The purpose of this study was to investigate the initial on-site supervision experience of school counseling interns. Current counseling supervision research has failed to address dynamics specific to the context of school counselor training and professional development. This gap in the research suggest that examining the phenomenological experience of what constitutes school counselor trainee growth in the context of on-site counseling supervision was worthwhile. An emergent qualitative research design was utilized to clarify and elaborate on data while pursuing lines of inquiry grounded in the experience of three school counseling supervisory dyads (supervisee-supervisor), a university internship supervisor, two additional supervisees, and three additional supervisors. During the course of an academic school counseling internship experience, data was collected through multiple taped on-site school counseling supervision process observations, participant semi-structured interviews, and reflective participant and researcher journals.

Utilizing a constant comparative method of data analysis, results indicated an emerging model of on-site school counseling supervision which, (a) progressed sequentially through a series of four developmental phases (contextual orientation, establishing trust, conceptual development, and clinical independence), (b) focused on twelve dimensions of supervisee learning specific to each phase of development (contextual urgency, site disparity, ethical awareness, accessibility, support, collegiality, thematic observations, reflective modeling, illustrative examples, self assessment, self generation,
and professional risk taking), and (c) illustrated a reflective cycle of supervisor-supervisee interaction focused on the supervisee transforming dissonant internship counseling experiences into professional schemas. Presented as an emergent model and specific to the investigated context, the results suggest that developmental principles of counseling supervision are applicable to school counseling, and that the supervision relationship illustrated pedagogical interventions and processes congruent with reflective learning theory. It is recommended that counselor education programs provide preliminary exposure to the school counseling context and relevant counseling models while maintaining ongoing follow-up and support with on-site school counseling supervisors. Furthermore, research is needed to more fully examine instructional strategies in the context of school counselor preparation and on-site supervision.
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The Initial On-Site Supervision Experiences Of School Counseling Interns

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The learning and acquisition of counseling skills and the formation of a professional counselor identity are two of the most important functions of graduate training in counselor education, with counseling supervision playing a central role in this learning. This is especially true for the preparation of school counselors. Despite training to work with individuals, and groups (American School Counselor Association, 1993), it is becoming increasingly difficult for school counselors to provide adequate counseling services for the diverse and complex counseling issues and student groups represented in their schools (Borders & Drury, 1992; Borders, 1991). Furthermore, school counselors receive little counseling supervision beyond their training internship experience (Roberts & Borders, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994). Whether because of limited resources, interest, or failure of the profession to clearly articulate the benefits of counseling supervision (Van Zandt & Hayslip, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994) a lack of supervision can impact both their professional confidence (Peace, 1995) and effectiveness (Crutchfield & Borders, 1997). Although supervision can have positive effects on the professional development of school counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Wiley & Ray, 1986; Borders, 1991; Sutton & Page, 1994), little is known about this experience specific to the school setting (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Borders, 1991; Borders & Roberts, 1993). The absence of supervision specific to school counselors, and the fact that a clinical internship provides the only on-
site supervision most school counselors will acquire, understanding this experience from the “meaning-perspectives” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of both the school counselor trainee and the on-site supervisor represents a first step toward establishing theoretical principles for school counseling supervision.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the on-site supervision experience of school counseling interns. It sought to build school counseling supervision theory through an in-depth examination of a purposeful sample of school counseling supervisory dyads. It was hoped that an emergent qualitative research design would add to the school counseling supervision literature by providing an interpretative “thick description” of the supervisory dynamics associated with the professional development of school counselor interns. Furthermore, a constant comparative method of inductive analysis was utilized to develop assertions related to on-site supervision and preparation of school counseling professionals. Grounded in school counseling internship supervision experiences, this study sought to also maintain appropriate criteria of rigor consistent with an interpretative research design (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL SENSITIVITY

Status of Counseling Supervision Research

Supervision refers to ongoing activities to enhance the professional development of counselors. Bernard & Goodyear (1992) defined counseling supervision as an intervention provided by a senior member of the profession that is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of (a) enhancing the professional functioning of supervisees (b) monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients and, (c) serving to gate-keep for the profession. Although skill enhancement frequently is the specified goal, the supervision process also encourages greater self-awareness and fosters an integrated professional and personal identity related to the roles and tasks of counselors (Holloway, 1995).

Past investigations of counseling supervision have focused on the developmental nature of supervisee growth, the cognitive complexity and skill processes associated with advanced trainee learning, and the influence of the supervisory relationship on supervisee change and development.

Supervisee Development

The following are studies that support the tenets of developmental counseling supervision theory that recognize the emotional and cognitive dissonance inherent in trainee development. This support of cross-theoretical supervision models implies a
relationship between a therapist’s willingness to reflect on and critique his/her own work and subsequent effectiveness with clients (Skovholt, 1993).

A study that attempted to directly confirm Stoltenberg’s Counselor Complexity Model (1981), while highlighting emotional and cognitive dissonance as a characteristic of early counselor trainees, was Border’s (1990) short-term longitudinal study (16 weeks) of supervisees’ self perceptions about their self awareness, autonomy, and theory/skill acquisition. Utilizing the SLQ (Supervisee Level Questionnaire) at the beginning and end of an initial trainee practicum, the results supported supervisee growth along Stoltenberg’s identified subscales. Marginally limited by its sample size (N=44) and reliance on a unitary source of measurement, the results of this self-report research provided support for viewing supervision as a developmental process. It also depicted supervision as a context for learning from the management of emotional and cognitive dissonance identified in the growth of supervisees.

Tracey, Ellickson & Sherry (1989), in a study that explored beginning supervisees’ need for structure as defined by levels of reactance potential (emotional and cognitive dissonance), years of experience, and session content, provided an empirical foundation for the assertions of Skovholt & Ronnestand (1992). The study consisted of 78 volunteer counselors-in-training from two separate APA psychology programs. Utilizing the Therapeutic Reactance Scale (TRS) to determine counselor reactance levels of the trainees, the Supervision Evaluation Scale (SES), the Counselor Rating Form-Short (CRF-S), and the Counselor Development Questionnaire (CDQ), the results indicated that trainees who were able to reflect on relational dynamics and emotionality were more likely
to desire supervision focused on process dynamics in managing their uncertainty rather than the increased structure as desired by early counselor trainees.

This is supported by Rabinowitz, Heppner & Roehlke (1986) descriptive study of supervision process and outcome from trainees’ perception of important issues and supervisor intervention over a 12 week period. Utilizing a two-part supervision checklist with 44 supervisory dyads across training levels, the results supported the developmental nature of supervisee change over time. This is illustrated through the report of beginning trainees preferring structure and direct supervisor interventions to aid in reducing confusion and anxiety in relation to their concerns with competency issues. This is in contrast to advanced trainees who reported the examination of personal issues as necessary issues in supervision to promote their professional growth and assist in client change. This distinction between beginning and advanced trainees highlights supervisee growth as moving from a dependent stance illustrated by emotional and cognitive dissonance to a supervisory context that promotes autonomy that encourages increased self awareness in relation to the therapeutic process.

By supporting the general tenets of the Counselor Complexity Model (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987), these studies (Tracey et. al, 1989; Borders, 1990; Rabinowitz et. al, 1986) found that trainees experience emotional and cognitive dissonance while confronting issues of motivation, learning needs, and dynamics of resistance related to counseling supervision. This highlights the progressive nature of counselor-trainees to transform emotional and cognitive dissonance associated with multiple developmental tasks (skills, assessment, interpersonal, conceptualization, individual differences,
theoretical orientation, treatment goals/plans, and professional ethics) into a conceptual map to guide their practice.

**Cognitive Complexity**

Professional development has been described as largely a reflective metacognitive process whereby base assumptions of self, others, and interaction are critically analyzed (Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993; Mezirow, 1994; Pultorak, 1993; Ross, 1989; Schon, 1983,1987; Shapiro, & Reiff, 1993; Tennant, 1993;Tremmel, 1993;Van Manen, 1977; Wilson, Shulman, & Richert, 1987; Ziechner & Liston, 1987). This "connotation of deliberation" (VanManen, 1977) is addressed in supervision research by Lutwak & Hennessy (1982) who attempted to discover whether a counselor’s level of empathic responding is related to meaning and understanding. The authors selected 97 first year graduate and advanced undergraduate students enrolled in a graduate level interview skills course and administered the This I Believe (TIB) during the early stages of the course. The TIB is a sentence completion test on which an individual indicates his/her beliefs about a number of social and personal concepts. Utilizing ANOVA and independent sample t-tests, the results provided support that the capacity to learn complex interview skills at minimally proficient levels was found to be related to more than just training and instruction. Students at lower conceptual stages did not master the skills the practica was designed to teach.

Borders, Fong-Beyette & Cron (1988) expanded the research of Lutwak & Hennessy (1982) in her study of in-session supervisee cognitions. This single case design analyzed the in-session cognitions of a counseling student while utilizing an open ended
free recall procedure. Six dimensions, inductively identified, were utilized to classify the participant's retrospections (time, place, focus, locus, orientation, mode) and were independently classified by two trained raters. The analysis of the descriptive data provided a portrait of a beginning counseling student with few intentional or self-instructive thoughts during a session. Borders et. al (1988) suggested that counselor training programs utilize self instructional strategies for increasing counselors' effectiveness with clients. The results of this study illustrated the importance of addressing critical self-reflective processes in supervisees' conceptual and skill development.

Morran (1986) also addressed the impact of self-instructional cognitions of counselor in a nonrandomized sample of 40 counselors across a range of skill levels to conduct a 25 minute counseling interview with a female client and complete instruments measuring frequency of task facilitative (counselor thoughts in guiding clinical behavior in productive directions), task distractive self-talk (counselor thoughts focus on self and feelings of apprehension and inadequacy), and quality of clinical hypothesis formulation. The results supported the belief that counselors who formulated better hypothesis also performed at higher levels in terms of therapeutic skill and supported the definition of professional reflectivity as a guide to action (Mezirow, 1994; Colton & Langer, 1993). This study also demonstrated the importance of attending to client messages, organizing data into meaningful categories, making judgments about which data are relevant and then integrating this data into a comprehensive understanding of the client's concern (Holloway & Wolleat, 1980).
The review and exploration of base assumptions, a quality of professional reflectivity, was addressed by Haverkamp (1994). She utilized a survey design to explore patterns of self-monitoring and its relationship to levels of conformity and anxiety. Utilizing the Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS) and the Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI) with 65 doctoral trainees, the author concluded that low self-monitors, focused on consistency and principles, "...make it difficult for them to adopt aspects of the counselor's role that do not come naturally....and may also be more skeptical about supervisory feedback that is inconsistent with their self-perception" (Haverkamp, 1994, p. 322). She also reported that high self-monitors, focused on flexibility and adapting to social cues may, "...adapt to the norms of supervision to 'do the right thing' and increase their desire for concrete suggestions" (Haverkamp, 1994, p. 322). This is further supported by Frontman & Kunkel (1994) in their grounded analysis of 69 mental health professionals. Their analysis of open-ended questionnaires, seeking reflection of success following an initial therapeutic session, indicated that self-reflection is perceived by counselors as a condition of effectiveness. Each of these studies by Haverkamp (1994) and Frontman & Kunkel (1994) demonstrated self-monitoring as an essential quality inherent in supervisee development in transforming training experiences into a meaningful guide to action.

This is additionally addressed by Martin, Slemon, Hiebert, Hallberg & Cummings (1989) exploration of the conceptualizations of 23 (11 experienced and 12 novice) counselors with respect to general counseling process and specific client concerns by means of a conceptual mapping task (CMT). The CMT is a two-step process in which concepts are generated in response to probing questions and then arranged into a pictorial map illustrating the relationships between concepts as depicted by the trainee. Analysis
indicated an interactive effect of counselor experience and generality of the conceptual task on the extensiveness of counselor conceptualization. In view of possible sample bias, the authors concluded the results were evidence that experienced counselors possess extensive abstract and general knowledge of counseling. Whereas, novice counselors lacked such knowledge.

This is further illustrated in the Cummings, Hallberg, Martin, Slemon, & Hiebert (1990) study that performed an in-depth content analysis of the conceptualizations of two novice and two experienced counselors related to client change over time. The Cognitive Mapping Task, which examined the conceptual processes of respondents, was blindly used over a period of six client sessions. As predicted by the authors, experienced counselors exhibited greater consistency of conceptualization over time, utilized a greater number of interpersonal concepts, and focused on domain specific concepts rather than being concerned with procedural tactics in response to their clients. The authors also noted that the experienced counselors focused on family background and current client relationships as a starting point for conceptualizing the counseling process, while novice counselors utilized no interactional concepts at all. Although hampered by small sample size and limited duration, the results continue to identify the function of reflective processes for enhancing a counseling student's schemata's for determining therapeutic intervention.

