should have experiences that increase their awareness and understanding of the differences in values, beliefs, and behaviors of individuals from diverse populations.

This sensitivity will promote cultural competence, foster personal growth, and introduce students to counseling approaches and rehabilitation issues that affect service delivery (CORE, Sec. D.1, 2010).

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) mandate that graduate training programs monitor students' personal and professional growth. There are certain aspects of the supervisory relationship that can benefit or impede supervisee development. This research adds to the body of research involving RCT programs and increase knowledge of commonly used tools and models of supervision employed in RCT programs. Educators can use this information in their decisions on what material they wish to focus on in supervisor and counselor training.

Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees?

2. Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?
3. Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees?
4. Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no relationship among the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees.
2. There is no relationship among the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees.
3. Prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee does not moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees.

4. Prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee does not moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees

Definition of Terms

1. *Competency*: A measurable ability required for effective performance. This could entail particular knowledge, a single skill or ability, a personal characteristic or combinations of these abilities (Marrelli et al., 2005).
2. *Proficient counselors*: Individuals who achieve positive changes by altering the consumers' perception of self while minimizing or eliminating negative symptoms (Wheeler, 2000).
3. *Self-Efficacy*: An individual's belief in their ability to successfully accomplish a specific task (Bandura (1977b)).
4. *Skills*: Competence to perform a certain task with a specific outcome as the goal (Marrelli, Tondora, & Hogue, 2005).
5. *Supervisee*: Individual who receives clinical supervision from a supervisor.
6. *Supervision*: A on-going process in which typically a more tenured member of the field with knowledge and skills specific to the supervisees' profession helps the supervisee develop knowledge, skills and abilities to effectively practice in the field (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009). An experience of joint support and mutuality (Hensley et al., 2003).
7. *Supervisor*: Individual who provides clinical supervision to a supervisee.

8. *Supervisory Styles*: Different approaches that supervisors use, along with their own personal way of interacting with supervisees in the supervision process (Friedlander & Ward, 1984).

Summary

The preceding chapter presented information related to the multidimensional nature of rehabilitation counseling supervision. The chapter emphasized the importance of a more systematic assessment and cross-validation of supervisory assessment tools. Smith (1970) stated that researchers have ignored cross-validation and replication research. Smith pointed out that the best examination of a tool's reliability can be found in replication or cross-validation studies. The variety of tasks and knowledge base of rehabilitation practicum students differs from counseling programs from other disciplines (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz et al., 1999). This point emphasizes the importance of replicating and cross-validating research using participant populations of only rehabilitation counselors.

This chapter examined the relational component between supervisor and supervisee and essential information necessary for competent supervision to take place. The supervisors' style of supervision and factors that influence supervisee development were introduced. The tendency for counseling supervisors to use the attractive/collaborator style of supervision was presented. The possible overuse of the socially acceptable attractive/collaborator style of supervision was discussed. The supervisees' anxiety and lack of self-efficacy were presented in relationship to counseling skill acquisition and personal development. The chapter elaborated on some of the ambiguity involved in assessing the personal development of the supervisee. Some of the negative implications for female supervisees were detailed. Female supervisees experience a lack of empowerment and autonomy that male supervisees do not experience.

This manuscript consists of five chapters. The first chapter provided an introduction discussing the background, purpose, and significance of the study. The second chapter examines relevant research involving the supervisory styles, self-efficacy, counseling skills, personal development of the supervisee, and the sex of the supervisees. Chapter three will present the methodology used in the study sampling, procedures, instruments, data collection and analysis. Chapter four will discuss the results of the analysis followed by chapter five which includes a discussion of the results, recommendations, conclusions and the limitations and delimitations of the study. This document will end with a list of tables, a list of references, and the appendices section.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review includes some of the complexities noted by researchers involving counseling supervision. Lizzio, Stokes and Wilson (2005) stated that supervisors have critical decisions to make in regards to how they work with supervisees. Supervisors delicately approach a balance of being an authority figure while promoting supervisees' self-direction and autonomy. The review discusses some of the complicated aspects of the supervisory process and the supervisees' perception of the supervisory styles used by supervisors. The supervisory style used is presented in relation to the counseling skill and personal developmental level of practicum students. Using an inappropriate style of supervision and not considering the students' level of development could impede counselor development and affect the supervisory relationship. Beginning counselors can have low self-efficacy if they do not feel confident in the supervision they are receiving. The student counselor may be inhibited in attempting new strategies in the counseling session negatively impacting development. A brief history of how the developmental model of counseling supervision evolved over the decades is presented. The ambiguity in assessing the personal development of the supervisees and particular models of assessment are discussed. The implications of sex of supervisee are examined, specifically the impact of supervision for female supervisees. Counseling supervision is a complex multidimensional endeavor consisting of many factors.

Counseling supervision is broadly accepted as an essential component in counselor development (Barnett, 2007; West, 2004; Wheeler, 2000). Supervisors undertake a variety of responsibilities on several dimensions. Supervisors not only have a responsibility and obligation to the supervisee, but to the consumer, profession and institution or agency (Bernard &

Goodyear, 2009; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007). The skills necessary for counseling and supervision are not the same (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Herbert & Trusty, 2006), and as the field of supervision moved toward professionalism, research shows that competent counselors do not inevitably become competent supervisors (Allen & Stebnicki, 1995; Dye & Borders, 1990; Herbert & Ward, 1989; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Thielsen & Leahy, 2001). Counseling supervision is now recognized as a discipline separate from counseling, having its own set of processes, skills, and theories that direct the field (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Dye & Borders, 1990; Herbert & Trusty, 2006).

Several definitions of supervision have been presented in the research literature. Bernard and Goodyear's comprehensive definition has been widely accepted in the field of rehabilitation counseling supervision (Herbert, et al., 1995; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Thielsen & Leahy, 2001). Bernard and Goodyear defined supervision as follows:

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

This definition involves monitoring clinical treatment, evaluating supervisees' acquisition of knowledge, skills and the integration of theory (Herbert et al., 1995).

Models of counseling supervision do not adequately address the multidimensional nature of rehabilitation counseling. Rehabilitation counselors engage in case management, program evaluation, environmental interventions, consultation, job analysis, job placement, and development along with many other tasks (Schultz et al., 1999). Supervisory models can be very

basic or highly complex. The majority of models include strategies or intervention in developing supervisees' theoretical orientation, establishing supervisor and supervisee roles, structure of supervision and counseling environments, assessment and evaluation, ethical behavior, and termination of the supervisory relationship (Schultz et al., 1999). Thus, there appears to be a gap between the nature of rehabilitation counseling and the majority of supervisory models.

Supervisory Styles

Friedlander and Ward (1984) defined supervisory styles as a supervisors' personal manner of interacting with supervisees and implementing supervision. Researchers acknowledge supervisors should interact with supervisees using several different supervisory styles or approaches. The developmental models postulates that beginner counselors progress through different stages or levels continuing to develop more complex skills requiring supervisors to adopt different styles, strategies and approaches at the advancing levels (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). Supervisors may start out with a particular style they would prefer to use, the decision ultimately involves the supervisees' learning needs or developmental level (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Herbert & Trusty 2006; Stoltenberg et al., 2010).

Not all supervisors have the same level of motivation, knowledge or skills (Crespi & Dube, 2005). Rigid supervisors that depend on only one supervisory style can drastically limit the supervisor-supervisee interaction and impede counselor development (Herbert & Trusty, 2006; Magnuson et al., 2000). Although it is advised to integrate supervision styles, researchers have indicated that a more structured didactic approach should be the dominant style of

supervision used with inexperienced counselors (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Herbert & Ward, 1990; Ladany et al., 2001; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Prieto, 1998; Usher & Borders, 1993).

Friedlander and Ward (1984) developed the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) to identify the dimensions of supervisory styles, theoretical orientations and their prominence with supervisees of various levels of development from different counseling settings. The researchers conducted a content analysis from interviews with 20 counseling supervisors. Following four separate analyses three supervisory subscales were developed: attractive, interpersonally sensitive and task-oriented. The three subscales were derived from Bernard's (1979) popular Discrimination Model of supervision. Bernard developed three supervisory roles, teacher, counselor, and consultant, along with three supervisory functions: process skills, conceptualization, and personalization. Bernard's integrative model represents nine approaches supervisors can implement in supervision combining the two categories of supervisory styles and functions while considering the level of the supervisee.

The SSI is a 33-item self-report questionnaire and is recognized as one of the most commonly used and best validated instruments in supervision research (Prieto, 1998). The SSI measures the supervisors' or supervisees' perception of the supervisors' use of the three styles portrayed on the SSI during supervision: attractive, representing a collegial or consultant approach (7-items), interpersonally sensitive, representing a therapeutic or counselor approach (8-items), and task-oriented, representing a didactic teacher approach (10-items). Although no rationale has been found there are also eight filler questions included in the scale. The 33 subscale questions are scored on a 7-point Likert scale from (1) not very to (7) very. A mean

scale index from 1 to 7 is obtained where a higher score on a subscale represents greater support for the style's use, meaning the most often used or dominant style (Appendix B).

Friedlander and Ward's (1984) analysis established internal consistency estimates for the scales. Scores from both supervisor and supervisee versions had alphas ranging from .76 to .93 and item-scale correlations .70 to .88 for the attractive scale, .51 to .82 for the interpersonally sensitive scale and .38 to .76 for the task-oriented scale. The test-retest (two week) reliability assessing master level supervisees were .92 combined and for the individual scale: attractive .94, interpersonally sensitive .91, and task-oriented .78. The authors found significant agreement on the scales of the SSI that strongly relate to all forms of supervision.

Usher and Borders (1993) examined supervisory style preference of 106 school counselors and 168 counselors from either mental health or private practice settings. Both groups of counselors preferred Friedlander and Ward's (1984) attractive/collaborator style and interpersonally sensitive/counselor style of supervision more than the task-oriented/teacher approach. It is worth noting that the school counselors' ratings for the task-oriented/teacher approach were greater than the other setting counselors' ratings (Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007). These findings represent counseling supervisees' preference in being supervised in a attractive/collaborative and interpersonally sensitive/counselor style of supervision over the task-oriented style.

Ladany et al. (2001) examined the relationship between supervisor perception of the supervisory style used, the supervisory working alliance, and the supervisor use of self-disclosure during the supervisory process. In a sample using 137 counseling supervisors as participants Ladany et al. (2001) found significant positive correlations between three separate tools of measurement. The first tool used is the SSI with three subscales or styles: attractive or

collaborator style, interpersonally sensitive or counselor style and the task-oriented or teacher style. The second tool used was the Working Alliance Inventory Supervisor (WAIS; Baker, 1991) using the bonding, agreement on goals, and agreement on tasks subscales of the tool. The third tool used was the Supervisor Self-Disclosure Inventory (SSDI; Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, 1999) questionnaire that asks supervisors what types of circumstantial information was disclosed during supervision.

The examination showed that the perception of an attractive style subscale of the SSI was related to the supervisees' perception of bonding on the WAIS (Baker, 1991). The interpersonally sensitive style of the SSI was related to the tasks component of the WAIS. Ladany et al. (2001) concluded when supervisors perceived the attractive style there was a greater sense of an emotional bond and consensus on the goals and tasks subscales of the WAIS. The supervisors' perception of the style used with supervisees was linked to the working relationship they believed they had with their supervisees. Explicitly stated, supervisors who indicated they used the attractive style viewed the supervisory relationship as more collaborative with a greater agreement with supervisees on the process of supervision. Those who indicated they used either the interpersonally sensitive or the task-oriented styles had a greater agreement on the tasks or goals of supervision. Supervisors who perceived that they used the attractive style also perceived that they had self-disclosed to supervisees during supervision (Ladany et al., 2001).

In an exploratory study of practicum courses accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), Prieto (1998) found that supervisors are inclined to use attractive or collaborator style of supervision despite the level of practicum course being supervised. The study used a sample of 65 counseling educators

(practicum course faculty supervisors) from 48 of 112 CACREP accredited counselor education programs from all geographical regions in the United States. Using the three subscales of the SSI Prieto found that supervisors use the attractive style of supervision in practicum courses with both new and advanced students.

Although the SSI is recognized as one of the most commonly used and best validated instruments in supervision research (Prieto, 1998) investigators have voiced concerns (Herbert & Ward, 1990; Herbert et al., 1995). Herbert and Ward (1990) examined the three supervisory styles used in rehabilitation counseling practicum and the relationship to supervision outcomes. Data obtained from 92 supervisor participants enrolled in 55 masters level rehabilitation counseling programs suggests that practicum supervisors view themselves as being collegial or relationship-oriented. The research also examined if the SSI's factor structure supported the original findings by Friedlander and Ward (1984). Another part of this investigation examined Friedlander and Ward's initial study results involving the supervisory styles and their relationship to the supervisor counseling orientation.

The results indicate that the SSI was not useful in discriminating among counseling orientations. Internal consistency reliability estimates of .76 to .84, were obtained and consistent with those found by Friedlander and Ward (1984) representing a moderate relationship between the SSI subscales. There was also a stronger correlation between the attractiveness and interpersonally sensitive scales with the task-oriented scale indicating that the constructs are more closely related than originally thought. Herbert and Ward (1990) cite this as further proof that the tools subscales are not as parallel as prior research has claimed.

In a confirmatory analysis using 123 rehabilitation counseling students Herbert et al. (1995) examined the perceptions of supervisory style and behaviors during practicum course.

The authors used the SSI and the Supervision Questionnaire-Revised (SQ-R; Worthington, 1984). The SQ-R is a widely used tool in the supervision research measuring two factors of supervisory behaviors: evaluation and support. The researchers found that the confirmatory factor analysis did not support the factor structure of the original assessment. In previous research by Herbert and Ward (1989; 1990), the SSI showed high interdependence between the subscales. The SSI was also found to be unable to distinguish between the supervisory styles or identify a relationship to counselor theoretical orientation (Herbert et al., 1995).

Herbert et al. (1995) stated that with a limited self-knowledge students may not be aware of what constitutes appropriate supervision. They also point to the situational demands of rehabilitation practicum that may differ from counseling programs from other disciplines. One of the more unexpected results involved one factor of the SQ-R, directive feedback and the finding that it was moderately correlated with the SSI's attractive and interpersonally sensitive styles, but not with the task-oriented style. Herbert et al. (1995) proposed that it seems to make sense that the task-oriented teacher style would show a relationship with the feedback behaviors of the SQ-R. Similarly the goal evaluation factor of the SQ-R was expected to be highly correlated with the task-oriented teaching style, but only a low correlation was found. The personal support factor of the SQ-R should be representative of the interpersonally sensitive style of the SSI, but instead the personal support factor was highly correlated to the attractive style. The results also showed the shared experience factor of the SQ-R related to the interpersonally sensitive style of the SSI and not the attractive or collegial style that would make sense.

Herbert et al. (1995) asserted that the lack of support for the original factor structure may lie in the characteristics of the sample. The Herbert et al. (1995) study used rehabilitation practicum students and in the original factor analysis by Friedlander and Ward (1984)

psychologists, psychiatrists, counselors, and social workers were sampled. The Herbert findings indicated that supervisory behaviors are not unique to individual supervisory styles. Although the SSI and SQ-R are two widely used tools in assessing supervision, no meaningful relationships were found. The authors conclude that behavioral observations are necessary to establish supervisory styles and behaviors. Herbert et al. (1995) called for a more systematic assessment and cross-validation of supervisory assessment tools and that future research assess supervisory styles and behaviors using multiple methods of assessment. Herbert and Ward (1995) assessed the SSI's use through theoretical orientations of the supervisor. The current study examined the SSI with a focus on the different developmental levels of the supervisee. The SSI is one of the most widely used and validated assessment tools used in general counseling supervision. Additional investigation of the popular tools validity in assessing rehabilitation counselors is necessary.

Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) used 82 master level counseling students from six programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) to examine which supervisory styles are associated with supervisee satisfaction with supervision and the supervisee perceived self-efficacy. The researchers used the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) and the Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, & Nutt, 1996), a self-report measure in which supervisees rate their overall satisfaction in different areas of supervision. Lastly, the study used the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE; Larson, 1990; Larson et al., 1992) a measure using declarative statements that supervisees judge their beliefs regarding their abilities in five areas of counseling.

In analyzing supervisee satisfaction with supervision an estimated 53% ($R^2 = .532$) of the variance was attributed to the supervisory style. The interpersonally sensitive style was statistically significant at $p < .05$ ($\beta = .483, p < .005$) while the attractive ($\beta = .221, p = .129$) and the least contributor to supervisee satisfaction, task-oriented styles ($\beta = .072, p = .503$) were not significant. The interpersonally sensitive style was the only supervisory style that was found significant in predicting satisfaction with supervision. In assessing the variance in self-efficacy and the three supervisory styles an estimated 13% ($R^2 = .137$) of the variance is attributed. Only the task-oriented style had a statistically significant contribution ($\beta = .376, p < .011$) in the model. The attractive style had a negative contribution ($p = -.073$), and the interpersonally sensitive style had little contribution ($p = .043$). The task-oriented style was the only supervisory style that was found significant in predicting supervisees' perceived self-efficacy. Examining the correlations between supervisory styles and satisfaction with supervision and self-efficacy showed that all three styles were significantly correlated with the dependent measure. The interpersonally sensitive style had a stronger ($r = .718$) correlation with supervisees' satisfaction with supervision than both the attractive style ($r = .666$) and the task-orientation style ($r = .519$). The supervisee perceived self-efficacy measure and the task-oriented style was more strongly associated ($r = .368$) than both the interpersonally sensitive style ($r = .240$), and the attractive style ($r = .165$) which showed the weakest association (Fernando and Hulse-Killacky, 2005).

Summary. During supervision, supervisors use several commonly known approaches or styles along with their own personal way of interacting with supervisees. The supervisory style used and personality of the supervisor has a major impact on supervisees' development and the counseling relationship (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). The literature has shown that there are preferences from supervisors and supervisees in using the attractive/collaborator style or

interpersonally sensitive/counselor style in supervision over the task-oriented/teacher style (Prieto, 1998; Usher & Borders, 1993). According to the developmental model of supervision the level one supervisees are in need of high structure and direction, and level three, the more advanced counselors need for greater autonomy and less structure (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Falender et al., 2004; Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Loganbill et al., 1982; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994).

Although it is recognized that supervisors should be prepared to use all three supervisory styles (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009; Falender et al., 2004; Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Loganbill et al., 1982; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994) it is obvious to see the need for supervisors to use the more task-oriented style of supervision with inexperienced supervisees who are in need of high structure and direction.

Supervisors who indicated they used the attractive style viewed the supervisory relationship as more of a collaborative experience with agreement with supervisees on the process of supervision. Those who indicated they used either the interpersonally sensitive or the task-oriented styles had a greater agreement on the tasks or goals of supervision (Ladany et al., 2001). The task-oriented supervisory style has been shown to be predictive of the supervisees' perceived self-efficacy and the attractive style associated with supervisee satisfaction with supervision (Fernando and Hulse-Killacky, 2005) and higher levels of self-disclosure (Ladany et al., 2001). It is important to better understand supervisory behaviors and processes to identify which styles or behaviors work best with supervisees at particular levels of development.

Self-Efficacy and Counseling Skill

Bernard and Goodyear (2009) stated that the focus of supervision is to increase the supervisees' level of confidence in their skills. Skovholt and Ronnestad (2003) found that the absence of professional confidence increases anxiety when situations that are more complex surface in the counseling session. Anxiety prevents the counselor from attending to the consumer as he or she focus on themselves. Students gain entry to graduate school based on their prior academic performance, but are not required to possess any counseling skills (Heller-Levitt, 2002). Counseling supervision is an essential component in facilitating growth and counseling skills for beginner counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2009).

Spruill and Benschhoff (2000) explained that in graduate training programs students are introduced to different styles of counseling and will begin to formulate their own personal style. Supervisee performance is more externally driven in the beginning of professional training, ultimately inhibiting personal methods of interaction for more appropriate professional behavior. Spruill and Benschhoff's claim is in agreement with previous research that stated counseling students develop as they move from concrete experiences through reflection, conceptualization and experimentation in developing more complex ways of viewing consumers as they learn counseling skills (Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003; Ivey & Ivey, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992).

Through the supervisory process supervisees learn micro-skills and professional conduct. The following counseling micro-skills are focused on in supervision: rapport building, opening and closing sessions, active listening, attending, reflection of feelings, summarization, paraphrasing, open questions, use of silence, confrontation and identify conflict (Ivey & Ivey, 2003). To facilitate growth supervisors model appropriate counseling behaviors of empathy,

respect, and genuineness while supervisees explore issues involving their values, attitudes and beliefs (Torres-Rivera, Wilbur, Maddux, Smaby, Phan, & Roberts-Wilbur, 2002).

A study conducted by Melchert et al. (1996) investigating models of counselor development and self-efficacy concluded that a counselor's level of experience contributed to higher levels of self-efficacy in counseling skills. Bandura's (1977b) self-efficacy theory, asserts that an individual needs to have a sense of competency in their ability of successfully completing a task before advancing to more complex tasks. This sense of competence of successful completion will dictate if a task is attempted or not and how much effort and time an individual spends on the task. Research has shown that counseling experience and training can have a confirming impact on perceived self-efficacy of a developing counselor (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Tang et al., 2004).

Melchert et al., (1996) developed a self-efficacy instrument to assess self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977b) with counselors of varied levels of development (first-year master level, second-year master level, doctoral level third-sixth year, and psychologists). Bandura's logic follows that a counselors self-efficacy increases as their level of experience grows, which causes their counseling skills to improve. The level of experience of the 138 participants used in Melchert's et al. study ranged from first-year counseling students in psychology to licensed psychologists. The researchers developed the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (CSES), a 20 question self-report measure of the knowledge and skills associated with both individual and group counseling. Melchert et al. based the scale items on literature reviews of counselor competencies. The authors used a professional review by three counseling psychologist to evaluate content validity. The Self-Efficacy Inventory (S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983) was used to evaluate the convergent construct validity of the measure (correlation CSES & S-EI; $r =$

.83) and the internal consistency of the measure was .91. The one-week test-retest reliability coefficient was .85.

The results showed high correlations between CSES scores and level of counselor training and experience. This study supported the developmental model of counseling supervision finding higher levels of self-efficacy consistent with the four advancing levels of counselors. The results are consistent with Larson's et al. (1992) conclusion that beginning practicum students had significantly lower scores of self-efficacy than both master level counselors and practicing psychologists.

In examining two of the eight domains within the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987), Leach and Stoltenberg (1997) studied the intervention skills competence and the individual differences domains of the model. The two domains depict constructs essential to counseling stage development model. An important concept of the IDM is that supervisees will perform at different levels across the various domains.

The study used the Counseling Self-Estimate (COSE; Larson, 1990; Larson et al., 1992) a measure using declarative statements that supervisees judge their beliefs regarding their abilities in five areas of counseling: micro-skills, process skills, difficult consumer behaviors, cultural competence and awareness of values. Gathering data from 142 master and doctoral counseling students from four different areas in the United States the researchers found that higher level-two supervisees had higher scores of self-efficacy in the areas of micro-skills, understanding, processing issues and increased proficiency with the difficult consumer behaviors than level-one supervisees. The results also showed that the higher-level supervisees had responded better to culturally diverse consumers than level-one supervisees. The authors claimed that understanding

their own values more deeply in earlier stages of training can create higher levels of self-understanding and self-efficacy (Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997).

Tang et al. (2004) collected data which revealed that students from accredited CACREP programs had higher levels of self-efficacy than counselors who were in programs that were not accredited. A sample of 116 counseling students from three accredited and three non-accredited programs yielded a moderate effect size in counseling anxiety reactions, completing assessments using a clinical interview, counseling adjustment reactions, and counseling affective disorders. Using the Self-Efficacy Inventory (S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983) the authors found that the length of internship hours and prior related experiences to counseling would increase students' self-efficacy. Counselors who were not from accredited programs had more anxiety, affection adjustment, and assessment difficulties.

The researchers found that increased clinical training and experience obtained from accredited programs in which specific courses, practicum and internship experiences could equip and introduce counseling students to an array of counseling situations resulting in an increased level of student self-efficacy. Tang et al. (2004) concluded that students with more course work, internship hours and experience in the related job function possessed a greater sense of competence in developing counseling skills. Counselors' prior experience and involvement in specific work related functions helped them to develop confidence in their performance.

Results from a study conducted by Cashwell and Dooley (2001) suggested that supervision heightens skills of professional counselors. The study used 33 participants, 11 who did not receive supervision and 22 that did receive supervision. The pool of participants consisted of 29 who worked in community mental health and four counseling doctoral students. Scores from Larson et al. (1992) Counseling Self-Efficacy Inventory (COSE) showed that

counselors receiving supervision had a mean score of 185.6 while counselors without supervision had a mean score of 167.4. Higher scores on the COSE indicate a greater level of counseling self-efficacy. The researchers found statistically significant differences among counselors receiving supervision and counselors without supervision.

The appropriate use of supervision has a major impact on the skill development of the supervisee. As supervisees develop counseling skills, supervisors need to begin using more challenging strategies to implement further growth and development of the supervisee. Leach and Stoltenberg (1997), Larson et al. (1992), and Melchert et al. (1996) found that higher skilled level-two counselors had higher scores of self-efficacy than level-one, less skilled supervisees. Counselors that received clinical supervision had higher levels of self-efficacy than counselors that did not receive counseling supervision (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001) and supervisees with more course work, internship hours and experience in the related job function possessed a greater sense of competence in developing counseling skills (Tang et al., 2004). Bandura's (1977b) self-efficacy theory, asserts that an individual needs to have a sense of competency in their ability of successfully completing a task before advancing to more complex tasks. Bandura's theory purports that a counselor's self-efficacy increases as the level of experience increases causing their counseling skills to improve (Larson et al., 1992; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert et al., 1996).

Developmental Model

The field of rehabilitation has adopted many theory-based models of counseling supervision from psychology resulting in a void of specific strategies relevant in the field of rehabilitation (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz et al., 1999). No model of supervision has been shown to be superior to others (Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007; White & Russell, 1995). Many

experts support a developmental approach, gauging the needs and developmental level through the process of assessment and closely monitoring interventions (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Hogan, 1964; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Loganbill et al., 1982; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994).

The developmental models postulates that beginner counselors progress through different stages or levels continuing to develop more complex skills requiring supervisors to adopt different styles, strategies and approaches at the advancing levels (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). Supervisees move from needing a highly structured learning environment to less as they advance in levels. In Ashby's (as cited in Stoltenberg, 2005) qualitative study in which beginner counselors identified themselves as being dependent on their supervisors for detailed instruction and had little self-awareness. Ashby's study supported the developmental model in the areas of intervention skills, interpersonal assessment, and theoretical orientation. Ashby found that it was not until the end of the academic school year that students claimed they were beginning to have conflict in the area of dependency versus autonomy with supervisors.

An early developmental model theorized by Hogan (1964) claimed that there are four levels of counselor development. The beginner counselor is viewed as being unstable, insecure with high levels of anxiety. The second level was conflicted regarding their dependency-autonomy. The third level was seen to have self-confidence and stability. The final level Hogan named the master psychologist seen as self-confident and personally autonomous. Hogan

concluded that the supervision environment needs to be matched to the developmental needs of the student and should foster supervisee growth at every level.

Stoltenberg (1981) supported Hogan's (1964) assertions and believed that as development occurs the student counselor becomes more cognitively complex. Stoltenberg developed the counselor complexity model adding more detail of how supervisors can facilitate growth. At the first level, supervisors use structure, encouragement, and promote independence. The second level, allowing for increased autonomy, supervisors present new material and feedback that student's can make cognitive choices to use or not use. In the third level, a more collegial relationship develops and in the final level, master counselor level, consultation occurs on an as needed basis (Worthington, 1987).

Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth (1982) constructed a three level model of counselor development: stagnation, confusion, and integration. These three levels are similar to those developed by Hogan (1964) and Stoltenberg (1981). Loganbill et al. (1982) incorporated eight areas relevant to developmental conceptualization in this model. These areas included: competence, emotional awareness, autonomy, theoretical identity, respect for individual differences, purpose and direction, personal motivation, and professional ethics. Loganbill et al. viewed these eight areas as critical for supervisees to resolve on their path toward master psychologist.

Recognizing that supervisees can be at varied levels of development for different counseling behaviors Stoltenberg and Delworth (1987) revised and expanded on Stoltenberg's (1981) complexity model. The authors developed the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987) involving three overriding structures that follow supervisees as they advance through four levels of development across eight specific domains. The three

important structures are: self and other awareness, motivation, and dependency-autonomy. The eight domains are: intervention skills, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, client conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plans and goals, and professional ethics. Supervisees advance through the four levels of development requiring a different supervisor reaction at the advancing levels (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994).

Maki and Delworth (1995) stated that Stoltenberg et al., (1987) Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) is appropriate and can be adapted to the rehabilitation counseling field. Maki and Delworth developed the Structured Developmental Model (SDM) based on the IDM. The SDM creators restructured Stoltenberg et al. eight domains into two main categories relevant to rehabilitation counseling supervision: primary and process domains. The primary domain category consists of three areas considered important to all counselors: sensitivity to individual differences, theoretical orientation, and professional ethics. The process domain category consists of five areas of rehabilitation counselor tasks: interpersonal assessment, using the supervisory relationship to assess consumers' unique characteristics; individual consumer assessment in their environments, understanding the environmental impact of disability and assess consumer's needs; case conceptualization, viewing consumers holistically; the development of goals, plans and benchmarks; and finally intervention strategies. Supervisees are evaluated on the three primary domains as they advance through the developmental levels and the five process domains.

Maki and Delworth (1995) briefly describe some of the supervisor and supervisee behaviors common at the different levels supervisee function. Although usually highly motivated, level-one rehabilitation counselors tend to have high levels of anxiety and look to supervisors for support and direction. Skovholt and Ronnestad (2003) found that the lack of professional confidence increases anxiety when complex situations surface in the counseling session. Anxiety prevents the counselor from attending to the consumer as he or she focuses on self. The level-one counselors look to the supervisors to show them the correct path to mastery. Due to a lack of skill and self-confidence the level-one supervisee's were dependent on supervisors for support and direction.

In the level-two rehabilitation counselors the focus on self begins to diminish and a deeper more sensitive understanding of the consumer is likely to emerge. This statement is in agreement with previous research claims that during development students move from concrete experiences through reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation in finding more abstract ways of viewing consumers as they learn counseling skills (Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003; Ivey & Ivey, 2003; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). The increased understanding and awareness of the challenges of the work a level-two and level-one counselor behaviors may not be viewed as drastically different from one another. This sense of challenge recognized by a level-two supervisee can have an impact on his or her motivational level. The motivational level of a level-two counselor can fluctuate due to an increased awareness of the complexities of counseling. This level of counselor may struggle with a dependency-autonomy conflict with the supervisor. The student may begin to challenge the supervisors' decisions and reject direction. Although dependent on strong support and direction at this level supervisees begin to seek greater autonomy.

Finally, level-two fluctuating attributes begin to diminish and the level-three rehabilitation counselor is capable of viewing self and has an awareness of others. A much deeper understanding of both self and others is achieved. At this level of functioning supervisees are developing their own personal counseling style. They look for greater autonomy while recognizing that at different times there is a need for consultation and opinions of other more experienced professionals. Finally, the level-four or integrated counselor level viewed as the master counselor has developed and merged their own personal style with a deep understanding of methods, interventions, and strategies useful in working with persons with disabilities.

