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Counselor self-efficacy (CSE) refers to counselors’ beliefs about their ability to perform counseling-related behaviors or to negotiate particular clinical situations. This is a relatively new field of study in which there are some promising results. However, several researchers have called for further investigation of the sources of CSE and how CSE impacts counselor performance. This research examined the relationship between elements of supervision and CSE, the relationship between CSE and counselor performance from the supervisor’s perspective, and the mediation by CSE of the relationship between elements of supervision and counselor performance.

Fifty-eight supervisor-supervisee dyads participated in this study. Supervisees completed the following measures of elements of supervision and CSE: the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984); the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001); the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI; Olk & Friedlander, 1992); the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI; Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990); and the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003). To measure counselor performance, supervisors completed the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales (CERS; Myrick & Kelly, 1971).
Results indicated that elements of supervision were predictive of CSE with the supervisory working alliance as the most important predictor. The Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive supervision styles were positively related to CSE as well. CSE was positively related to counselor performance from the supervisor’s perspective, and there was partial support for the hypothesized mediation by CSE of the relationships between elements of supervision and counselor performance. Limitations, directions for future research, and implications are discussed.
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In 1952 Eysenck reported that those who had received therapy were no better off than those who had not. This ignited debate and extensive investigation into the effectiveness of psychotherapy, and researchers have since convincingly found that therapy is an effective treatment for a variety of psychological problems (e.g., Lambert & Bergin, 1994). However, the question still remains, what influences effectiveness? We now know therapy works, but how?

A host of factors have been examined such as therapist characteristics, client characteristics, specific treatment modalities and techniques, therapeutic alliance, length of treatment, common factors in therapy, empirically supported treatments, and so on (Beutler, 1991; Chwalisz, 2003; Seligman, 1995; Wampold, 2000). Despite this large body of research, it is apparent that a good portion of the facilitators of therapeutic change remain largely unexplained (Bergin, 1997).

One common criticism of this literature is that there exists a uniformity myth, which suggests that all therapists within a given theoretical perspective do not differ in their level of skill and effectiveness with clients (Teyber & McClure, 2000). Thus, much of the research on therapeutic effectiveness is limited due to its efforts to compare the effectiveness of theoretical and technical approaches without taking into account specific therapist personal factors and qualities and how these impact intervention skills. Indeed, Lambert (1989) found that variation in theory and technique, the most frequently evaluated component believed to have an impact on treatment effectiveness, predicted a
much smaller portion of variation in therapeutic outcome than that accounted for by therapist characteristics and client characteristics. However, the field has been reluctant to examine the qualities of effective therapists, perhaps because the study of skills, theory, and technique are safer topics with regard to the reputations and self-esteem of many therapists (Teyber & McClure, 2000).

Although more research is needed, several studies have found that some therapists are consistently effective and others are consistently ineffective, regardless of the type of treatment practices (e.g., Crits-Christoph et al., 1991; Luborsky et al., 1997). Some qualities found in effective therapists include warmth, understanding, openness to criticism, and the absence of ignoring, neglecting, attacking, and rejecting clients (Najavits & Strupp, 1994). It has also been reported that the counseling relationship consistently contributes more to treatment success than discrete therapist variables alone (Sexton & Whiston, 1994). Furthermore, the most consistently important aspects of this relationship are common factors across therapies such as empathy, positive regard, warmth, and genuineness (Weinberger, 1995). Thus, when considering important therapist characteristics, it is essential to study those that likely lead to the enhancement of the therapist-client relationship (Teyber & McClure, 2000).

This study aims to accomplish this by investigating both what is likely a central therapist characteristic, counselor self-efficacy (CSE), and how this impacts therapists’ ability to perform basic as well as more complex counseling tasks such as creating a trusting therapeutic environment, relaying empathy and warmth, as well as other client-centered core conditions. It also aims to examine conditions in supervision that lead to having more or less of this therapist characteristic.
Underlying Theory and Research

In Bandura’s seminal social-cognitive theory (SCT; 1982; 1986), he defined self-efficacy as the degree to which individuals consider themselves capable of performing a particular activity. He suggested that behavior is a function of the complex relationship between belief systems (i.e., self-efficacy) and environmental conditions, and hypothesized that self-efficacy beliefs play a critical role in determining whether and how an action will be pursued as well as level of performance. There is a good deal of research in support of these claims (e.g., Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Thompson & Perlini, 1998).

Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994; 1996) extended the work of Bandura in their Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), which makes elaborate and specific predictions of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. Specifically, Lent et al., proposed three main hypotheses: (1) Self-efficacy beliefs are positively related to performance; (2) The relationship between abilities/experience and performance outcomes is mediated by self-efficacy beliefs and goals; and (3) The relationship between abilities and interests is fully mediated by self-efficacy beliefs. SCCT was chosen as a theoretical base in this study because (1) it provides a solid theoretical underpinning for the current investigation, (2) it extends general social-cognitive-theory to offer the most elaborate and well-supported model of relationships for variables of interest in this study, and (3) it has received extensive attention and empirical support in the literature (Swanson & Gore, 2000).

Given the extensive evidence of the importance of self-efficacy, it is logical to explore its potential role in counseling. CSE has emerged over the last decade as a
growing field of study. It is typically defined as counselors’ beliefs about their ability to perform counseling-related behaviors or to negotiate particular clinical situations (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent et al., 2003). Adequate measures of the construct have been developed (e.g., Larson et al., 1992; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003), and promising results are evident. For example, research has shown CSE to be related to experience, development, negative affectivity, positive outcome expectations, and interest in counseling as a career choice (Heppner et al., 1998; Kocarek, 2001; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Larson et al., 1992; Leach, Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Eichenfield, 1997; Lent et al., 2003). Some research has also found CSE to be related to better counselor performance, but there are significant limitations to these studies (e.g., use of poor measures, small sample sizes, lack of theoretical base, etc.). Very little research has addressed sources of CSE, and several researchers have called for the study of CSE in the context of supervision (Heppner et al., 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent et al., 1998; Lent et al., 2003).

The Present Study

The present study had three aims guided by SCCT and previous research in both the social-cognitive literature and the supervision literature: (1) To examine elements of supervision as possible sources of CSE; (2) To examine how CSE impacts counselor performance from the perspective of the supervisor; and (3) To examine the possibility of CSE playing a mediating role in the relationship between elements of supervision and counselor performance.
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

*Self-Efficacy Theory*

In a thorough and often cited literature review, Larson and Daniels (1998) explicate the concept of counselor self-efficacy, which is in large part a logical extension of the seminal social-cognitive theory (SCT) proposed by Albert Bandura. SCT hypothesizes that individuals' behaviors are a function of the complex relationship between belief systems and environmental conditions, and within this framework, self-efficacy beliefs play a central role in determining whether and how an action will be pursued as well as level of performance (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy has been defined as “people’s judgments in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance” (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). In short, self-efficacy is the degree to which individuals consider themselves capable of performing a particular activity. It is a generative mechanism responsible for integrating cognitive, behavioral, and social resources in such a way that, in part, determines people's actions, the decision to engage in a task, to put forth effort, and to persevere under difficult conditions (Bandura, 1989).

Bandura (1982) hypothesized that the development of self-efficacy beliefs is facilitated by previous success experiences, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and physical states and reactions. He also suggested that the most effective level of self-efficacy is that which slightly exceeds one’s ability and that successful performance is
dependent on the acquisition of the necessary skills as well as robust efficacy beliefs (Bandua, 1991).

Extended directly from this, the concept of counselor self-efficacy (CSE) has emerged over the last decade as a growing topic of study. CSE is typically defined as one's beliefs or judgments about one’s capabilities to effectively counsel clients in one’s particular setting. Said another way, CSE reflects counselors' beliefs about their ability to perform counseling-related behaviors or to negotiate particular clinical situations (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003). These beliefs are thought to be important as they are assumed to affect aspects of trainees' clinical functioning, such as the nature of their cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses while engaged in counseling (Larson, 1998). CSE likely plays an important role in counselor career development by impacting counselors’ degree of interest in counseling and the extent to which they make goals for counseling to be a central component of their future career (Lent et al., 2003). Larson & Daniels (1998) even suggested that CSE is the primary causal determinant of effective counseling action affecting choice of responses, effort expenditure, persistence in the face of failure, and risk-taking behavior. These assertions, however, are in need of empirical investigation.

Of particular value in the CSE literature is that the concept takes into account that counselors are at the same time both acted upon by, and shapers of, their environments. On one hand, they receive supervision from an assigned supervisor, are randomly paired with clients, and practice in certain environments, while on the other, they simultaneously regulate their actions, thoughts, and feelings, which allows them to impact their environments. In other words, people are both “products and producers of their
environment” (Bandura, 1989). This highlights the potential importance of counselor self-efficacy beliefs in the process of counseling.

Research on General Self-Efficacy

Given that CSE is a relatively new area of study, a review of general self-efficacy is necessary to establish the potential value of CSE and possible relationships it may have with other variables. Self-efficacy beliefs have been shown to predict choice of behavioral activities, effort expended on those activities, persistence despite obstacles, and actual performance abilities (Bandura, 1977). More specifically, higher self-efficacy has been linked with greater persistence, increased task preparation, and increased effort during actual performance. People with low self-efficacy often have self-hindering thoughts and actions, whereas people with high self-efficacy often have more investment in preparation as well as actual performance. Furthermore, Bandura (1982) found that self-efficacy was actually more accurate than previous performances at predicting future performance. In addition, meta-analysis based on 114 studies on work-related performance in a wide variety of occupational settings has shown a consistent relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance in general, and complex tasks are more affected by self-efficacy than are simple tasks (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Thompson & Perlini, 1998). Given the substantial evidence of the importance of general self-efficacy, it is logical to investigate its role in counseling. To best do this, a solid theoretical base is needed, and Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (1994) Social Cognitive Career Theory serves this need well.
CSE and Social Cognitive Career Theory

Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) expanded on Bandura’s work by proposing a social-cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) is largely based on meta-analytic data collected in academic and occupational settings from thousands of participants. These data have consistently shown a direct relationship between self-efficacy and performance.

Additional research based on SCCT has shown self-efficacy to be related to several career constructs, math performance, work-related behavior, and academic performance (Lent et al., 1994). Even though this study is not focusing on vocational psychology, per se, this theory will be reviewed in some detail for three main reasons: (1) It provides a solid theoretical underpinning for the current investigation; (2) It extends general social-cognitive theory to offer the most elaborate and well-supported model of relationships for variables of interest in this study; and (3) It has received extensive attention and empirical support in the literature (Swanson & Gore, 2000).

SCCT is based on the notion that people help construct their own career outcomes and that belief systems play a key role in this process. The concept of self-efficacy seems to capture the essence of what is meant by belief systems. More specifically, Lent et al. (1994) proposed three interrelated models of academic and career-related interest, choice, and performance. In short, the first main component of the theory is experience, which is a function of environmental and personal factors (e.g., genetics, personality variables, academic and employment opportunities, etc.). The next main components of the theory are social-cognitive variables (i.e., self-efficacy and outcome expectations), which are dependent on the first component, experience. Bandura (1986) outlined several key
elements of experience (to be further discussed later) on which these social-cognitive variables are based such as performance enactment, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. Finally, the third main components of the theory are interest and performance, which are hypothesized to be mediated by self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations. Interests evolve into goals, behavior, and actual performance, and the outcome of this behavior and performance will ultimately cycle to experience on which the further development of self-efficacy is based.

Lent et al. (1994) made three specific hypotheses regarding the relationships among main variables in SCCT. They hypothesized that (1) self-efficacy beliefs are positively related to performance, (2) the relationship between abilities/experience and performance will be mediated by self-efficacy beliefs and goals, and (3) the relationship between abilities and interests will be fully mediated by self-efficacy beliefs. As for the first hypothesis, meta-analysis of 39 studies with participants from elementary to college age has shown a consistent positive relationship (\( r_s \) range from .3-.4) between self-efficacy and a variety of areas of academic performance (Lent, Brown, & Gore, 1997; Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; as cited in Swanson & Gore, 2000). The hypotheses proposing the mediating role of self-efficacy have received far less attention. Lent et al. (1994) reported a modest relationship between abilities and interests that was eliminated when the effects of self-efficacy beliefs were controlled. They also reported data indicating partial mediation of the relationship between past achievement and performance. Some studies have also shown self-efficacy having a moderating effect on the relationship between abilities and performance (Lent et al., 1996). Although more
research is needed in assessing the mediating and/or moderating role of self-efficacy, Lent and colleagues’ hypotheses seem warranted thus far.

Beyond these specific hypotheses, SCCT’s claim that interests are positively related to self-efficacy and outcome expectations has received considerable support. Lent et al. (1994) reported effect sizes in the .5 range, and similar effect sizes have been reported in a number of other studies as well (e.g., Lenox & Subich, 1994; Lopez, Lent, Brown, & Gore, 1997; as cited in Swanson & Gore, 2000). Studies have also shown self-efficacy and outcome expectations to be related to intentions and performance (Fouad & Smith, 1996), and there have been several efforts to apply SCCT to career counseling work with clients (Heppner, Multon, Gysbers, Ellis, & Zook, 1998; O’Brein, Heppner, Flores, & Bikos, 1997). One of the areas lacking empirical investigation has been the sources of outcome expectations, but sources of self-efficacy have received more attention. In addition, there is ample evidence of adequate construct validity of measures of self-efficacy as well as other elements of SCCT (Swanson & Gore, 2000). Most pertinent to this study, there have been recent efforts to apply SCCT and SCT to counselor development and performance (Larson, 1998; Lent et al., 2003).

Given the strong and growing empirical support for the propositions of SCCT, Swanson and Gore (2000) noted the potential of applying self-efficacy belief measures to other career-relevant behavioral domains. One such area beginning to receive attention has focused on counseling psychologists in training. It is not difficult to view areas of counselor development and performance in the context of SCCT. For example, it would be beneficial to understand what the main sources of CSE are (e.g., previous experience, elements of supervision, quality of instruction, etc.). How does CSE impact interest in
counseling activities? How does CSE impact the amount of time preparing for and actually doing counseling work? Further, how does CSE relate to counseling performance? Does CSE mediate the relationship between learning experiences (i.e., supervision) and performance as suggested by SCCT? SCCT proposes several testable hypotheses to better understand how these factors might relate, and this study will focus primarily on sources of CSE in supervision, the impact of CSE on performance, and the possible mediation of the relationship between elements of supervision and performance by CSE.

**Review of the CSE Literature**

Although relatively new, the study of CSE has blossomed into a thriving research domain with several interesting findings. For the sake of coherence and structure, these findings will be presented in a general review from the perspective of SCCT, and detailed reviews of each CSE study will be included in the next section. It should also be noted that graduate counseling psychology students ranging from pre-practica to advanced practica served as participants in nearly every study. Specific studies dealing with CSE and supervision and CSE and performance will be reviewed in detail following this general review of the CSE literature.