Borders (1989) further explored these advanced skills identified by Cummings et al. (1990) in two related studies exploring the impact of ego development on counseling skill attainment. Based on Loevinger's Personality Stage Theory, the study employed the Sentence Completion Test of Ego Development in relation to skill attainment and in-session cognitions (ascertained through post session rating procedures). Although both
studies were restrained by sample and instrument bias, they each illustrated the importance of intrinsic processing between advanced and novice trainees. Supervisees at the same level of experience produced different types of cognitions and level of skill attainment relative to their ego level. These multiple-subject studies imply that levels of empathic response and patterns of clinical conceptualization are related to a trainee’s ego development.

Transforming early dissonant training experiences into meaningful professional schemata represent not only the developmental transition from novice to advanced trainees, but articulates important qualities for growth. Identifying such variables as, conceptual development (Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982), in-session cognitions (Borders et. al, 1988; Borders, 1989), instructional self-talk (Morran, 1986), self-monitoring (Haverkamp, 1994; Frontman & Kunkel, 1994), and conceptual complexity (Martin et. al, 1989; Hiebert & Johnson, 1994; Cummings et. al, 1990), demonstrated these reflective qualities in supervisee development.

**Supervision Relationship**

In addition to the multiple studies that demonstrated the existence of developmental constructs in counselor development (Heppner, 1994; Hiebert & Johnson, 1994; Borders, 1989, 1990; Piercy, 1990; Rabinowitz et. al, 1986; McNiell & Worthen, 1989; Friedlander, Siegel & Brenock, 1989; Holloway, 1994; McNiell, Stoltenberg & Pierce, 1985), creating and maintaining an optimal supervisory context has been deemed necessary for supervisee growth to occur (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Loganbill et al., 1982). The ability of supervision to contain and transform emotional and cognitive
dissonance into a meaningful guide for counselor development is contingent on the quality of the supervisory relationship (Sexton & Whiston, 1994). It is this "constructed interaction" where active learning occurs and knowledge on how to change behavior develops (Mahon & Altmann, 1991).

This is given broad empirical support in Kennard, Stewart & Gluck (1987) exploration of variables influencing interaction between trainees and supervisors contributing to positive versus negative experiences in psychotherapy supervision. Utilizing a subject pool of 68 supervisory dyads from two graduate programs and divided into two groups (very positive reports of supervision or very negative reports supervision experience), a multiple one-way analysis of variance indicated that trainees had positive supervision experiences when they were seen as interested in the supervisor's feedback. The results indicated that trainees preferred a supportive and trusting atmosphere with supervisors, articulated in an instructional and interpretive intervention style. These conclusions were later substantiated by Carey, Williams, & Wells (1988) who designed a study to test the applicability of Strong's (1968) model to training supervisors by examining the relationship among supervisor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness, as well as supervisory performance measures. Employing the Supervisory Rating Form (SRF) and the Counselor Evaluation Rating Scale (CERS) on 31 supervisory dyads, the results indicated a significant relationship between supervisor credibility and trainee performance. Trustworthiness was identified as significantly associated with the quality of the supervisory relationship and with the influence of the trainees' investment into learning and growth.
These studies by Kennard et. al (1989) and Carey et. al (1988) contended that the supervisory relationship must contain the emotional discomfort associated with change and facilitate the supervisee’s professional reflection toward learning. The quality of the supervision relationship, therefore, must not only address the developmental needs consistent with supervisee change but also maintain an atmosphere of support and trust to promote self directed learning and acquiring of conceptualization skills consistent with expert counselors. However, supervisors and supervisees often perceive this happening in very different ways. This is illustrated by Wark (1995) who interviewed family therapy supervisors and supervisees. Utilizing five supervisional dyads, the researcher collected data through both direct observation and semi-structured interviews following each supervision session. Utilizing a grounded method for data analysis, Wark (1995) found that while supervisors focused on direct instruction, supervisees preferred support and collaborative interventions instead. Although the results are unique to the context of the sample, curbed by limited exposure (6 sessions), and lacking sufficient triangulation, the study does highlight the importance supervisees placed on the quality of the supervision relationship in regards to their development. Wark (1995) identified the learning processes recognized by supervisors, the relational dynamics necessary for supervisees to trust the learning process in the context of supervision, and the gulf between these perceptions.

Heppner (1994) sought to empirically examine dimensions underlying supervisory behaviors that might illuminate the cause for differing perceptions as highlighted by Wark (1995). Transcribing two sessions of 16 supervisory dyads and rated on a 7 point Likert format rating scale, multidimensional scaling revealed the importance of supervisor
interventions focused on process as well as content, and addressed the trainee's emotional process and involvement in the learning and acquisition of skills associated with developmental growth. The study supported the importance of creating an empathic context for reflective learning and safety in counseling supervision. In support, Piercy (1990) noted that the level of supervisor supportive behaviors impacted trainees levels of exhibiting supportive behaviors in therapy, by stating; “it appears that supervisors’ structuring and relationship skills can positively affect trainee’s subsequent structuring and relationship skill level” (p.418). This research by Heppner (1994) and Wark (1995) indicated that the emotional and cognitive dissonance associated with counselor training is salient to the quality of the supervisory working alliance. These studies suggested that a context of trust and support in supervision to encourage professional reflection on uncertain experiences is central to the supervision process.

Examining supervisor interventions in the context of live supervision, Frankl (1990) addressed the impact of supportive supervisory dynamics to predict immediate change in client resistance. Utilizing the Live Supervision Process Form to aid supervisory dyads to reflect on interventions when reviewing the clinical session, Frankl (1990) noted that the level of supervisor supportive behaviors impacted the trainees level of exhibiting supportive behaviors in therapy, stating “it appears that supervisors’ structuring and relationship skills can positively affect trainee’s subsequent structuring and relationship skill level” (p.418). The implication of these results is that a positive learning alliance is necessary for acquiring complex counseling skills.

Ladany & Friedlander (1995) applied an ex post facto research design to test the importance of the supervisory relationship to supervisee learning. His research hypothesis
predicted trainees and supervisors who form a level of emotional attachment and agree on
the goals and tasks of supervision will less likely result in trainees feeling confused about
their roles in the supervision process. Employing the Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee
Version (WAI-T) and the Role Conflict and Role Ambiguity Inventory (RCRAI) with 123
supervisory dyads, the authors concluded that the supervisory working alliance was
significantly related to trainees' perceptions of role conflict and role ambiguity. The results
also indicated that the bond component of the alliance and the combined influence of the
goal and task components contributed to role conflict. Additionally, the goal-task
component of the supervisory alliance also predicted role ambiguity. Although unable to
indicate causation, the research did indicate the importance of a positive supervisory
relationship focused on collaboration and a trusting work environment on trainee
development and willingness for professional reflectivity.

Worthen & McNiell (1996) addressed the importance of supervisees' perception of
the supervisory relationship on their developmental growth. Applying a phenomenological
investigation of "good" events in eight supervisinal dyads, Worthern (1996) presented a
thematic and meaningful portrait of supervision from the eyes of the supervisee. The
authors utilized grounded analysis on a single taped interview of participants, the results
articulated themes of relational development (existential baseline, setting the stage, a good
supervision experience, outcomes of good supervision) that illustrated the significant role
the supervisory relationship had on supervisee learning in the acquisition of therapeutic
skill. As Worthen & McNiell (1996) wrote:

It appears that these three identified elements of sensed inadequacy need
to be activated to set the stage for openness to supervisory input and new
learning to occur. It also appears that these elements can be activated by
naturally occurring events within the counseling or supervisory relationship or the supervisors strategic interventions. What is clear from this study is that this sensed inadequacy preceded the good supervision experiences... However, without a positive supervisory relationship that invited openness to learning, it is likely that learning from this anxiety-arousing experience would have been minimized. (p. 29).

In summary, these studies illuminated the supervisory relationship as central to promoting supervisee development through articulating such relational qualities as: trustworthiness (Kennard et. al, 1987; Carey et. al, 1988; Piercy, 1990), emotional support (Wark, 1995; Worthen & Mc Niell, 1996; Heppner, 1994), and perceived level of role conflict and ambiguity (Ladany & Friedlander, 1995). Furthermore, this research contended that the quality of a supervisory relationship impacted the willingness of supervisees to address uncertainties inherent in counselor training. Transforming emotional and cognitive dissonance into meaningful professional schematas, appears largely contingent on the level of support and trust in the supervisory relationship. It can, therefore, be concluded that:

- Cross theoretical models to counseling supervision portray counseling trainees as progressing through a sequence of definitive stages while experiencing increased levels of emotional and cognitive dissonance. These models, especially Stoltenberg’s (1981) Counselor complexity model (CCM), have been tested and supported in supervision research.

- Transforming dissonant counselor-training experiences into a meaningful guide for practice is largely a factor of increased conceptual complexity, and articulates the difference between novice and advanced trainees.
• A trusting and supportive supervisory relationship is a prerequisite for advanced supervisee development.

Methodological Limitations

The investigation of counseling supervision has benefited from both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. Differences between these designs are not attributes of two competing types of research, but of types of data (Yin, 1993). A review of the counseling supervision research provided types of data that illuminated the complex and dynamic processes associated with counseling supervision. Utilizing both quantitative and qualitative research designs the studies addressed:

• in-session trainee cognitions (Borders et al., 1988; Morran, 1986)
• differences in self-monitoring (Haverkamp, 1994; Tracey et al., 1989)
• conceptualization processes between novice and advanced supervisees (Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982; Martin et al., 1989; Cummings et al., 1990; Hiebert, 1994)
• supervisee experience of the supervision process (Frontman & Kunkel, 1994; Worthen & McNeill, 1996; Wark, 1995; Kennard et al., 1987; Ladany, et al., 1995, 1996)
• supervisor interventions (Heppner et al., 1994; Frankl, 1990)
• supervisee developmental changes over time (Miars, et al., 1983; Borders, 1990; Rabinowitz, et al., 1986; McNeill et al., 1985)
• supervisee reflectivity (Neufeldt et al., 1996).

Despite these contributions, both types of data suffered from limitations impacting both their generalizability and transferability of their conclusions to the school counseling supervision context.
An initial limitation of quantitative researchers in counseling supervision is the inherent paradox embedded in their design. The more rigorous the design in isolating variables, the less relevant the results in application to the natural context. This "decontextualizing" of the research setting, especially in such a dynamic and complex triadic system as supervision, limits generalizability and provides only shallow understanding of the identified variables. Although supporting the tenets of developmental supervision theory (Stoltenberg, 1981; Loganbill, 1982; Blocher, 1983; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Skovholt, 1993), these quantitative research studies represent a realist philosophy, where the verification of hypotheses is taken as evidence of general laws. This is in stark contrast to qualitative ideology that postulates people have reasons for their actions, and these reasons are contextualized and particularized (Bruner, 1986).