Summary. Developmental models render a purposeful structure for how supervisors can identify changes in supervisee behaviors. The model presents a conceptual road map for the implementation of potential methods, strategies, and styles to facilitate growth. The research shows a consensus of the developmental models view of level-one supervisees being in need of high structure and direction, and level-three, the more advanced counselors need for greater autonomy and less structure (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Hogan, 1964; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Loganbill et al., 1982; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benshoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). Ashby's (as cited in Stoltenberg, 2005, p.5) qualitative study beginner counselors identified themselves as being dependent on their supervisors for detailed instruction and had little self-awareness. Supervision is a crucially important function at all levels of counselor development and needs to continue throughout the practitioner's career (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Schultz et al., 2002; Stoltenberg et al., 2010).

Personal Development

Professional Obligation. There are ethical obligations for graduate programs to monitor and evaluate the personal development of counseling students. CORE states that the sensitivity in training will promote "cultural competence, and promote personal growth and introduce students to counseling approaches and rehabilitation issues that affect service delivery" (CORE, Sec. D.1, 2010). Other counseling regulatory bodies have requirements for programs to monitor students' professional and personal development. The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) mandates that counselor educators and supervisors have an obligation to monitor student personal and professional competence (ACES, 2010). CACREP require programs to conduct systematic review of academic, professional and personal development of the student (CACREP, 2010).

Competency. Students beginning their first practicum experience often question their capabilities as a counselor. They may try to hide their fears and in many cases supervisors will not readily identify that a personal problem exists (Emerson & Markos, 1996; Hensley & Haag-Granello, 2006; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). Students gain knowledge through the academic course work, but lack counseling skills and experience, creating anxiety and even fear (Heller-Levitt, 2002). Skovholt and Ronnestad (2003) found that the absence of professional confidence increases anxiety when situations that are more complex surface in the counseling session. Anxiety prevents the counselor from attending to the consumer as they focus on themselves.

Falender et al. (2004) discussed the findings of an expert workgroup paneled at the Competencies Conference: Future Directions in Education and Credentialing in Professional Psychology (2004) to address counseling supervision competencies, training, and assessments. The group worked to achieve a consensus on competency standards to move the profession to

more criterion based evaluations. The group recognized the need for supervisors to use the developmental model, assessing the learning needs of the student. The workgroup advised the use of a more structured, didactic approach with inexperienced counselors (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Hogan, 1964; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Loganbill et al., 1982; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). Despite the general acceptance of the developmental model, research shows that supervisors commonly use a collaborative or relationship focused approach irrespective of the developmental level of the supervisee (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Herbert & Ward, 1990; Ladany et al., 2001; Morgan & Sprenkle, 2007; Prieto, 1998; Usher & Borders, 1993). The task-oriented approach is the least favored over the attractive or interpersonally sensitive style.

The expert workgroup developed five factors that affect all aspects of the supervisory process. The five factors are: competency is a life-long developmental process; diversity; legal and ethical issues; professional and personal development; self-reflection and peer assessment. Personal reflection of individual values, beliefs, biases and conflicts along with an understanding of the contextual factors of the community, social, socioeconomic circumstances, attitudes and values are recommended points to assess in training.

Development. There is sparse information regarding how to integrate the professional and personal-self (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; 2003). The concept of personal development is vague and assessment is difficult. The ambiguous and subjective assessment leaves counseling programs and supervisees in jeopardy. Many theories ignore life experiences before graduate training and fail to identify appropriate stages of counselor development (Spruill

& Benschhoff, 2000; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992). Cultivating supervisees' personal development in supervision is important considering that the lack of personal development can impede counseling skill development. Counselors in training need to explore issues of attitudes, values, beliefs and skills that are necessary to facilitate growth (Torres-Rivera et al., 2002).

In their delineation of the signs and symptoms of professional distress Emerson and Markos (1996) differentiate between distress and impairment. The investigators recognize distress as something counselors are at some level aware that they have a problem. Impairment is attached to distress, but in many cases due to impairment, the counselor is not cognizant of the problem. It would be fair to presume that unresolved distress can lead to full blown impairment.

In the literature regarding student dismissal, retention and due process Hensley et al., (2003) found that problems first begin when programs perform student evaluations on an as-needed basis. Students will work very hard to cover up and minimize any incompetence. If there is an absence of regular monitoring of a supervisees personal development dysfunctional, maladaptive issues may not be identified. The researchers conclude that it is imperative that educators formulate a consensus on particular personal and professional competencies.

In developing a stage model of counselor development Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992) conducted 100 interviews using 23 semi-structured interview questions. The qualitative study focused on the synthesis of professional and personal-self of a counselor. The authors sought information on the important components of supervision involving supervisees of varying levels of development. Participants' experience levels ranged from first year of graduate training to 40 years of work experience. Following a process of refinement the authors elicited

20 themes from the interviews that fell into four categories: primary characteristic, process descriptor, source of influence and secondary characteristic.

The study's interview questionnaire examined professional development and considered sources of both professional and personal influences. Skovholt and Ronnestad (1992) found that difficult and normative life experiences impact professional and personal development. Participants discussed the worth of their own personal suffering and deprivation. The participants stated that their own personal experiences were extremely productive, enlightening, and empowering for their work in counseling. One of the themes developed states that personal life greatly influences professional functioning. The 20 themes identified in this analysis indicated that development follows a path from a dependence on an extraneous monitoring process to a more personal internal function. This process takes place overtime and through interacting with many sources of influence.

Spruill and Benschhoff (2000) presented several strategies of incorporating supervisee development and supervisee development of a personal theory of counseling. The researchers support the developmental approach and state that educators and supervisors need to use appropriate behaviors dependent on the developmental needs of the supervisees (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). Spruill and Benschhoff (2000) point out that material presented in earlier phases should be unambiguous and that early theory-building can help supervisees merge related course work and training with a better understanding of their personal values and beliefs.

Spruill and Benshoff's (2000) model consists of three phases of development: phase-one, personal beliefs (pre-training); phase-two, counseling theories (training); and phase-three, personal theory of counseling (post-training). The personal belief (pre-training) phase begins when students begin their graduate course work. During this phase, supervisees begin to explore their knowledge from previous real life experiences. The model proposes an emphasis on the personal beliefs of the student increasing their awareness of self and others. The model uses in-class exercises, constructing small group discussions sharing information about personal beliefs and worldviews. Surveys and questionnaires can be introduced to ignite the conversation. Strategies to help students begin meaningful introspection and self-reflection can lay the foundation for a deeper understanding of self.

In the second-phase, counseling theories (training) students begin to incorporate their innate abilities and strategies of helping with material presented from graduate course work. At this phase students begin to identify support for and defend particular counseling theories while continuing to evaluate their personal beliefs. Students review their personal beliefs and identify the beliefs and counseling orientations of their peers. Similar to phase-one, in-class exercises can help to integrate different counseling theories with the advanced knowledge of the students' personal beliefs. Researchers have developed useful charts that show different counseling theories associated with personal beliefs that can be used in-class or for a formal paper. It is also suggested that students meet with and discuss issues related to counselor development with practicing counselors. The model recommends assigning a formal paper in which students discuss their personal beliefs explaining the origin and the effect that the beliefs have on their lives.

In the final-phase three, the personal theory of counseling student begins their first counseling experience (post-training). The beginner counselor works to merge their course work material, personal beliefs, and counseling theories. Students are asked theory building questions that promote student introspection and reflection either in class or during supervision.

Through this process, Spruill and Benschhoff (2000) asserted that supervisees will develop a better understanding of their own personal beliefs while developing their own personal approach towards counseling. There are two important components of this model: the in class instruction and personal reflection and introspection. These components can aid students to better understand that development involves both the professional and the personal-self.

Counsel Skill and Personal Development Rating Form

In an attempt to bolster the relevance of group supervision in counseling training programs, Wilbur (1991) developed the Structured Group Supervision (SGS) model based on individual clinical supervision. Following course activities purported to mirror that which occurs during individual clinical supervision the authors conducted a pilot study using the author developed Counselor Skill and Personal Development Rating Form (CSPD-RF; Wilbur, 1991) to test the effectiveness of the SGS group model of supervision. The SGS model represents expected phases that beginner counselors move through. Phase-one is the request for assistance period. Phase-two is the questioning and identification of focus. Phase-three involves feedback and the fourth is the supervisee response. Supervisees were assessed prior to the semester and implementation of the SGS model and at the end of the semester.

The CSPD-RF was used in pre-test and post-test analysis of the counseling skills and personal development of experimental and control groups. Data was collected from 194 master-level counseling students over seven years. A significant difference between the two groups was

found, $t(19) = 25.66, p < .001$. The study used new inexperienced counselors and taking into account the developmental considerations the findings indicate that the CSPD-RF has appropriately detected expected differences of higher scores on the post-test than pre-test supporting the efficacy of the SGS model for group supervision.

Torres-Rivera et al. (2002) conducted an exploratory factor analysis using data collected from 248 counseling students from CORE accredited programs. The purpose of the study was to establish construct validity of the CSPD-RF through a factor analysis. Wilbur, Robert-Wilbur, Morris, Betz, and Hart (1994) claimed that the CSPD-RF evaluates two factors: counseling skills and personal development. Torres-Rivera et al., (2002) factor analysis generated four factors (emotional sensitivity, basic listening skills, multicultural skills, and influencing skills) from the two subscales of the CSPD-RF. The four factors represent 58.4% of the total variance.

The CSPD-RF is a 20-item self-report measure consisting of ten items purported to measure personal development, and ten items purported to measure counseling skills development (Wilbur et al., 1994). The four factors developed from Torres-Rivera et al., (2002) factor analysis has factors one (emotional sensitivity) and factor three (multicultural skills) as representing the personal development subscale of the CSPD-RF and factors two (basic listening skills) and factor four (influencing skills) representing the counseling skills development subscale.

Prior research on the CSPD-RF has neglected to show any reliability and only faint validity. The researchers' conclude that the factor analysis performed in the Torres-Rivera et al., (2002) study defends Wilbur (1991) and Wilbur et al., (1994) assertions concerning the structural validity of the measure. The intended use of the CSPD-RF was to find areas that could enhance counseling performance. Torres-Rivera et al., (2001) stated that personal

development is essential in developing the multicultural counseling skills of future counselors. Although additional evidence of the CSPD-RF reliability and validity are needed, the authors suggest the tool could be used to assess training program effectiveness or interventions implemented to address deficiencies.

Summary. Counseling programs have an ethical obligation to monitor and assess the personal development of their students. There is very little research and few assessment tools to evaluate the personal development of counselors (Skovholt et al., 1992a; Skovholt et al., 2003; Hensley et al., 2003). Hensley et al, (2003) recommended the development of research-based standards and consensus on specific personal developmental competencies and benchmarks. Student counselors have made a major commitment spent a great deal of time and money in graduate school and acknowledging that they are having a problem could be threatening to them. Admitting difficulties can be seen as an admission of failure and any deficiency can jeopardize continued practice (Emerson & Markos, 1996). This unwillingness to come forward with problems is one of the reasons why a more systematic approach in assessing personal development is necessary. Without appropriate evaluation and monitoring that explores personal aspects of students' lives, the impaired counselor can go undetected.

Personal development is one of five factors identified as affecting all aspects of the supervisory process (Falender et al., 2004). Many programs and theories ignore life experiences before graduate training and neglect to assess the appropriate developmental level of the students. There is worth in life experience and both difficult and normative experiences have an impact on the professional and personal development of a counselor (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000). Personal development is considered to be essential in

developing general counseling skills (Torres-Rivera et al., 2001) and multicultural counseling skills of counselors (Torres-Rivera et al., 2002).

Spruill and Benshoff (2000) presented several strategies of incorporating supervisee development and supervisee development of a personal theory of counseling. Using a developmental approach and promoting students to evaluate their personal value, and beliefs while assessing different counseling theories. The authors begin introducing introspection and self-reflection during course work prior to practicum. Spruill and Benshoff begin with basic discussions of personal values and beliefs to more complex ways in later stages of development using self-reflection and introspection.

Sex of Supervisee

Nelson and Holloway (1990) found that there are some negative implications involving female supervisees. The researchers' identified differences in treatment and behavior related to the sex of the supervisees. The structure and communication between male and female supervisors and supervisees can impact supervisee development. In Nelson and Holloway (1990) content analysis investigating power and involvement results exposed that female supervisees relinquish issues of power and submit to the supervisor more frequently than male supervisees. Surprisingly, the research indicated that supervisors from both sexes do not empower and support female supervisees in the same way they do male supervisees. The sex of the supervisee can have a major impact on how the supervisor and supervisee interact. Participants for Nelson and Holloway's (1990) study were from a wide variety of counseling settings. There were 20 male and 20 female supervisors along with 20 male and 20 female supervisees used in the research. Audio taped sessions from the 40 supervisory dyads were collected and transcribed. Categories designated as of high power, low power, and high

involvements were developed. The authors assessed the probabilities of certain behaviors or actions taking place and if any patterns can be identified.

The results of the analysis indicated that female supervisees relinquish issues of power and submit to the supervisor more frequently than male supervisees, and that supervisors from both sexes do not empower and support female supervisees in the same way they do male supervisees. The negative implication for female supervisees is that their interactions with supervisors are not only different from that of male supervisees, but they are also conducting themselves differently by relinquishing power that male supervisees do not relinquish.

In a study by Granello et al., (1997) investigating gender and counseling supervision found support for Nelson and Holloway's (1990) research. In this study a content analysis of transcribed audio tapes of supervisory sessions from 20 supervisory dyads were obtained. The session discussions were analyzed and the authors' developed 11 categories of evaluation. A few of the 11 categories are: supervisor gives supportive communication, supervisor asks for opinions or suggestions, supervisor gives opinions, supervisee requests information, supervisee gives information.

The results indicated that supervisors from both sexes asked female supervisees less for their views, impressions, and input than they did male supervisees. The research also showed that in dyads lasting longer than one year with female supervisees; the supervisors gave more opinions and suggestions than other dyad's with females that lasted only six months. The opposite was found for male supervisees. The final interaction was that dyad's lasting for longer than one year; female supervisees gave significantly less opinions than dyad's less than six months. Again, the opposite was found for male supervisees.

Although several limitations to this study were noted, Granello et al. (1997) concluded that a developmental model of counseling supervision is not experienced by female supervisees. As for male supervisees, with support and direction diminishing and being given control and empowered as the length of the dyad relationship increased, the developmental approach was experienced by the male supervisees.

Walker, Ladany, and Pate-Carolan (2007) investigated if gender-related events (GRE) occur in counseling supervision. A gender-related event (GRE) is defined as an event that occurs in a supervisory session that the supervisee experienced as being related to the supervisees' sex or consumers' sex, the social construct of gender, or stereotypical assumptions regarding sex. The GRE's were developed as the participants were furnished with samples of potential GRE's, both positive and negative. There were four categories of supportive GRE's developed and five categories non-supportive GRE's. The researchers were interested in the perspectives of female supervisees and sampled 111 female supervisees from a variety of counseling programs and settings across the country. The authors looked to see what affect supportive and non-supportive GRE's had on the supervisory dyad and supervisees' willingness to self-disclosure.

Walker, et al. (2007) used the Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee version (WAI-T) developed by Bahrnick (1990) to measure the strength of the supervisory relationship. The WAI-T is a 36-item survey measuring three constructs: mutual agreement on goals, mutual agreement on tasks, and an emotional bond or rapport. Walker et al. (2007) established internal consistency measures of .98 for the overall WAI-T score; goal=.94; bond=.94; task=.93. The authors developed the Trainee Disclosure Scale (TDS) that identified 13 categories that supervisees' preferred not to disclose.