**Measures**

A large portion of research on CSE has been done with poor measures developed for individual studies that neglect to establish and report adequate reliability and validity data. Larson and colleagues (1992), however, developed the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE), which is a sufficient measure of the CSE construct and has been used in several published studies and dissertations. Two hundred thirteen graduate-level
students in an introductory counseling course at three different universities were participants during scale construction. This scale has consistently exhibited adequate internal consistency reliability, test-retest reliability, and construct validity through factor analysis and comparisons with related variables. The scale yields a total CSE score and five subscale scores measuring self-efficacy beliefs for microskills, counseling process, difficult client behaviors, cultural competence, and awareness of personal values.

Lent et al. (2003) are supportive of Larson’s efforts to investigate CSE, but they noted several limitations to her conception and measure of the construct. They argued that the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory is not adequately grounded in theories of counselor development or helping skills, that it presupposes a level of skill proficiency perhaps not held by beginning counselors, that it may be tapping constructs other than self-efficacy (e.g., values), and that it is not sensitive to elements of counseling at a more advanced level. To remedy these limitations, Lent et al. developed the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES), which has exhibited good internal consistency reliability, test-retest reliability, and construct validity (note: this scale will be reviewed in depth in the Method section). In addition to a total CSE score, this instrument yields scores on subscales measuring exploration, insight, and action skills (based on Hill & O’Brien, 1999), session management skills, managing relationship conflict skills, and dealing with difficult client skills.

In addition to these CSE measures, O’Brien et al. (1997) developed the Career Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (CCSES). This instrument has received less attention in the literature but has exhibited strong psychometric properties and is solidly based in SCT theory. The CCSES yields a total score as well as scale scores assessing self-
efficacy in therapeutic process and alliance skills, vocational assessment and interpretation skills, multicultural competency skills, and current trends in the world of work and career research skills.

*Experience/Developmental Level*

Several studies have found CSE to increase with added levels of relevant experience such as sessions of supervision, counseling coursework, experience with clients, and developmental level (Heppner et al., 1998; Kocarek, 2001; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Leach, Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Eichenfield, 1997; Lent et al., 2003; Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996; O'Brein et al., 1997). All of these studies are based on data from counseling psychology graduate students from their first practicum course to more advanced levels of training, and the relationship has been consistent across studies. Larson and Daniels (1998) also cite evidence suggesting that this relationship may not be so clear-cut with experience having a weak to non-existent relationship with CSE after a certain level of training and experience is achieved. However, they base this claim on master's theses and poster presentations, so closer examination of their evidence was not possible.

*Affect*

CSE has been found to correlate negatively with state and trait anxiety ($r_s = -.24$ to -.79) (Daniels, 1997; Larson et al., 1992). CSE has also been found to correlate modestly in expected directions with specific affective states such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, negative affect, and positive affect (DeGraff, 1996; Larson & Daniels, 1998). Lent et al. (2003) found CSE to be moderately correlated with the
experience of negative and positive affect during counseling ($rs = -.20$ to -.42 and .26 to .39, respectively).

**Personal Characteristics**

Larson et al. (1992) found CSE to correlate positively with a more positive self-concept, personal perception of effective problem solving ability, and negatively with defensiveness and self-criticism. CSE was not found to relate to aptitude, academic performance, theoretical orientation, or personality type in this study.

**Outcome Expectations**

Few studies have examined the relationship between CSE and outcome expectations, and the psychometric properties of outcome expectations scales are notably weak. Despite this important limitation, research concerning outcome expectations has found relationships in the expected direction. For example, Sipps, Sugden, and Faiver (1988) and Larson et al. (1992), each using different measures of CSE and outcome expectations, found large positive correlations between CSE and outcome expectations ($r = .77$, .75, respectively). In the process of scale development, Lent, Hill, and Hoffman (2003) found CSE to be moderately correlated ($r = .24$) with more favorable counseling outcome expectations as well.

**Interests/Goals/Activities**

Lent et al. (2003) found CSE to be moderately correlated ($r = .35$ to .47) with interest in engaging in therapy activities as measured by the Scientist-Practitioner Inventory (SPI; Leong & Zachar, 1991). Together, CSE and outcome expectations explained 47% of variance in interest in counseling as a career, and in accordance with SCCT, the relationship between CSE and career choice was mediated by interests. Lent
et al. also found CSE to have small to moderate correlations ($r = .11$ to $.31$) with participants’ intended career choices. No research has examined the relationship between CSE and actual amount of time performing counseling activities.

**Limitations in the Research**

Despite promising findings so far, there are several limitations to the research on CSE, and claims for the importance of the construct need further study. Given Lent and colleagues’ extensive experience with social-cognitive theory, they provide an insightful review of what is needed in this literature (Lent et al., 1998). Among the concerns they have is the way CSE has been defined and measured. Larson and others have acknowledged that general self-efficacy is flexible, changing from situation to situation, but they have assessed CSE in such a way that suggests it remains constant when dealing with any client and any problem. This sort of view of CSE makes it more into a decontextualized trait rather than a set of dynamic beliefs. Furthermore, does “capability to effectively counsel” simply imply the ability to perform particular behaviors in session, or does it require the counselor have some beneficial impact on the client? Lent et al. feel that there has been less attention to outcome criteria than is needed.

Heppner et al. (1998), Larson & Daniels (1998), and Lent et al. (2003) recommended that more research examine how CSE impacts performance and skill level. Studies examining this relationship thus far (to be reviewed in detail later) are limited in that they used questionable rating systems in the context of short mock or analogue counseling sessions. More research is needed on CSE and performance from the perspective of the supervisor and in the context of actual counseling sessions to further assess how CSE impacts counselor/client behavior in counseling as well as for the
ensuing change process. O’Brien et al. (1997) pointed out that the goal of increasing
CSE may be premature and overly simplistic because it is likely that both overestimates
and underestimates of efficacy have detrimental effects on performance. Therefore,
understanding the optimal level of self-efficacy may be of more importance. O’Brien et
al. suggested that future research would benefit from assessment of actual skill levels
evidenced in specific counseling sessions, particularly through the use of supervisor
ratings of tapes.

Lent et al. (1998) also noted that more research is needed on the sources of
CSE. Although it is well-established that CSE scores increase with added counseling
experience and training, no substantial research has indicated specific training elements
that may be responsible for such change. A proposed source of CSE that has received
little attention is supervision. Based on SCT, Lent et al. suggested several likely
mechanisms by which supervisory persuasion works in promoting robust efficacy beliefs
such as positive feedback, support, modeling, and creating situations in which success is
likely.

Other needs in the research have been pointed out as well. Lent et al. (2003)
noted that much of the CSE research uses poorly developed measures and is not
adequately based in social-cognitive theory. The present study aims to improve on these
issues by studying relationships among elements of supervision, CSE, and performance
from the perspective of SCCT and by using a theoretically and psychometrically sound
measure of CSE.
When asked about his conception of supervision, Carl Rogers said, “I think my major goal is to help the therapist to grow in self-confidence and to grow in understanding of himself or herself, and to grow in understanding the therapeutic process” (Hackner & Goodyear, 1984, p. 283; as cited in Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Although he used the word self-confidence, it seems clear that Rogers understood the importance of supervisees learning to feel efficacious about their counseling abilities in supervision. The following is a review of how this is likely accomplished.

Bandura (1982) proposed four sources of information that increase or decrease percepts of self-efficacy: (a) performance enactment (e.g., performing a specific behavior successfully); (b) vicarious learning (e.g., observing a model successfully perform the specific behavior); (c) verbal persuasion (e.g., listening to someone accurately explain how to perform the behavior); and (d) emotional arousal (e.g., anxiety or other emotional states that either inhibit or enhance one’s self-efficacy). Bandura suggested that previous performance experiences are the strongest source of change in self-efficacy with success increasing self-efficacy and failure decreasing it.

Using confirmatory factor analysis, Lent, Lopez, Brown, and Gore (1996) found strong support for these four factors as main determinants of mathematics self-efficacy scores in high school and college students. As hypothesized by Bandura, other research (Lent, et al. 1996) has consistently shown personal performance accomplishments as the strongest of the predictors, in addition to the other three hypothesized variables, of mathematics self-efficacy. Larson and Daniels (1998) reviewed preliminary evidence that role-plays (performance enactment) and modeling (vicarious learning) may impact
CSE, but the studies cited are not available for closer review. Thus, it appears Bandura's original hypotheses regarding sources of self-efficacy are supported, but further research in the area of counselor development is needed.

Beyond Bandura, Lent et al. (1996) recognized that social cognitive variables do not arise in a vacuum independent of personal and contextual variables. They suggested that even though self-efficacy and outcome expectations have been found to be highly predictive of interest and performance, ability, values, previous learning experiences/opportunities, and a host of demographic variables (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, disability/health, etc.) influence social cognitive variables as well. Elements such as support, encouragement, needed resources, and the absence of barriers are important variables to consider. Lent et al. have shown that the effect of heritable aptitudes on subsequent career interests and performance operate largely through intervening learning experiences that both refine abilities and shape self-efficacy and outcome expectations.

More pertinent to supervision, Lent et al. (1998) hypothesized that a combination of knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy for central counseling tasks paired with challenging, proximal, and specific goals leads to counseling effectiveness. Beyond these basic assertions, they suggest that SCCT points to critical aspects of supervision that should lead to the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and self-efficacy. That is, supervision likely provides primary sources of efficacy through the relaying of factual information, providing supervisees with vicarious learning experiences, structured practice in which success is maximized, assistance with anxiety and affect management, and much needed support and encouragement. They also emphasize the importance of the supervisor-
supervisee relationship. This relationship is important in an indirect sense in that supervisors offer social persuasion within the context of their relationship with the supervisee, and it is also important in a direct sense in that the supervisory relationship is used to monitor and convey feedback about counselor performance. Clear and accurate feedback is required for counselors to accurately assess their performance and what is required for improvement. Supervisors whose feedback is inaccurate, ill timed, or ambiguous likely produce less positive results (Lent et al., 1998).

Lent et al. (1998) also proposed the following ingredients of verbal persuasion based on SCT: (1) Assisting the supervisee to establish challenging, proximal, and specific goals for skill acquisition; (2) Setting up counseling experiences in which success is likely; (3) Keeping the supervisee focused more on progress rather than ultimate goal attainment; (4) Reinforcing success experiences; and (5) Challenging maladaptive attributions regarding performance. Finally, they suggested that it would be extremely valuable to consider CSE in relation to the counselor's current performance capabilities as assessed by the supervisor. They noted that substantial over or underestimates of CSE can serve as a basis for supervisory intervention (Lent et al., 1998; Lent et al., 2003).

Larson and Daniels (1998) likewise suggested that one of the major tasks in supervision is to assess the counselor's level of CSE and current level of performance given that CSE is likely a crucial link that partly determines whether a counselor will produce efficacious results with clients. Larson and Daniels also noted that supervision is an ideal setting in which to deal with overly high and overly low CSE in trainees. Other
researchers have suggested the role of supervision in CSE as an area of much needed study as well (Heppner et al., 1998; O’Brien et al., 1997).

**Review of Related Supervision Literature**

Research based in the supervision literature offers evidence supportive of Bandura and Lent and colleagues’ proposed sources of self-efficacy as well. As for the supervisory relationship, several studies have examined the supervisory working alliance, which can arguably be thought of as a basis on which effective social influence, verbal persuasion, and performance enactments can take place. A strong supervisory working alliance has been shown to be related to stronger working alliances between counselors and clients, improved repair after a “tear” in the supervision relationship, less role-conflict and ambiguity, and increased supervisee willingness to disclose to the supervisor (Goodyear & Guzzard, 2000; Ladany & Friedlander, 1995; Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). Research has also shown that aspects of social influence (i.e., expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness) in the supervisor have lead to stronger supervisory alliances and increased openness to learning on the part of supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

As already noted, there are several studies in the CSE literature suggesting that experience is related to increased CSE. The supervision literature has also examined the relationship between amount of training and supervisee behavior and consistently found significant change in supervisee self-awareness, autonomy, and theory-skills acquisition over the course of a semester. Counselors with more training have also been found to have more confidence and clarity in presenting case information to others (Borders, 1990; Burke, Goodyear, & Guzzard, 1998). No research has addressed how specific positive and negative experiences with clients (i.e., performance enactments) impact self-efficacy.
Some researchers have indicated the importance of setting goals in supervision. Talen and Schindler (1993) found that supervisee-initiated goals helped set the stage for a collaborative relationship with the supervisor. Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) found that goal setting was highly correlated with supervisee satisfaction with supervision and a stronger supervisory working alliance. Bernard and Goodyear (2004) recommend that all supervision contracts should establish training goals along with a discussion of how these goals will be evaluated and achieved. In addition, researchers have noted the importance of providing ample support while at the same time balancing this with challenging goals and feedback (e.g., Blocher, 1983).

As for vicarious learning and verbal persuasion, the degree to which supervisors engage in modeling, role-plays, and directive explanations of knowledge likely depends on their theoretical orientations. However, research has shown that behavioral practice of skills during supervision through the use of imagery exercises, behavioral rehearsals, and role playing contributed to positive supervision outcomes (Milne & James, 2000; Rosenbaum & Ronen, 1998). In addition, several social role models emphasize the importance of the supervisor acting as teacher when appropriate (e.g., Bernard, 1997; Hawkins & Shohet, 1989; Holloway, 1995). At times, it is important for supervisors to monitor, evaluate, instruct, advise, model, consult, conceptualize, and support. However, there is little empirical investigation on how these interventions impact the supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Finally, emotional arousal has been examined in the supervision literature as well. As in the CSE literature, anxiety has been the main emotion studied although there have been calls to investigate other likely important emotions in supervision such as guilt,
shame, and embarrassment (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Hahn, 2002). With regard to anxiety, common sources in supervision are unclear expectations and roles as well as evaluation, with beginning students being more anxious than advanced students (Chapin & Ellis, 2002; as cited in Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Higher anxiety decreases ability to learn through observation, and too much or too little anxiety inhibits performance (Matthews, Davies, & Lees, 1990). Ronnestad and Skovholt (1993) also found that anxiety impacts what the supervisee reveals during supervision; anxious students may paint an overly optimistic picture of their performance by only bringing up clients showing good progress while avoiding more difficult issues. Helpful ways for supervisors to manage supervisee anxiety include increasing structure (Stoltenberg et al., 1998) and reducing ambiguity and confusion through more explicit discussion of supervisor/supervisee roles in supervision (Chapin & Ellis, 2002). Indeed, in addition to being challenged and learning new things, supervisees need to feel and appear competent, and an important task for the supervisor is to balance these needs (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Summary

This review of SCT, SCCT, CSE, and the supervision literature has shown that there is empirical support for Bandura’s four sources of CSE as well as Lent and colleagues’ additional hypotheses for supervisees, clients, and the supervision process. To further illuminate the potential role of supervision as a source of CSE, research is needed examining supervisor style, role conflict and ambiguity, the supervisory working alliance, and goal setting and feedback.
Supervision and Performance

In addition to the likely relationship between supervision and CSE, supervision has also been shown to play an important role in trainee performance. This seems logical and is in agreement with SCCT, which holds that learning experiences are related to performance outcomes through self-efficacy and outcome expectations (Lent et al., 1996).