The reviewed qualitative studies, therefore, sought to illustrate, rather than generalize, the counseling supervision experience. The purpose of qualitative research is to develop an understanding of individuals and events in their natural and relevant context (Borg, Gall & Gall, 1993). They explored the conceptual complexity of supervisees and the dynamics associated with a positive supervisory alliance. Although the designs were contextual and utilized various inductive analytic procedures, the studies exhibited multiple limitations impacting trustworthiness and transferability of assertions. A primary methodological weakness centered on the researchers' dependence on a single data source for analysis (Frontman & Kunkel, 1994; Borders, 1988; Worthen & McNeill, 1996; Wark, 1995; Ladany et al., 1996). The richness of a qualitative design is defined by the inclusion of variables and multiple data collection methods (Yin, 1993). By limiting data collection to a unitary source, not only is triangulation compromised, but analysis is limited to a
single perspective constructed within an interactive context. Since patterns become
grounded in only one member of an interdependent system, the units of meaning (Rennie,
1992) ignore the reciprocal impact of the investigated context. This limits the validity of a
study’s assertions and its potential for constructing a picture emergent from the ongoing
collection and analysis of data. This is articulated by Bossert (1979) who wrote, “As
patterns and relationships are perceived in the data, they are investigated and new field
plans are developed to illuminate relationships further or discover new patterns” (p. 17-18).
Yin (1993) further clarifies the limitations associated with qualitative research
utilizing a single source of data collection by identifying analytic benchmarks of rigor.
These include:

- multiple sources of evidence,
- establishment of a chain of evidence,
- reliance on pattern-matching and explanation building, and
- utilizing supportive works for contributing to theory and explanation base

Moreover, the studies reviewed were hampered by limited exposure to the context
of investigation. This is illustrated by Frontman (1994) and Ladany (1996) who utilized
inductive and descriptive analysis on a single supervisory session: Neufeldt (1996) on
selection of two sessions for a peer audited “constant comparison” of data (Strauss &
phenomenological analytic procedures on a single transcribed session; and Wark (1995)
who sought transferability of evidence with six live supervision sessions. This failure to
obtain prolonged exposure in “close conjunction with intensive analysis of data” (Strauss,
Counseling supervision bridges the gap between basic counseling competence developed in counselor training programs and the advanced skills and conceptualizations necessary for addressing the complex cases encountered in the reality of work settings (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Holloway, 1995). In the isolation often experienced by school counselors, supervision can provide skill development (Sutton & Page, 1994) and needed support and encouragement (Sutton & Southworth, 1990). Despite the benefits associated with counseling supervision, literature on supervision of school counselors reveals a paucity of research (AACD, 1989; Borders, 1991) and lack of practice (Borders, 1991; Borders & Roberts, 1993). Eighty percent of practicing school counselors surveyed by Sutton & Page (1994) reported receiving no clinical supervision following their counselor preparation and training experiences. The American Counseling Association (ACA) stated that “Essentially, proper supervision of school counselors is lacking at best, non-existent at it’s worst” (1989, p.20). Although some approaches for supervising school counselors have been suggested (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Henderson & Lampe, 1992), there are few reports in the literature of existing counseling supervision practices in schools (Borders, 1991). It is clear that the school counseling profession has yet to integrate clinical supervision as part of their profession (Sutton & Page, 1994).

Various reasons have been proposed to explain the absence of supervision practice and research in school counseling. The profession has failed to communicate clearly the
purpose and benefits of supervision to school counselors (Sutton & Page, 1994). This is illustrated in ASCA’s (American School Counseling Association) failure to include clinical supervision in its role statement (Van Zandt & Hayslip, 1994). Also, adequate resources, in terms of financial support and positive attitudes toward supervision, appear vital to whether school counselors seek supervision (Sutton & Page, 1994). “Typically,” stated Schmidt (1990), “there are insufficient personnel and funds to allocate persons or contract services so that adequate supervision can be given in this area” (p. 92). Therefore, supervision is usually performed by administrators who have little background or training for evaluating the effectiveness of counseling services (Borders, 1991).

It is clear that counseling supervision for most school counselors occurs only during their practicum and internship experiences as a part of their training programs. Supervised counseling experience in a CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs) master’s level counselor training program consists of campus practicum courses and a 600 hour internship experience. This requires the student to perform, under the supervision of a certified school counselor, activities associated with that expected of a school counselor with 240 hours focused on direct services including individual counseling, group work, developmental classroom guidance, and consultation (CACREP, 1994). It is difficult for counseling students to master all the needed skills and pertinent client issues prior to graduation based on these minimum standards, even from the best training programs (Barret & Schmidt, 1986). Facing difficult student issues and performing multiple functions, ongoing school counseling supervision is needed to compliment evaluation practices to improve skills, develop new areas of competence, refine counseling programs, and receive support for their efforts (Borders, 1991).
Further understanding the supervision received by school counselor interns is a first step toward building a theory for school counseling supervision. Current counseling supervision research has failed to address dynamics specific to the context of school counselor training and professional development. This gap in the research suggested that examining the phenomenological experience of what constitutes school counselor trainee growth in the context of on-site counseling supervision would be worthwhile. Additional inceptive research questions were:

- What influence does supervision have on supervisee development and how is this perceived by the participants?
- Which dynamics of school counseling supervision, from the meaning perspective of the participants, support the development of a counseling supervision model specific to school counseling preparation and professional development?
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN

Rationale

The question under investigation and the focus toward building theory in the field of school counseling supervision lends itself to a qualitative research design. An emergent qualitative research design allows for immediate clarification and elaboration of data while pursuing those lines of inquiry grounded in the context of inquiry (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). By addressing the general design issues pertinent to a qualitative study (see Appendix A), knowledge is arrived at through an inductive process, leading from specific observations to the identification of general patterns (Patton, 1990).

Qualitative methodology is necessary because past research has spent little time examining the experiences of on-site school counseling supervision. This may be due, in part, because the design characteristics of traditional research methodology are not devised to ask questions about personal meaning and reflective understanding (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). The application of discovery-oriented research methodologies in the examination and description of the counseling supervision experience as a means of testing the soundness of theory and discovering salient supervision components and processes that might contribute to theory building and effective practice has been lacking (Borders, 1989; Holloway & Hosford, 1983). A qualitative design focused on exploring and understanding the on-site supervision experience of school counseling interns provides depth toward understanding the complexity of counseling supervision in the context of schools, and learning processes specific to school counseling preparation. As Borg, Gall,
& Gall (1993) stated, "The purpose of qualitative research is to develop an understanding of individuals and events in their natural state, taking into account the relevant context" (p. 194).

While quantitative studies provided data lacking in this contextual relevancy, the qualitative studies reviewed failed to utilize field-work that obtained a "thick description" (Geertz as cited in Bogdan & Biklen, 1992), and prolonged exposure, triangulation, and inductive analytic procedures "grounded" in the data (Strauss & Glaser as cited in Strauss, 1987). This study sought to address these gaps in both its design and its analysis procedures. Its purpose was to provide an in-depth picture of school counseling supervision as experienced by a select sample of school counseling interns and their on-site supervisors. In response to the limitations of previous counseling supervision research, this study was contextual to its focus of inquiry (on-site school counseling supervision), adaptive to the themes and patterns emergent from the simultaneous collection and analysis of data, inclusive to multiple perspectives (supervisees, supervisors, and the school counseling supervision process), and engaged throughout the participants' experience of a school counseling internship. These design characteristics not only compensated for a lack of rigor illustrative of previous counseling supervision research, but also provided a depth of data not available prior to the onset of this research study.

Furthermore, understanding the experience of on-site school counseling interns is essentially a question of personal meaning. A phenomenological qualitative research design lends itself to such an investigation. As such, this study was exploratory and descriptive in nature, utilized purposeful and emergent sampling procedures, collected data qualitatively in the natural setting, emphasized the human-as-instrument in data
collection and analysis, focused on in-depth investigation, and emphasized early and ongoing inductive data analysis (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). The following is a description of these characteristics.

**An Exploratory and Descriptive Focus**

Qualitative researchers develop a general “focus of inquiry” that guides the discovery about some social phenomenon (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The outcome of qualitative research is not the generalization of results, but a deeper understanding of experience from the perspectives of the participants. This focus on contextualism is a function of complex person-situation interactions, with individuals reciprocally determining one another in a continuous process of change (Lyddon, 1989). Counseling supervision is analogous to this description. Thus, the intent of this study was to provide a descriptive “narrative explanation” (Bruner, 1986) for understanding the context of school counseling supervision from the participants’ perspectives.

**An Emergent Design**

According to Lincoln & Guba (1985) the purpose of a qualitative study is to “accumulate sufficient knowledge to lead to understanding” (p. 227). They recommended the use of an emergent research design where data collection and data analysis are simultaneous. In an emergent research design, not all the specifics of study can be outlined in advance. Salient themes are identified early in data analysis and pursued by asking new questions, observing new situations or previous situations with a new perspective, or examining previously unimportant documents. It is, therefore, emergent
and sequential (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) where additional participants and data sources may be added based on the ongoing analysis and identification of themes "emerging" from the data. Referred to as "theoretical sampling" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) it allows the researcher to build and broaden theoretical insights in the ongoing process of data collection and analysis until the theory is saturated, that is, until the newly generated data can be assimilated by the theory (Polkinghorne, 1994).

A Purposive Sample

A qualitative research design selects for inclusion in the study participants that will expand the variability of the sample. The aim of purposeful sampling is to select information-rich cases whose study will illuminate the questions under consideration. It is chosen when the investigation must cover both a particular phenomenon (Yin, 1993), where people and settings are explored in depth and described in detail in the final report (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). As Patton (1990) wrote, "The logic and power of purposeful sampling lies in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term purposeful sampling" (p. 169).

Data Collection in the Natural Setting

The essence of this qualitative design is to focus on what people "actually do" within the supervisory culture rather than what they ought or report to do. The natural
setting is the place where the researcher is most likely to discover, or uncover, what is to be known about the phenomenon of interest (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

**Emphasis on Human-as-Instrument**

In qualitative designs, the researcher is the “key instrument in data collection” (Wolcott, 1973, p. 11). Rather than attempting to divest from the context, ignoring bias that hampers quantitative studies, qualitative researchers emphasize immersion. Data collection in the field becomes the process of exploring the subject’s world; not as a person who knows everything, but as a person who has come to learn; not as a person who wants to be like them, but as someone that wants to know what it is like to be them (Geertz, as cited in Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). It is a dichotomous contextual stance where the researcher is both involved and detached from the interacting system. As characteristic of qualitative research, this study identified the researcher as both the collector of relevant data and culler of meaning from that data, which is often the participants’ words or actions (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

Furthermore, recording personal reactions and values provides trustworthiness to the analysis of data (Borg, Gall & Gall, 1993) and articulates the process by which the researcher and participants, in concert, co-construct the context of the research process (Sexton, 1994). This aspect of a qualitative design is clearly illustrated by Wolcott (1973), “...just as the cultural anthropologist seeks to contextualize the human behavior he [she] observes and describes, he [she] needs also to provide this reader with something of his [her] personal biases and with an account of the context in which he [she] has conducted his [her] fieldwork and translated it into an ethnographic statement” (p. 18).
**Qualitative Methods of Data Collection**

The data of qualitative inquiry is most often the words and actions of people’s experience of the phenomenon under investigation. Maintaining and identifying multiple sources of evidence add to the credibility and trustworthiness of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

**Early and Ongoing Inductive data Analysis**

Qualitative research is represented by two important dynamics; (a) the emphasis of research as an ongoing activity, and (b) the use of primarily inductive analytic processes (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Establishment of a chain of evidence through analytical induction, pattern matching and explanation building will occur throughout the data collection process. This “constant comparative” method of analysis (Strauss & Glaser, 1967) is grounded and interpreted in the context of the data. This analysis provides a representational theoretical model of the phenomenon under study (school counseling supervision) grounded explicitly and meaningfully in the participant’s reports (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Finally, the outcomes of this research study evolved from the systematic building of homogeneous categories of meaning inductively derived from the data (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).
Provisions for Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness of this study was satisfied in a number of ways. First, several methods of data collection and sources of information were utilized. Second, data collection occurred over a three month period building an audit trail. Third, Dr. Tom Evans of Oregon State University and multiple committee members served as peer debriefers and regularly reviewed the data analysis and plausibility of conclusions. Lastly, the outcomes were reviewed by the participants in the study to determine the accuracy captured in their experiences as supervisees and supervisors within their school counseling internship experiences.
CHAPTER 4

METHODS

Sampling Strategy

The selection of participants in this study was purposeful, in that, school counseling interns were identified that might provide information-rich cases to illuminate the identified focus of inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This was accomplished in consultation with the university counseling internship coordinator and review of students participating in school counseling internships for the upcoming spring quarter of 1997. Sample size focused on the purpose of inquiry, what would be useful, what would have credibility, and what could be done with available time and resources (Patton, 1990).

While maintaining variability in the characteristics of the sample, this “maximum variation” in an emergent research design (Patton, 1990) did not allow for a definitive number of participants or settings to be provided a priori (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Information was gathered and analyzed in an ongoing process until the saturation point was reached or when newly collected data was redundant with previously collected data (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As Lincoln & Guba point out, “If the purpose is to maximize information, the sampling is terminated when no new information is forthcoming from new sampled units…” (as cited in Patton, 1990, p.186). In this study the criterion for saturation represented the length of an academic quarter pertaining to an initial school counseling internship experience (Spring-1997).

Since the goal of this study was not to acquire a random sample, but to select persons (or settings) that represented the range of experience of on-site school
supervision, a minimum sample of three school counseling internship on-site supervisory dyads was targeted. In review of previous qualitative studies related to counseling supervision (Borders, 1988; Worthen & McNeill, 1996; Wark, 1995), three on-site supervisory dyads and their university supervisor represented an initial reasonable coverage of the phenomenon given the purpose of the study (Patton, 1990). The advantages of selecting a small sample of diversity for data collection and analysis are findings that represent (a) high-quality, detailed descriptions of each case, which are useful for documenting uniqueness, and (b) important shared patterns that cut across cases and derive their significance from having emerged out of heterogeneity (Patton, 1990). This is quite different from the logic of probability sampling where credibility for generalization is based on sufficient sample sizes. The meaningfulness, insights, and validity generated from qualitative inquiry are based more on the information richness of the cases and the observational/analytical skills of the researcher than with sample size (Patton, 1990).