Walker et al. (2007) found that the supportive GRE's were associated with a strong bond and agreement on the tasks of supervision measured by the WAI-T. The results suggest that supervisors should be proactive and address issues related to the sexual identity of the dyad. Supervisors that have made non-supportive stereotypical statements can negatively impact female supervisees' who may internalize these stereotypes and adopt this mindset with female consumers. Supervisors that dismissed GRE discussions brought up by female supervisees had less agreement on the tasks of supervision. The non-supportive GRE's negatively impact the supervisory relationship personally, emotionally, and the ability to develop a collaborative working relationship. Supervisees that stated they had received supportive GRE's had self-disclosed significantly more than the supervisees who stated they received non-supportive GRE's. Walker et al., (2007) stated that the non-supportive GRE's can prevent female supervisees from achieving a comfort level within the supervisory environment that allows them the capacity to self-disclose.

There are several negative implications for female counseling supervisees. Supervisors of both sexes do not properly empower and support female supervisees in the same way that they do male supervisees negatively affecting female supervisee development. Following a developmental model of supervision less support and direction and increased autonomy was afforded male supervisees. Conversely, female supervisees received more support and direction as the supervisory relationship continued over time contrary to the developmental approach (Granello et al., 1997).

Summary

The preceding chapter presented information related to the multidimensional nature of counseling supervision recognized by researchers. The review discussed the importance of the

developmental model of counseling supervision considering both the personal learning and professional developmental needs of the supervisee. Although no model of supervision has been proven superior over others the widespread acceptance of the developmental model of counseling supervision and specifically in rehabilitation counseling supervision was presented.

The supervisors' style of supervision was examined and factors that influence supervisee development were considered. The propensity for counseling supervisors to use the attractive/collaborator style of supervision was uncovered. The possible overuse of the socially acceptable attractive/collaborator style of supervision was discussed. Supervisors tend to utilize the attractive approach irrespective of the developmental level of the supervisee. Research indicates that a more didactic approach be used with beginning counselors. Negative outcomes result when rigid supervisors limit themselves to just one style of supervision ignoring the personal learning and developmental needs of the supervisee.

The supervisees' anxiety and lack of self-efficacy were discussed in relationship to counseling skill acquisition and personal development. The chapter elaborated on some of the ambiguity involved in assessing the personal development of the supervisee. The need to establish a core set of competencies to monitor and assess the personal development of the supervisee was presented. The call for systematic evaluation process regarding personal development and the negative implication of monitoring personal development on an "as needed" basis was explained. Some of the negative implications for female supervisees were detailed. The lack of empowerment and autonomy female supervisees experience can impede female counselors' development.

The following chapter will present the methodology used in the study, the design of the study, sample, procedures, instruments, and the data collection and analysis sections. Chapter

four presents the results of the analysis followed chapter five which includes a discussion of the results, recommendations, conclusions and the limitations and delimitations of the study. This manuscript will end with a list of tables, a list of references, and the appendices section.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The focus of this research was to replicate the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) study which used CACREP accredited counseling students with a study examining a population of CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling students. The present study used the SSI with a population of rehabilitation counselors to assess the relationship between the supervisory styles, counseling skill, and personal development level (CSPD-RF) perceived by supervisee. The supervisees' perceptions were collected using a self report measure. For greater insight into the personal characteristics of the counseling students the years of prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisees were examined.

The first chapter of this manuscript introduced the study presenting background information, purpose, and significance of the study. The second chapter reviewed relevant literature involving the supervisory styles, self-efficacy, counseling skills, personal development of the supervisee, and the sex of the supervisees. In the current chapter the methodology used in the study will be discussed, including the sampling, procedures, instruments, and the data collection and analysis. Chapter four the results of the analysis will be presented followed by chapter five which includes a discussion of the results, recommendations, conclusions, and the limitations and delimitations of the study. This document will end with a list of tables, a list of references, and the appendices.

Design of the Study

The current study utilized a survey research design. The data was gathered via web-based survey resource. Participants were contacted through email and were given access to both instruments used and the demographic questionnaire at a secure online survey website. Rhodes,

Bowie, and Hergenrather (2003) pointed out that as electronic communication grows web-based data collection will become a much more utilized mode of collecting data. There are many advantages to collecting data via the World Wide Web. Self report survey research does not measure or assess actual performance. Online data collection allows researchers to rapidly access large pools of potential study participants. Convenient access to research materials fosters uninhibited openness and greater participation (Rhodes et al., 2003). Using survey data allows researchers to gather data quickly and inexpensively (Kazdin, 2003).

The dependent variables for the current study were the supervisees' self-perceived counseling skill and the second dependent variable was personal development measured by scores from the CSPD-RF. The independent variable was the supervisees' perceived style of supervision used by the supervisor measured by the Supervisory Styles Inventory Trainee Version (SSI-T; Friedlander & Ward, 1984), the prior counseling experience of the supervisee in years, and the sex of the supervisees will be gathered through a demographic questionnaire.

Research Questions

1. Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees?
2. Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?
3. Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE

accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees?

4. Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?

Sample

The population for the current study consisted of all currently enrolled practicum students from Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) accredited rehabilitation counseling training programs completing their practicum in the Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters. The study's sample was drawn from an unknown number of potential participants from 93 CORE-accredited rehabilitation counseling programs. All designated faculty contact persons listed in the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE) member directory were contacted via email requesting they encourage their students to participate in this study. The designated faculty contact persons were asked to forward to all currently enrolled practicum students the email containing the study cover letter, informed consent information, a link to the secure web-based survey resource where two instruments and a demographic questionnaire were available.

To determine the appropriate number of participants for this study a power analysis has been conducted. Statistical power refers to the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when the null hypothesis is actually false (Kazdin, 2003). The computer software, G-power 3.1, was used to conduct the analysis. G-power is a commonly used power analysis program for many different statistical tests in social and behavioral research (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2009).

Information needed to conduct a power analysis are the number of predictor variables used in the study, desired power, estimated effect size, and alpha level (Faul et al., 2009). Generally, power is recommended to be 0.8 or greater meaning that there should be an 80% or greater chance of finding a statistically significant difference when there is one (Howell, 2009). The effect size is a measure of the magnitude of an experimental effect (Huck, 2008). Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003) established effect sizes to be .02 (small), .15 (moderate), and .35 (large). In multiple regression analysis using multiple predictors a moderate effect size is recommended (Howell, 2009). The alpha level for this study of .05 has been adjusted to accommodate for the inflated alpha due to the multiple comparisons. The Bonferroni procedure of dividing the alpha level by the number of comparisons ($.05/2=.025$) and using that alpha level for the study was used (Howell, 2009). Utilizing the number of predictors (5), with high statistical power (0.8) and an estimated moderate effect size (.15), with an alpha level of .025, the power analysis using G-power software established that 107 participants were needed for the current study. There were 146 responses, but only 129 were used in the study.

Procedures

After securing permission from Southern Illinois University Carbondale Human Subjects Committee, approval from NCRE was obtained. All rehabilitation counseling training program designated faculty contact persons listed with the NCRE were contacted via email. All programs listed with the NCRE were contacted, but only CORE accredited were retained. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) required a minimum of four formal university based supervisory sessions for participation in their study. Based on the semester system used by several of the universities in the study the current study began contacting participants after approximately the 6th week of the semester. At approximately the 7th week of the fall semester 2011 all designated faculty

contact persons listed with the NCRE received via email the pre-notice of research participation request (Appendix A). This email discussed the focus of the study and the contact person's involvement in forwarding emails containing the research materials to other faculty supervising practicum students or directly to the students. The pre-notice request also informed them of follow up procedures explaining future contacts and correspondence.

Approximately the 8th week of the semester the designated faculty contact person received the initial research participation request via email (Appendix A-Correspondence). This email consisted of a cover letter detailing the scope of the investigation and requested faculty to encourage their students to participate in this study. This email discussed the parameters of the study and requested they forward the email to all current practicum students enrolled in practicum in the Fall and Spring semesters or corresponding quarters. The designated faculty contact person was also asked to reply to the email and confirm their willingness to participate and convey how many current practicum students they had enrolled in practicum during the current semester. In the initial research participation request for the Fall semester, designated faculty contact persons were informed that they would receive one follow up research participation request and a final research participation request via email. Due to low response rates in the early weeks of data collection permission to extend the previously approved data collection period and to include additional contacts was obtained from Southern Illinois University Carbondale Human Subjects Committee and the dissertation chairperson. A phone script and an additional follow up email (Appendix A) were approved by the Human Subjects Committee to extend data collection and the period was extended by one month.

In the follow up research participation email request for respondent faculty members, they were thanked for their participation and requested that they again forward the email

containing research materials to currently enrolled practicum students (Appendix A). The designated faculty contact persons who did not respond to the previous contact attempts received the non-respondent designated faculty contact email (Appendix A) explaining that this is the second request for their assistance and a second copy of research materials to be forwarded to their currently enrolled practicum students. One week after the first follow up email all non-respondent designated faculty contacts at that point were contacted via telephone. The phone script asked the designated faculty contact to send the research materials previously emailed to them to currently enrolled practicum students. Voicemail messages of the phone script were left for faculty members that were not available for the phone call.

One week after the follow up phone contacts, all participating faculty members (non-respondent and respondent faculty members) were sent the additional follow up research participation request email. As in the first follow up email, respondent faculty contact persons were thanked for their participation and requested that they, once again, forward the email containing research materials to their currently enrolled practicum students (Appendix A). The designated faculty contact persons who did not respond to the previous email contacts received the additional follow up research participation request for non-respondent faculty email (Appendix A) explaining previous contact attempts and requested their assistance in forwarding research materials to their currently enrolled practicum students. Follow up contact continued until the required numbers of responses were obtained.

At the end of the Fall semester the required number of responses needed for high power (0.8) was not obtained. It was decided to continue data collection into the following semester (Spring) until the required number of participants was attained. Closely following the same procedures as in the previous semester data was collected until the necessary number of

responses (minimum 107) was obtained. All contacts and correspondences were duplicated and one week after the follow up phone script contact 129 completed responses were attained.

In all designated faculty contact emails and participant cover letter, recipients were informed that participation was voluntary and that they can opt out at anytime. By replying to any of the email contacts and stating that they do not wish to receive any future correspondence the designated faculty contacts email address was removed from the contact list. Circumstances where the designated faculty contact email was returned undeliverable, the NCRE member directory was referenced. The program director or coordinators listed in the NCRE member directory were sent the research materials to forward to faculty members supervising practicum students.

The students who received the forwarded email from the designated faculty contact received the participant cover both as an attachment and in the body of the email detailing the scope of the investigation. Also, the informed consent form explaining participant rights, the limitations of confidentiality and issues of voluntary participation were located in the body of the email and as an attachment. The informed consent form had brief directions for navigating the survey website and a web-link to the research materials.

All surveys and questionnaires: SSI, CSPD-RF, and the Demographic Questionnaire (Appendices B-D) were accessible to the participants on a secure online password protected survey website (Limesurvey.com®) following the initial contact. Limesurvey is a free online web resource with many features helpful to researchers. It allows for an unlimited number of surveys at one time, an unlimited number of questions in a survey, and supports unlimited number of participants. It is offered in various languages, provides opportunity to include 28 different question types (conditional questions, anonymous or non anonymous surveys) and

many other features (Schmitz, 2010). In a review by Engard (2009) Limesurvey was found to have a user friendly interface with highly enhanced import and export function to many statistical applications (i.e., SPSS). This product not only supports over 50 different languages it has screen reader accessibility for users.

The first survey made available on the Limesurvey web resource was the SSI, followed by the CSPD-RF, and lastly the demographic questionnaire. The surveys were available 24 hours a day and accessible until the required number of participants were obtained. The data remained on the secure online survey website until approximately the 8th week of the Spring semester. At that time all data were downloaded by the primary researcher and stored in an encrypted file on a secure password protected computer for analysis. The data collected for this study was available only to the primary researcher and the dissertation committee.

Instruments

Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI). The SSI is a 33-item self-report questionnaire and is recognized as one of the most commonly used and best validated instruments in supervision research (Prieto, 1998). The SSI measures perceptions of the supervisor's use of the three supervisory styles portrayed on the SSI during supervision: attractive, representing a collegial approach (7-items), interpersonally sensitive, representing a therapeutic approach (8-items), and task-oriented, representing a didactic approach (10-items). Although no rationale has been found there are also eight filler questions included in the scale. The 33 subscale questions are scored on a 7-point Likert scale from (1) not very to (7) very. A mean scale index from 1 to 7 is obtained where a higher score on a subscale represents greater support for the style's use (most dominant). See Appendix B for the SSI instrument.

Construct validity was established through convergent validity of the SSI with supervisory roles developed by Stenack and Dye (1982) that were derived from Bernard's Discrimination Model (1979). The initial study by Friedlander and Ward obtained moderate to high positive correlations between the three subscales of the SSI and the three supervisory roles of teacher, counselor, and collaborator developed by Stenack and Dye (1982). Two week, test-retest reliability estimates ranged between .78 and .94. Internal consistency coefficients for the three subscales were .93 attractive, .88 interpersonally sensitive, and .85 task-oriented. Finally, the initial study found item-scale correlations of .70 to .88 for the attractive scale; .51 to .82 for the interpersonally sensitive scale; and .38 to .76 for the task-oriented scale (Friedlander & Ward, 1984). The current study attained internal consistency coefficients of .95 for the task-oriented subscale, .91 for the interpersonally sensitive, and .93 for the attractive. Item-scale correlation range were .72 to .86 for the task-oriented, .66 to .78 for the interpersonally sensitive, and .71 to .82 for the attractive subscale.

Friedlander and Ward (1984) originally developed the SSI for use with a developmental model of supervision. Following a content analysis of transcribed interviews with a diverse group of supervisors the creators developed three subscales of supervisory styles (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented). The tool was designed for use with either supervisors or supervisees. The two forms of the measure are Form-T to be used with trainees and Form-S to be used with supervisors. Other than the direction of the question the two forms are identical. The trainee Form-T asks trainees the style of their current supervisor and Form-S asks supervisors to gauge their own style of supervision. Because the current investigation involves the students' perception Form-T was utilized for this study (Appendix B).

Counselor Skills Personal Development Rating Form (CSPD-RF). The CSPD-RF is an unpublished assessment instrument consisting of two subscales: personal growth and counseling skill development (Appendix C). Originally this tool was constructed to assess the efficacy of the Structured Group Supervision (SGS) model which was based on one-to-one supervision. The CSPD-RF is a 20-item self-report measure. Ten questions are purported to evaluate the personal growth and ten questions evaluate the counseling skill development of the supervisee. The original measure uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from (1) unacceptable to (7) outstanding.

In an exploratory factor analysis conducted by Torres-Rivera et al. (2002) using data collected from 248 counseling students, evidence supporting construct validity of the CSPD-RF was established. Wilbur et al. (1994) asserted that the CSPD-RF evaluates two factors: personal development and counseling skills development. Torres-Rivera et al. (2002) generated four factors (emotional sensitivity, basic listening skills, multicultural skills, and influencing skills) from the two subscales of the CSPD-RF. The four factors explain 58.4% of the total variance. The four factors developed are identified as factor one (emotional sensitivity) and factor three (multicultural skills) representing the personal development subscale of the CSPD-RF and factors two (basic listening skills) and factor four (influencing skills) representing the counseling skill development subscale. The total scores on the measure represent the overall level of functioning of the supervisees. The two subscale scores could be calculated separately: (a) personal development and (b) skills development. Internal consistency for the study was .91 and the split-half reliability estimates were .83 and .84 (Torres-Rivera, 2002). The current study found internal consistency of .96 and split-half reliability estimates of .924 and .925. Torres-Rivera used the modified version of the tool that changes it from a 7-point Likert scale to

a 6-point Likert scale. This modification changes the instrument by eliminating the midpoint scores resulting in a forced-choice format. For a greater level of validity, the current study used the original 7-point Likert scale. Higher scores on the measure suggest higher levels of counseling skills and personal development.