Lambert and Ogles (1997) hypothesized that supervision is an essential step in generalizing skills learned in counseling training to actual work with clients, and Bernard and Goodyear (2004) suggested that a central purpose of supervision is to support and enhance trainee professional functioning. Holloway (1992) asserted that the ultimate goal of supervision is counselor competence in facilitating client change. However, evidence of supervision’s direct effect on client outcomes is scarce. Ellis and Ladany (1997) concluded that of the very few studies addressing this question, methodological and other problems make it impossible to draw justifiable conclusions. Goodyear and Guzzardo (2000) suggested that there are few studies directly addressing this question because (1) supervision models are limited in their prescriptive possibilities making them hard to compare, (2) there are generally no supervision manuals or protocols to ensure a particular style is being followed, and (3) it is hard to design a supervision efficacy study with a control group that maintains ethical obligations to clients.

Despite these limitations, there is indication that supervision facilitates trainee performance. For example, Holloway and Neufeldt (1995) found that supervision impacts particular trainee attitudes, skills, and behaviors, and all of these have been linked to performance with clients. Patton and Kivlighan (1997) found supervision to
positively affect trainee’s working alliances with their clients, and it is well known that a strong working alliance is associated with positive therapeutic outcome (Teyber & McClure, 2000). Findings such as these led Goodyear and Guzzardo (2000) to suggest that supervision likely affects client outcomes indirectly, and this relationship should be conceptualized in terms of mediated or path models. Perhaps it is the case that one such mediator of supervision’s impact on counselor performance is CSE.

*Review of Research Examining Both CSE and Supervision*

In her dissertation, among other hypotheses, Beverage (1989) examined the relationship between supervisory evaluation and CSE. She hypothesized that change in CSE over a six-week period would be related to supervisor evaluation. She also hypothesized that significant difference in counselor self-evaluation and supervisory evaluation would be significantly related to CSE as well. Thirty-one counseling students participated, and scales included the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS; Myrick & Kelly, 1971) and an unpublished CSE measure developed for this study. Her hypotheses were not supported; she did not find that change in CSE over time was significantly related to performance, but she did find a significant correlation ($r = .60$) between the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales and two individual administrations of the CSE measure. A major limitation to this study is the use of a CSE scale with unknown psychometric properties that was not created with any specific theory in mind. Beverage also noted that she was interested in examining the impact of supervisor evaluation, but several groups of students in her study did not receive feedback based on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales before completing the CSE measure.
In another dissertation, DeGraff (1996) used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to examine the relationship between change in CSE, exposure to clients, negative affectivity, and the supervisory alliance. The Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992) was used to measure CSE and was given weekly from mid-semester to the end of the semester. The Negative Affectivity Measure (Stokes & Levin, 1990) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI; Efstation et al., 1990) were administered at mid-semester. Eighteen students in either their first or second practicum participated. HLM indicated no significant growth pattern, so hypotheses addressing change in CSE were not supported. Surprisingly, negative affectivity was significantly related to higher CSE, but no other significant relationships were observed. The lack of findings in this study may be due to a low degree of power because of the small sample size.

In part of Daniels’s dissertation (1997), 45 graduate students in counseling and related programs were randomly assigned to receive either bogus positive or negative feedback after completing a 10-minute mock counseling session. Using the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992) to measure CSE, Daniels found that positive feedback was related to higher CSE while negative feedback was related to decreased CSE. These relationships were enhanced by negative affectivity.

Ossana (1990) examined the relationship between congruence in supervisee level of development and supervisor intervention with CSE and performance in her dissertation. Seventy-five counseling psychology supervisor-supervisee dyads participated and completed the Supervisor Levels Scale (SLS; Wiley & Ray, 1986) and an unpublished parallel measure of CSE and performance twice during a semester.
Results were mixed; both congruence and incongruence were related to CSE and performance depending on counselor developmental level and time of assessment. Likewise, both congruence and incongruence were related to increases in CSE and counseling ability depending on supervisee level and time of assessment. This study is quite limited due to its use of a CSE and ability measure with unknown psychometric properties and its lack of reference to any social-cognitive theory to guide proposed relationships.

In another dissertation, Humeidan (2002) used regression analysis to examine relationships between working alliance, social influence, experience, and CSE. Eighty-two participants completed the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992), the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (Efstation et al., 1990) and the Supervision Rating Form – Short (SRF-S; Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). Results indicated that supervisory working alliance from the supervisee’s perspective accounted for 22% of variance in CSE, social influence accounted for an additional 6%, and experience level accounted for an additional 13% of variance in CSE.

Summary

Research specifically examining relationships between supervision and CSE are scarce, and results are somewhat contradictory and limited due to methodological problems. A significant positive relationship was found between supervisor evaluation and CSE, but this study used an unpublished measure of CSE (Beverage, 1989). Two studies have examined the supervisory working alliance and found mixed results; Degraff (1996) found no relationship while Humiedan (2002) did. Congruence in supervisee level and supervisor intervention produced mixed results in CSE and performance
(Osanna, 1990), and aspects of supervisor social influence were significantly related to CSE (Humiedan, 2002). Daniels (1997) found that positive feedback and negative feedback impacted CSE in expected ways. With exception to Humiedan and DeGraff, these studies are limited due to their use of unpublished measures of CSE. In addition, few conclusions can be drawn about how supervision impacts CSE other than that aspects of social influence likely play a role, and the role of the supervision working alliance needs further investigation. Moreover, few of these studies were guided by social-cognitive theory. As many have noted, more research is needed in this area (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent et al., 1998; Lent et al., 2003).

CSE and Performance

As noted, general self-efficacy has been found to be predictive of performance (Bandura, 1982, Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Thompson & Perlini, 1998), and research based on SCCT has consistently shown various academic self-efficacies to be related to academic performance (Lent et al., 1994). However, even though self-efficacy has been shown to play an important role in determining how well people organize and use their skills, it is not a substitute for actual or objectively assessed skill. As many have pointed out (e.g., Heppner et al., 1998; Larson, 1998; Lent et al., 2003), people sometimes misread or misreport their capabilities, especially when they lack sufficient knowledge of task demands. O’Brien and colleagues (1997) noted the potential for beginning counselors to underestimate the complexity of the counseling process and overrate their skills as a result. For example, a trainee may feel very efficacious at dealing with highly anxious clients, while the supervisor judges the trainee’s self-rating as overly positive and unrealistic. This suggests that it may be necessary for supervisors to challenge trainees’
overly optimistic self-efficacy appraisals to orient them to skills that need further work. It also suggests that it is likely overly simplistic to automatically assume that higher CSE is better. It is essential to view CSE in the context of actual ability, and many have suggested that supervision is an ideal situation in which to do this (e.g., Heppner et al., 1998; Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Lent et al., 2003; O’Brien et al., 1997).

**Review of Research on CSE and Performance**

In the process of scale development, Larson et al. (1992) had 26 graduate students enrolled in a prepracticum counseling skills course complete the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory and participate in a 15-minute mock interview with an advanced counseling doctoral student playing the client. The interview was taped, and two counseling students rated performance using an 18-item rating form developed for this study (no psychometric properties were reported). Results showed that CSE had a significant positive relationship with performance ($r = .33$). Larson & Daniels (1998) also reported two dissertations (Johnson, 1985; Watson, 1992) using trained raters and unpublished CSE measures having found a positive relationship between CSE and performance.

Sharply and Ridgway (1993) used 31 Australian graduate students in a one-semester length counseling skills course to examine the role of self-efficacy in performance. Self-efficacy was assessed three times throughout the semester using an unpublished measure that consisted of two items asking students to estimate their grade in the course and their confidence in this estimation. At the end of the semester, performance was evaluated during an analogue counseling session in which the instructor or another psychologist served as both the client and evaluator. No significant
relationship was found between CSE and performance. Among the limitations to this study are the use of unpublished measures with only two items in the case of CSE, the absence of psychometric data on measures used, and the obvious confound of the instructor acting as both client and evaluator. Nevertheless, this is the only research indicating no relationship between CSE and performance.

Heppner et al. (1998) completed the most elaborate study of CSE and performance to date. Twenty-four graduate level career counselors completed a well-developed measure of Career Counseling Self-Efficacy (CCSES; O’Brien et al., 1997), and process/outcome data were collected from 55 actual clients receiving career counseling at a university career counseling center. Heppner et al. hypothesized that CSE would be positively related to increase in session-by-session outcomes (i.e., working alliance, goal accomplishment, career decidedness) as well as increase in overall outcome (i.e., self-clarity, overall career decidedness, increased career resources/knowledge, etc.). Using hierarchical linear modeling (HLM), results indicated that career counseling self-efficacy was not significantly related to growth patterns in any of the process measures. As for client outcome, Heppner et al. only reported data concerning the Career Transitions Inventory (Heppner, 1991); career counseling self-efficacy had a positive significant relationship ($r = .49$) with independence (i.e., feeling a degree of independence in making a career decision), and career counseling self-efficacy had a negative significant relationship ($r = -.52$) with control (i.e., perceived internal – external locus of control in decision making). This indicates clients of career counselors who have higher career counseling self-efficacy may actually experience less growth in personal control in the career planning process. Thus, the relationship between CSE and
performance may not be entirely linear, at least when performance is conceptualized as positive client outcomes. Based on these results, Heppner et al. caution against the assumption that a higher degree of CSE is automatically better. They recommend that future research attend to actual counselor skill level as evidenced in specific counseling sessions through the use of tapes and supervisor ratings. This may help in avoiding counselors’ over and under estimation of their own abilities.

Few studies have examined counselor performance from the supervisor’s perspective. Recall that in her dissertation, Beverage (1989) found a positive significant relationship between CSE and individual supervisor ratings of performance ($r = .60$) using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales (Myrick & Kelly, 1971). However, she had few participants in her study and used an unpublished measure of CSE. Larson & Daniels (1998) reported mixed findings between CSE and supervisor rated performance ($rs$ ranged from $-.84$ to $.31$), but these data are based on a paper presentation and are not available for further examination.

In her dissertation, among other variables of interest, Kocarek (2001) examined the relationship between CSE as measured by the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson et al., 1992) and performance as measured by supervisors’ evaluations using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales (Myrick & Kelly, 1971). Participants included 117 master’s level counselors and 82 supervisors in a variety of settings. Results using hierarchical regression analysis indicated that CSE, anxiety, developmental level, number of courses, and amount of counseling experience together significantly predicted 22% of variance in counselor performance. However, CSE did not predict variance in performance over and above the other predictors. There was also a multicolinearity
confound between the CSE measure and the measure of counselor developmental level (i.e., the SLQ-R).

Summary

Larson et al. (1992) found a positive correlation between CSE and performance in the process of scale development. Beverage (1989) and Kocarek (2001) found CSE to be related to performance as well. Sharply and Ridgway (1993) and Heppner et al. (1998) found a minimal relationship to no relationship. Therefore, results are mixed, and further investigation is needed in this area. These results are also quite limited due to noted methodological flaws such as the use of mock interviews, poor measures of CSE and performance, and small sample sizes. Only two studies, which were unpublished dissertations, examined performance from the supervisor’s perspective and had slightly contradictory results with one indicating a strong relationship (Beverage, 1989) and the other a minimal relationship (Kocerak, 2001). Heppner et al. (1998) performed the strongest study in this area, but results in the career counseling domain may be difficult to generalize to other types of counseling. It has also been suggested that conceptualizing counselor performance as positive client outcome may not be a realistic way to assess performance due to client variability (Lent et al., 2003). This review is in agreement with Larson and Daniel’s (1998) view that the relationship between supervisors’ ratings of counselor performance and CSE is unclear and that more research is needed.

Evidence of a Mediation Model

As noted, Bandura hypothesized that the relationship between abilities and performance outcomes will be partially mediated by self-efficacy beliefs. Lent et al. (1994; 1996) also hypothesized that (1) self-efficacy is directly related to performance
and that (2) sources of self-efficacy (e.g., learning experiences) are related to performance through their relationship with self-efficacy. Therefore, self-efficacy is hypothesized to mediate the relationship between sources of self-efficacy and performance, and existing empirical evidence is in support of these hypotheses.

Lent et al. (1994) reported a modest relationship between abilities and interests that was eliminated when the effects of self-efficacy beliefs were controlled. They also report data indicating partial mediation of the relationship between past achievement and performance. Some studies have also shown self-efficacy having a moderating effect on the relationship between abilities and performance (Lent et al., 1994; as cited in Swanson & Gore, 2000). Therefore, based on SCT and SCCT theory, it is likely that CSE plays a mediating role in the relationship between sources of self-efficacy (i.e., elements of supervision) and performance as rated by the supervisor.

The Present Study

Based on this review of theory and research, the present study examined the following variables: (1) The relationship between elements of supervision and CSE; (2) The relationship between CSE and performance as evaluated by the supervisor; and (3) Whether CSE mediates the relationship between elements of supervision and counselor performance. It was hypothesized that elements of supervision would predict a significant portion of variance in CSE. It was also expected that higher levels of CSE would be significantly related to higher levels of performance from the supervisor’s perspective. Finally, it was hypothesized that CSE would mediate significant relationships between elements of supervision and counselor performance.
Elements of supervision were assessed using a variety of measures each measuring a different construct; these measures were filled out by counselor trainees. The Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001) was used to measure to what extent creating goals and receiving helpful feedback occur in supervision. The supervisory working alliance was measured using the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI; Efstation, Patton, & Kardash; 1990). This measure assesses the degree of client focus, rapport, and identification with mutual goals for supervision. Supervisory style was measured using the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984), which assesses levels of supervisor attractiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, and task orientation. Finally, the presence of role conflict and role ambiguity in the supervisory relationship was assessed using the Role Conflict and Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI; Olk & Friedlander, 1992).