While not attempting to generalize beyond the context and participants under investigation, a purposeful and emergent design allowed for an in-depth investigation of the school counseling supervision experience of counseling interns.

Participants

A pool of six school counseling trainees were targeted based on their enrollment in a school internship experience as required by their CACREP counselor training institution. Each had successfully completed three academic quarters of course-work focused on counseling theory and counseling practicas emphasizing microskill training. All attended the same university training institution and had been placed in either a middle or high
school internship site that represented the first quarter of their school internship experience. The length of the spring quarter was ten weeks (April 7 to June 13, 1997). Supervision for the interns was provided by both their on-site supervisor, who was an experienced and practicing school counselor in the internship setting, and weekly group supervision sessions provided by a faculty member of the university counselor education program. The pool of six school counseling interns was identified through consultation with the university internship coordinator/supervisor and prior to the first university supervision session of the quarter. On review of their backgrounds, on-site supervision settings, social contexts, internship supervisors, and length of previous counseling internship experiences, the pool of identified interns met the criteria for maximum variation (Patton, 1990). At their first university supervision session the pool of six interns were presented with the intent and design of the research project and asked for their participation. Criteria for selection was their willingness to participate in the data collection process, use of English as primary language, and current counseling supervision in a school internship setting. Their ability to articulate the experiences of supervision was assumed based on their previous success in both their counseling course-work and practicas. Five school counselor interns agreed to participate in the study. The one intern that declined cited time constraints as the primary reason for non-participation. On-site supervisors for the study were recruited based on the initial agreement of the counseling intern they would be supervising. A letter was sent requesting their involvement (see Appendix B) with a follow-up phone call to confirm their agreement for participation. Three of the five supervisors who were asked to participate in the study agreed. The
supervisors who declined participation in the study cited time and job demands. Furthermore, the internship university supervisor agreed to participate in the study.

This minimum sample of three on-site school counseling supervisory dyads represented an initial coverage of the context under investigation (Patton, 1990) and participated in all levels of data collection and subsequent grounded analysis (taped process observations, semi-structured interviews, and reflective journals). Characteristic of an emergent design (Maykut & Moorehouse, 1994), the simultaneous collection and analysis of data prompted the recruitment of two additional school counselor trainees and three on-site school counselor supervisors during the course of the research. Their agreed participation coincided with the emergent focus of inquiry following the initial discovery of research findings. They were periodically interviewed (supervisees and supervisors) and submitted weekly reflective journals (supervisees). Taped process observations were not collected from the additional sample members.

The total number of participants in the study, therefore, represented three supervisory dyads (supervisee-supervisor), two additional supervisees, and three additional supervisors. The supervisees encompassed three women and two men, ranging in age from 24 to 34 years. Three women and three men represented on-site school counseling supervisors in the study with an age range between 41 and 56 years of age. Furthermore, they all had over eight years experience as practicing school counselors. The university supervisor was female, with over 20 years experience as a counseling supervisor. Each of the participants were volunteers consenting to their involvement in the research and not paid for any part of their involvement in the research.
As a 37 year old European-American at the time of this research, I had completed my doctoral course work in counselor education and supervision, which included both didactic and experiential training in developmental conceptualization of the counseling supervision process while supervising master level trainees. Significant to this research process, my epistemology had been shaped by three sequential professional historical events. The first was the three years I spent as a special educator at a Northwest middle school. In this role, I became cognizant of how factors outside the classroom had an enormous impact on the academic and personal growth of students. This increasing awareness of social, familial, and cultural forces influencing the learning, attitudes and behaviors of my students prompted my return to graduate school.

Following training as a professional counselor, I spent eight years as a family therapist. In this capacity, I attempted to understand the inner world of client(s). By experiencing this with them, meaning of less obvious material surfaced. This emerging constructivistic, systemic, and developmental framework guided my counseling approach and interview techniques. It stemmed from a belief that people create, rather than acquire meaning where the mind filters contextual input based on life experience and social interaction.

My epistemology was further influenced by a decision to enter doctoral coursework in counselor education at a major Pacific Northwest university. This was influenced by my literature review and experience as a counselor supervisor. Perceiving counseling supervision as a unique learning environment for enhancing the professional development
of counselor trainees, it became essential to adjust both my supervisory tasks and function
to the unique needs of the supervisee. This was heightened by the course-work and
training I received in research methodology. Although versed in quantitative design
principles and statistical analysis, qualitative ideology appeared a more suited match to my
developing systemic, developmental, and constructivistic worldview of knowledge
construction.

Consistent with this epistemological framework, my professional history, and the
focus of inquiry, an emergent design was chosen. As the primary instrument for data
collection and analysis, I maintained a journal throughout the research process which was
transcribed and integrated into analysis process. Although aware of my systemic
involvement and the knowledge co-constructed in my interaction with the research
participants, the journal served to monitor my growing awareness and any undue bias
influencing either the collection or analysis of forthcoming data.

Data Collection Methods

A variety of methods of data collection were utilized to acquire multiple views and
data sources as a measure of validity (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Lincoln & Guba, 1985;
Maykut & Morehouse, 1994; Patton, 1990) in achieving a clearer understanding of the
context under investigation and the units of meaning as reported by the participants to
increase the credibility of the findings. They included (a) audio/video-taped observations
of on-site school counseling supervision, (b) semi-structured interviews with supervisees
and supervisors, (c) reflective participant journals, and (d) researcher reflective journal.
Process Observations

Wolcott (1973) contended that field research involved, (a) recording as much richness of the context as possible, (b) observation without judgment, (c) focus on nonverbal dimensions, and (d) illustration of "time in motion" dynamics (sequence, action, dialogue, and reflections). These were accomplished by first assuming an unobtrusive appearance and thereby minimizing the participants' reactions to the researchers entry into the research setting (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). To this end, therefore, the role of a "complete observer" was maintained by the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992) when on-site school supervision sessions were audio/video taped, transcribed and prepared for analysis. On-site school counseling supervision process tapes were collected from each the initial sample of supervisory dyads at three intervals throughout the course of the trainee's internship experience. This balance between involved interaction and detached observation is highlighted by Patton (1990) who states, "The ideal is to negotiate and adopt that degree of participation that will yield the most meaningful data about the program given the characteristics of the participants, the nature of the staff-participant interactions, and the sociopolitical context of the program" (p. 209).

Semi-structured Interviews

Particularly beneficial when investigators are interested in understanding the perceptions of participants or learning how participants come to attach certain meanings to phenomena or events, interviewing provides a useful means of access (Berg, 1995). A qualitative interview results in appropriate and relevant questions arising from interactions
during the interview itself. It allows the researcher to gain meaningful insights about the observed phenomenon in the words of the participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). With a research design focused on understanding the phenomenological experience of school interns engaged in on-site supervision, a semi-standardized interview format was utilized. Following the observation, transcription and analysis of school counseling supervision sessions, a set of issues were identified and explored with each participant in separate interviews. The issues and questions of the interview were adapted to each respondent and the context of their on-site supervision process. Utilizing elaboration and clarification probes (Patton, 1990), the interviewer digressed for clarification of participant meaning far beyond the given answers (Berg, 1995). In the interview, the researcher’s role was to facilitate and/or stimulate the awareness of the participant beyond the level of operation during the taped supervision sessions. The researcher or “inquirer” (Kagen & Kagen, 1991) assumed that people perceive each other in depth and detail, but acknowledge little of what they know. As a powerful tool for discovery, the inquirer enters the interview with the expectation that people have encyclopedic knowledge of their interactions that can be brought to awareness.

Interview guides were utilized by the researcher to provide a framework in which to develop questions, sequence those questions, and make decisions about which information to pursue in greater depth (see Appendix C). They articulated a list of questions or issues to be explored in the course of an interview and prepared in order to ensure that similar information is obtained from the research participants given the limited time available in the interview situation. As described by Patton (1990):
An interview guide provides topics or subject areas within which the interviewer is free to explore, probe, and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate that particular subject. Thus the interviewer remains free to build a conversation within a particular subject area, to word questions spontaneously and to establish a conversational style—but with the focus on a particular subject that has been predetermined. (p. 283).

The interviews occurred within one week following the taping of a “typical” school counseling supervision session between the intern and the supervising school counselor. With a research design focused on understanding the phenomenological experience of school interns engaged in on-site supervision, alternating between taped observation of the supervision experience and participant interviews to clarify identified themes and units of meaning, represented a format of inquiry with the potential to contribute to the theory and knowledge of supervisory interactions through an examination of psychological events (see Appendix D). Time between each set of process observations (video and/or audio taped on-site supervision session) and subsequent follow-up semi-structured interviews for clarification of the supervision experience and identified themes and patterns of interaction, was approximately three weeks. This represented three intervals within a school counseling internship experience. This time period was chosen with regard to the time required for data collection, transcription, and analysis for maintaining the criteria necessary for an emergent design (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

It should be noted, however, that this sequence of data collection (process observation followed by a clarifying semistructured interview), although a tool for gathering contextual data into the experiences of the interacting participants, was essentially a vehicle for learning. It represented an intervention for promoting learning and change while seeking reflection into those very processes experienced by the participants.
It is likely, therefore, that research participants were influenced by their participation in the study and differed from non-research participants.

**Participants Reflective Journals**

As a personal document, reflective journals were utilized to seek further understanding of the participant’s internal processes not evident within the supervision process or interview sessions. Referred to as a first person narrative that describes an individual’s actions, experiences, and beliefs (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992) personal documents have been requested in numerous qualitative studies for capturing the meaningful experiences as perceived by the participants (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

In this study, supervisees were given a set of reflective questions (see Appendix E) to focus their journal entries toward the intent of the study. Congruent with reflective learning theory (Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993; Mezirow, 1994; Pultorak, 1993; Ross, 1989; Schon, 1987; Shapiro & Reiff, 1993; Tennant, 1993; Tremmel, 1993; Van Manen, 1977; Ziechner & Liston, 1987), the questions encouraged trainees to meaningful reconstruct internship experiences, understandings, images, and actions, related to their growth and practice in becoming school counseling professionals. The journals were collected weekly and transcribed for use in data analysis.

**Researcher Reflective Journal**

To add to the validity and integrity of the study, the researcher’s journal was collected and analyzed throughout the research process. As an integral part of the research process (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Taylor & Bogdan,
1984), a personal record of insights, understanding, reactions, and concerns assists in identifying any undue bias impacting the collection and analysis of data. Called Epoche (Patton, 1990), it is a process where the researcher attempts to become aware of and remove viewpoints, prejudices, or assumptions regarding the phenomenon under investigation. In order to understand the participant’s intentional world of lived experience, one must first arrive at it by a suspension, or bracketing off, of all presumptive constructs about it (Aanstoos, 1983). Rosalie Wax astutely describes this as assuming a “mental position peripheral” (as cited in Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 124) to perceiving and describing the relationships, systems, and patterns of interactions engaged in by the researcher. It is both an awareness of and suspension of judgment that may influence the context being investigated. This stance is congruent with the theoretical framework of the participating counseling interns and supervisors (as well as the researcher), and important since the “participants” are viewed as co-researchers in an emergent qualitative design (Wolcott, 1973).

Confidentiality

The issue of confidentiality was important to the success of this research project. Anonymity of all participants was painstakingly protected so that no information gathered in this research project and no individual response could be traced. Original journals submissions were transcribed, coded and returned to the participant. Likewise, audio or videotapes utilized for recording on-site school supervision processes were transcribed, coded and erased. A single file, that linked the identity of the codes to the raw data, was
separate from the data collected and erased following the completion of auditing by the
research participants.