Demographic Questionnaire. Information regarding participants' demographic characteristics was collected. The information included the supervisees' age, supervisee sex, race or ethnicity, type of supervision (group or individual), hours of supervision per week, length of prior counseling experience in years and educational level achieved (Appendix D).

Data Collection and Analysis

In compliance with Southern Illinois University Carbondale Human Subjects Committee (HSC), all data was collected in an appropriate ethical fashion adhering to the standards and guidelines of the HSC. Participants generated from the research participation requests were provided a web-link directing them to the three surveys on the secure password protected server. The informed consent form was included in the participant cover letter forwarded from the designated faculty contact person to the practicum students. The informed consent explained the participant's rights as a volunteer informing the participants that they could refuse to participate or opt out of the study at anytime. At the bottom of the informed consent form was a web-link to a secure online survey resource.

Participants had access to the research tools (Appendix B-D) at a secure online web resource. The order in which the surveys were made available to the respondents was the SSI, the CSPD-RF, and the demographic questionnaire. Respondents were asked to give one answer only for each and all questions on the three surveys. To complete the survey all questions had to be answered to proceed to the next page of questions. Unanswered questions were highlighted in

red text informing participants what questions still needed to be answered. Participants could leave a partially completed survey by clicking the "resume later" button found at the bottom of each page of questions. Partially completed surveys could then be accessed by clicking on the original web-link that brought the participant back to the partially completed survey. No identifiable accounts or passwords needed to be created to ensure anonymity.

No identifiable participant information was collected for this study and all data collected for this study were stored on a secure password protected server. At the time when the initial research participation request (Appendix A) email was sent out to all designated faculty contacts, the three surveys were made available on the secure password protected server. To further ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants Internet Protocol (IP) addresses of the respondents were blocked from the researcher. IP addresses are numbers that identify every computer on the internet. An account with Limesurvey.com® was used as the secure online server for this study. Limesurvey.com® has an option to block the IP addresses protecting the participants' anonymity and confidentiality. Once a survey is begun or completed that computer terminal or IP address is blocked from repeating the survey.

The survey was available 24 hours a day and could be completed on any computer with Internet access. Data was collected for a total of 16 weeks. The data remained on the secure online survey website until the end of the 16th week of data collection. At that time all data was downloaded by the primary researcher and stored in an encrypted file on a secure password protected computer. The data collected for this study was available only to the primary researcher and the dissertation committee.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 19.0) was used to analyze the data. The analysis consisted of using the mean scores from the two subscales of the CSPD-RF

(counseling skill and personal development) as the dependent variables and mean scores of the independent variables, the three subscales of the SSI (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented), along with the prior counseling experience, and the sex of the supervisee. All four research questions were analyzed using two separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses.

Research questions one and two examine the relationship between two continuous variables. RQ1: Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees? RQ2: Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?

RQ3 and RQ4 examine if prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory styles and the self-perceived counseling skill and personal developmental level of the supervisee. RQ3: Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees? RQ4: Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?

A multiple regression analysis consists of one dependent variable (DV) and multiple independent variables (IV; Howell, 2009). The two subscale of the CSPD-RF, counseling skill development, and personal development were the DVs or criterion measures of the two

hierarchical multiple regression analyses. The five IVs or predictor variables used in both analyses were the years of prior counseling experience, the sex of the supervisee, and the three subscales of the SSI (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented). To address an inflated alpha resulting from the repeated measures Bonferroni's procedure of dividing the alpha by the number of comparisons and applying that alpha level to the study was used (Howell, 2009). An alpha level of .05 was divided by 2 to compensate for the two hierarchical multiple regression analysis. Following Bonferroni's procedure an alpha level of .025 was used in the study.

Multiple regression allows for explanations or predictions to be made and assesses multiple independent variables at one time. This procedure produces one multiple correlation coefficient explaining the proportion of variability in the dependent variable that is attributable to all independent variables (Howell, 2009; Huck, 2008). The current study looked for more detailed information regarding the contribution of particular blocks of predictor variables. One way to accomplish this was to control for or hold certain variables or blocks of variables constant.

Using hierarchical or sequential multiple regression allows for the predictor variables to be entered in a particular order or combination producing several multiple correlation coefficients at different stages of data entry. At each stage individual or blocks of independent variables are added and multiple correlation coefficient were computed (Howell, 2009; Huck, 2008). In the first stage of data entry the first block of variables were entered in both hierarchical multiple regression analyses (sex of supervisee and prior counseling experience) creating model one. For the second model the three subscales of the SSI were added to the first block creating model two. The interactions of each moderating variable (sex of supervisee and

prior counseling experience) with each subscale of the SSI (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented) were calculated and interaction variables were generated. The third model consisted of adding the interaction variables calculated to the block one and block two variables creating the final model.

The assumptions associated with multiple regression were tested. The absence of outliers assumption was tested examining univariate and multivariate data for the presence of outliers. The second assumption tested was normality. This assumption purports that the errors of prediction are normally distributed around each predicted dependent variable score. The third assumption tested was multicollinearity. This is identified in multiple regression when very large standard errors for the regression coefficients are found. The procedures discussed by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) were used to test and address any violations of the assumptions. Tests of collinearity examining large standard errors, Cook's distance identify the presence of outliers, and a scatter plot of the residuals was used to examine normality, linearity and homoscedasticity.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The present study replicated research conducted by Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) involving a population of CACREP-accredited general counseling practicum students with data collected from a population of CORE-accredited rehabilitation counseling practicum students. Clinical supervision of practicum students is critically important in counselor development. In the current chapter the results of this study are presented.

The study's sample was comprised of 129 practicum students from an unknown population size from 93 CORE accredited programs listed in the 2010-2011 NCRE member directory. The mean age of participants was 29.4 years and the age range was 22-55 years. Of the 129 participants 83 were female and 46 were male. Among the participants 6 identified themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander, 22 identified themselves as Black/African American, 15 indicated that they were Hispanic/Latino, and 86 were White/Caucasian. There were 106 participants that indicated they received individual supervision, 3 claimed group supervision, and 20 received both individual and group supervision. The mean hours of supervision per-week were 2.2 hours per-week. Of the 129 completed surveys, 93 participants indicated that they had no prior counseling experience, and 36 indicated that they had some counseling experience. Among 129 participants 119 had bachelors degrees and 10 had masters degrees (for additional information see Tables 1-3).

Respondents' highest mean score on the three SSI subscales (task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive) indicated the most dominant supervisory style perceived to be used during supervision. The attractive style was identified most often as the dominant

style of supervision (N=105). The interpersonally sensitive style was the next highest identified style (N=13), followed by the least identified dominant style, the task-oriented (N=11).

Data Preparation

There were 146 total responses in the current study, 11 of which were incomplete and not used in the analysis. Six responses were excluded due to questions regarding the respondent's understanding of the study. For example, respondents who identified themselves as being at the doctorate level for the highest educational level achieved question on the demographic questionnaire were excluded. During the data collection process the principal researcher was contacted by one of the designated faculty contacts who requested that they be removed from the follow up contact list explaining that they had completed the survey. There was a second designated faculty member email contact that questioned whether they were to complete the survey or their students. These correspondences indicated that there may have been some confusion involving respondents that identified as doctoral level.

In examining the data and testing the assumptions of the analysis the six doctorate responses were closely examined. In reviewing other demographic questions answered by the six respondents that indicated doctorate level, the question involving the amount of supervision per-week raised more concerns. There were responses that indicated no supervision while others indicated considerably more hours of supervision per-week (10 hours per-week). It was unclear whether the doctorate responses were actual practicum students or designated faculty member contacts completing the survey in error. It was decided to exclude the six doctorate responses from the analysis leaving the sample total of the present study at 129.

Two hierarchical or sequential multiple regression analyses were used to address all four research questions. Hierarchical multiple regression allows for the predictor variables to be

entered in a particular order or combination producing several multiple correlation coefficients at different stages of data entry. At each stage individual or blocks of independent variables are added and multiple correlation coefficients were computed (Huck, 2008; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In the first stage of data entry the first block of variables entered in both hierarchical multiple regression analyses included the sex of participants and prior counseling experience creating model one. The second model consisted of the three subscales of the SSI being added to the first block of variables (sex of participants and prior counseling experience). The interactions of each moderating variable (sex of supervisee and prior counseling experience) with each subscale of the SSI (attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task-oriented) were calculated and interaction variables were generated. The third model consisted of adding the interaction variables that were calculated to the block one and block two variables creating the final model.

The DV for analysis one was the self-perceived counseling skills measured by one of the CSPD-RF subscales and for analysis two the self-perceived personal development measured by the second CSPD-RF subscale. The IVs in both analyses were the three subscales of the SSI (task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive), prior counseling experience, and the sex of the supervisee. An alpha level of .05 was divided by two to compensate for the repeated measures and possible inflated alpha from the two hierarchical multiple regression analyses. Following Bonferroni's procedure of dividing the alpha level by the number of analyses, an alpha level of .025 was used in the study (Howell, 2009).

The assumptions for the analyses were tested. First, the data were inspected for extreme scores. In testing the absence of outliers using Cook's D analysis this assumption was violated. The prior counseling experience in year's variable was identified as having extreme outliers. To address this violation the variable was transformed from a continuous variable to a dichotomous

variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The years of prior experience was recoded to 0 for no prior counseling experience and 1 for any prior counseling experience. A second Cook's D analysis was conducted and an acceptable value less than one was obtained for scores on the residual plot (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The transformation resolved the violation and the absence of outlier assumption was met. The assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity were examined through a residual plot. The residuals were spread evenly around the residual line satisfying the assumptions (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

The final assumption tested was the absence of multicollinearity. Using SPSS a collinearity data analysis was conducted. Testing for the multicollinearity, both tolerance and VIF (variance inflation factor) were examined with all predictors. The tolerance levels and VIF scores were within the acceptable range for all predictors in the model with the exception of the interactions (Howell, 2009).

Research Questions

The current study examined the following research questions:

1) Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees?

H_0 : All slopes = 0.

H_a : All slopes \neq 0.

2) Does a relationship exist between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?

H_0 : All slopes = 0.

H_a: All slopes $\neq 0$.

All four research questions were addressed using two hierarchical multiple regression analyses. For RQ1 and RQ2 the three subscales of the SSI (task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive) were the predictor variables in both analyses. The two subscales of the CSPD-RF (counseling skill and personal development) were the criterion measures in the two analyses.

The results for question one indicated that approximately 39% ($F_{(3, 123)} = 21.917, R^2 = .387$) of the variance in self-perceived counseling skill was attributed to the linear combination of the three IVs (Table 5, Model 2). More specifically, the task-oriented subscale ($\beta = .477, p > .000$) was the only subscale found to be statistically significant predictor of scores on the dependent measure. The interpersonally sensitive ($\beta = .173, p < .323$) and the attractive ($\beta = -.170, p < .221$) styles were not statistically significant (Table 6, Model 2). In examining the correlations involving the three subscales of the SSI with the scores of the DV (counseling skill), the task-oriented style was the most strongly correlated subscale ($r = .581$) followed by the interpersonally sensitive ($r = .364$), and the attractive style ($r = .111$) (Table 7).

The results from question two's regression indicated that approximately 40% ($F_{(3, 123)} = 24.205, R^2 = .399$) of the variance in self-perceived personal development were attributed to the linear combination of the three subscales of the SSI (Table 8, Model 2). The task-oriented style was the only style found statistically significant ($\beta = .390, p > .000$). The interpersonally sensitive style ($\beta = .376, p < .035$) and the attractive style ($\beta = -.191, p < .173$) were both non-significant at an alpha of .025 (Table 9, Model 2). In examining the correlations involving the three subscales of the SSI with the scores on the DV (personal development), the task-oriented style was the most strongly correlated subscale ($r = .585$), followed by the interpersonally sensitive style ($r = .461$), and the attractive style ($r = .200$) (Table 10).

Questions three and four were analyzed using the two hierarchical multiple regression analyses examining prior counseling experience and sex of the supervisee as moderators.

3) Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived counseling skill level of the supervisees?

H_0 : All slopes = 0.

H_a : All slopes \neq 0.

4) Does prior counseling experience and the sex of the supervisee moderate the relationship between the supervisory style perceived to be used by supervisors in CORE accredited Master level RCT programs and the self-perceived personal development level of the supervisees?

H_0 : All slopes = 0.

H_a : All slopes \neq 0.

To identify if the sex of the supervisee and prior counseling experience moderate the relationship between the three supervisory styles (task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive) and counseling skill and personal development, the moderating variables were entered first in both analyses creating model one. For the second model the three subscales of the SSI were added to the block one variables creating the second model. The interactions of each moderating variable (sex of the supervisee and prior counseling experience) with each of the three SSI subscales (task-oriented, interpersonally sensitive, and attractive) were calculated. The third model consisted of adding the interaction variables to the first and second block of variables creating the final model. The two subscales of the CSPD-RF (counseling skill and personal development) were the criterion measures for the two analyses. For both RQ3 and 4 including the interactions,

the models were found to be insignificant (RQ3: $p < .500$; RQ4: $p < .264$) and no further analysis was conducted (Table 5, Model 3 & Table 8, Model 3).

The current chapter presented the results from two hierarchical multiple regression analyses. The two analyses examined supervisory styles used in rehabilitation counseling supervision replicating Fernando and Hulse-Killacky study with general counseling students. The results of the present study support Fernando, Hulse-Killacky's findings that the task-oriented style is the greatest predictor of the dependent measure. The current study has also identified a disproportionate use of the attractive style of counseling supervision used with inexperienced practicum students. The following chapter will discuss these results and present some recommendations, conclusions and the limitations and delimitations of the study.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to replicate research conducted by Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) involving a population of CACREP accredited general counseling practicum students with data collected from a population of CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling practicum students. Clinical supervision of practicum students is critically important in counselor development. In supervision counselors learn skills and develop traits that they will carry with them throughout their professional lives. Clinical supervision promotes positive self-efficacy for counseling supervisees and professionals working in the field.

Unfortunately in the post-educational environment much of the focus of supervision is administrative in nature. This problem emphasizes the importance of appropriate comprehensive clinical supervision in educational training programs. Training will help supervisees as they move from the educational setting to post-educational settings where adequate or competent supervision may not be available (Allen & Stebnicki, 1995; Falender et al., 2004; Herbert & Trusty, 2006; Howard, Inman, & Altman, 2006; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Schultz et al., 2002). It is essential for rehabilitation educators to identify supervisory behaviors that enhance supervisee development. One way to facilitate this is through appropriate assessment and evaluation.

Assessing and evaluating behaviors affords educators the ability to identify particular characteristics and better understand the supervisory process. Through appropriate tools of measurement and data analysis researchers can accurately examine very specific and unique behaviors. The origins of many of the models used in rehabilitation counseling supervision were developed from the field of psychology. Some rehabilitation counseling researchers have argued that this has created a void of specific strategies relevant in the field of rehabilitation (Herbert et

al., 1995; Schultz et al., 1999). Herbert et al. (1995) recommend that there be a more systematic assessment and cross-validation of supervisory assessment tools. The researchers stated that future research assessing supervisory styles and rehabilitation counseling behaviors should use multiple methods of assessment and cross-validation.