CSE was measured using the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003). This scale yields a total CSE score as well as self-efficacy scores for exploration, insight, and action skills, session management, managing client distress, and managing relationship conflict. Counselor performance was evaluated by supervisors using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS; Myrick & Kelly, 1971). The scale yields scores for counselors’ work in counseling sessions as well as counselors’ use of supervision. Although this scale was chosen for its adequate psychometric qualities and relatively extensive use in the literature, there is frankly a dearth of good measures in this area from which to choose (Ellis & Ladany, 1997).
CHAPTER 3

Method

Participants

Data collection occurred during the fall and spring semesters of 2004 and 2005. During the 11\textsuperscript{th}-14\textsuperscript{th} weeks of the fall semester of 2004, 93 packets were distributed, and during the 7\textsuperscript{th}-15\textsuperscript{th} weeks of the spring semester of 2005, 110 packets were distributed. A total of 58 complete data sets (i.e., those with both supervisee and supervisor data) were returned in all, which resulted in a 29\% return rate. In addition to complete data sets, five supervisees returned data without data from their supervisors, and four supervisors returned data without data from their supervisees. These incomplete data sets were not used in any analyses.

Research data were collected primarily from supervisee-supervisor dyads at university counseling centers across the country. Participants at doctoral counseling training sites were used in order to increase the likelihood of collecting from a sample with a similar training background and applied experience. Data were also collected from five supervisees and seven supervisors working at a career counseling clinic at Southern Illinois University. Although the focus is primarily career counseling at this site, it was deemed reasonable to assume that the counseling skills and elements of supervision assessed by the measures used in this study were equally applicable to this group of participants given their counseling training background and supervision.

Supervisees were eligible to participate if (1) they had accrued over six direct client contact hours during the semester in which they received the research packet, (2)
they were receiving at least one hour of individual supervision a week in which the supervisor observed their counseling work via direct observation, audio, or video tape, and (3) they had met with their supervisors for at least six sessions of supervision during the semester in which they were contacted. Supervisors were eligible to participate if they were at the internship level or higher. However, the seven supervisors at the career counseling clinic were in the fourth year of their counseling doctoral program and going on internship the next semester. It should also be noted that three of the supervisors had more than one supervisee participating in the study. In each case, the supervisor had two supervisees and simply completed a separate evaluation for each supervisee.

Please see Table 1 for a full description of participant demographic data. Two supervisees and one supervisor did not return completed demographic data sheets and were therefore not included in the demographic summary.

Supervisees ranged in age from 22 to 48 years with an average of 28-years-old. The majority were female (72.4%) and identified their ethnicity/race as Euro American (74.1%). Of the remaining 25% of supervisees, three were African American, five were multiracial, three were Asian American, and two indicated that they were of an ethnic background not identified among the response options. As for their current educational level, 41.4% were at the bachelor’s level, 51.7% were at the master’s level, and 3.4% were at the doctoral level. The majority of supervisees (79.3%) were in counseling psychology doctoral programs. Other supervisees indicated that they were in social work (3.4%), clinical psychology (6.9%), or a program type other than one of the response options (5.2%). Supervisees were fairly equally distributed in terms of their amount of training experience; 39.7% were in the first year of their program, 27.6% were in the
second, 22.4% were in the third, and 6.8% were in the fourth year or beyond. The majority of supervisees entered their program with a bachelor’s degree (74.1%) and had completed an average of 2.8 semester-length practica. Sessions of supervision completed ranged from 6 to 28 ($M = 11.67, SD = 3.44$). Direct client contact hours during the semester of participation ranged from 6 to 150 hours ($M = 35.44, SD = 24.13$). Total direct contact hours throughout all of their training experience ranged from 13 to 1,500 hours ($M = 170.60, SD = 271.21$).

The majority of supervisors were women (55.2%), ranged in age from 25 to 64 years ($M = 36.84, SD = 10.20$), and identified their ethnicity/race as Euro American (77.6%). Five supervisors were African American, one was multiracial, four were Asian American, one was Latina, and one indicated that s/he was of an ethnic background not identified among the response options. The majority of supervisors had doctoral degrees (63.8%); 34.5% had a master’s degree. The majority of degrees held by supervisors were in the field of counseling psychology (65.5%) or clinical psychology (22.4%). Supervisors held degrees in social work (3.4%) or educational psychology (1.7%) as well. Supervisors’ years of experience providing supervision ranged from 0 to 38 years ($M = 6.67, SD = 7.79$), and their total number of previous supervisees ranged from 0 to 75 ($M = 16.65, SD = 21.21$).

**Measures**

*Elements of Supervision*

*Supervisory Working Alliance.* The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI; Efstation et al., 1990; see Appendix A) is a 19-item self-report measure of trainees’ perceptions of their relationship in counseling supervision. Items are rated
using a 7-point Likert response format (1 = almost never; 7 = almost always). Scores are the average of the item ratings and can range from one to seven with a higher score indicating a stronger working alliance.

Psychometric data were collected from 185 supervisors and 178 trainees in counseling and clinical psychology training programs. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated two factors; one of them taps the trainee’s perception of support from the supervisor (i.e., Rapport) and the other taps the extent to which trainees perceive that they work closely with their supervisors to improve their clinical skills (i.e., Client focus). Internal consistency reliability estimates were $a = .90$ for Rapport, .77 for Client Focus, and .95 for total score. Similar alphas have been found in subsequent research (Humeidan, 2002; Sumeral & Borders, 1996). Adequate convergent and divergent validity was found using the Supervisor Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984) and a counselor self-efficacy scale made for this study. Item-scale correlations ranged from .37 to .77. In the current study, total scale internal consistency reliability was found to be $a = .92$. At the subscale level, internal consistency reliabilities were $a = .93$ for Rapport and .77 for Client Focus.

**Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory.** The Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; see Appendix B) is a 21-item self-report measure of the degree to which trainees feel their supervision is characterized by effective goal setting and feedback. The instrument consists of two subscales, which are rated using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). One of the subscales assesses the extent to which trainees feel supervisors have facilitated the setting of goals for the supervision experience, and the
other assesses the extent to which trainees feel feedback or information is relayed about their performance and progress towards their goals. Scores can range from 21 to 147 with higher scores indicating more effective goal setting and feedback in supervision from the trainee’s perspective.

Psychometric properties were established using 274 counseling trainees enrolled in practicum or internship at a variety of sites. Participants ranged from having one to eight years of counseling experience. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the two factor model, and internal consistency reliability estimates for the Goal Setting and Feedback subscales were $\alpha = .89$ and .69, respectively. Item-scale correlations ranged from .23 to .80, and construct validity was evidenced by both subscales having significant relationships with the supervisory working alliance (WAI-T; Bahrick, 1990), increased supervisor influence on trainee general self-efficacy (S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983), and increased satisfaction with supervision (SSQ; Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). In the current study, internal consistency reliability at the total scale level had an alpha of .85. At the subscale level, Goal Setting had an alpha of .82, and Feedback had an alpha of .73.

**Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory.** The Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI; Olk & Friedlander, 1992; see Appendix C) is a self-report 29-item measure of the extent to which trainees experience role difficulties in supervision. Role ambiguity occurs when trainees are unsure of supervisory expectations for their performance or evaluation, and role conflict occurs when trainees encounter opposing expectations for their behavior. Items are rated in terms of how representative they are of the current supervisory relationship on a 5-point scale from 1 (not at all) to 5
(very much so) yielding a total score and subscale scores for Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. Scores, the average of ratings, can range from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating higher levels of role conflict and role ambiguity in supervision.

Psychometric data were collected from 240 doctoral-level trainees in counseling and clinical psychology ranging in experience from practicum to postdoctoral fellowship. Confirmatory factor analysis supported the two-factor model, and internal consistency reliability was adequate ($a = .91$ and $.89$). Item-scale correlations ranged from .37 to .77, and construct validity was established through significant relationships with increased work-related anxiety (STAI; Spielberger et al., 1983), general work dissatisfaction (JDI; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), and dissatisfaction with supervision (TPRS-R; Holloway & Wampold, 1984). In the current study, total scale internal consistency reliability had an alpha of .92. The Role Conflict subscale had an alpha of .88, and the Role Ambiguity subscale had an alpha of .89.

**Supervisory Styles Inventory.** The Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI; Friedlander & Ward, 1984; see Appendix D) is a 33-item self-report measure that asks supervisees to rate how much several descriptors are representative of their supervisor on a 7-point Likert scale ($1 = \text{not very}, 7 = \text{very}$). The three subscales assess attractiveness (e.g., warm, supportive, friendly, etc.), interpersonal sensitivity (e.g., relationship-oriented, invested, therapeutic, etc.), and task orientation (e.g., content-focused, goal-oriented, practical, structured, etc.). Scores, the average ratings for the items keyed on each of the three subscales, can range from 1 to 7 with higher scores indicating stronger presence of a particular style.
Psychometric properties were examined in four separate studies using 337 supervisors and 252 trainees in a variety of practicum settings. The majority of supervisors and supervisees were from counseling and clinical psychology doctoral programs, but 52 trainees were from counselor education and social work programs as well. Two factor analyses supported the three factor model. Several measures of internal consistency reliability were adequate at the subscale and total scale level (alphas ranged from .76 to .94), and item-scale correlations ranged from .38 to .82. In the current study, the total scale had an internal consistency reliability of $\alpha = .92$. At the subscale level, Attractive had an alpha of .93, Interpersonally Sensitive had an alpha of .90, and Task Oriented had an alpha of .89. Test-retest reliability over a two-week period for the total scale and each separate subscale ranged from .78 to .92. Convergent validity was evidenced by significant relationships between the three SSI subscale scores and three composite variables from Stenack and Dye’s (1982) Teacher, Counselor, and Consultant items. Trainee scores were independent of social desirability, and scores were significantly related to satisfaction with supervision. The scale was also able to differentiate between supervisors of different theoretical orientations in expected ways (e.g., task oriented scale related to behavioral orientation, etc.). Several studies are in support of the psychometric adequacy of the SSI (Efstation et al., 1990).

Counselor Self-Efficacy

Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale. The Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES; Lent, Hill, & Hoffman, 2003; see Appendix E) was developed in order to remedy problems with existing measures of counseling self-efficacy (i.e., lack of theoretical base, tapping constructs other than self-efficacy, and inability to sample self-
efficacy relative to more advanced counseling skills). The scale asks counselors to rate 41 items on a 10-point scale (0 = no confidence, 10 = complete confidence) in terms of their perceived confidence in their ability to use the noted skills or deal effectively with the noted situations. The scale is comprised of three subdomains: The Helping Skills Self-Efficacy subdomain, which is based on Hill and O’Brien’s training model (1999), assesses self-efficacy for basic counseling skills at three stages (i.e., exploration, insight, and action). The Session Management Self-Efficacy subdomain captures counselors’ self-efficacy to integrate the basic helping skills in managing a variety of specific counseling session tasks (e.g., respond with the best helping skill, help your client talk about his/her problem at a deep level, etc.). The Counseling Challenges Self-Efficacy subdomain assesses self-efficacy for dealing with situations counselors likely find highly challenging (e.g., working with a suicidal client, working with a client who is sexually attracted to you, etc.). Scores on each of the subscales and at the total scale level are the average of item ratings and can range from 0 to 10 with higher scores indicating higher CSE.

Psychometric data were collected from 345 students enrolled either in a helping skills training class for advanced undergraduates, a master’s level counseling practicum, or from students at various levels of doctoral training in counseling psychology. Factor analysis supported the three-factor model. Internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .79 to .92, and the total scale alpha was .97. In the current study, internal consistency at the total scale level had an alpha of .95. At the subscale level, Helping Skills had an alpha of .87, Session Management had an alpha of .87, and Counseling Challenges had an alpha of .92. Intercorrelations among the individual CASES scales were medium to
large, suggesting that the scales represent overlapping, yet distinct, aspects of CSE. Test-retest reliability at two weeks was adequate (.80 to .96). Convergent validity was established by large correlations ($r_s = .50$ range) with Larson et al.’s measure of CSE (COSE), and correlations with social desirability were minimal. Criterion validity was established through significant relationships with positive outcome expectations (scale developed for this study), intended career choice, and relationships in expected directions with positive and negative affect (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988).

As proposed by SCCT, CSE explained 24% of variance in interest in counseling-related activities as measured by Leong and Zachar’s Scientist-Practitioner Inventory (SPI). Total CASES scores were also significantly related to career choice intentions in the counseling area. Also as proposed by SCCT, interests fully mediated the effects of CSE and outcome expectations on career choice. In addition, CASES scores were sensitive to change over the course of a semester, and scores had a positive linear relationship with experience level.

Counselor Performance

Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS; Myrick & Kelly, 1971) is the most widely used measure of counselor performance for which reliability and validity information is available (Ellis & Ladany, 1997) (See Appendix F). The CERS contains 27 items on which supervisors rate supervisees using a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). The instrument is comprised of two 13-item scales assessing Performance in Counseling and Performance in Supervision. A final composite item asks whether supervisees can be recommended for a counseling position without hesitation. Item ratings are combined to
yield a total score that can range from 27 to 189 with higher scores indicating better performance.

Psychometric properties were initially established using 45 counseling supervisee/supervisor dyads from the University of Florida. Split-half reliability was .86, and test-retest reliability over four weeks was .94. Factor analysis (Loesch & Rucker, 1977) corresponded with the two-scale model, and more recent research has obtained similar internal consistency reliability estimates (Kocarek, 2001). In the current study, total scale internal consistency reliability had an alpha of .90. The Performance in Counseling subscale had an alpha of .86, and the Performance in Supervision subscale had an alpha of .76.

Procedure

Sites were contacted to participate by two methods. During the fall semester of 2004, the primary researcher contacted Southern Illinois University (SIU) interns and SIU alumnus at university counseling centers across the country to request that they serve as a research contact at their training site. The research contact at each site was responsible for handing out the research packets to the supervisees, forwarding an informational email about the study to the supervisees and supervisors, collecting the research materials by the due date, and mailing the materials back to the primary researcher. Approximately nine sites participated.

Because not enough packets were returned after this initial collection period, data were again collected during the spring semester of 2005. In order to expand the number of possible collection sites, additional sites were contacted by the primary researcher with the use of the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC)
website (www.appic.org). The APPIC website was used because it summarizes site information such as whether supervision of practicum students training is available to interns as training experience and includes contact information for both the director of training and chief psychologist. Sites were contacted to participate if they offered supervision training and if they had at least three or more practicum students seeing clients. The majority of correspondence was through email, and both training directors and chief psychologists served as research contacts for their sites. Out of approximately 30 counseling centers contacted, 15 sites sent back data.

The research contact at each site gave supervisees the research packet and forwarded a brief email welcoming their participation in the study. Research packets contained (1) a brief demographic questionnaire for supervisees (see Appendix G), (2) a cover letter and informed consent explanation to supervisees (see Appendix I), (3) measures to be completed by supervisees, and (4) a research packet to be handed by the supervisees to their supervisors should s/he choose to participate. Research packets given to supervisors by their supervisees contained (1) a brief demographic questionnaire (see Appendix H), (2) a cover letter and informed consent explanation (see Appendix J), and (3) the measure to be completed by supervisors. Rather than the research contact handing out packets directly to supervisors, supervisees were instructed to give the supervisor’s portion of the research packet to him/her in order to keep sets of data together and minimize the number of incomplete data sets (i.e., data sets missing data from either the supervisee or supervisor). Upon completion, supervisees and supervisors were instructed to individually return their research materials sealed in provided envelopes, one for the supervisee and one for the supervisor, by the noted deadline to the research contact at
each site. At no time were supervisees and supervisors privy to each other’s data, and they were given a window of about two weeks to complete the research at a time and place of their choosing. The research contact then sent back any returned materials to the primary researcher via a pre-paid envelope.