Data Analysis

The constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was utilized to analyze
the data. This is a non-mathematical procedure that is designed to inductively identify
themes and patterns from multiple qualitative data sources with a simultaneous
comparison of all units of meaning obtained (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Bogdan & Biklen,
1992). Each new unit of meaning was selected for case analysis and then compared to all
other units of meaning between the cases while grouped (categorized and coded) with
similar units of meaning (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). If there were no similarities in
meaning (negative case analysis), a new category was created. The process of developing
and refining the categories from the units of meaning was a continuous process where
categories were changed, merged, and generated (Goertz & LeCompte, 1981). The
intent of the grounded theory of data analysis was to provide a representational model of
school counseling supervision explicitly and meaningfully grounded in the participants
reports (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Lincoln &
Guba described the coding and categorizing process utilized in this study for data analysis
by stating:

The essential tasks of categorizing are to bring together into provisional
categories those cards (data cards) that apparently relate to the same
content; to devise rules that describe category properties and that can,
ultimately, be used to justify the inclusion of each card that remains to
be assigned to the category as well as to provide a basis for later tests
of replicability; and to render the category internally consistent. (1985,
p. 347).
The constant comparative procedure utilized in this study was adapted from the procedures outlined by Maykut & Morehouse (1994) and Strauss & Corbin (1990). The steps of the analysis were as follows:

- Inductive category coding and simultaneous comparing of units of meaning across categories (utilizing open, axial, and selective coding procedures that seek connections between categories involving conditions, context, interactional strategies, and consequences).
- Refinement of categories (developing rules of inclusion as meaningful propositions)
- Exploration of relationships and patterns across categories (developing outcome propositions formed by connecting two or more propositions and returning to the field).
- Integration of the data yielding understanding of people and settings being studied (developing assertions grounded in the analysis).

All field notes and transcripts were prepared for analysis by first photocopying all data and obtaining a sense of the whole (reading 3 or 4 times) and then identifying units of meaning in the data. These units of meaning were examined for relevancy to the investigation of school counseling on-site supervision and grammatically rephrased, if necessary, to more directly express the theme or pattern of interaction. The units of meaning were then separated and placed on 5 x 8 index cards to assist in the constant comparative analysis for the discovery and articulation of categories. This process consisted of moving back and forth from the data to meanings. Derived meanings were, in essence, tested against the raw interview data to determine whether they were supported by the data. Findings of this type of analysis were then compiled in the form of
propositions that summarized the salient themes and patterns represented by the identified categories within individual lives (supervisees, supervisors, and the supervision process) and across individual lives (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The validity of these findings rested with a recognizable reality as perceived from the participants, and the plausibility of the conclusions as reviewed by peers.

Analysis emphasized an immersion in the documents (transcripts) in order to identify the dimensions or themes that seemed meaningful to the producers of each message. The development of categories allowed for the linking of these categories to the data from which they derived. According to Glaser and Strauss (1967):

To generate theory...we suggest as the best approach an initial, systematic discovery of the theory from the data of social research. Then one can be relatively sure that the theory will fit the work. And since categories are discovered by examination of the data, laymen involved in the area to which the theory applies will usually be able to understand it, while sociologists who work in other areas will recognize an understandable theory linked with the data of a given area. (p. 2-3).
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Although the quantitative and qualitative studies in counseling supervision have provided a breadth of data to the field, they have been hampered by methodological shortcomings. Furthermore, they have failed to investigate supervisory dynamics specific to school counselors. This study sought to address these gaps in both its design and data analysis procedures. Initial research questions, founded in the counseling supervision literature, facilitated a discovery of additional avenues of inquiry emergent from the participants' experiences. An overview of findings in reference to both these initial and emergent research questions are presented, as well as a descriptive and illustrative presentation of the results.

A Discovery Process: An Overview of the Findings

Current counseling supervision research has failed to address counseling supervision dynamics specific to the context of school counselor training (Borders, 1991; Sutton & Page, 1994). This study sought to address this gap in the counseling supervision literature by examining the phenomenological experience of school counselor trainee growth in the context of on-site counseling supervision. It also sought to initially discover whether developmental processes of counseling supervision were present within the school context and applicable to on-site supervision. Founded on previous research findings in counseling supervision, these inceptive research questions were:
• What influence does supervision have on supervisee development and how is this perceived by the participants?

• Which dynamics of school counseling supervision, from the meaning perspective of the participants, support the development of a counseling supervision model specific to school counseling preparation and professional development?

Overview of Findings I: Phases of School Counseling Supervision Development

Initial findings based on a qualitative analysis of raw data collected from interviews, taped process observations of on-site school counseling supervision, and participant journals suggested that school counseling on-site supervision was consistent with previous research articulating the developmental nature of supervision (Borders, 1990; Tracey et.al, 1989; Rabinowitz et. al, 1986; Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982). The findings articulate supervision as a collaborative process focused on increasing the conceptual and clinical skill development of school counseling interns. A sequential series of four phases grounded in the experience of the participants emerged as representative of how the process of on-site school counseling supervision developed. Evolving over the course of an internship, each supervisory dyad progressed through a series of sequential phases. These were:

• contextual orientation (orienting the supervisee to the school climate)
• establishing trust (establishing a level of trust within the supervisory relationship)
• conceptual development (encouraging advanced conceptualization processes)
• clinical independence (promoting trainee clinical independence).
Finding that the school counseling on-site supervision relationship experienced by the participants was emerging as developmentally progressive, a more in-depth focus of discovery was initiated. Characteristic of an emergent research design (Maykut & Moorehous, 1994) the simultaneous collection and analysis of data prompted inquiry into what dynamics of supervision development might be influencing the learning and sequential growth of supervisees specific to this research. This research focus, emerging from the study’s initial findings, focused on the learning processes present in the on-site supervision of school counseling interns. Grounded in the data analysis and research experience co-constructed between the participants and myself, these additional emergent questions of inquiry were:

- What benchmarks in on-site supervision appears to contribute to supervisee learning and supervision development?
- What interactive dynamics within the on-site supervision relationship appear to contribute to the growth of school counseling interns?

**Overview Findings II: Dimensions of Supervisee Growth**

Through a grounded analysis of additional participant interviews, taped process observations of the school counseling on-site supervision experience, and reflective participant journals, twelve dimensions were identified as characteristic of the supervisory developmental process specific to the participants of this study. These dimensions represented the experience of supervisees with each phase of supervision development (see Appendix G). The first phase of on-site counseling supervision, contextual orientation, was represented by three dimensions specific to the experience of supervisees:
contextual urgency, site disparity (university setting to that of the internship site), and awareness of contextual ethical issues. Establishing trust, the second phase of supervision development was represented by the dimensions of supervisors' accessibility, support, and with interns. This assisted in on-site supervision progressing to the third developmental, conceptual development, which portrayed the supervisor utilizing thematic observations, reflective modeling, and illustrative examples to enhance supervisees' conceptual understanding of counseling and their roles as school counselors. This pedagogical focus was central to expanding the conceptual complexity of the interns while encouraging their clinical independence. The final supervision developmental phase of clinical independence, subsequently, focused on dimensions encouraging supervisees' self-assessment, self-generation, and professional risk taking representative of independent school counseling professionals.

Further analysis also identified a cyclical interactive process between supervisors and supervisees exhibited throughout the development of their on-site supervision relationship and central to relating dimensions of growth (see Appendix F). As a general illustration, this interaction typically began with supervisees entering supervision in a state of anxiety and perceived professional inadequacy stemming from a recent disorienting internship counseling experience. This state of emotional and cognitive dissonance was addressed by supervisors with a discernibly nonjudgmental, supporting, and validating stance that sought to normalize the interns' struggle. As a result, supervisees and supervisors experienced a level of trust where supervisees perceived supervision as a relational context for reflecting on dissonant internship experiences. Supervisors then sought to expand the conceptual abilities of supervisees with the intent of promoting their
counseling skills. School counseling interns returned to the internship setting and experienced further disruptive counseling situations. This cycle was repeated upon subsequent return to on-site supervision. As a microcosm of the larger sequence of on-site supervision, this reflective cycle served to assist school counseling interns in addressing previously uncertain school counseling internship experiences. A renewed confidence resulted and effectively invoked the learning dimensions specific to each phase of on-site supervision development and their overall supervisory experience.

A Review of the Results: A Model for On-Site School Counseling Supervision

The emergent quality of the research design allowed for the exploration of themes and patterns not available from previous counseling supervision research designs. The twelve dimensions of supervisee learning specific to the sequential phases of on-site school counseling supervision development and a focus of the interactive supervisee/supervisor reflective cycle illustrate this increased depth. Hence, as dissonant experiences are transformed into meaningful schemas and corresponding counseling skills, the supervisee develops in concert with the progression of the on-site supervision relationship. This model of dynamic interchange illustrated the concurrent development of both supervisees and the supervision relationship leading to the clinical independence of the school counseling intern.

The following results articulate each phase of on-site school counseling supervision development and the dimensions of supervisee learning pertinent to each phase. Table 1 displays the overall results of this analysis portraying an emergent
theoretical model of the interconnection of supervision development with supervisee dimensions of growth and learning.

Table 1 An Emergent Model of Initial On-Site School Counseling Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Reflective Cycle of Interaction</th>
<th>Twelve Dimensions of Supervisee Experience</th>
<th>Phases of On-Site Supervision Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disorienting School Counseling Experiences</th>
<th>1. Contextual Urgency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee is anxious with a perceived sense of professional inadequacy</td>
<td>Constraints of Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple Roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University vs. On-site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguity in translating ethics to site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Relationship</td>
<td>4. Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee is nonjudgmental, supportive and validating</td>
<td>Supervisor Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor support and encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor modeling and disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Intervention</td>
<td>7. Thematic Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor seeks to expand supervisee conceptual complexity to promote clinical independence</td>
<td>Dialogue shift from content to process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation of intern’s case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illustrative Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Examples from clinical experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift in Supervisee Perception and/or Behavior on reemergence to context</td>
<td>10. Self Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisee links supervision experience to clientele/context</td>
<td>Reassessment of theory and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiating projects, experiences, and/or skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Risk Taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contract for Professional Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTEXTUAL ORIENTATION**
- Supervisee experience of Cognitive and Emotional Dissonance in adjustment to the School Internship Climate

**ESTABLISHING TRUST**
- Experience of trust central to supervisee willingness to address dissonant internship experiences

**CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT**
- Supervisor promoting advanced conceptual complexity through thematic and reflective dialogue

**CLINICAL INDEPENDENCE**
- Supervisor facilitates supervisee autonomy
Grounded in the experience of the study's participants, examples will also be presented to highlight typical responses representative of each phase of on-site supervision development and related dimensions of supervisee learning. The use of examples also serve to assist the reader in linking the raw data to the final thematic categories representative of a constant comparative analysis of qualitative data. Subsequently, the developmental phases, descriptive properties, and subsequent dimensions discussed in the following sections include examples of participants' descriptive statements and interactions. These will consist of transcripts from either participant journals, semi-structured interviews, and/or the interactive dialogue between supervisees and supervisors during on-site school counseling supervision. Pseudonyms will be used to protect the anonymity of all participants.

**Phases Of School Counseling Supervision Development**

Dimensions of school counselor trainee learning were significantly influenced by the interaction and quality of the on-site supervisory relationship. A sequential series of four phases, grounded in the experience of on-site supervisory dyads, emerged as representative of on-site school counseling trainee supervision development (see Appendix G). These phases were: contextual orientation, establishing trust, conceptual development, clinical independence.

Furthermore, twelve dimensions were identified as characteristic of the supervisory developmental process. These dimensions represent the experience of supervisees with each phase of supervision and provide a focus for the reflective cycle between internship experiences and the supervisory relationship. The following outlines the results of this
analysis, articulating the definition of each phase and interrelated learning dimensions associated with it. Transcripts from either participant journals, semi-structured interviews, or the on-site school counseling supervision process observations will also be provided to highlight a typical experience of each phase expressed by the participants.

**Phase one: Contextual orientation**

Novice counselors are plagued by guilt, anxiety, perfectionism, and confusion and anger (Friedberg & Taylor, 1994) which challenges supervisors to work through these thoughts and feelings to promote professional development. This was clearly evident with each of the trainees participating in the study. The results portray school counseling interns as experiencing significant levels of emotional and cognitive dissonance upon entry into the school climate. Dimensions at this phase of supervision development contributing to supervisee included a sense of contextual urgency, an awareness of site disparity, and an application of ethical principles. Although specific to each school context, school counseling on-site supervisors addressed these early transitional experiences of trainees by providing guided exposure and orientation to the processes and dynamics relevant to the duties and responsibilities of school counseling.

**Dimension one: Contextual urgency**

The transition of interns to the school counseling context created high levels of uncertainty and anxiety. These emotional and cognitive dissonances within trainees associated in part to the brevity of the school counseling process and the pace in which issues with students, faculty, and parents were addressed. The constraints of time
experienced in the internship site and the multiple roles performed by supervisors as witnessed by supervisees, created a sense of contextual urgency related to their adjustment to the school climate.