The current study replicated the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) study using the SSI. The SSI is a widely used and validated instrument measuring supervisory styles. The knowledge base and skill set necessary for rehabilitation counselors differs from other counseling disciplines and it is unclear if these traits are being accurately measured through traditional measures. The supervisory relationship is an important component of clinical supervision. Gaining knowledge and insight into behaviors or current trends of behavior will aid rehabilitation educators in the training of supervisors. Supervisors interact differently and not all have the same level of motivation, knowledge or skills (Crespi & Dube, 2005). Rigid supervisors who depend on only one supervisory style can drastically limit the supervisor-supervisee interaction and impede counselor development (Herbert & Trusty, 2006; Magnuson et al., 2000).

The current study support the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) results that the task-oriented style of supervision was the only significant style predicting scores on the DV. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky found that the task-oriented style was the only predictor of self-efficacy (task-oriented, $\beta = .376$) and that the interpersonally sensitive and attractive styles (interpersonally sensitive, $\beta = .043$; attractive, $\beta = -.073$) were not significant. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) also found that the task-oriented style had the strongest correlation to scores on the DV and the attractive style had the weakest (task-oriented, $r = .368$; interpersonally sensitive, $r = .240$; attractive, $r = .165$).

The current study found that for both research questions one and two that the task-oriented style was the only style that was significant in predicting scores on the DV. The task-oriented style was also found to be more highly correlated to scores on the DV than the other two styles for both question one and two. These results represent a positive relationship between the task-oriented style of supervision and measures of self-perceived counseling skill, personal development and self-efficacy. The current study has successfully replicated previous research and validated a widely used tool of measurement, but has also contributed in gathering information on rehabilitation counselor supervisory behaviors.

Although it is advised to integrate supervision styles, researchers have indicated that a more structured didactic approach should be used with inexperienced counselors. The unexpected finding was that less than 10% of respondents indicated the task-oriented style of supervision as the most dominant style, while more than 80% identified the attractive style as the most dominant style used. Of the 129 participants 93 indicated that they have had no prior counseling experience and only 36 indicated prior experience. These findings indicate that the developmental approach to counseling supervision is rarely used in rehabilitation counseling supervision. Many researchers (Herbert & Richardson, 1995; Falender et al., 2004; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994) have asserted that the attractive or consultant style is most appropriate for supervising more experienced supervisees. Of the 105 that identified the attractive style of supervision as the most dominant 77 indicated no experience. Only 11 of 129 of the responses identified that the task-oriented style of supervision was that most dominant style. (Additional information can be found in Table 4).

These results are important to rehabilitation counseling educators that support the developmental model of counseling supervision. The current study supports previous research of Morgan and Sprenkle (2007) and Prieto (1998) that found many supervisors use the attractive or collaborator style with supervisees regardless of the level of course being taught or the supervisees' developmental level. Those who follow the popular developmental approach would use a task-oriented style of supervision when supervising students with no experience. Supervisors who use the attractive/collaborator or the interpersonally sensitive/counselor style compared to the task-oriented/teacher style were preferred by beginning counselors. The researchers stated that the social acceptability of this style fit well with an encouraging supervision process (Usher & Borders, 1993). These results are important for rehabilitation educators that support a developmental approach to counseling supervision. Inexperienced counselors require different direction and support than experienced counselors. Supervisors that are rigid using only one supervisory style can drastically limit the supervisor-supervisee interaction and impede development.

Many experts in rehabilitation counseling and general counseling support a developmental approach to counseling supervision. Maki and Delworth (1995) developed the Structured Developmental Model (SDM) based on Stoltenberg et al.'s (1987) Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) is appropriate and can be adapted to the rehabilitation field. The SDM creators restructured Stoltenberg et al.'s IDM's eight domains into two main categories relevant to rehabilitation counseling supervision.

The developmental models postulates that beginner counselors advance through stages or levels continuing to develop more complex skills as they progress requiring supervisors to adopt different styles, strategies and approaches at the advancing levels (Falender et al., 2004; Herbert

& Richardson, 1995; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Maki & Delworth, 1995; Prieto, 1998; Schultz et al., 2002; Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2003; Spruill & Benschhoff, 2000; Stoltenberg et al., 2010; Stoltenberg, 2005; Stoltenberg et al., 1994). Supervisees move from needing a highly structured learning environment to less as they advance in levels.

In Ashby's (as cited in Stoltenberg, 2005) qualitative study, beginner counselors identified themselves as being dependent on their supervisors for detailed instruction and they had little self-awareness. Ashby's study supported the developmental model in the areas of intervention skills, interpersonal assessment, and theoretical orientation. Ashby found that it was not until the end of the academic school year that students claimed they were beginning to have conflict in the area of dependency versus autonomy with supervisors. If a developmental approach is used in rehabilitation practicum supervision it would be logical to assume that rehabilitation counseling practicum students with no experience would have indicated the task-oriented style of supervision as the most dominant style.

Although the interactions of prior counseling experience and sex of the supervisee in RQ3 and RQ4 were found insignificant, the results from the current study are relevant to the field of rehabilitation. The variables examined in this study are important factors for rehabilitation educators to consider in supervising practicum students. Self-efficacy is viewed as a determining factor in a counselor's capacity to enter the profession (Tang et al., 2004). Individuals need to have a sense of competency in their ability to successfully complete a task before advancing to more complex tasks. Self-efficacy influences cognitions, behaviors, and emotions. Bandura's theory purports that a counselors' self-efficacy increases as the level of experience increases, causing their counseling skills to improve (Larson et al., 1992; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997; Melchert et al., 1996). These factors are important constructs to investigate as

is the personal development of the supervisee. Personal development is difficult to assess and students tend to cover up or minimize any incompetence. If there is an absence of regular monitoring of a supervisees personal development, dysfunctional or maladaptive issues may not be identified.

The current study not only supported Fernando and Hulse-Killacky findings of the task-oriented style as the greatest predictor of self-efficacy, but also supported the efficacy of the task-oriented style with measures of counseling skill and personal development. The present study contributes to the body of research replicating research from other counseling disciplines with rehabilitation counseling students. Herbert et al. (1995) recommended that there be a more systematic assessment and cross-validation of supervisory assessment tools with rehabilitation counselors. Replication studies are an important (Herbert et al., 1995; Schultz et al., 1999), but often neglected area in research (Smith, 1970; Super & Crites, 1962). This void in research can be attributed to the lack of funding, new research interests, and scholarly journal reluctance to publish replication studies.

The interactions of prior counseling experience and sex of the supervisee in RQ3 and RQ4 were found insignificant. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) controlled for the total number of hours of supervision to assess developmental level and type of supervision (faculty or doctoral student) and found that the previous analysis was robust to the added influence. The result from the current study support Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) results examining a population of general counseling students. The moderating variable of prior counseling experience assessing developmental level had an insignificant effect in the regression model. The prior counseling experience data exposed a possible overuse of the attractive style of supervision in rehabilitation counseling practicum supervision.

Unfortunately the same information regarding the large number of respondents that indicated the attractive style made the prior counseling skill information relevant also made the sex of the supervisee of minimal importance. The unusual and unexpected large number of respondents indentifying the attractive style of supervision as the most dominant style precludes making any inferences regarding the sex of the supervisee. To support Nelson and Holloway (1990) and Granello et al. (1997) research examining the negative implications for female supervisees' development related to their sex, a disproportionate numbers of females would have identified the use of the task-oriented style of supervision.

An overuse of the task-oriented style with females would support Nelson and Holloway (1990) and Granello et al.'s (1997) statement that supervisors asked for female supervisees' views and input less than male supervisees. Female supervisees relinquish power more frequently than male supervisees and received more direction and less autonomy from supervisors than male supervisees. The research showed that supervisors of both sexes do not empower and support female supervisees in the same way that they do male supervisees, negatively impacting female supervisee development. In the current study the proportion of females indicating the task-oriented style was normal and no inferences were attained from the results involving the sex of the supervisee.

In the post-educational setting counselors will receive little clinical supervision. Many supervisors are promoted to supervisory positions based on their length of tenure and are inexperienced or poorly trained in conducting clinical supervision (Herbert, 1995). This emphasizes the importance of rehabilitation counseling programs conducting the best training and evaluations as possible. This entails the replication and validation of research and measures of supervisory behaviors.

Recommendations

The need for replication and validation research in the field of rehabilitation will continue. Specifically the tools used in rehabilitation counseling that were originally developed in other disciplines have a need for replication and validation. Although these results have supported the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) study there still remains a void of support for many tools and theories used in assessing rehabilitation practicum supervision. The specialized tasks and knowledge required of rehabilitation practicum students is different from that of general counseling students. The best examination of a study or tool can be found in replication or cross-validation research. Rehabilitation counselors serve an increasingly diverse population of consumers. This increased diversity requires specialized training and methods of assessment. Supervisory behaviors have a major impact on the future behaviors of counselors and it is imperative that the most accurate of measures are identified.

Rehabilitation researchers need to develop tools to examine rehabilitation counseling supervisory behaviors. One suggestion is using Maki and Delworth's SDM model while considering the characteristics described by Schultz et al. (1999). Counseling supervision is recognized as a discipline separate from counseling, having its own set of processes, skills, and theories that direct the field. Future research needs to consider both supervisor and supervisee perceptions. Understanding supervisory behaviors is an important aspect of counseling supervision. While traditional (self-report survey) methods are convenient and useful, using multiple modalities of assessment to support findings is necessary to substantiate results (qualitative and quantitative). Integrating measures allows more precise assessment and understanding of the supervisory process. Only the perceptions of students were gathered in the

present study. Future research including supervisor perceptions examining the dyad would be useful to rehabilitation educators.

The current study found an unusually large number of inexperienced supervisees that identified the attractive or collaborator style of supervision as the most dominant. This unexpected result indicates that supervisors may be using a less effective style of supervision with the inexperienced students. Rehabilitation educators that support the use of developmental approach in counseling supervision may want to modify supervisor training to include an emphasis of the developmental approach. The inexperienced counselor needs support and direction affirming that they are completing tasks competently. These results support prior research that found the predictive value of the task-oriented style of supervision and emphasizing the importance of this style in training rehabilitation counseling supervisors is suggested.

Conclusions

This study replicated the Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) investigation of supervisory styles and self-efficacy perceived by the supervisee. The Fernando and Hulse-Killacky study assessed general counseling students from CACREP accredited programs using the SSI with a measure of self-efficacy (COSE). The present study used the SSI with a population of rehabilitation counselors from CORE accredited master level RCT programs. Rehabilitation educators can use this information in their decisions on what material they wish to focus on in supervisor training

Although support for the SSI was found in the current study the concerns of Herbert and Ward (1995) were not part of this investigation. Further examination of the SSI and other tools and replicating studies is needed in the field rehabilitation. Rehabilitation counseling supervision is an important component in supervisee development. To better prepare counselors

for the post-educational environment the most appropriate strategies and styles of supervision should be utilized in training. Increased understanding and assessing behaviors will improve rehabilitation counseling programs in developing high quality counselors.

This research examined the practicum experience for rehabilitation counselors and will provide educators with a deeper understanding of the supervisory behaviors and process. The current study contributes to the limited inquiry involving rehabilitation counseling training programs and specifically practicum course supervision.

Limitations and Delimitations

The current study has several issues limiting the findings. The present study examined only CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling programs precluding generalizations to other rehabilitation counseling programs not accredited by CORE. The exact size of the sample population was unknown. Although all correspondence requested that the designated faculty persons reply and confirm participation and disclose the number of currently enrolled practicum students, very few of the faculty contacts provided the requested information. In the first semester of data collection seven of the 93 programs contacted replied and reported the number of currently enrolled practicum students. In the second semester of data collection only four of the 93 programs reported the requested information. There were two programs that responded stating that they were no longer a CORE accredited program and three reported having no currently enrolled practicum students. Two of the programs invited were excluded due to the programs requiring institutional review through their university in order to participate. These two programs required that a faculty sponsor from the programs university request institutional review permission. It was impossible to ascertain the number of potential participants in the present study limiting generalization of the results

Another issue involves the use of a survey design. Although this research design allows for data to be collected from large populations, inexpensively, and quickly the design has a certain level of fallibility (Kazdin, 2003). Using the online web-based survey design did not measure or evaluate participant's actual counseling skill or personal developmental level. The current study relied on participant's perception and assessment of their counseling skill and personal development. The self-reporting is subject to biases due to social desirability, selective memories, and current status of the supervisory relationship.

Data collection began approximately the sixth-week of both semesters, data was collected and continued until the end of the semester in the first round (semester). The second round of data collection occurred between approximately the sixth-ninth weeks of the semester. When the sought after number of participants was obtained data collection ceased. Due to the time spent collecting data it is unknown how much interaction took place between supervisor and supervisee prior to survey completion. Whether the survey was completed at the sixth or sixteenth week of the semester is unknown.

Although participants were assured of confidentiality in their responses to survey items the respondents desire to be viewed in a more competent or favorable light could have influenced the accuracy of their ratings of themselves. Participants were informed of anonymity and that Internet Protocol addresses (IP) were blocked, but not all students have the same familiarity or trust of the internet and this lack of trust may have impacted participation and item response.

The survey respondents were also subject to the current status of the supervisory relationship. Responses to survey items could have been influenced by the more recent memories, evaluations, and other interactions with their supervisors. Respondents may have answered survey questions differently if the survey was taken at a different point in time or in an

alternate modality (Howard, 1994). Finally, the demographic variable "prior experience in years" was transformed from a continuous to a dichotomous variable. The variable was transformed to 0 for no experience and 1 for experience. This transformation prevents gauging or understanding the amount of prior experience a respondent actually had. Assessing the developmental level of the participant was limited, other than indicating some duration of prior experience the exact amount was not included in either of the analyses.

REFERENCES

- Allen, H. A., & Stebnicki, M. A. (1995). Training clinical supervisors in rehabilitation: A conceptual model for training doctoral-level supervisors. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 38*(4), 307-318.
- Ashby, R. H. (1999). Counselor development and supervision: An exploratory study of the Integrated Developmental Model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma.
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (2010). Ethical guidelines for counselor educators and supervisors. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Baker, D. E. (1991). The relationship of the supervisory working alliance to supervisor and supervisee narcissism, gender, and theoretical orientation. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*(7-B), 1484B. (University Microfilms No. 90-14, 392)
- Bandura, A. (1977b). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.
- Bahrlick, A. S. (1990). Role induction for counselor trainees: effects on the supervisory working alliance. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1990). *Dissertation Abstract International, 51*(3-B), 1484.
- Barnett, J. E., Erickson-Cornish, J. A., Goodyear, R. K., & Lichtenberg, J. W. (2007). Commentaries on the ethical and effective practice of clinical supervision. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 38*(3), 268-275.
- Bernard, J. M. (1979). Supervision training: A discriminative model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 19*, 60-68.

- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2009). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Cashwell, T. H., & Dooley K. (2001). The impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 20(1), 39-47.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., & Aiken, S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Psychology Press, (Vol. 1).
- Counsel on Rehabilitation Education. (n.d.) Retrieved November 22, 2010 from <http://www.core-rehab.org/>.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, Committee on Standards Revisions. (2010, Fall). CACREP: The 2010 standards. Arlington, VA: CACREP.
- Crespi, T. D., Dube, J. M. B. (2005). Clinical supervision in school psychology: Challenges, considerations, and ethical and legal issues for clinical supervisors. *Clinical Supervisor*, 24(1), 115-135.
- Dye, H. A., & Borders, L. D. (1990). Counseling Supervisors: Standard for preparation and practice. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69(1), 27-29.
- Emerson, S., & Markos, P. A. (1996). Signs and symptoms of the impaired counselor, *Journal of Humanistic Education and Development*. 34(3), 108-118.
- Engard, N. (2009). LimeSurvey<http://limesurvey.org>. *Public Services Quarterly*, 5, 272-273. doi: 10.10180/15228950903288728
- Eriksen, K., & McAuliffe, G. (2003). A measure of counselor competency. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43(2), 120-133.