This procedure differed slightly at two sites. The research contact at one university counseling center handed out the supervisors’ portion of the research packets directly to the supervisors rather than have supervisees give it to them. And because it was during the last week of the semester, supervisor packets were given directly to supervisors at the SIU career counseling clinic by the primary researcher in order to reduce collection time.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1

How do elements of supervision contribute to CSE?

Hypothesis 1. Scores on the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI), Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) will predict a significant portion of variance in total CSE score as measured by the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES).

Exploratory correlation analysis was used to indicate how each of the three supervisory styles as measured by the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) relate to CSE as measured by the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES).

Research Question 2

Is CSE related to counselor performance?
Hypothesis 2. Correlation analysis will indicate that total CSE score as measured by the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES) has a significant positive relationship with counselor performance as evaluated by supervisors using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales (CERS).

Research Question 3

Is the relationship between elements of supervision and counselor performance mediated by CSE?

Hypothesis 3. Regression analysis will indicate that the relationship between elements of supervision (i.e., Supervisory Styles Inventory, Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory, Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory, and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory) and counselor performance (i.e., total score Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale) will be mediated by CSE (i.e., total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale).

Additional ad hoc correlation analysis explored relationships between elements of supervision, CSE, and counselor performance at the subscale level. Relationships between supervisee training level, experience, and CSE were explored as well.
CHAPTER 4

Results

The first portion of this chapter will present results related to the hypotheses posed in the study. The second portion of the chapter presents the results of selected ad hoc exploratory analyses.

Table 2 reports the means and standard deviations at the subscale and total scale level for all of the measures used in this study. The means and standard deviations for all of the scales were similar to those obtained in validation studies as well as other research using these instruments. Table 3 shows a correlation matrix for the main variables in this study and will be described throughout this chapter. All significance tests of the hypotheses were one-tailed.

Results Related to Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Scores on the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI), Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) will predict a significant portion of variance in total CSE score as measured by the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). This hypothesis was tested using multiple regression analysis. As shown in Table 4, the full model containing all three predictors did predict a significant portion of variance in total score CSE ($R = .58, R^2 = .33, F_{3,54} = 9.04, p < .01$). However, neither total score Role Conflict Role Ambiguity (RCRAI) or total score Evaluation Process Within Supervision (EPSI) made significant contributions to the equation beyond total score Supervisory Working
Alliance (SWAI). When these variables are dropped from the equation, total score on the Supervisory Working Alliance (SWAI) predicts 31% of variance in total score CSE ($R = .55, R^2 = .31, F_{1,56} = 24.62, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was partially supported.

Because some of the variables used in this regression analysis are highly intercorrelated, multicollinearity was assessed. The first step in assessing multicollinearity is to examine a correlation matrix of the variables being used in regression analysis (see Table 3). In general, correlations greater than .80 between independent variables are regarded as problematic (Berry & Feldman, 1985; Polit, 1996). Intercorrelations among total score Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity (RCRAI), Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI), and Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) approach this mark ranging from .70 to -.74, so further investigation of multicollinearity was warranted. Statistical analysis of the full model indicated variable tolerances ranging from .38 to .42 and Variation Inflation Factors (VIF) ranging from 2.36 to 2.67. These tolerances and VIFs are within an acceptable range, which indicates multicollinearity was not problematic in this regression analysis.

Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to examine relationships between each of the three supervisory styles as measured by the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) and CSE as measured by total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). As shown in Table 3, both the Attractive ($r = .35, p < .01$) and Interpersonally Sensitive ($r = .31, p < .01$) subscales on the Supervisory Styles Inventory were significantly related to total score CSE. The Task Oriented supervisory style was not significantly related to total score CSE ($r = .17, ns$).
Hypothesis 2

Correlation analysis will indicate that total CSE score as measured by the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES) has a significant positive relationship with counselor performance as evaluated by supervisors using the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scales (CERS). This hypothesis was tested by computing a Pearson product-moment correlation between the total score CASES and total score CERS. As shown in Table 3, higher total CASES scores were significantly related to higher total CERS scores ($r = .46, p < .01$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was supported.

Mediation Hypothesis

The relationship between elements of supervision (i.e., Supervisory Styles Inventory, total score Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory, Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory, and Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory) and counselor performance (i.e., total score Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale) will be mediated by CSE (i.e., total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale). In order to determine whether CSE plays a mediating role in the relationships between elements of supervision and counselor performance, a series of regression analyses were computed. Following Baron and Kenny (1986), to test for mediation (1) the predictor (elements of supervision) must be significantly related to the criterion (performance). This was tested by individually regressing the proposed elements of supervision (RCRAI, EPSI, SWAI, SSI-Attractive, SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive, SSI-Task Oriented) on performance (total score CERS). After this step, SSI-Task Oriented and total score Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) were dropped from further testing because they were not significantly related to the criterion. (2) The predictor (elements of supervision)
must be significantly related to the proposed mediator (CSE). This was tested by individually regressing the proposed elements of supervision (RCRAI, SWAI, SSI-Attractive, SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive) on CSE (total score CASES). (3) The proposed mediator (CSE) must be significantly related to the criterion (performance). This was tested by regressing total score CASES on total score CERS. (4) The relationship between the initial predictor (elements of supervision) and the criterion (performance) disappears or is substantially reduced when the variance in the criterion accounted for by the mediator is controlled. To test for this, both the initial variables (i.e., elements of supervision) and the proposed mediator (i.e., CSE) are entered together as predictor variables in the same regression equation. To establish mediation, the semipartial correlation between the initial predictor and the outcome variable should be zero or at least significantly smaller than it was in the first step of the procedure. Its beta weight should be significantly reduced as well. The mediator variable should still have a significant semipartial correlation with the outcome variable of interest. This procedure was followed for each of the four predictor variables.

*Supervisory Styles Inventory-Attractive.* Figure 1 shows a graphic representation of this series of tests for Supervisory Styles Inventory-Attractive as the predictor variable. Table 4 shows the relevant regression results. First, SSI-Attractive accounts for significant variation in total score CERS \( (R = .48, R^2 = .23, F_{1,56} = 16.82, p < .01) \). In step 2, SSI-Attractive accounted for a significant portion of variance in total score CASES \( (R = .35, R^2 = .12, F_{1,56} = 7.87, p < .01) \). In step three, total score CASES accounted for a significant portion of variance in total score CERS \( (R = .46, R^2 = .21, F_{1,56} = 14.65, p < .01) \). Therefore, the first three conditions for mediation were met.
Regression of both total score CASES and SSI-Attractive on total score CERS showed that although the SSI-Attractive beta weight was slightly reduced from the first step in the mediation analysis ($\beta = .48$ to $\beta = .37$), SSI-Attractive remained a significant predictor of total score CERS after controlling for CASES scores ($sr = .39$, $\beta = .37$, $t = 3.09$, $p < .01$). Therefore, CSE did not mediate the relationship between SSI-Attractive and counselor performance.

*Supervisory Styles Inventory-Interpersonally Sensitive.* Figure 2 and Table 6 show the relevant tests with SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive as the predictor. In the first step, SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive was a significant predictor of total score CERS ($R = .22$, $R^2 = .05$, $F_{1,56} = 2.93$, $p < .05$). In the second step, SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive was a significant predictor of variance in total score CASES ($R = .31$, $R^2 = .10$, $F_{1,56} = 5.98$, $p < .05$). In the third step, the relationship between the proposed mediator and the criterion was, of course, the same with total score CASES predicting a significant portion of variance in total score CERS ($R = .46$, $R^2 = .21$, $F_{1,56} = 14.65$, $p < .01$). Regression of both total score CASES and SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive on total score CERS showed that SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive was no longer a significant predictor of total score CERS after controlling for total score CASES. The SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive beta weight changed from $\beta = .22$ to $\beta = .09$, and it had an insignificant semipartial correlation with total score CERS ($sr = .10$, $t = .72$, $ns$). Total score CASES maintained a significant semipartial correlation with total score CERS ($sr = .42$, $\beta = .43$, $t = 3.40$, $p < .01$). Therefore, conditions for the mediation by CSE of the relationship between SSI-Interpersonally Sensitive and counselor performance appear to have been met.
Supervisory Working Alliance. Figure 3 and Table 7 show the relevant tests with total score SWAI as the predictor. In the first step, total score SWAI was a significant predictor of total score CERS ($R = .38$, $R^2 = .15$, $F_{1,56} = 9.59$, $p < .01$). The second step showed total score SWAI as a significant predictor of variation in total score CASES ($R = .55$, $R^2 = .31$, $F_{1,56} = 24.62$, $p < .01$). In the third step, total score CASES predicted a significant portion of variance in total score CERS ($R = .46$, $R^2 = .21$, $F_{1,56} = 14.65$, $p < .01$). In the fourth step, regression of both total score CASES and total score SWAI on total score CERS showed that SWAI was no longer a significant predictor of total score CERS after controlling for total score CASES. The total score SWAI beta weight changed from $\beta = .38$ to $\beta = .19$, and it had an insignificant semipartial correlation with total score CERS ($sr = .18$, $t = 1.33$, $ns$). Total score CASES maintained a significant semipartial correlation with total score CERS ($sr = .32$, $\beta = .35$, $t = 2.48$, $p < .05$).

Therefore, conditions for the mediation by CSE of the relationship between Supervisor Working Alliance and counselor performance appear to have been met.

Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. Figure 4 and Table 8 show the relevant tests with total score RCRAI as the predictor. In the first step, total score RCRAI was a significant predictor of total score CERS ($R = .31$, $R^2 = .10$, $F_{1,56} = 5.87$, $p < .05$). The second step showed total score RCRAI as a significant predictor of variation in total score CASES ($R = .52$, $R^2 = .27$, $F_{1,56} = 20.74$, $p < .01$). In the third step, total score CASES predicted a significant portion of variance in total score CERS ($R = .46$, $R^2 = .21$, $F_{1,56} = 14.65$, $p < .01$). In the fourth step, regression of both total score CASES and total score RCRAI on total score CERS showed that RCRAI was no longer a significant predictor of total score CERS after controlling for total score CASES. The total score
RCRAI beta weight changed from $\beta = -.31$ to $\beta = -.10$, and it had an insignificant semipartial correlation with total score CERS ($sr = -.09, t = -.70, ns$). Total score CASES maintained a significant semipartial correlation with total score CERS ($sr = .36, \beta = .41, t = 2.89, p < .01$). Therefore, conditions for the mediation by CSE of the relationship between Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity and counselor performance appear to have been met.

*Supplementary Exploratory Analyses*

Supplementary analyses were conducted to further assess relationships between elements of supervision, CSE, and performance at the subscale level. Relationships among supervisee experience, CSE, and performance were explored as well. Supplementary exploratory analysis tests of significance were two-tailed.

*Elements of Supervision and CSE*

Correlation analyses were computed between subscales of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI), and the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI). Table 9 shows the results of these analyses as well as intercorrelations among the subscales. Recall that relationships between the Supervisory Styles Inventory and CSE and the subscale level were reported in the main results section.

Both the Goal Setting ($r = .34, p < .01$) and the Feedback ($r = .36, p < .01$) subscales of the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) were significantly related to total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). Both the Role Conflict ($r = -.41, p < .01$) and the Role Ambiguity ($r = -.52, p < .01$) subscales of the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) were significantly related to
total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES) as well. In addition, both the Rapport \( (r = .55, p < .01) \) and Client Focus \( (r = .42, p < .01) \) subscales of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) were significantly related to total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES).

**CSE and Counselor Performance**

Correlation analyses were computed between subscales of the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES) and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS). Table 10 shows the results of these analyses as well as intercorrelations among the subscales. The Helping Skills subscale had the strongest significant relationship with total score CERS \( (r = .50, p < .01) \). The Session Management \( (r = .38, p < 01) \) and the Counseling Challenges \( (r = .38, p < .01) \) subscales had significant relationships with total score CERS as well.

**Supervisee Experience, CSE, and Counselor Performance**

Correlation analyses were computed to explore the relationship between supervisee experience level, CSE, and counselor performance. The number of semester length practica completed \( (r = .36, p < .01) \) and number of years in a graduate program \( (r = .29, p < .05) \) had significant positive relationships with total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). Although in the expected direction, age \( (r = .23, ns) \), the number of direct client contact hours during the semester of data collection \( (r = .21, ns) \) and supervisees’ total direct client contact hours \( (r = .22, ns) \) were not significantly related to total score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). In terms of the relationship between supervisee experience level and performance as rated by supervisors, number of semester length practicum completed \( (r = .39, p < .01) \) and total
direct contact hours \( (r = .33, p < .05) \) had significant positive relationships with total score Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) while age, years in a graduate program, and total direct contact hours during the collection semester did not.
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Discussion

The findings were generally supportive of the study’s hypotheses. Using Cohen’s (1988) suggested definitions of correlation sizes, all of the proposed elements of supervision except the Task Oriented supervisory style had moderate to large relationships with CSE at the general (i.e., total score) and specific (i.e., subscale score) level. The supervisory working alliance was the strongest predictor of CSE among these elements of supervision. CSE had moderate relationships with counselor performance at the general and specific level as well. As for the proposed mediation of the relationship between elements of supervision and counselor performance by CSE, results were mixed. CSE appeared to play a mediating role for three of the six possible predictors (i.e., interpersonally sensitive supervision style, the supervisory working alliance, and role conflict and role ambiguity). CSE did not play a mediating role between the attractive supervision style, the task oriented supervision style, or the evaluation process in supervision. Finally, counselor experience was moderately related to both CSE and counselor performance.

Prior to a more detailed discussion of these results, the moderate to large intercorrelations among variables is addressed. Limitations, recommendations for future research, and the implications of this study for counselor supervision and training are discussed.
Intercorrelations Among the Variables

Because results in a study of this nature are based on scores obtained from paper-and-pencil instruments, it is necessary that the findings be considered with the quality of the instruments in mind. A potentially problematic aspect of this study was the high level of intercorrelations among the proposed elements of supervision at both the total and subscale level. Although multicollinearity was technically not a confound, the utility of using this combination of measures in future research is questionable.

Correlations at the total scale level between the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI), the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (SWAI) and the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) were moderate to large ranging from $r = .36$ to $.74$. At the subscale level, correlations were moderate to large as well ranging from $r = .34$ to $.68$. However, scale intercorrelations of this nature with these measures are common in the literature.