On-site supervisors sought to address initial supervisee dissonance by orienting the interns to the school climate. Providing support and reassurance with regard to the brevity and pace of school counseling, the supervisor instructed the intern in “basic survival skills” to assist in reducing supervisee dissonance in their adjustment to the realities of school counseling. This contextual orientation included supervisee guidance in numerous activities including working with the computer network both within the school and district, managing front desk operation, scheduling, program orientation, counseling service delivery protocol, academic testing and interpretation, proper procedures when dealing with special education, community referral networks, parental groups, community support services and policies relevant to the school and counseling department impacting counseling services to students.

(Intern Journal Entry--Heather)

I have been concerned about how I was feeling so rushed with clients. I am seeing quite a few individual clients and I am feeling like I need to be so goal-oriented. The school environment feels so fast-paced and I was beginning to feel part of that pace. Because of this focus, I wasn’t feeling totally “with” the client and empathic towards them. Rather, it has been feeling “get em in-fix em-get em out” attitude. I have been telling myself that this is what I need to do to be part of the SMS (school) team. AND I have also been telling myself to slow down, don’t set the fast pace, and let them (clients) lead the session.

In the middle of feeling this struggle, I had a supervision meeting. I let my supervisor know how I was feeling. It felt great letting her know because she was very reassuring that she was not expecting that in me. I was relieved! She told me to get the experience I need and if I needed to take more time to do so. She then
told me a story of how she used to do the same thing with clients, but it back-fired on her. With one client she set the agenda that she thought the client would want to or should follow. A few sessions into it the client never came back in. She felt that what the client really needed was to be heard. I was so glad I talked to her because I was validated and encouraged to slow down. I felt that I grew from this. In discussing my weaknesses and wanting to improve and learn from them. My supervisor helped me do this.

(Intern Journal Entry--Jim)

Counseling on the fly: that is life at the school I am at. My days at the middle school are best described as chaos. From the moment I walk into the office I am inundated with students. I have yet to eat lunch at this school. Usually when I finally get a chance to slow down the kitchen is closed. We are so busy putting out fires that there is not a lot of time spent with therapy. Finding a balance working with teachers, administrators, special ed. instructors, social workers, attendance office; parents, and fellow counselors can be difficult

(Supervisor Interview--Ilda)

Supervisor: I guess what I hear from interns often is that they come in thinking that the internship here won't yield much of a--they're not sure they're going to get much experience with true crazy... And after a matter of just a week or so it's holy smokes, this has everything. In particular, this population that we have here really holds some incredible dysfunction and some incredible mental health issues and illnesses and all of it along with the impact of the way staff get along. And the issues that go on that you--that's not just what the student brings to the setting. It's also what the teachers bring into the setting and the way the teachers and the administrators are interacting and what's happening in the community, and all those other facts that I think... fertile ground in which to work. And I'm not sure they entered with that belief.

Dimension two: Site disparity

The disparity between university training experiences and contextual school counseling practices further contributed to supervisee emotional and cognitive dissonance.
School counseling interns perceived the university as emphasizing skills and processes characteristic of an "ideal" counseling relationship and illustrative of an agency model of therapeutic progress. They identified that this emphasis was not "realistic" to the contextual demands of the school and struggled with finding a balance between adapting to the internship site while balancing often conflictual expectations of the university. Furthermore, supervisees perceived on-site supervision as relevant and more specific to their orientation of both the brevity and pace of providing counseling services to students, staff, and parents within a school culture.

Supervisors responded by validating supervisees' dissonance related to their experience of contextual disparity and provided assistance in their developing and adapting their counseling skills specific to the climate and student population of their internship sites. Through modeling, supportive affirmation, encouragement, and direct counseling skill instruction, on-site supervisors assisted supervisees in:

- utilizing counseling strategies specific to the time constraints (i.e. brief therapy models) and student population (i.e. play therapy models)
- providing school counseling consultation and case-management interventions
- developing and coordinating school counseling programs
- understanding policies and procedures relevant to school counselors
- reviewing the parameters specific to special education and academic case management

(Intern Journal Entry--Tami)

It is more individualized with my onsite supervisor then it would be here [university], because there is pressure here for the time and competition because everyone wants to get their tape in. I always tend to stress and want just not be the first to speak up and not be the first one and that
becomes a boundary issue....Feeling that pressure makes me want to...I don’t want to take others time with that pressure, so I tend to not let them hear what I want to. On-site I am able to bring questions and can always go back again instead of waiting.

(Intern Interview--Nancy)

**Intern**: The expectations and tasks at the site are much different than the expectations and tasks of what you would do in a session here at the university; or what they would expect; or what they would see. Here it is your counseling relationship and what is happening in the session and this is what counseling should look like. In my supervision site, I see that what my supervisor likes what I do because I think that he wishes he were doing more of that. But, what happens in reality is that he...his counseling might be 10 minutes because a kid comes in due to an F in a class, or a question about a scholarship, or...brochures for the awards night. So, lots of things that are actually happening in the office are not necessarily things are that they would like to see here (university), yet we are in internship and need to follow-through with what we are doing there. I am not finding it necessarily discouraging...it is real realistic to look at that....but, when we come back here (university) what we get credit for are the one tape for every credit, so really I get credit or not credit for my (internship hours) based on tapes that I have that are passing tapes for this term. I don’t get credit for going to every Monday morning meeting and sitting in and being involved or for....whatever....going to the day-care center so that I get acquaint myself with the teen-parent program.

**Researcher**: So, the internship is being evaluated for you on only one aspect of the many different functions that actually happen in context, and I am wondering if you are saying that you would like to see that assessment happen in more contextual way that account for all the other pieces that are part of being a school counselor.

**Intern**: Yes. I also find that sometime tapes that I might show here or get feedback or supervision would be tapes that may not be passing tapes, or get totally different feedback than he would give me (on-site supervisor). I have also stopped showing the same tapes here that I do to him because I don’t like to deal with the discrepancy between what he has given me feedback on and what I get here. They are often not congruent. I struggle with who’s right and who’s wrong and how do I play into that. I just don’t feel comfortable with that because it makes me think that everybody has their own idea about everything, which is true, but than how
can one’s person feedback be, “This is really good tape and then, wait a minute. This didn’t happen or weren’t listening to the client”. I have had a couple of situations where I have had vastly, vastly different sets of feedback. I think, “Well, if the feedback from my supervisor is saying you need to lay it out here. This person has a history of not telling the truth and get this figured out and help him get on a positive path”. I try to take that in and work with it, but when I get here it is, “Wait a minute. You weren’t listening to what the client had to say. That is not the agenda they have. Why is it that you asked that question”. So, I couldn’t take in both those vastly different forms of feedback.

Researcher: Is it a sense of feeling kind of caught in the middle. Here I am getting two very distinct kinds of supervision happening and I am the only one between them.

Intern: Yes. Reality is...is that here (university) is where I am getting my passing grade and the other reality is that I need to do well a my internship site as well because this could be a potential job site. It could be...if my supervisor thinks that I am not meeting certain goals that get back to my supervisor here, so I do feel a little in the middle. I am hard worker and problem solving. I want to make sure that I trying to do that. In a way it may sound manipulative, but I get feedback from him (on-site) in certain ways and I get feedback from her (university) in certain ways and then I see how it gels together. I use a little bit of this, a little bit of this and then it seems like people are....I am happier and they are thinking some of things I am doing are better.

Researcher: So, there is kind of dance you are needing to learn to get what you need and to also present to each supervisor...

Intern: What they are wanting you to do. In some ways I don’t see all negative in that. I have had different internship supervisors here and I haven’t there. I have just one at my internship. I see when I come into a new situation with different people that may not have seen the same person, and I see some of the skills that I have honed that maybe some other people are still working, and then there are new things that I get from a new supervisor that I need to work on. So, I look at it with more...that it is helping me in the bigger picture, but right now when I am doing the day to day survival, there are times when I feel caught in the middle and I don’t like it.
Dimension three: Ethical awareness

Supervisees articulated both emotional and cognitive dissonance associated with translating the ethical guidelines reviewed in their graduate studies to the context of their internship sites. Each indicated a growing awareness of the ambiguity associated with maintaining and applying an ethical standard to their roles as school counselors (i.e., confidentiality). On-site supervision appeared to provide an environment in which ethical concerns could be processed and strategies for addressing ethical dilemmas could be encountered. In nonjudgmental, supportive, and validating responses, on-site supervisors assisted school counseling trainees in translating ethical principles to their internship school counseling practice.

(Intern Journal Entry--Jim)

Discussions this past week was centered around confidentiality and taping. I have had a difficult time balancing the requirement of school and what is needed at the intern site. There are times that the two do not match. On the one hand I need to pursue permission slips and find space to be able to tape. On the other hand, there is a need for me to run around the school and see students without permission slips. My supervisor has been very supportive around taping to accommodate my needs and requirements lately.

Confidentiality has also been discussed. I was in a session where three girls were talking about running away. A student came into the office during the session and overheard the conversation. He later approached one of the girls and told her that I told him what the session was about. Word spread quickly that I broke confidentiality. I had to explain the circumstances to my advisor. Again, [on-site supervisor] was supportive and had some suggestions for maintaining confidentiality.
I met with a student who had suicidal thoughts. The meeting went well. I completed a contract with him—that he wrote up—and then pulled my on-site supervisor. The uncomfortableness came from the student not wanting to tell his parents. After we assessed him and came to the conclusion that he is not in critical crisis, we let him know we would like to contact his parent, but we wouldn’t without his permission.

Well, a few days passed and I kept thinking about how I really want to contact his parent. I kept thinking “what if” something happens.... So, I brought it back to my on-site supervisor. She said “yes”—“Just let him know what you’ll be doing and saying...”. She then helped me process what I would do and say.

It was very helpful to talk with her. She really slowed me down by advising me not to contact mom until I was completely ready. I did so and got a great outcome with mom.

Phase two: Establishing trust

The supervisor’s ability to contain and transform emotional and cognitive dissonance into a meaningful guide for counselor development is contingent on the quality of the supervisory relationship (Sexton & Whiston, 1994). Perceiving the counseling supervisor as supportive has been shown to be important to both the perceived level of trust (Kennard, et al., 1982; Wark, 1995; Frankl, 1990; Carey, et al., 1988) and the supervisee’s learning and growth (Worthen, et al., 1996; Ladany, et al., 1995). The findings of this study support these assertions and further highlight the importance of a trusting on-site supervisory relationship on school counselor trainee development. Both supervisors and supervisees identified trust as an important characteristic in the supervisory relationship for enhancing the supervisee’s willingness to address dissonant
Internship experiences and the conceptual and clinical demands reflected in later supervision phases of development. Furthermore, the analysis of data collected from supervisees, supervisors, and observation of the taped on-site supervision process suggested the presence of three dimensions contributing to trainees experience of a trusting on-site supervisory relationship. These dimensions included (a) supervisor accessibility, (b) support, and (c) collegiality.

**Dimension four: Accessibility**

The first dimension evident of a trusting on-site supervisory relationship emerging from the analysis of data was the accessibility of the supervisor as perceived by the supervisee. Supervisees identified that learning was enhanced when supervisors were accessible to address emerging uncertainties. This seemed especially important in view of the mounting transitional dissonance experienced by trainees in their adjustment to the school counseling context and crisis management of student concerns. As one school counseling intern remarked, “The supervisor supported by ‘jumping right in’ and was both available and willing to help out if I needed her” (Heather, intern journal entry).

The supervisees’ perceived importance of supervisor accessibility was supported by the response of supervisors who exhibited a willingness to be available to trainee concerns stemming from their internship experiences. Supervisors indicated that being accessible to supervisees was not only crucial for assessing the skills and developing the needs of counselor trainees, but also promoted trust for continued supervisee disclosure of uncertain internship experiences. This increased “freedom” by supervisees to express uncertain counseling experiences provided a shift in supervisory dialogue from contextual
orientation to conceptual development. This prompted greater opportunities for
supervision to address the dimensions central to the clinical independence of school
counseling trainees.

(Supervisor Interview--Shannon)

Supervisor: What I found in the past with supervisees is that the more
she does under my supervision and a gradual pulling out of my
involvement so that I am letting go, that is where I found the
confidence is built. That if I am always there, always hovering, the
temptation and the tendency is to defer to me. So, what...actually
last year when I was working with (previous intern), one of things
that really helped was that I was also doing some substituting,
administratively down the hall, and on those days (intern) would be
in my office right down the hall so she confer and consult and yet
she was kind of taking over and I think that really helped her
confidence level and that is what I am trying to build with
[supervisee] to have build up to doing more direct services with
kids...I always I want to be accessible, I just want to be less
physical. I want to be less present and less visible. So, that she is
actually doing the counseling role. Very much like a student
teacher where I am in the background and stepping out and letting
her take it over. That is to me what I see the benefit of a
supervisee-supervisor role.