- Falender, C. A., Erickson-Cornish, J. A., Goodyear, R. K., Hatcher, R., Kaslow, N. J., Leventhal, G., Shafranske, E., & Sigmon, S. T. (2004). Defining competencies in psychology supervision: A consensus statement. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60*(7), 771-785.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*(4), 1149-1160.
- 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*(4), 293-304.
- Friedlander, M. L., & Snyder, J. (1983). Trainees' expectations for the supervisory process: Testing a developmental model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 22*, 343-348.
- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*(4), 541-557.
- Granello, D. H., Beamish, P. M., & Davis, T. E. (1997). Supervisee empowerment: Does gender make a difference? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*(4), 305-317.
- Hensley, L. G., Smith, S. L., & Thompson, R. W. (2003). Assessing competencies of counselors-in-training: Complexities in evaluating personal and professional development. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*(3), 219-230.
- Hensley-Choate, L. G., & Haag-Granello, D. (2006). Promoting student cognitive development in counselor preparation: A proposed expanded role for faculty advisers. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 46*(2), 116-130.
- Heller-Levitt, D. (2002). Active listening and counselor self-efficacy: Emphasis on one micro-skill in beginning counselor training. *The Clinical Supervisor, 20*(2), 101-115.

- Herbert, J. T., & Ward, T. J. (1989). Rehabilitation counselor supervision: A national survey of NCRE graduate training practica. *Rehabilitation Education, 3*, 163-175.
- Herbert, J. T., & Ward, T. J. (1990). Supervisory Styles among rehabilitation counseling practica supervisors. *Rehabilitation Education, 4*, 203-212.
- Herbert, J. T., & Richardson, B. K. (1995). Introduction to the special issue on rehabilitation counselor supervision. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 38*, 278-281.
- Herbert, J. T., Ward, T. J., & Hemlick, L. M. (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of the supervisory style inventory and the revised supervision questionnaire. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 38*(4), 334-349.
- Herbert, J. T., & Trusty, J. (2006). Clinical supervision practices and satisfaction within the public vocational rehabilitation program. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 49*(2), 66-80.
- Hogan, R. A. (1964). Issues and approaches in supervision. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1*, 139-141.
- Howard, G.S. (1994). Why do people say nasty things about self-reports? *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(5), 399-404.
- Howell, D. C. (2009). *Statistical methods for psychology* (7th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA; Thomson Learning.
- Huck, S. W. (2008). *Reading statistics and research* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Ivey, A. E., & Ivey, M. B. (2003). *Intentional interviewing and counseling: Facilitating client development in a multicultural society* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Kazdin, A. E. (2003). *Research design in clinical psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Ladany, N., Walker, J. A., & Melincoff, D. S. (2001). Supervisory Style: Its relation to the supervisory working alliance and supervisor self-disclosure. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*(4), 263-275.
- Ladany, N., Hill, C. E., & Nutt, E. A. (1996). Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire. Unpublished instrument.
- Ladany, N., Lehrman-Waterman, D. (1999). The content and frequency of supervisor self-disclosures and their relationship to supervisor style and the supervisor working alliance. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*, 143-160.
- Larson, L. M. (1990). Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. Unpublished inventory. University of Nebraska at Lincoln.
- Larson, L. M., Suzuki, L. A., Gillespie, K. N., Potenza, M. T., Bechtel, M. A., & Toulouse, A. L. (1992). Development and validation of the counseling self-estimate inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*(1), 105-120.
- Leach, M. M., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (1997). Self-efficacy and counselor development: Testing the integrated developmental model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37*(2), 115-124.
- LimeSurvey (Version 1.91+) [Computer Software].
- Lizzio, A., Stokes, L., & Wilson, K. (2005). Approaches to learning in professional supervision: Supervisee perceptions of processes and outcome. *Studies in Continuing Education, 27*(3), 239-256.
- Loganbill, C. R., Hardy, E. V., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(1), 3-42.

- Magnuson, S., Wilcoxon, A., Norem, K. (2000). A profile of lousy supervision: Experienced counselors' perspectives. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*(3), 189-202.
- Maki, D. R., & Delworth, U. (1995). Clinical supervision: A definition and model for the rehabilitation counseling profession. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 38*(4), 282-293.
- Marrelli, A. F., Tondora, J., & Hogue, M. A. (2005). Strategies for developing competency models. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 32*(5), 533-551.
- Melchert, T. P., 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 and Development, 74*(6) 640-644.
- Morgan, M. M., & Sprenkle, D. H. (2007). Toward a common-factors approach to supervision. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 33*(1), 1-17.
- Nelson, M. L., & Holloway, E. L. (1990). Relation of gender to power and involvement in supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*(4), 473-481.
- Patton, M. J., Kivlighan, D. M., & Multon, K. D. (1997). Relevance of the supervisory alliance to the counseling alliance and to treatment adherence in counselor training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*(1), 189-208.
- Phan, L. T., & Torres-Rivera, E. (2000). Group Dynamics Inventory. Unpublished instrument. University of Nevada, Reno, NV.
- Prieto, L. (1998). Practicum class supervision in CACREP-accredited counselor training programs: A national survey. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*(2), 113-23.
- Rhodes, S. D., Bowie, D. A., & Hergenrather K. C. (2003). Collecting behavioral data using the world wide web: considerations for researchers. *Epidemiology and Community Health, 57*(1), 68-73.

- Rønnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M., (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71, 396-405.
- Schmitz, C. 2010. Limesurvey [computer software]. <http://www.limesurvey.org>.
- Schultz, J.C., Ososkie, J. N., Fried, J. H., Nelson, R.E., & Bardos, A. N. (2002). Clinical Supervision in Public Rehabilitation Counseling Settings. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 45(4), 213-222.
- Schultz, J. C, Copple, B. A., & Ososkie, J. N. (1999). An integrative model for supervision in rehabilitation counseling. *Rehabilitation Education*, 13(4), 323–334.
- Skovholt, T. M., & Rønnestad, M. H. (1992a). Themes in therapist and counselor development. *Journal. of Counseling and Development*, 70(4), 505-515.
- Skovholt, T. M., & Rønnestad, M. H. (2003). Struggles of the novice counselor and therapist. *Journal of Career Development*, 30(1), 45-58.
- Smith, N. C. (1970). Replication Studies: A Neglected aspect of psychological research. *American Psychologist*, 25(10), 970-975.
- Spruill, D. A., & Benschoff, J. M. (2000). Helping beginning counselors develop a personal theory of counseling. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 40(1), 70-80.
- Stenack, R. J., & Dye, H. A. (1982). Behavioral descriptions of counseling supervision roles. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 21(4), 295-304.
- Stoltenberg, C. D. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 59–65.
- Stoltenberg, C. D. (2005). Enhancing professional competence through developmental approaches to supervision. *American Psychologist*, 60(8), 857-864.

- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B., & Crethar, H. C (1994). Changes in supervision as counselors and therapists gain experience: A review. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 25(4), 416-449.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., & Delworth, U. (1987). *Supervising counselors and therapists: A developmental approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B., & Delworth, U. (2010). *Integrated Developmental Model of Supervision (IDM): An integrated developmental model of supervising counselors and therapists*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Super, D. E., & Crites, J. O. (1962). *Appraising vocational fitness*. New York: Harper.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. (5th ed). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- 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 and Supervision*, 44(1), 70-80.
- Thielsen, V. A., & Leahy, M. J. (2001). Essential knowledge and skills for effective clinical supervision in rehabilitation counseling. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 44(4), 196-208.
- Torres-Rivera, E., Phan, L. T., Maddux, C., Wilbur, M. P., Garrett, M. T. (2001). Process Versus Content: Integrating Personal Awareness and Counseling Skills to Meet the Multicultural Challenge of the Twenty-First Century. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41(1) 28-40.

- Torres-Rivera, E., Wilbur, M. P., Maddux, C. D., Smaby, M. H., Phan, L. T., & Roberts-Wilbur J. (2002). Factor structure and construct validity of the counselor skills personal development rating form. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*(4), 268-278.
- Usher, C. H., & Borders, D. L. (1993). Practicing counselors' preferences for supervisory style and supervisory emphasis. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*(2), 66-79.
- Walker, J. A., Ladany, N., Pate-Carolan, L. M. (2007). Gender-related events in psychotherapy supervision: Female trainee perspectives. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research, 7*(1), 12-18.
- West, W. (2004). Learning from a qualitative study into counseling supervision: listening to supervisor and supervisee. *Counseling and Psychotherapy Research, 4*(2), 20-26.
- Wheeler, S. (2000). What makes a good counselor? An analysis of ways in which counselor trainers construe good and bad counseling trainees. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 13*(1), 65-83.
- White, M. B., & Russell, C. S. (1995). The essential elements of supervisory systems: A modified delphi study. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 21*(1), 33-53.
- Wilbur, M. P. (1991). Counselor skill and personal development rating form. Unpublished assessment instrument. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Wilbur, M. P., Roberts-Wilbur, J., Morris, J., Betz, R., & Hart, G. M. (1994). Structured group supervision: Theory into practice. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 16*(2), 91-100.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1984). Empirical investigation of supervision of counselors as they gain experience. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*(1), 63-75.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1987). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18*, 189-208.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Correspondences

Pre-Notice of Research Participation Request Fall Semester 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). I am contacting you to request your assistance in my dissertation research. My dissertation is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) accredited rehabilitation counseling training programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE).

In a few days from today I will send an initial research participation request via email. This email will consist of a cover letter detailing the scope of the investigation and requesting faculty members to encourage their students to participate in this study. Accompanying the request for participation will be the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource.

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

One week from your receipt of the initial request for participation you will receive a follow up request to forward to the practicum students. The next week you will receive a final request for participation email. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A

Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Pre-Notice of Research Participation Request
Spring Semester 2012

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). I am contacting you to request your assistance in my dissertation research. My dissertation is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) accredited rehabilitation counseling training programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE).

In a few days from today I will send an initial research participation request via email. This email will consist of a cover letter detailing the scope of the investigation and requesting faculty members to encourage their students to participate in this study. Accompanying the request for participation will be the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource.

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

One week from your receipt of the initial request for participation you will receive a follow up request to forward to the practicum students. The following week, non-respondent faculty members will receive a follow up phone call requesting participation. One week later an additional follow up request will be sent. The following week you will receive the final request for participation email. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Initial Research Participation Request
Fall Semester 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC).

In a prior email you should have received a pre-notice research participation request explaining my dissertation research project. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my dissertation research.

This study is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling training programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE).

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

Also, please forward this email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

In an attempt to increase response rates one follow up request email will be sent, followed by the final request for participation email one week later. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC
Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901

Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Initial Research Participation Request
Spring Semester 2012

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC).

In a prior email you should have received a pre-notice research participation request explaining my dissertation research project. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my dissertation research.

This study is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling training programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE).

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

Also, please forward this email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

In an attempt to increase response rates two follow up requests will be sent in one week intervals. Non-respondent faculty members will receive a follow up phone call requesting participation, followed by a final email request. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC

1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Follow-Up Research Participation Request
Respondent Faculty Fall 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

I would like to express my appreciation for your willingness to allow students from your program to participate in this study.

This follow-up contact is a request that you again forward this email to your currently enrolled practicum students. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

This email contains the same information as previously sent in the initial research participation request: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource.

I would like to thank you for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901

Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Follow-Up Research Participation Request
Non-Respondent Faculty Fall 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). This is my second request for participation. In previous emails you should have received a pre-notice research participation request and the initial research participation request explaining my dissertation research. The emails contained: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my research.

This study is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). There is a large void in the literature regarding supervisory behaviors in rehabilitation counseling programs. Your students' participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation educators

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

Please forward this email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Follow-Up Research Participation Request
Respondent Faculty Fall 2012

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

I would like to express my appreciation for your willingness to allow students from your program to participate in this study.

This follow-up contact is a request that you again forward this email to your currently enrolled practicum students. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

This email contains the same information as previously sent in the initial research participation request: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource.

Once again I would like to thank you for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901

Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Follow Up Research Participation Request
Non-Respondent Faculty Spring 2012

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). This is my second request for participation. In previous emails you should have received a pre-notice research participation request and the initial research participation request explaining my dissertation research. The emails contained: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my research.

This study is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). There is a large void in the literature regarding supervisory behaviors in rehabilitation counseling programs. Your students' participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation educators.

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

Please forward this email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Follow-Up Participation Request
Phone Script - Non-Respondent Faculty
Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

Good morning/afternoon Dr. _____, my name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate working on my dissertation at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). In previously sent emails you should have received information explaining my dissertation research. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my study.

This study is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) accredited rehabilitation counseling programs. My research has been approved by SIUC human subjects committee and the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). Your students' participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation educators.

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you forward the previously sent email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

* If left as a voice message: If for some reason you did not receive the previously sent emails please contact Bruce Meissner at 217-637-3534 or meissner@siu.edu

Thank you very much for your time.
Bruce M. Meissner

* If at anytime a faculty member indicates that they are not interested in participating the call will be ended immediately thanking them for their time. If there is no answer to the phone call the above script will be left on the faculty members voicemail.

Additional Follow-Up Research Participation Request
Respondent Faculty Fall 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

This email is an additional request for participation. Due to low response rates an additional request is needed.

Dear Faculty Member,

I would like to express my appreciation for your willingness to allow students from your program to participate in this study.

This additional follow-up contact is a request that you again forward this email to your currently enrolled practicum students. These follow up requests will hopefully increase the response rates and therefore the validity of the research.

This email contains the same information as previously sent in the initial research participation request and the first follow up: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource. This study is approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE).

I would like to thank you for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Additional Follow-Up Research Participation Request
Non-Respondent Faculty Fall 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

This email is an additional request for participation. Due to low response rates an additional request is needed.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC). This is my third request for participation. In previous emails you should have pre-notice, initial research participation request, and follow-up contacts explaining my dissertation research. The emails contained: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my research.

This study is an investigation of supervisory behaviors in CORE accredited rehabilitation counseling programs and has been approved by the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). There is a large void in the literature regarding supervisory behaviors in rehabilitation counseling programs. Your students' participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation educators.

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

Please forward this email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

If for any reason you do not wish to participate in this project please reply to this email and you will be removed from the contact list.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A

Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Final Research Participation Request
Respondent Faculty Fall 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

Once again, I would like to express my appreciation for your willingness to allow students from your program to participate in this study. This final contact is a request that you forward this email, one final time, to your currently enrolled practicum students.

This email contains the same information as previously sent: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource.

I would like to thank you again for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Final Research Participation Request
Non-Respondent Faculty Fall 2011

This research project has obtained permission to gain access to the NCRE membership for purposes of furthering the mission of the association.

To access the survey please click the link below:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Dear Faculty Member,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate in the Rehabilitation Science Program at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale (SIUC).

This is my final request for participation. In previous emails you should have received a pre-notice research participation request, the initial research participation request, follow up research participation request and an additional follow up research participation request explaining my dissertation research. The emails contained: the participant cover letter, informed consent information, a link to a secure online survey resource. I am contacting you to request your assistance in obtaining potential participant for my research.

There is a large void in the literature regarding supervisory behaviors in rehabilitation counseling training programs. Your students' participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation educators.

If you are willing to participate I am requesting that you reply to this email and inform me how many currently enrolled practicum students you have.

Also, please forward this email to all currently enrolled practicum students.

I would like to thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with my dissertation research. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive
Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

Participant Cover Letter
Informed Consent

Dear Participant,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am a doctoral candidate at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC). I am contacting you to request your participation in my dissertation research. The focus of this national study is to investigate supervisory behaviors in Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) accredited counseling training programs.

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary you can opt out at anytime without penalty. Should you elect to participate I estimate that completing the questionnaires will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes. This study has been reviewed and approved by the Southern Illinois University Human Subjects Committee and the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). No identifiable information will be requested and the Internet Protocol (IP) addresses will be blocked.