For example, in a scale validation study, Efstation et al. (1990) found correlations between the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) and the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) to be moderate to large at both the total and subscale level ($r = .40$ to $.78$). Likewise, Strauss (1994) found large correlations ranging from $r = .52$ to $.78$ between the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) as well. Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) found large correlations ($r = .50$ to $.78$) at both the total and subscale level between the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) and a measure of the supervisory working alliance (i.e., the Working Alliance Inventory; WAI-T; Bahrick, 1990). Friedlander and Ward (1984) found correlations among the three supervisory styles on the Supervisory
Styles Inventory (SSI) to be between $r = .23$ to $.61$, which is similar to results in this study ($r = .18$ to $.53$). Using regression analysis, Ladany and Friedlander (1995) found the three subscales on the Working Alliance Inventory–Trainee Version (WAI-T; Bahrick, 1990) to predict significant portions of variance of Role Conflict ($F_{3,119} = 28.65, p < .01$) and Role Ambiguity ($F_{3,119} = 39.73, p < .01$). They did not report the correlation sizes, but the size of the F-ratio suggests large correlations.

This trend is apparent with the use of measures similar to the ones used in this study as well. Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) found large correlations ($r = .57$ to $.72$) between the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) and the Supervisee Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, & Nguyen, 1979). Humeidan (2002) found a large correlation at the total scale level ($r = .70$) between the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) and a measure of supervisor social influence in supervision (SRF-S; Corrigan & Schmidt, 1983). In addition, in Kocarek’s (2001) dissertation, multicollinearity ($r = .82$) was a confound between the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE; Larson et al., 1992) and the Supervisee Levels Questionnaire-Revised (SLQ-R; McNeill, Stoltenberg, & Romans, 1992).

Given this trend for significant overlap, it is questionable whether each of these measures independently assesses unique aspects of counselor supervision. They were each developed to examine seemingly distinct qualities of supervision such as the supervisory relationship, role conflict, goal feedback, etc., but the measures are quite similar at the item level. Perhaps it would be beneficial for future research to analyze the qualities of these scales as a group through factor analysis to fully assess the degree of
overlap among them. On the other hand, correlations of $r = .40$ to $r = .70$ share between 16% and 49% of variance leaving a considerable portion unexplained. Whatever the case, if the minimization of participant time requirements and photocopy and postage costs is desirable, one or two of the scales will probably be sufficient. As will be discussed later, the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) is likely the most useful measure.

**Elements of Supervision and CSE**

The prediction that the proposed elements of supervision (i.e., the supervisory working alliance, the absence of role conflict and role ambiguity, and the evaluation process within supervision) would predict a significant portion of variance in general CSE was supported. This finding indicates that maintaining a strong supervisory working alliance, having clearly defined roles and expectations, and setting clear and achievable goals are aspects of supervision that are very relevant to the facilitation of counselors in training developing a strong sense of counseling self-efficacy.

Supplementary analysis indicated that the positive relationship between these elements of supervision and CSE was consistently present at the more specific level as well. However, the supervisory working alliance was the strongest predictor of CSE; role conflict and role ambiguity and the evaluation process within supervision did not explain additional variance in CSE beyond what was explained by the supervisory working alliance alone. Therefore, although setting clear and achievable goals, giving appropriate feedback, and having clear expectations for behavior in supervision are no doubt important to the success of supervision, maintaining a strong supervisory working alliance is likely a central factor in facilitating supervisees’ self-efficacy. Perhaps it may be the case that aspects of supervision such as goal setting, feedback, and
role/expectation clarity are a means of achieving a strong working alliance, but of most importance to CSE is trainees feeling like they are supported in supervision and like their supervisors are working closely with them to improve their clinical skills.

These results are consistent with and elaborate on previous related research. One study has examined the relationship between the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) and CSE, and no research has examined the relationship between the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) and CSE prior to the present research. Consistent with the present study, Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) found both the Goal Setting and Feedback subscales of the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) to have large correlations with a measure of counselor self-efficacy (Self-Efficacy Inventory; S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983). Three previous studies have examined the relationship between the supervisory working alliance and CSE. DeGraff (1996) found no significant relationship while Humeidan (2002) and Efstation et al. (1990) did. The relationship between the supervisory working alliance and CSE was in the expected direction in the DeGraff study, but since there were only 18 participants there was likely not enough power to detect a statistically significant relationship. The current study extended other research by having an adequate sample size and was the first to assess CSE with the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES). These findings taken as a whole suggest that there is a robust positive relationship between the supervisory working alliance and CSE and that this relationship is a more important predictor of CSE than the evaluation process within supervision and role conflict and role ambiguity.
The primary importance of the supervisory working alliance is well noted in the supervision literature. Holloway (1995) and Stoltenberg et al. (1998) argued that the supervisory relationship is the central component to the master-apprentice approach to counselor training and that a quality working alliance serves as the basis of all effective teaching and training in supervision. Stoltenberg et al. suggested that across all levels of development, a strong supervisory working alliance encompasses warmth, acceptance, respect, understanding, and trust. Indeed, utilizing a qualitative phenomenological research methodology, Worthen and McNeill (1996) found that the most crucial component of a good supervision experience was the quality of the supervisory relationship. The importance of the supervisory working alliance is parallel to the commonly accepted notion that the basis of all effective therapeutic interventions with clients across theoretical orientations, client characteristics, and counselor characteristics is a solid therapeutic relationship and working alliance characterized by trust, warmth, respect, and understanding (Stoltenberg et al., 1998).

**Supervisory Style and CSE**

Exploratory analyses indicated that the Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory styles were positively related to CSE while the Task Oriented style was not. This suggests that supervisors with collegial (e.g., warm, supportive, friendly, open, flexible, trusting) and relationship-oriented (e.g., intuitive, committed, therapeutic, perceptive, reflective) approaches to supervision tend to have supervisees with higher CSE while those with a more content-focused style (e.g., practical, structured, didactic, concrete, prescriptive) do not.
Two previous studies have reported correlations between the Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI), which was used in this study, and CSE. Somewhat divergent from the present study, Efstation et al. (1990) found small to moderate correlations between the three subscales of the Supervision Styles Inventory (SSI) and a measure of CSE (Self-Efficacy Inventory; S-EI; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983). Unlike the present study in which the Task Oriented style was the only style not significantly related to CSE, the Task Oriented style had the strongest correlation ($r = .30$) with CSE in Efstation et al. (1990). In addition, using the COSE (Larson et al., 1992) to measure CSE, Strauss (1994) found the Task Oriented style to be the most predictive of the three supervisory styles of CSE as well.

Comparison of these three studies is difficult because each used a different measure of CSE. It is also possible that the developmental level of supervisees used in each sample played a role in the somewhat inconsistent findings. In their discussion of the Integrated Developmental Model (IDM) of supervision, Stoltenberg, McNeill, and Delworth (1998) suggested that novice counseling trainees require greater structure and direction (i.e., a Task Oriented supervisory style) in supervision while more advanced trainees desire increased autonomy. Strauss (1995) used beginning level supervisees in his sample while the majority of supervisees in the current study were in the second or third year of their program and had completed an average of three semester length practica. However, Efstation et al. (1990) used supervisees at the internship level, and the Task Oriented style had a stronger relationship with CSE than the other two styles. In light of these inconsistencies, further research is needed to better understand how each of the supervisory styles is related to CSE while taking supervisee developmental level into
account. But beyond how each style may or may not be related to CSE, Stoltenberg et al. (1998) noted that qualities consistent with an Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory style such as support, warmth, commitment, validation, and empathy are essential at all levels of training and likely form the basis upon which a strong supervision relationship is built.

*Elements of Supervision and Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)*

As predicted by SCCT (Lent et al., 1996), the proposed elements of supervision were predictive of CSE. In the broadest sense, SCCT hypothesizes that previous learning experiences—among other factors such as ability, previous performance enactments, and demographic variables—play a key role in the development of self-efficacy. It stands to reason that supervision is a major source of these learning experiences for counselors in training, and Lent et al. (1998) suggested specific aspects of supervision that likely lead to the development of CSE. They noted the importance of establishing challenging, proximal, and specific goals for development and giving accurate, well-timed feedback regarding progress towards these goals (i.e., aspects assessed with the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory). They also noted the importance of establishing clear roles, boundaries, and expectations for the supervision experience (i.e., aspects assessed with the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory). Lent et al., also suggested that assistance with anxiety and affect management and offering consistent support and encouragement were all important and likely predictive of CSE (i.e., aspects measured by the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory and the Supervisory Styles Inventory). Finally, they emphasized the importance of the supervisory relationship and described it as the context in which sources of CSE are achieved, which likely accounts for the
supervisory working alliance being the most important predictor of CSE. Therefore, SCCT proved to be a valuable model offering testable hypotheses in this and future related research.

**Summary**

The proposed elements of supervision were predictive of CSE, and the supervisory working alliance was the strongest predictor of these elements. The Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory styles were related to CSE while the Task Orientation was not. Further research is needed to explore the relationship between supervisory style and CSE in the context of supervisee developmental level. These findings extend previous research by being the first to examine the relationship between role conflict and role ambiguity and CSE and examining elements of supervision as a group in order to determine the most important predictors of CSE. In addition, this is the first research to use the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale (CASES), which arguably has stronger psychometric and theoretical qualities than other measures of CSE.

**CSE and Performance**

CSE had moderate positive relationships at the general and specific level with counselor performance as rated by supervisors. This suggests that counselors with higher levels of CSE for general helping skills, session management skills, and skills to handle challenging counseling situations are also rated by their supervisors as performing at higher levels both in supervision and with clients. This finding clarifies previous mixed results. Larson et al. (1992), Beverage (1989), and Kocarek (2001) found significant positive relationships between CSE and performance using various measures of CSE and performance. Sharply and Ridgway (1993) and Heppner et al. (1998) found a minimal to
no relationship between CSE and performance. The current study replicates Kocarek’s findings and adds to others by having an adequate sample size and using well-established measures of CSE and counselor performance. These findings taken as a whole suggest that there is a consistent positive relationship between CSE and counselor performance as rated by supervisors, but the relationship between CSE and performance defined as client outcome requires further investigation. These results are also consistent with the hypotheses and findings of SCT and SCCT, which have shown general self-efficacy to be predictive of performance and various academic self-efficacies as predictive of academic performance (Bandura, 1982; Lent et al., 1994).

The Mediation Model

As hypothesized, CSE mediated the relationship between the Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory style, role conflict and role ambiguity, and the supervisory working alliance and counselor performance. That is, these three elements of supervision are related to counselor performance through their relationship with CSE. CSE did not mediate the relationship between the Attractive supervisory style and counselor performance; the Attractive supervisory style maintained a positive relationship with counselor performance independent of CSE. There was no relationship present to mediate between counselor performance and the evaluation process within supervision and the Task Oriented supervision style.

The Task Oriented supervisory style and the content measured by the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) are quite similar in that they both seem to tap a structure-oriented factor containing aspects such as goals, concreteness, objectivity, evaluation, practicality, and so on. This is in contrast to the Attractive and Interpersonal
supervisory styles and measures of the supervisory working alliance and role conflict and role ambiguity, which all seem to tap a more relationship-oriented factor containing aspects such as comfort level, mutual understanding of roles, collaboration, support, sensitivity, warmth, etc. Two explanations seem plausible for why the relationship-oriented factor would be related to counselor performance as rated by supervisors while the structure-oriented factor would not. First, as already noted, the Integrated Developmental Model (Stoltenberg et al., 1998) suggests that less experienced counselors are somewhat dependent on their supervisors for structure and prescriptive interventions while more advanced counselors prefer a higher degree of autonomy and collegiality. Therefore, since the majority of supervisees in this study had completed three semester-length practica and were in the second year of their program or beyond, perhaps measures tapping a more structure-oriented factor were not as salient as those addressing the supervisory relationship. However, since supervisee developmental level was not directly measured, this explanation is tenuous at best. A second explanation may be that factors such as structure, practicality, goal setting, and measuring objectives are simply not as related to counselor performance as are factors more related to the supervision relationship.

It is unclear why the Attractive supervisory style retained a significant positive relationship with counselor performance independent of CSE while other closely related elements of supervision (e.g., the supervisory working alliance and Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory style) did not. Perhaps collegial supervisory qualities such as warmth, flexibility, friendliness, and supportiveness are predictive of both CSE and
counselor performance because they are so central to what is considered part of good supervision across developmental level and setting (Stoltenberg et al., 1998).

Research on mediation of supervision-related variables upon one another has been virtually nonexistent (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004), offering little context in which to interpret the findings of this study. However, several authors (e.g., Goodyear & Guzzard, 2000; Wampold & Holloway, 1997) have noted the value of testing for mediation in supervision research. Larson (1998) argued, “In its simplest form, SCT identifies self-efficacy as the major mediator between knowing what to do and executing the action.” (p. 256) In the same vein, SCCT hypothesizes that the relationship between sources of self-efficacy and performance attainment is mediated by self-efficacy. The results of the current study are largely supportive of these claims. For three of the four proposed elements of supervision that had relationships with counselor performance to test for mediation, CSE did indeed play a mediating role.

*Experience Level and CSE*

Exploratory analyses of demographic variables indicated that the number of practica completed and the number of years in a graduate program were moderately related to CSE. In addition, the number of semester length practica and client contact hours were moderately related to counselor performance as well. These findings suggest that as counselors gain experience, they also make gains in CSE and performance as rated by supervisors.

These results are similar to other studies that have found CSE to increase with added relevant experience such as sessions of supervision, counseling coursework, experience with clients, and IDM developmental level (Heppner et al., 1998; Kocarek,
2001; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Leach, Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Eichenfield, 1997; Lent et al., 2003; Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996; O'Brein et al., 1997). These findings make sense from a theoretical standpoint as well. Bandura (1986) asserted that previous task performances are the most significant factor influencing self-efficacy expectations. If an individual has successfully completed a task in the past, expectation for completing that task or a similar task successfully in the future naturally increases. In SCCT (Lent et al., 1996), performance attainments are hypothesized to cycle to the beginning of the model and serve as a primary source of self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations. In addition, the IDM model of counselor development (Stoltenberg et al., 1998) describes supervisees as moving from a need for structure and direction from the supervisor towards a preference for greater autonomy, independence, and collegiality. It seems likely that as trainee self-efficacy for standard counseling skills increases, the need for prescriptive skill-based supervisory interventions decreases allowing for the focus of supervision to transition to more complex issues such as personal development, transference and countertransference, parallel processes, defensiveness, and professional identity.