Researcher: How do you know when to begin letting go?

Supervisor A lot of it...is you don't. It is kind of real gradual thing. It
is kind of like the mother-bird kind of thing, you have to push them
out. So often time, even in the last week, we have had some
scheduling changes forecasted for the next year and I have said
[intern] “This is what we need to do. You need to call the students
down and play with the computers. I am down in this next office”
and I said, “you need to do it”. So, that was pretty vague stuff.
She did it. She consulted with me if she had questions and she
called the kids down....she had done enough if that before, so she
knew what she was doing, so she just kind of had to do it.
University Supervisor: I think it is very important that they have a supportive supervisor who is accessible. Someone that they see as accessible. Where I see supervisees struggling is when they don’t perceive the supervisors as accessible. Someone who gives the supervisee that they are accessible and providing support and, from my perspective as a campus supervisor, I think it is important to have a supervisor that asks them and challenges them. Early on when these people are early in their process, the most important piece for me is accessibility... The other piece is—relating to accessibility—is that I don’t think the student (supervisee) lets the supervisor know what they need. So they are not clear to articulate their needs. And when they do that supervisors are usually responsive. It is not they are not accessible, it is they don’t appear accessible to the student, because the student doesn’t say I need your support or I need your help. Because there is this issue that both bring in. One is that the supervisor perceives the supervisee to be more competent then the supervisee perceives themselves to be, and the supervisee doesn’t want to appear not competent so they don’t ask. So, I think those two dynamics work against each other.

Dimension five: Support

Significant to developing a level of trust necessary for supervisees to express the emotional and cognitive dissonance associated with their orientation to the school counseling context was their perception of support from their on-site supervisors. The findings suggest that supportive and encouraging feedback was important for increasing trainee self-efficacy and willingness to engage in new counseling strategies specific to their adaptation to the school context. Supervisors who exhibited a genuine concern for the growth and learning of school counseling interns, in addition to student and school welfare, were perceived as supportive. This was exhibited through nonjudgmental feedback illustrated through affirming process observations and tentative counseling suggestions and strategies. Validating their struggles with orienting to the school
counseling context and providing suggestions for developing skills adaptive to the school culture appeared crucial for school counseling trainees to increase their level of self-efficacy and willingness to express uncertain counseling experiences central to later conceptual and clinical growth.

(Intern Journal Entry--Heather)

I felt encouraged to try new things despite my initial fears...if she [on-site supervisor] had not been this way I would entered in much more cautiously and less willing to try new things. Supervision felt like there was a freedom to try new things, that it was OK to learn and make mistakes and this was a normal part of the learning process and of supervision.

(Intern Journal Entry--Tami)

I feel she [on-site supervisor] is very honest and definitely not afraid to tell me how she is feeling. I appreciate and respect what she has to tell me. I do here too. That is not a lack here either....I see her work with kids and gained a lot of respect for her...And the sense of caring. I feel she really does care about my process and where I am at and what I need to learn there.

(Intern Journal Entry--Mike)

I think the purpose [of on-site supervision] is to allow me to gain knowledge of different services working in the schools. Also, allow me to....express my concerns or questions regarding what’s going on in the counseling process, or working with students, or the interactions with faculty. I think the purpose is to allow me, and [supervisor], to...share my experiences that I’ve been having and have him validate, correct, or let me know....he tells me information or knowledge that I probably didn’t know before.

Dimension six: Collegiality

Supervisors in this study portrayed confidence in supervisees through a collegial style of interaction that encouraged the supervisees to continue to expose themselves to
increasingly challenging school counseling experiences. The supervisors approached this by not only exposing trainees to the tasks and duties associated with school counseling, but also by sharing their own professional growth history and experiences. This aided the supervisees in developing their professional identities and addressing periods of uncertainty and indecision. Professional self-disclosure appeared to enhance the level of supervisory trust experienced by the supervisee and to encourage a safety for their disclosure of uncertain and anxiety producing internship experiences. This appears congruent with their perceived shift in roles from a university student to a professional colleague at the internship site. Each supervisor in the study appeared attuned to the similarities of interns’ uncertainties and struggles with adjusting to counseling in the schools and their own developmental history.

(Supervisor Interview--Shannon)

**Supervisor:** I haven’t really thought out this metaphor thoroughly enough, but in some ways I kind of see it as a small child learns to walk. At first the child is hanging on to everything, to make sure that things are sturdy. It the progresses that the child hangs on to two fingers and get on that way. Gradually, they begin to let go and before you know it they are running. A parent is always there, they just step further in the background. That is my sense of mentoring. That is what I want to do. I want an intern who comes here to have the sense of me being more parallel with a little more in the leadership role and eventually step backward and let them go. That is my intent. I am not always successful with it but it is my goal. I think that knowing what I needed when I got out of the internship situation, and I had a real good one, you still walk out it lost. I would want….I still have contact with my supervisor and I think it is crucial. I would like to be in that role where interns who have interned with me could call and say, “I’m lost”.

**Researcher:** To maintain that mentorship.
Supervisor: Yes. That is what I think our goal is when you take this on. Like parenting, you have to take it on for a long time. You can’t just hang it up and say, “You’re out of here. I don’t want to hear from you again”. Although you might want to.....but, I think it is a far bigger picture than the 6 months or so of the internship...I want the intern to feel accepted as a part of our counseling environment. I want the intern to feel as a counselor in our department.

Researcher: In a professional role.

Supervisor: Right. In that when the intern and I go into my office for supervision—and this is kind of a blended role; a conflicting role—I want there to be rapport, so that the intern is feeling, on the one hand, I am not critical in a debasing sort of way. That any sort of constructive criticism is coming from a problem solving basis. That, “How did you feel like you did here? Was that in line with your goals? If not, where were you uncomfortable and why? What do you think you can do differently?” At this point too, making some suggestions about what I heard and trying to fit that into the whole process. But, I want the intern to feel like there is rapport. That I am mentor, not a teacher. That’s my goal.

Researcher: Where does that come from for you?

Supervisor: Philosophy. Even as a classroom teacher I feel that...I’m a teacher, I can present information and help to get to students motivated to do what they need to do. But, it is more important to be a mentor to help...to reflect where anyone wants to go, and reflect if that is working. I really believe in a problem-solving model.

Phase three: Conceptual development

As trust was experienced within the supervisory dyad the dissonance of supervisees shifted from that associated with contextual orientation, to the conceptual uncertainties associated with working within their internship sites. Each of the supervisors in this research focused on assisting trainees in expanding their conceptual understanding of both the school counseling process and the interactive dynamics between the trainee
and students/faculty/parents. This represented a conceptual change from case or content summary of events, to an increased awareness of patterns, themes, and systemic influences necessary for case conceptualization and subsequent treatment planning. The importance of conceptual complexity to the process of transforming early dissonant training experiences into meaningful professional schemas representative of advanced counselor trainees, has been clearly demonstrated in previous counseling supervision research (Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982; Borders, 1988, 1989; Morran, 1986; Martin, 1989; Hiebert, 1994; Cummings, 1990). Consistent with these research conclusions, this study found that supervisors addressed the conceptual dissonance of trainees to enhance their understanding of student issues and case planning. Additionally, school counselor trainees desired supervisor feedback directed at their conceptual process relevant to school counseling and instructive suggestions for improvement. Supervisors approached the conceptual development of trainees by seeking to develop a reflective supervisory dialogue to elicit advanced case conceptualization process in the trainees. The intent of eliciting greater conceptual complexity in school counseling trainees appeared focused on promoting their clinical skills of self assessment, self generation and professional risk taking, which are all dimensions of the final phase of on-site supervision development--clinical independence.

Central to the learning and clinical development of trainees, this phase of supervision addressed uncertain school counseling experiences of trainees within a reflective dialogue that encouraged supervisees to contemplate fundamental questions such as: (a) What do I do?; (b) How do I do it?; and; (c) What does this mean for both myself as a professional and those whom I serve? On-site supervisors sought to shift
supervision to a higher order of conceptual processing that directly assisted trainees in construing and appropriating new or revised interpretations of the meaning related to their school counseling experience. It increased the trainee's level of consciousness through the recognition of inconsistencies or incongruencies and articulated principles that assisted in their developing increased dimensions representative of independent school counseling practice and development.

Initiating a reflective dialogue to facilitate the conceptual complexity and development of trainees, on-site supervisors utilized (a) thematic observations, (b) reflective modeling, and (c) illustrative examples. These dimensions of school counselor trainee experience represented supervisory pedagogical interventions focused on supervisee conceptual development intended to facilitate clinical independence.

**Dimension seven: Thematic observations**

Thematic observations are supervisor responses to supervisees that prompt a shift in supervisory dialogue from counseling content review to counseling process conceptualization. Supervisors often responded with thematic observations in response to the content orientated case summary initially provided by their supervisees. This appeared to facilitate a dialogue between supervisee-supervisor from a report of content of counseling events to patterns of interaction and related themes. Open-ended inquiry assisted the supervisee to reflect on the meaning of these interactions. It also assisted in identifying both client goals and supervision goals for school trainee development.
(Supervision Process—Shannon [supervisor] & Tami [intern])

**Supervisor:** What are some of her issues?

**Intern:** Ok...When she first started coming here there was the stuff with her boyfriend, another friend and the whole triangle thing...and...that was like in February...and she has a lot of weekly crisis kind of things that have been real....down. This week is the first week I have talked to here where she came in and she is all smiles and...the fight with her mom that her mom called and was so concerned about just kind of blew over her, like it wasn't that big of deal.

**Supervisor:** In the whole scheme of things that fight wasn't as significant to (client) than it was to her mom

**Intern:** Right.

**Supervisor:** And the fights between (client) and mom tend be what...power struggles

**Intern:** I think so...somewhat. But they can be very physical. The police get involved. She knows the police on a regular basis (head nodding). She will call the police when ever...

**Supervisor:** So, she knows that when ever they are starting into a fighting syndrome that she calls the police, almost ahead of time...Some self care skills (lightly). She is pretty aware of what trigger..It sounds like she is pretty aware of what triggers fights at home...

**Intern:** (head nodding)...In the fight with her mom it was..she feels like her mom just mentally beats her down... 'she's no good’, 'she doesn't do anything right’. The fight that she is talking about with her mom, that her mom called me about, was that they were in the middle of the grocery store and her mom was talking with a friend she had met there at the store and she informed her friend how ‘her daughter doesn’t do anything right’, is this and that and all this stuff (hands moving). And mom did this right in front of her, with her just standing there. So, she just walked away. She said that is what she does is just walked away. And I asked her, “Did you leave the store...what did you do?”...She just went and bought some chap stick..when she came back...ready to go home she stated, “I better get going, I have a daughter to attend to (said with frustration)”. Just put one more negative thing with her friend.
Supervisor: Sounds like (client) has pretty OK coping mechanisms, at least it sounds like it.

Intern: She hasn’t really recognized...I’ve asked her.. “How do you keep yourself going”?.. She gets attention overall with all the negative things she does. That is where she gets her attention from....But she has learned....in her job, at the restaurant where she works....the regular customers have given her praise.

Supervisor: So, she is at a point in her life where she is breaking out of the mother-daughter mold, and she is getting some feedback from some objective people, so she is recognizing that maybe what mom is saying isn’t necessarily true.

Intern: Yes (head nodding)..

Supervisor: So, she is fighting back.....

Intern: So, she is getting some real positive feedback from work...I asked her the difference..and she said, “Well at work, I get better tips if I smile”. So, she is learning that there are some positive things to be happy...and, she is getting some positive feedback that she is used to, and she came and really spoke...one of the first time I had seen her...

Dimension eight: Reflective modeling

Reflective modeling represented a supervisory response that demonstrated diagnostic, interpretative, and case conceptualization skills with regard to the client(s) or situation the intern presented in the on-site supervision session. Advanced case conceptualization of the counseling process contextual to schools was exhibited to the supervisee to assist in shifting the language and dialogue in supervision from content summary to therapeutic processes and pattern awareness. Exposing the school counseling trainee to their reflective processes with regard to case conceptualization and treatment planning in reference to students, parents, teachers, and administrators promoted the onset
of increased supervisee clinical independence. Moreover, they also provided a period of debriefing for supervisee questions and an opportunity to “reflect out loud” on the intentionality of their school counseling approach.