Click the link below to access survey:

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on the link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Your participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation education. In advance I thank you for your valuable time and cooperation in helping to make this research project possible. I hope you find participation both interesting and worthwhile.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the phone numbers listed below.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Informed Consent

Dear Student,

My name is Bruce Meissner and I am currently a doctoral candidate at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC). You have been given an opportunity to participate in a national survey investigating supervisory behaviors during practicum course. Your participation in this study will inform the topic of supervisory behaviors and benefit rehabilitation education.

This study utilizes two measures and a short demographic questionnaire; one measure evaluating the students' perception of the supervisory styles used during practicum and the second assessing the counseling skill and personal development of the student.

By clicking on the link below you are expressing your willingness to participate in the dissertation research project described in the cover letter. By clicking the link below you are also acknowledging an awareness that your participation is completely voluntary and that you may withdraw at any time without penalty. This study has been reviewed and approved by the Southern Illinois University Human Subjects Committee and the National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact me or my advisor at the email addresses or phone numbers listed below.

Confidentiality

All data collected for this study will be stored on the secure password protect server. After data collection is complete all data will then be stored in an encrypted file on my secure password protected computer. No personal identifiable information will be collected. Your identity will be kept confidential and all responses will be anonymous. The Internet Protocol (IP) addresses of the computers used will be blocked ensuring anonymity.

All responses will be kept confidential within reasonable limits. Only those directly involved with this project will have access to the data.

When you click on the link you will find a brief statement explaining how to navigate the website and access the surveys. The three surveys should take a approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

In clicking the link below I acknowledge that I have read and understand my rights and the limitations of confidentiality.

<http://tinyurl.com/supervisory-styles-SIUC>

*If clicking on this link does not work please copy and paste the link into your web browser.

Once again I would like to express my appreciation for your cooperation in making this project possible.

Sincerely,

Bruce M. Meissner, M.S., CRC

Principal Researcher
Bruce Meissner, M.S., CRC
1200 E. Grand Ave. Apt 4-7A
Carbondale, IL 62901
Phone number: 217.637.3534
meissner@siu.edu

Advisor
Stacia Robertson, PhD., CRC
Department of Rehabilitation Counseling
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
1025 Lincoln Drive

Carbondale IL, 62901
Office number: 618.453.8279
srbrtsn@siu.edu

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions regarding participants' rights can be brought to the attention of the Committee Chairperson Office of Research Development and Administration SIUC Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone: (618) 453-4533. E-mail: siuhsc@siu.edu

APPENDIX B

Supervisory Styles Inventory - Trainee Version - Form-T (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984)

Please indicate your perception of your current supervisors' style on each of the following descriptors. Mark the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view of him or her. If you have more than one primary supervisor, please fill this out with reference to your academic/university supervisor whose style you know best.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<u>not very</u>						<u>very</u>
1. Goal-Oriented	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Perceptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Concrete	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Explicit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Committed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Affirming	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Practical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Sensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Collaborative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Intuitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Reflective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Responsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Structured	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Evaluative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Flexible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Prescriptive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Supervisory Styles Inventory - Trainee Version - Form-T - Continued

Please indicate your perception of your current supervisors' style on each of the following descriptors. Mark the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view of him or her. If you have more than one primary supervisor, please fill this out with reference to your academic/university supervisor whose style you know best.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<u>not very</u>						<u>very</u>
18. Didactic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Thorough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Focused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Creative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Supportive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Open	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Realistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Resourceful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Invested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Facilitative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Therapeutic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Trusting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Informative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Humorous	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. Warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C

Counselor Skills and Personal Development Rating Form (CSPD-RF; Wilbur, 1991)

Please indicate your perception of your performance level. Mark the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, which best reflects your view.

1. The counselor observed ability to communicate directly and honestly in his/her interaction with the client.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

2. The counselor observed use of clarification skills in responding to client statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

3. The counselor observed awareness of his/her own emotional states while interacting and communicating with the client.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

4. The counselor observed personal congruence between his/her own verbal and nonverbal behaviors in the session with the client.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

5. The counselor observed emotional sensitivity (empathy, not sympathy) toward the client's statements of feelings, problems, issues, conflicts, life situations, etc.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

6. The counselor observed use of paraphrasing and summarization skills in responding to client statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

7. The counselor observed use of feedback skills in responding to client statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

Counselor Skills and Personal Development Rating Form - Continued

8. The counselor observed awareness of his/her own personal strengths and weaknesses while interacting and communicating with the client.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

9. The counselor observed use of attending and observational skills while responding to client statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

10. The counselor observed use of giving/providing directives in his/her responses to client statement.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

11. The counselor observed use of confrontation skills in responding to client statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

12. The counselor observed tolerance for differences between his/her perspectives (be they cultural, socio-economic, socio-political, gender, sexual preference, race, age, ethnicity, etc.) and differing perspectives observed in or expressed by the client.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

13. The counselor observed use of advice/information and educational/instructional skills in his/her responses to client statements.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

14. The counselor observed awareness of his/her sexist, racist, agist, and etc. beliefs, feelings, and behaviors while interacting and communicating with the client.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 (Unacceptable) (Outstanding)

Counselor Skills and Personal Development Rating Form - Continued

15. The counselor observed use of interpretation skills in his/her responses to client statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

16. The counselor observed awareness of his/her own interpersonal influence on the client while interacting and communicating with the client.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

17. The counselor use of reflection of meaning and reflection of feelings skills while responding to client statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

18. The counselor observed awareness of his/her own general beliefs while responding to clients' statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

19. The counselor observed awareness of his/her own personal and familial development in response to client statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

20. The counselor observed use of self-disclosure skills in responding to the client's statements.

$\frac{1}{\text{(Unacceptable)}} \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad \frac{7}{\text{(Outstanding)}}$

APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to all questions using only one answer per-question

1. Age (in years)

2. Indicate Sex

_____ Male

_____ Female

3. Race or Ethnic Group

_____ Asian/Pacific Islander

_____ Black/African American

_____ Hispanic/Latino

_____ Native American

_____ White/Caucasian

_____ Other

4. Type of Supervision Received

_____ Individual

_____ Group

_____ Both

5. How Many Hours of Supervision Do You Receive Per-Week

6. Prior Counseling Experience in Years

7. Your Highest Educational Level Achieved

_____ a. Bachelors

_____ b. Masters

_____ c. Doctoral Degree

Table 1*Demographics: Age*

Age						
	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age (in years)	129	33.00	22.00	55.00	29.4031	6.09754

Table 2*Demographics: Hours of Supervision Per-Week*

Hours of Supervision Per-Week						
N	Mean	Median	Mode	Maximum	Minimum	Range
129	2.18	1.00	1.00	25.00	1.00	24.00

Table 3*Demographic Characteristics*

Race or Ethnic Group	Frequency	Percent
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	4.7
Black/African American	22	17.1
Hispanic/Latino	15	11.6
White/Caucasian	86	66.7
Total	129	100.0
Sex of Supervisee	Frequency	Percent
Female	83	64.3
Male	46	35.7
Total	129	100.0
Type of Supervision	Frequency	Percent
Individual	106	82.2
Group	3	2.3
Both	20	15.5
Total	129	100.0
Prior Experience	Frequency	Percent
No Experience	93	72.1
Experience	36	27.9
Total	129	100.0
Educational Level	Frequency	Percent
Bachelors	119	92.2
Masters	10	7.8
Total	129	100.0

Table 4*Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) Subscales with Gender & Prior Counseling Experience*

SSI Task-Oriented Subscale with Gender & Prior Counseling Experience

Task Oriented Style - Gender & Prior Experience - 8.5% of Responses					
		Prior Exp			
		No Exp	Exp	Total	
Indicate Gender	Female	Count	5	2	7
		% within Indicate Gender	71.4%	28.6%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	62.5%	66.7%	63.6%
		% of Total	45.5%	18.2%	63.6%
	Male	Count	3	1	4
		% within Indicate Gender	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	37.5%	33.3%	36.4%
		% of Total	27.3%	9.1%	36.4%
Total		Count	8	3	11
		% within Indicate Gender	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	72.7%	27.3%	100.0%

Table 4 Continued

SSI Interpersonally Sensitive Subscale with Gender & Prior Counseling Experience

Interpersonally Sensitive Style - Gender & Prior Experience - 10.1% of Responses					
		Prior Exp			
			No Exp	Exp	Total
Indicate Gender	Female	Count	7	2	9
		% within Indicate Gender	77.8%	22.2%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	87.5%	40.0%	69.2%
		% of Total	53.8%	15.4%	69.2%
	Male	Count	1	3	4
		% within Indicate Gender	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	12.5%	60.0%	30.8%
		% of Total	7.7%	23.1%	30.8%
Total	Count	8	5	13	
	% within Indicate Gender	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%	
	% within Prior Exp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	61.5%	38.5%	100.0%	

SSI Attractive Subscale with Gender & Prior Counseling Experience

Attractive Style - Gender & Prior Experience - 81.4% of Responses					
		Prior Exp			
			No Exp	Exp	Total
Indicate Gender	Female	Count	50	17	67
		% within Indicate Gender	74.6%	25.4%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	64.9%	60.7%	63.8%
		% of Total	47.6%	16.2%	63.8%
	Male	Count	27	11	38
		% within Indicate Gender	71.1%	28.9%	100.0%
		% within Prior Exp	35.1%	39.3%	36.2%
		% of Total	25.7%	10.5%	36.2%
Total	Count	77	28	105	
	% within Indicate Gender	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%	
	% within Prior Exp	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	73.3%	26.7%	100.0%	

Table 5*Model Summary Skill Development = DV*

Model Summary										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.242 ^a	.059	.044	.91907	.059	3.931	2	126	.022	
2	.622 ^b	.387	.362	.75091	.328	21.917	3	123	.000	
3	.643 ^c	.414	.358	.75282	.027	.896	6	117	.500	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Prior Exp, Indicate Gender										
b. Predictors: (Constant), Prior Exp, Indicate Gender, SSI_IS, SSI_TO, SSI_ATT										
c. Predictors: (Constant), Prior Exp, Indicate Gender, SSI_IS, SSI_TO, SSI_ATT, Ipe TO, Ig TO, Ipe ATT, Ig IS, Ipe IS, Ig ATT										

Table 6*Skill Development - Beta Coefficients*

		Coefficients				
		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	4.063	.245		16.571	.000
	Indicate Gender	-.143	.169	-.073	-.843	.401
	Prior Exp	.494	.181	.237	2.732	.007
2	(Constant)	2.147	.488		4.398	.000
	Indicate Gender	-.208	.147	-.106	-1.418	.159
	Prior Exp	.347	.151	.166	2.303	.023
	SSI_TO	.477	.095	.522	4.997	.000
	SSI_IS	.173	.175	.156	.992	.323
	SSI_ATT	-.170	.138	-.158	-1.230	.221
3	(Constant)	2.979	1.615		1.845	.068
	Indicate Gender	-.525	1.343	-.269	-.391	.696
	Prior Exp	-1.261	1.126	-.604	-1.120	.265
	SSI_TO	.401	.314	.439	1.277	.204
	SSI_IS	.405	.569	.366	.711	.478
	SSI_ATT	-.451	.456	-.419	-.989	.325
	Ig TO	-.011	.221	-.033	-.051	.959
	Ig IS	-.166	.395	-.510	-.421	.674
	Ig ATT	.201	.349	.708	.576	.566
	Ipe TO	.319	.244	.745	1.310	.193
	Ipe IS	-.181	.435	-.468	-.415	.679
	Ipe ATT	.193	.327	.549	.590	.557

a. Dependent Variable: CSPD_RF_SD

Table 7*Skill Development Correlations*

		Correlations			
		CSPD_RF_SD	SSI_TO	SSI_IS	SSI_ATT
Pearson Correlation	CSPD_RF_SD	1.000	.581	.364	.111
	SSI_TO	.581	1.000	.651	.334
	SSI_IS	.364	.651	1.000	.781
	SSI_ATT	.111	.334	.781	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	CSPD_RF_SD	.	.000	.000	.104
	SSI_TO	.000	.	.000	.000
	SSI_IS	.000	.000	.	.000
	SSI_ATT	.104	.000	.000	.
N	CSPD_RF_SD	129	129	129	129
	SSI_TO	129	129	129	129
	SSI_IS	129	129	129	129
	SSI_ATT	129	129	129	129

Table 8*Model Summary Personal Development = DV*

Model Summary										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics					
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
1	.210 ^a	.044	.029	.94388	.044	2.912	2	126	.058	
2	.632 ^b	.399	.375	.75753	.355	24.205	3	123	.000	
3	.661 ^c	.436	.383	.75211	.037	1.296	6	117	.264	
a. Predictors: (Constant), Prior Exp, Indicate Gender										
b. Predictors: (Constant), Prior Exp, Indicate Gender, SSI_IS, SSI_TO, SSI_ATT										
c. Predictors: (Constant), Prior Exp, Indicate Gender, SSI_IS, SSI_TO, SSI_ATT, Ipe TO, Ig TO, Ipe ATT, Ig IS, Ipe IS, Ig ATT										

Table 9*Personal Development - Beta Coefficients*

		Coefficients				
		Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	4.132	.252		16.407	.000
	Indicate Gender	-.148	.174	-.074	-.851	.396
	Prior Exp	.431	.186	.202	2.318	.022
2	(Constant)	1.628	.493		3.305	.001
	Indicate Gender	-.205	.148	-.103	-1.389	.167
	Prior Exp	.315	.152	.148	2.072	.040
	SSI_TO	.390	.096	.419	4.051	.000
	SSI_IS	.376	.176	.333	2.132	.035
	SSI_ATT	-.191	.139	-.174	-1.369	.173
3	(Constant)	1.599	1.613		.991	.324
	Indicate Gender	.332	1.342	.167	.247	.805
	Prior Exp	-1.798	1.125	-.845	-1.598	.113
	SSI_TO	.431	.314	.463	1.374	.172
	SSI_IS	.446	.569	.395	.784	.435
	SSI_ATT	-.272	.456	-.248	-.597	.552
	Ig TO	-.132	.220	-.379	-.598	.551
	Ig IS	.016	.394	.047	.039	.969
	Ig ATT	-.013	.348	-.045	-.037	.971
	Ipe TO	.522	.243	1.196	2.145	.034
	Ipe IS	-.551	.434	-1.400	-1.269	.207
	Ipe ATT	.455	.327	1.273	1.393	.166

a. Dependent Variable: CSPD_RF_PD

Table 10*Personal Development Correlations*

		Correlations			
		CSPD_RF_PD	SSI_TO	SSI_IS	SSI_ATT
	CSPD_RF_PD	1.000	.585	.461	.200
	SSI_TO	.585	1.000	.651	.334
	SSI_IS	.461	.651	1.000	.781
	SSI_ATT	.200	.334	.781	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	CSPD_RF_PD	.	.000	.000	.011
	SSI_TO	.000	.	.000	.000
	SSI_IS	.000	.000	.	.000
	SSI_ATT	.011	.000	.000	.
N	CSPD_RF_PD	129	129	129	129
	SSI_TO	129	129	129	129
	SSI_IS	129	129	129	129
	SSI_ATT	129	129	129	129

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Bruce M. Meissner

meissner.bruce@gmail.com

Parkland College
Associate in Arts, Psychology, May 2005

University of Illinois-Champaign
Bachelor of Science, Community Health/Disability Studies, May 2005

University of Illinois-Champaign
Master of Science, Rehabilitation, 2007

Dissertation Title:

Examining the Relationship Between Supervisory Styles and Counselor Skill and Personal Development Perceived By the Supervisee

Major Professor: Stacia Robertson Ph.D.