Implications

These findings have important implications for counselor development and supervision. Although more research is needed, at the broadest level, it appears that supervision positively impacts counselor performance with clients. Goodyear and Guzzardo (2000) suggested that supervision likely affects client outcomes indirectly through mediated or path models, which is consistent with the predictions of SCCT (Lent et al., 1996). As indicated by the present study, CSE is a likely mediator of the
relationship between supervision and performance and has a direct positive relationship with performance on its own. And several of the findings clarified just how supervision may be related to CSE. Therefore, it is clear that CSE is an important aspect of counselor development, and better understanding how to facilitate its development is highly desirable.

Cashwell and Dooley (2001) found that counselors receiving clinical supervision on a regular basis had higher CSE than counselors receiving no supervision at all. The present study elaborates on this finding by indicating what it is about supervision that is most related to CSE. Decreasing role conflict and role ambiguity are likely important to facilitating the growth of supervisee CSE. Stoltenberg et al. (1998) emphasized the importance of gathering information about the supervisees’ experiences relevant to the setting and assessing supervisee expectations regarding supervisor availability, how sessions will be conducted, who is responsible for the desired level of structure, etc. early in the supervisory relationship. Clarifying these matters up front can help avoid disappointment and resentment when/if the supervision experience differs from expectations, and explicitly clarifying roles may be especially important for Level 1 counselors in training.

The evaluation process in supervision is also important to the development of CSE. Daniels and Larson (2001) found that positive, strength-identifying feedback enhanced CSE while negative feedback decreased it. Stoltenberg et al. (1998) also noted the importance of emphasizing positive feedback, especially when working with novice counselors who are likely to have lower confidence in their abilities. They suggested that negative feedback, challenges, and confrontation are essential for counselor growth, but
that these supervisor interventions are better received at higher supervisee levels of development and after initial supervisee anxiety has lifted. Stoltenberg et al. also noted the importance of establishing an appropriate process for providing feedback to students, which involves informing them about expectations for performance, how their work will be evaluated, and how feedback will be provided. Barnes (2004) suggested that the supervisor modeling an open attitude towards feedback regarding his/her performance as a supervisor may lead to a collaborative environment in which the supervisee is open to feedback.

Also important to the development of supervisee CSE is the supervisor’s general supervisory style. Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive styles may be especially important for several reasons. A number of studies have found excess anxiety to be related to lower CSE and inhibitive to supervisee performance in supervision and with clients (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Hahn, 2002). Perhaps supervisory styles characterized by warmth, support, trust, openness, and commitment play an important role in reducing supervisee anxiety. Stoltenberg et al. (1998) argued that these qualities, along with the communication of empathy and understanding of the process of becoming a therapist, are essential for supervision across all levels of supervisee development.

In addition to these important aspects of supervision, the supervisory working alliance and the quality of the supervision relationship are central to the development of supervisee CSE. Although I agree with those (e.g., Bankart, 1997) who suggest that there is clearly an element of “art” to the therapeutic process and forming effective working
alliances, research and theory do suggest practices in supervision that are more likely to lead to a strong supervisory working alliance than others.

Bordin (1983) suggested that the working alliance is composed of three elements including agreement on goals, agreement on tasks, and the development of a strong relational bond. Goodyear and Bernard (2004) elaborated by arguing that clarifying roles, expectations, and having mutually agreed upon goals are ways to strengthen the supervisory working alliance. They suggest developing a paper-based supervision contract and offer a “Supervisee Bill of Rights” (Giordano, Altekruse, & Kern, 2000) in the appendix of their textbook. Other research reviewed by Goodyear and Bernard indicated that, not surprisingly, unethical behavior by the supervisor weakened the supervisory working alliance. The Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory styles have been found to enhance the supervisory working alliance while the Task Orientation has not (Ladany et al., 2001).

Ladany and Lehrman-Waterman (1999) found that relevant supervisor self-disclosures concerning personal issues, neutral counseling issues, and counseling struggles predicted the strength of the supervisory working alliance. Research also suggests that the greater the supervisor’s use of the expert (i.e., the perception that the supervisor has knowledge and expertise) and referent power bases (i.e., the perception that the supervisor is similar to the supervisee on some dimensions important to the supervisee), the stronger the supervisory working alliance (Schultz, Ososkie, Fried, Nelson, & Bardon, 2002; as cited in Goodyear & Bernard, 2004). Finally, Stoltenberg et al. (1998) stressed that the most crucial component of successful supervision was the supervisory relationship, which they feel is achieved by offering supervisees a sense of
validation, normalization, and a nonjudgmental stance towards exploration and experimentation. They offer further suggestions about how to create a positive supervisory relationship corresponding to each developmental level in their IDM model of counselor development.

**Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

Limitations of this study to be addressed include the low return rate, measurement issues, and research design issues. In addition to suggestions for how future research might improve upon these limitations, recommendations are made concerning further research on supervisory style, developmental level, SCCT, and CSE.

The overall return rate was 29%. After compiling return rates across several time periods and from several journals, Baruch (1999) indicated that return rates for mail surveys such as the ones used in this study tended to be lower than in-person data collection. Baruch suggested that an adequate return rate is one that is within one standard deviation of the average return rate (50%) found in his review. This equals approximately 30%, which places this study at the low end of the guideline. Although there is no overt indication of response bias, findings should be considered with this limitation in mind. Perhaps those who volunteered to participate differed from those who did not in ways that would bias the results (e.g., those who have higher self-efficacy, those who are more confident about their performance, or those who have more positive attitudes about their supervision).

Measurement issues include high intercorrelations among the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI), the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI), the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory (EPSI), and the
Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI). The content of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory (SWAI) seems to encompass material covered by the other measures, and given the results of this study, it may be the strongest measure for use in future supervision research. In addition, there are virtually no measures of counselor performance from the supervisor’s perspective other than the one used in this study from which to choose for rigorous research. The Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) is an adequate measure, but several items are dated and the scale does not offer a very elaborate evaluation of performance. Future research in this area would greatly benefit from the development of counselor evaluation instruments with strong psychometric properties and based on theory relevant to counselor training and performance.

Additionally, the way performance was measured in this study complicates the interpretation of results. It seems unlikely that supervisors would be able to separate their evaluations of counselor performance from the context of underlying relationship factors, thus limiting the objectivity of their evaluations of counselor performance. It may be that there is some sort of general “likeability” factor at play. If the supervisee likes the supervisor, s/he will rate the supervisor high on all of the measures of elements of supervision. If the supervisor likes the supervisee, s/he will rate the supervisee higher on the performance evaluation. Future research would avoid this possible confound (while still risking others) by examining counselor performance defined as client outcome.

Another noteworthy limitation to this study was its design. Because many of the findings are based on correlations, directionality may not be directly inferred. For example, the Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive supervisory styles were related to CSE. It may be the case that these styles foster higher CSE in supervisees or it may be
the case that supervisees with higher CSE draw these kinds of supervisory styles from their supervisors. It would make sense that a supervisor would feel more comfortable taking a collegial, as opposed to Task Oriented, approach with a student who exudes more confidence in counseling abilities. Further, CSE is related to counselor performance as rated by supervisors, but directionality is unclear here as well. It may be that supervisees with higher CSE do indeed outperform those with lower CSE, but it may also be the case that supervisors rate supervisees with higher CSE higher in performance due to the way these supervisees present themselves and their work with clients. The supervision literature would greatly benefit from research designs such as path analysis that would allow for stronger inferences of causality.

In addition, in light of previous inconsistencies in the literature, more research is needed on the relationship between supervisory style and CSE. This study found the Attractive and Interpersonally Sensitive styles to be related to CSE while others have found the Task Oriented style related to CSE. Future research could perhaps clarify these results by taking supervisee level of development into account. Just as developmental level is not set in stone across all clients and all clinical situations (Stoltenberg et al., 1998), neither is CSE likely to be a static trait independent of unique clients and new counseling challenges. It would be beneficial for future research to consider how CSE changes across clinical situations in the context of supervisee development. Finally, SCCT (Lent et al., 1996) proved to be a valuable theoretical underpinning in this study. Its hypothesized relationships were mainly supported, and future research would benefit from further examinations of proposed relationships as they apply to counselor training, supervision, CSE, and performance.
Table 1

*Participant Demographic Frequencies and Percentages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Supervisees (n = 56)</th>
<th>Supervisors (n = 54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro American</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Two supervisees and one supervisor did not return demographic data. Also, three supervisors completed data for more than one supervisee leading to a total of 54 unique sets of demographic data for supervisors.
Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations of Main Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (n = 58)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Focus</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>118.45</td>
<td>14.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Counseling</td>
<td>70.74</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in Supervision</td>
<td>76.22</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>152.74</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisory Styles Inventory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonally Sensitive</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Skills</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Management</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Challenges</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A sample of 58 supervisees completed the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory, the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory, the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory, and the Counseling Activity Self-Efficacy Scale. A sample of 55 supervisors completed the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. Three of the supervisors had two supervisees and completed the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale once for each of their supervisees.
Table 3

*Correlations Among Main Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory</td>
<td>-.74**</td>
<td>-.71**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supervisory Styles Inventory – Attractiveness</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervisory Styles Inventory – Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisory Styles Inventory – Task Orientation</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 4

Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Total Score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Model</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>9.04**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Model</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>24.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.96**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* EPSI = total score on the Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory. RCRAI = total score on the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory. SWAI = total score on the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory.

* p < .05.  ** p < .01.
Table 5

*Regression Equations for Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Supervisory Styles Inventory-Attractive and Counselor Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CERS</td>
<td>SSI-A</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>16.82**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CASES</td>
<td>SSI-A</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>7.87**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 CERS</td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>14.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CERS</td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>2.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSI-A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>3.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. SSI-A = total score for the Attractive subscale of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale.

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 6

*Regression Equations for Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Supervisory Styles Inventory-Interpersonally Sensitive and Counselor Performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.93*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>5.98*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>14.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale.  SSI-IS = total score for the Interpersonally Sensitive subscale of the Supervisory Styles Inventory.  CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale.

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 7

Regression Equations for Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Supervisory Working Alliance and Counselor Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>9.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>24.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>14.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SWAI</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. SWAI = total score Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale.

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
Table 8

Regression Equations for Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity and Counselor Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$sr$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  CERS</td>
<td>RCRAI</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>5.87*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  CASES</td>
<td>RCRAI</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>20.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  CERS</td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>14.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  CERS</td>
<td>CASES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RCRAI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. RCRAI = total score Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale.

*p < .05.  **p < .01.
### Table 9

**Correlations Among Subscales and Total Score Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Counselor Activity Self Efficacy Scale</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EPSI Goal Setting</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EPSI Feedback</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RCRAI Role Conflict</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RCRAI Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>-.58**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SWAI Rapport</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.66*</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SWAI Client Focus</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* EPSI = Evaluation Process Within Supervision Inventory. RCRAI = Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory. SWAI = Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory.

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Table 10

*Correlations Among Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Subscales and Total Score Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Counselor Evaluation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CASES</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CASES</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CASES</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* CASES = Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale.

*p < .05. **p < .01.*
Figure 1. Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Supervisory Styles Inventory-Attractive and Counselor Performance.

Note. CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. SSI-A = total score for the Attractive subscale of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale. Number in parentheses is relationship with CASES scores controlled.

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Figure 2. Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Supervisory Styles Inventory-Interpersonally Sensitive and Counselor Performance.

Note. CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. SSI-IS = total score for the Interpersonally Sensitive subscale of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale. Number in parentheses is relationship with CASES scores controlled.

*p < .05. **p < .01.
Figure 3. Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Supervisory Working Alliance and Counselor Performance.

Note. CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. SWAI = total score Supervisory Working Alliance. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale. Number in parentheses is relationship with CASES scores controlled.
*p < .05. **p < .01.
Figure 4. Test of Mediation by Counselor Self-Efficacy of the Relationship Between Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity and Counselor Performance.

Note. CERS = total score on the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale. RCRAI = total score Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory. CASES = total score on the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scale. Number in parentheses is relationship with CASES scores controlled.

*p < .05. **p < .01.
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APPENDICIES
SWAI

Directions: Following are a number of statements that reflect various activities that can occur in supervision. Please indicate the extent to which the activity in each statement is characteristic of your work with your supervisor in supervision. Circle the number that best fits for each statement and do not leave any unanswered.

Please Circle a number for each statement using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I feel comfortable working with my supervisor. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. My supervisor welcomes my explanations about the client’s behavior. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. My supervisor makes the effort to understand me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. My supervisor encourages me to talk about my work with clients in ways that are comfortable for me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. My supervisor is tactful when commenting about my performance. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6. My supervisor encourages me to formulate my own interventions with the client. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. My supervisor helps me to talk freely in our sessions. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. My supervisor stays in tune with me during supervision. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. I understand client behavior and treatment technique similarly to the way my supervisor does. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. I feel free to mention to my supervisor any troublesome feelings I might have about him/her. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. My supervisor treats me like a colleague in our supervisory sessions. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. In supervision, I am more curious than anxious when discussing my difficulties with clients. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13. In supervision, my supervisor places a high priority on our understanding the client’s perspective. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14. My supervisor encourages me to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15. My supervisor’s style is to carefully and systematically consider the material I bring to supervision. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16. When correcting my errors with a client, my supervisor offers alternative ways of intervening with the client. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17. My supervisor helps me to work within a specific treatment plan with my clients. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18. My supervisor helps me to stay on track during our meetings. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. I work with my supervisor on specific goals in the supervisory session. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX B
## EPSI

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. For each, circle the appropriate number on a 7-point scale, where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The goals that my supervisor and I generated for my training seem important</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisor and I created goals that were easy for me to understand</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The objectives that my supervisor and I created were specific</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor and I created goals that were realistic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I think my supervisor would have been against my reshaping/changing my learning objectives over the course of our work together</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My supervisor and I created goals that seemed too easy for me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My supervisor and I created objectives which were measurable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I felt uncertain as to what my most important goals were for this training experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>My training objectives were established early in our relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>My supervisor and I never had a discussion about my objectives for my training experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>My supervisor told me what he/she wanted me to learn from the experience without inquiring about what I wanted to learn</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Some of the goals that my supervisor and I established were not practical in light of the resources available at my site (e.g., requiring videotaping and not providing equipment.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My supervisor and I set objectives that seemed practical given the opportunities available at my site (e.g., if career counseling skills was a goal, I was able to work with people with career concerns.)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My supervisor welcomed comments about his/her style as a supervisor</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The appraisal I received from my supervisor seemed impartial</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My supervisor’s comments about my work were understandable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I didn’t receive information about how I was doing as a counselor until late in the semester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I had a summative, formal evaluation of my work at the end of the semester</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My supervisor balanced his/her feedback between positive and negative statements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The feedback I received from my supervisor was based on direct observation of my work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The feedback I received was directly related to the goals we established</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
RCRAI

Instructions: The following statements describe some problems that therapists-in-training may experience during the course of clinical supervision. Read each statement and then rate the extent to which you have experienced difficulty in supervision in your most recent clinical training.

For each of the following, circle the most appropriate number, where 1 = not at all and 5 = very much so.

I HAVE EXPERIENCED DIFFICULTY IN MY CURRENT OR MOST RECENT SUPERVISION BECAUSE:

1. I was not certain about what material to present to my supervisor  
2. I have felt that my supervisor was incompetent or less competent than I. I often felt like I was supervising him/her.  
3. I have wanted to challenge the appropriateness of my supervisor’s recommendations for using a technique with one of my clients, but I have thought it better to keep my opinions to myself  
4. I wasn’t sure how best to use supervision as I became more experienced, although I was aware that I was undecided about whether to confront him/her  
5. I have believed that my supervisor’s behavior in one of more situations was unethical or illegal and I was undecided about whether to confront him/her  
6. My orientation to therapy was different from that of my supervisor. She/he wanted me to work with clients using his/her framework, and I felt that I should be allowed to use my own approach  
7. I have wanted to intervene with one of my clients in a particular way and my supervisor has wanted me to approach the client in a very different way. I am expected both to judge what is appropriate for myself and also do what I am told.  
8. My supervisor expected me to come prepared for supervision, but I had no idea what or how to prepare  
9. I wasn’t sure how autonomous I should be in my work with clients  
10. My supervisor told me to do something I perceived to be illegal or unethical and I was expected to comply  
11. My supervisor’s criteria for evaluating my work were not specific  
12. I was not sure I had done what my supervisor expected me to do in a session with a client  
13. The criteria for evaluating my performance in supervision were not clear  
14. I got mixed signals from my supervisor and I was unsure of which signals to attend to  
15. When using a new technique, I was unclear about the specific steps involved. As a result, I wasn’t sure how my supervisor would evaluate my work
16. I disagreed with my supervisor about how to introduce a specific issue to a client, but I also wanted to do what my supervisor wanted

17. Part of me wanted to rely on my own instincts with clients, but I always knew my supervisor would have the last word

18. The feedback I got from my supervisor did not help me to know what was expected of me in my day-to-day work with clients

19. I was not comfortable using a technique recommended by my supervisor; however, I felt that I should do what he/she recommended

20. Everything was new and I wasn’t sure what would be expected of me

21. I was not sure if I should discuss my professional weaknesses in supervision because I was not sure how I would be evaluated

22. I disagreed with my supervisor about implementing a specific technique, but I also wanted to do what he/she thought was best

23. My supervisor gave me no feedback and I felt lost

24. My supervisor told me what to do with a client, but didn’t give me very specific ideas about how to do it

25. My supervisor wanted me to use an assessment technique that I considered inappropriate for a particular client

26. There were no clear guidelines for my behavior in supervision

27. My supervisor gave no constructive or negative feedback, and as a result, I did not know how to address my weaknesses

28. I didn’t know how I was doing as a therapist, and as a result I didn’t know how my supervisor would evaluate me

29. I was unsure of what to expect from my supervisor
APPENDIX D
Indicate your perception of the style of your current supervisor of psychotherapy/counseling on each of the following descriptors. Circle the number on the scale, from 1 to 7, that best reflects your view of him or her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>goal-oriented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>perceptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>explicit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>affirming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>practical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>sensitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>collaborative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>intuitive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>reflective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>responsive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>structured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>evaluative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>flexible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>prescriptive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>didactic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>thorough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>creative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>realistic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>resourceful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>invested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>facilitative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>therapeutic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>informative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>humorous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
CASES

CASES-G

General Instructions: The following questionnaire consists of three parts. Each part asks about your beliefs about your ability to perform various counselor behaviors or to deal with particular issues in counseling. We are looking for your honest, candid responses that reflect your beliefs about your current capabilities, rather than how you would like to be seen or how you might look in the future. There are no right or wrong answers to the following questions. Please circle the number that best reflects your response to each question.

Part I. Instructions: Please indicate how confident you are in your ability to use each of the following helping skills effectively, over the next week, in counseling most clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence at all</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How confident are you that you could use these general skills effectively with most clients over the next week?

1. Attending (orient yourself physically toward the client). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. Listening (capture and understand the messages that clients communicate). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. Restatements (repeat or rephrase what the client has said, in a way that is succinct, concrete, and clear). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. Open questions (ask questions that help clients to clarify or explore their thoughts or feelings). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. Reflection of feelings (repeat or rephrase the client’s statements with an emphasis on his or her feelings). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. Self-disclosure for exploration (reveal personal information about your history, credentials, or feelings). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. Intentional silence (use silence to allow clients to get in touch with their thoughts or feelings). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. Challenges (point out discrepancies, contradictions, defenses, or irrational beliefs of which the client is unaware or that he or she is unwilling or unable to change). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. Interpretations (make statements that go beyond what the client has overtly stated and that give the client a new way of seeing his or her behavior, thoughts, or feelings). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10. Self-disclosures for insight (disclose past experiences in which you gained some personal insight). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
11. Immediacy (disclose immediate feelings you have about the client, the therapeutic relationship, or yourself in relation to the client). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12. Information-giving (teach or provide the client with data, opinions, facts, resources, or answers to questions). 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
How confident are you that you could use these general skills effectively with most clients over the next week?

13. **Direct guidance** (give the client suggestions, directives, or advice that imply actions for the client to take).

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

14. **Role play and behavior rehearsal** (assist the client to role-play or rehearse behaviors in-session).

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

15. **Homework** (develop and prescribe therapeutic assignments for clients to try out between sessions).

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
**Part II. Instructions:** Please indicate how confident you are in your ability to do each of the following tasks **effectively**, over the next week, in counseling **most** clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Confidence at all</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How confident are you that you could do these specific tasks **effectively** with **most** clients over the next week?

1. Keep sessions “on track” and focused.                   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. Respond with the best helping skill, depending on what your client needs at a given moment. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. Help your client to explore his or her thoughts, feelings, and actions. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. Help your client to talk about his or her concerns at a “deep” level. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. Know what to do or say next after your client talks. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. Help your client to set realistic counseling goals. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. Help your client to understand his or her thoughts, feelings, and actions. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. Build a clear conceptualization of your client and his or her counseling issues. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. Remain aware of your intentions (i.e., the purposes of your interventions) during sessions. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10. Help your client to decide what actions to take regarding his or her problems. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
### Part III. Instructions: Please indicate how confident you are in your ability to work effectively, over the next week, with each of the following client types, issues, or scenarios. (By "work effectively," we are referring to your ability to develop successful treatment plans, to come up with polished in-session responses, to maintain your poise during difficult interactions and, ultimately, to help the client to resolve his or her issues.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Confidence at all</th>
<th>Some Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How confident are you that you could work effectively over the next week with a client who ...**

1. ... is clinically depressed. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. ... has been sexually abused. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. ... is suicidal. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. ... has experienced a recent traumatic life event (e.g., physical or psychological injury or abuse). 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. ... is extremely anxious. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. ... shows signs of severely disturbed thinking. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. ... you find sexually attractive. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. ... is dealing with issues that you personally find difficult to handle. 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. ... has core values or beliefs that conflict with your own (e.g., regarding religion, gender roles). 
   - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10. ... differs from you in a major way or ways (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, age, social class). 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
11. ... is not "psychologically-minded" or introspective. 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12. ... is sexually attracted to you. 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
13. ... you have negative reactions toward (e.g., boredom, annoyance). 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
14. ... is at an impasse in therapy 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
15. ... wants more from you than you are willing to give (e.g., in terms of frequency of contacts or problem-solving prescriptions). 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
16. ... demonstrates manipulative behaviors in-session. 
    - Confidence Level: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
APPENDIX F
Below are statements related to evaluation in supervising a counseling experience. Please consider each statement with reference to your knowledge of the counselor you are rating.

Mark each statement in the left hand blank according to how strongly you agree or disagree. Please mark every statement using the following responses:

1. I strongly disagree
2. I disagree
3. I slightly disagree
4. Not able to judge
5. I slightly agree
6. I agree
7. I strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstrates an interest in client’s problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tends to approach clients in a mechanical, perfunctory manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lacks sensitivity to dynamics of self in supervisory relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seeks and considers professional opinion of supervisors and other counselors when need arises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tends to talk more than clients during counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Is sensitive to dynamics of self in counseling relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cannot accept constructive criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Is genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the counseling session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is aware of both content and feelings in counseling session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Keeps appointments on time and completes supervisory assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Can deal with content and feelings during supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tends to be rigid in counseling behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lectures and moralizes in counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Can critique counseling tapes and gain insights with minimum help from supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Is genuinely relaxed and comfortable in the supervisory session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Works well with other professional personnel (e.g., teachers, counselors, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Can be spontaneous in counseling, yet behavior is relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lacks self-confidence in establishing counseling relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Can explain what is involved in counseling and intelligently discuss its objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Is open to self-examination during supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Can express thoughts and feelings clearly in counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Verbal behavior in counseling is appropriately flexible and varied according to the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lacks basic knowledge of fundamental counseling principles and methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Participates actively and willingly in supervisory sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Is indifferent to personal development and professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Applies a consistent rationale of human behavior to counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Can be recommended for a counseling position without reservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE - SUPERVISEES

1. _____ Age

2. Indicate gender
   _____ Female  _____ Male

3. Racial/Ethnic Identification (check as many as apply)
   _____ African American/Black  _____ Asian American
   _____ Caucasian/White  _____ Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)
   _____ Multiracial  _____ American Indian
   _____ Pacific Islander
   _____ Other, please indicate identification _______________________________

4. Indicate your educational level
   _____ Bachelor’s Degree  _____ Doctoral Degree
   _____ Master’s Degree  _____ Other, please indicate ______

5. Indicate the kind of graduate program you are currently in
   _____ Counseling Psychology  _____ Clinical Psychology
   _____ Social Work  _____ Other ____________________

6. What degree did you enter your program with? ________________________
   - If you entered your program with a degree/experience beyond the undergraduate level, please indicate
     what kind of program you attended (e.g., counseling, social work, family psychology, etc.).
     _______________________________________________________

7. Indicate number of semester-length practica completed _____

8. Indicate how many years you have been in your current program _____

9. Do you have any previous counseling-related work experience? If so, please briefly describe it and
   indicate the amount of time you had this job.
   ___________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________

10. Indicate the number of sessions of supervision you have had with your supervisor this
    semester ______

11. Indicate the approximate number of supervised direct contact hours you have
    had this semester ______

12. Indicate the approximate total number of supervised direct contact hours you have had thus far in
    your graduate work ________
APPENDIX H
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE – SUPERVISORS

1. _____ Age

2. Indicate gender
   _____ Female _____ Male

3. Racial/Ethnic Identification (check as many as apply)
   _____ African American/Black _____ Asian American
   _____ Caucasian/White _____ Hispanic/Latino(a)/Chicano(a)
   _____ Multiracial _____ American Indian
   _____ Pacific Islander
   _____ Other, please indicate identification

4. Indicate you educational level
   _____ Bachelor’s Degree _____ Doctoral Degree
   _____ Master’s Degree _____ Other, please indicate

5. What is your degree in? ____________________________

6. Indicate the number of sessions of supervision you have had with your supervisee this semester _____

7. Circle what your evaluation of your supervisee’s abilities is based on (circle as many as apply):
   audio tape     video tape     live observation     other _______

8. How many years of experience clinically supervising others do you have? _____

9. How many supervisees have you had throughout your experience? _____

10. If you have already participated in this study with another trainee, please note all of the code numbers you have already had
    ____________________  ____________________
    ____________________  ____________________
    ____________________  ____________________
    ____________________  ____________________
You are invited to participate in a research project examining how aspects of supervision affect counselors in training. This project is being conducted by Mark Hanson from Southern Illinois University as part of dissertation requirements in counseling psychology. The overall aim of the research is to learn more about how supervision can be used to have a positive impact on the experience of counselors in training. Criteria for participation are that you (1) are currently doing practicum at a counseling/clinical training site, (2) you have accrued over 6 direct contact hours this semester, and (3) you are receiving at least one hour of individual supervision a week.

The research involves five brief surveys and a demographics form, which all take about 45 minutes to complete. Your answers will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the forms. You may choose to not participate in this research at any time, and not to answer any question by simply leaving it blank. If you choose not to participate in this study, simply give the research packet back to the person who gave it to you with no penalty incurred. Returning the surveys completed indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you choose to participate:

(1) Complete the surveys in one sitting at your leisure before the noted due date.
(2) Return them in your envelope to your research contact.
(3) Give the “Supervisor’s Envelope” to your supervisor as soon as possible. It will contain separate instructions for him/her to follow.

If you have any questions you may contact either Dr. Yanico or myself at any time.

Barbara Yanico, Ph.D. Mark Hanson, M.A.
Southern Illinois University Southern Illinois University
Psychology Department: Mailcode 6502 Psychology Department: Mailcode 6502
Carbondale, IL 62901 Carbondale, IL 62901
(618) 453-3530 (618) 351-9923
bynico@siu.edu mhanson@siu.edu

Your participation is greatly appreciated!!

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Research Development and Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533.
APPENDIX J
COVER LETTER TO SUPERVISORS

Southern Illinois University
Counseling Psychology

Counselors in training and supervision
Barbara Yanico, Ph.D.
Mark Hanson, M.A.

Dear Supervisor,

You are invited to participate in a research project examining how aspects of supervision impact counselor self-efficacy and how counselor self-efficacy impacts counselor performance. This project is being conducted by Mark Hanson from Southern Illinois University as part of dissertation requirements in counseling psychology. Criteria for participation are that you (1) are at the internship level or higher and are currently supervising a practicum student and (2) that you have observed your supervisee’s work in session through the use of video tape, audio tape, or live observation.

Since you received this letter from your trainee, this means he/she is interested in participating in the study. If you wish to participate it would involve completing a brief demographic questionnaire and an evaluation of your supervisee’s performance, which would only take about ten minutes. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any point without penalty. You may also choose not to answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the forms. Returning the survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply.

If you choose to participate:

(1) Complete the survey and demographic form in one sitting at your leisure before the noted due date.
(2) Put your responses in the provided envelope, seal it, and give it to the noted research contact at your site.
(3) Tear off your code number and keep it for two weeks in case you have more than one supervisee participating in the study.

If you have any questions you may contact either Dr. Yanico or myself at any time.

Barbara Yanico, Ph.D.         Mark Hanson, M.A.
Southern Illinois University   Southern Illinois University
Psychology Department: Mailcode 6502  Psychology Department: Mailcode 6502
Carbondale, IL  62901          Carbondale, IL  62901
(618) 453-3530                 (618) 351-9923
byanico@siu.edu               mhanson@siu.edu

Your participation is greatly appreciated!!

This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Research Development and Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533.
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