(Supervisor Interview—Joanne)

Researcher: ...So there's a level of trust that you have with your interns. How do you establish that?

Supervisor: What I like to do when I first start is invite them to be a part of anything that happens in my day so that they see how I interact with parents, how I handle phone calls, how I go up and talk to the administrators about a discipline kind of thing. Asking for help from other people in the building, how I go about doing that. How I talk with the teachers, how the staffings are held and what the counselor's role is in the staffings. So I think just letting them see. To have that person be a part of everything I do in my day so they can see what a school counselor's role is.

Researcher: Exposure...

Supervisor: I don't know. I think I've been really lucky in that the three interns that I've had who are working at the Masters level, and this wonderful one who was working at the Doctorate level, and I think probably just being open with them about who I am and how I do things, and hopefully that allows them to be open about who they are and how they want to do things. And how their style would work in a school and how that would work with the entire school, and that's the employees and the rest of the staff and the parents and the kids. It involves the whole school.

Researcher: So part of what happens is not only are you sharing your role, but you're also sharing your professional experience. Is that it?

Supervisor: Yes. And I think I've gone back with them and said when I was doing that training that thing that you just mentioned wasn't there, so you're already starting [end of tape] thing is really valuable, and it will be useable in the school. And yet each school is different, so you have to modify and adjust a little bit too.
Dimension nine: Illustrative examples

To assist school counseling trainees in developing conceptualization processes beyond the facts and content of the student's presentation, on-site supervisors often provided illustrative examples of their own professional history and clinical experience with students, teachers, administrators, and families. Although not specific to the case presentation of the supervisee in supervision, illustrative examples provided thematic links between cases and assisted the supervisee to cross-case conceptualize repeating school counseling dynamics. By disclosing their counseling strategies and interpretations of similar student cases as presented by the intern, supervisors provided increased opportunities for the trainee to shift in their perception of case content to processes and dynamics as illustrated through the supervisors professional examples.

(Supervision Process—Erin [supervisor] & Mike [intern])

Intern: Is the student assistance program focused just on AODA?

Supervisor: No. It is just a component. The model is all encompassing....it is hoped that teachers will not just focus on the AODA and see it as covering all 'behaviors of concern'...The other day I was referred a student who has missing class recently and this is unusual for her. I called her down and on asking why this might be occurring, she indicated that her parents were going through a divorce and was feeling distracted and preoccupied with what to do to cope. I then asked her if it was all right with her that I share this with her teachers as way for them to offer support. I will often dialogue with students as a way to open things and normalize the issues they are being referred for, and then invite them to comment on them.

(Supervisor Interview—Ilda)

Supervisor: I guess--first of all I've become aware of it mostly from
comments that they might make, and then probably I say typically, yes, so there you go that's what it is here. What're you going to do? And then we get to a point where I talk about dealing with the environment that this is the way I deal with teachers, in order to find the time that will work with them not being able to . . . out of class. You may need to talk with the secretary entering the room, or the person who shares this room about how to give a signal about when they can or can't, or maybe you need to find a different room for you to work in. Let's figure out if this one would be more comfortable, or this might be a time when that room is less vulnerable to interruptions. So I guess I just kind of help them problem-solve and try not to run tackle for the intern. I try and give them a series of options or possibilities of what they could try and let them experience trying to carve out then conditions that they feel they require. While also letting them know that, yeah, that's going to be a problem anywhere. I don't think we're that unusual here and so you're going to have to figure out how to cope with that.

Researcher: So you normalize it--you provide some guidance, but you're also promoting them to be independent.

Supervisor: That sounds right. And I guess also, occasionally the first response from the intern is almost self-righteous. How can it be the people here don't know these basics. And I figure that isn't going to get them very far, so we try to yank that out real quick.

Researcher: Anything else you do to try to promote independence? . . .

Supervisor: I try to always make it a point to not do the communicating with the other party that . . . Which is hard for me because I'm apt to fall into that. So if, an example, when [intern] is running a group and is going to give awards to kids who succeeded the group and had generated the idea on her own. It's been announced to me and to the principal and assistant would they like to be present for her group when she presented those. My response was sure, sounds great, and I sent the memo back. The principal's response was a note to [intern]saying why not do it at the 6th and 7th grad awards assembly. And Mary did a note directly back to [intern], not through me, which is great, and the [intern] talked about it and talked about would the kids be made fun of since they aren't particularly positive in . . . Would they rather have that publicity or have it more private. What would the impact of that be, and could she be here to present it . . . So we went through the possibilities of that and I suggested she would want to give
that decision back to the group. She had another meeting, she . . .
But I didn't go run (to the Principal) to tell her, explain why [intern] had picked, I left that communication back to [principal] up to [intern]. So I guess I try not to communicate over the intern.

Phase four: Clinical independence

Cross theoretical models (Littrell et al., 1979; Stoltenberg, 1981; Loganbill et al., 1982; Yogev, 1982; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987) described a sequential, hierarchical process of counselor development and matching supervision interventions for each stage of development. A growing body of research supported the general tenets of developmental models (Borders, 1989; Tracey, 1989; Rabinowitz, 1986; Heppner, 1994). Of these, none has had a more systematic impact on supervision literature and research than Stoltenberg’s (1981) Counselor Complexity Model. Described as the “most heuristic model to date” (Worthington, 1984, p. 63), it integrated Hogan’s (1964) stage approach to supervision with Hunt’s (as cited in Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987) conceptual systems theory as applied to learning environments. The counselor is portrayed as progressing through a sequence of four identifiable stages while addressing issues of autonomy, self-awareness, and the acquisition of skills and related theory. Furthermore, trainees are characterized as initially anxious and dependent while confronting aspects of motivation, learning needs, and dynamics of resistance, and while addressing such areas of growth as counseling skills, assessment, interpersonal, conceptualization, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment goals/plans, and professional ethics.

The results of this study support the developmental constructs of supervisee development models. School counseling trainees entered the on-site supervision
experience emotionally and cognitively overwhelmed while completely dependent on the supervisor for providing structured guidance and encouragement in orienting to the school counseling context. Through continued exposure to the school counseling context and related supervisory dynamics, the supervisee's anxieties lessened; he/she became more independent in conceptualizing the school counseling process and determining areas of both professional and personal growth. The findings suggest that on-site supervision provided a supportive and reassuring context for instruction to the orientation to the school context, facilitated a trusting supervisory relationship, and promoted advanced conceptual development. The development of greater conceptual complexity of interns provided the foundation for this final phase of on-site school counseling supervision development focused on increasing the autonomy of trainees in both their clinical self assessment and practice of school counseling. The dimensions of supervisee experience, therefore, articulate processes central to their becoming independent school counseling professionals. These are: self-assessment, self-generation, and professional risk taking behaviors. On-site supervisors sought to encourage, engender, and support these processes within the reflective cycle and context of their interaction with supervisees.

Dimension ten: Self assessment

Each of the trainees indicated that the dissonance associated with transitioning to a school counseling internship resulted in a process of reassessing their theoretical orientation and counseling style. Supervisees acknowledged that the pressures associated with the contextual urgency present in schools, coupled with their desire for professional competency, resulted in an early abandonment of their counseling theory and approach for
a more pragmatic orientation to solving problems with kids. This resulted in a preoccupation with learning counseling techniques to address the multiple student issues surfacing in their school counseling experience. A focus of on-site supervision targeted the instruction of specific counseling skills relevant to the pace and to the student population. Each of the interns in the study reported a shift to a more directive counseling orientation which stood in stark contrast to that which they experienced in their university training. This awareness of theoretical dissonance facilitated the supervisees' syntheses of internship experiences to a new and more meaningful emergent counseling orientation within the school context. Furthermore, supervisees viewed on-site supervision as a context to reflect on their realignment of counseling theory to match their growing repertoire of counseling strategies and interventions perceived as helpful in addressing student concerns (see Appendix H).

Consequently, a dynamic central for interns in developing a counseling orientation congruent to the school context was the shift from a dependent stance in determining their professional competencies through supervisor confirmation and validation, to a stance of increased confidence in trusting their abilities in identifying issues of the counseling process. Also they addressed areas of improvement necessary for their own professional competence. This internal process of self-assessment was perceived by both supervisees and supervisors as a benchmark to professional development and a statement of independence as emerging school counselors. It was characterized by the trainees increased abilities to reflect objectively on the counseling process in relation to the needs of students, faculty and/or parents relevant to their internship site. These self-reflective questions addressed:
What are the student needs?

Do the presenting needs match my counseling skills?

If not, what do I need to do to be more effective or fill this gap (counseling strategies) to match the student needs?

Am I willing to take a risk for growth (impacted by supervisory trust)?

The subsequent response of supervisors was to assist supervisees in assessing their effectiveness with students, and identify effective counseling strategies to the needs and goals of their clients (i.e., students, families, faculty, etc.). Through open-ended questioning, reflective inquiry, and suggestive leads, the supervisors in this study prompted supervisees to become more self directed and self confident in conceptualizing their client’s processes and evaluating their own professional competency. Preparing school counselor trainees to exit the internship experience as independent school counseling professionals ready to address the diverse issues and roles represented in a school context was identified as the overall intent of on-site supervision. As the final phase in on-site supervision, supervisors facilitated supervisees’ insights as they developed clinical skills with less self judgment, and as they increased ownership for determining their direction of learning to best meet the needs of the school context and/or clientele. Promoting self assessment in supervisees involved encouraging a) identification of goals with regard to student issues and the counseling process, and b) increased self direction in identifying professional gaps and strategies for development of the skills necessary for addressing their own professional learning needs.
(Intern Interview--Heather)

**Intern:** Still the number one thing that I'm taking with me is my self confidence in working with youth and believing that school counselors are effective in school. I've always wanted to work with kids to help them stay in school because of my 6 or 7 year experience working with high school dropouts. And the question always is, are high school counselors really effective? And as I've done my internship this term I've come to believe that it's not only--I think that middle school counselors are probably more effective--then the high school counselors. Cause that's where you catch them, at that age. And so a lot of learning for my own career change that this is something that is very effective. The self confidence from learning around that.

**Researcher:** What do you think has contributed to your self confidence?

**Intern:** Just feeling good about what I'm doing and just getting a lot of, I don't know if it's really congratulations, I can't think of the word, feedback, that their feeling is that I'm making a change. I didn't think that I'd come in and just observe, and I didn't think that I'd come in and hurt anyone, as far as what I would say, but I just didn't think I'd really change or help people really get through things, and it's... that happened for me.

(Supervisor Interview--Clint)

**Researcher:** Do you find that interns go through a period of having to reassess and develop orientations...

**Supervisor:** I don't even know if the re-develop, I think they actually do develop. They have a lot of theories floating around in their heads, a lot of ideas, but many of them, in fact most of them, come here they don't really know what their orientation is. And that's the key step that we talk about as well in supervision. As a matter of fact that's one of the things where the theory part comes out of their experience and the school context. Not until they feel more confident in their skills can they ask, I wonder what it is I'm doing.

(Supervisor Interview--Shannon)

**Supervisor:** I am trying to get her self assessment. That I am wanting her to be self constructive.
Researcher: How come?

Supervisor: Because I think that I want her to look...it is part of the process that I want her to decide and have some goals with this student, and that if she can look back and see what was working and not working that as a counselor there is a constant process of evaluating how you have done; what was effective and was not. I wanted here to have some of that process every time she meet with the kid. Even though, most of the time you are meeting with them right after the other, at least you have a sense by looking that this seemed to work, this seemed to get her back on track. A lot of times, when you are first starting out as a counselor you just don't have enough background to make measure that. So, I was wanting her to take a look for herself.

Researcher: So, wanting to encourage her to reflect on her own process as way to begin to identify some benchmarks of growth.

Supervisor: About client growth, but also about her development as a counselor; her own style; her own...

Researcher: Is this working...

Supervisor: Right, so that she has the benchmarks to measure her effectiveness, because that is kind of what our task is.

Researcher: How did those tasks get set up?

Supervisor: It is kind of an ongoing process. I don't think that [intern] and talked about those things other than when we first met. When we first met we shared what we hoped this counseling would turn out to be. What my goal in supervising, and her goal in doing the internship, and for both of us it was having an experiment that was as broad as she could possibly have, and to get feedback so that when she walked out of this internship experience that she would have experience with a lot of the function of school, but also feedback on how she was doing as counselor, so that she walked out her feeling like she had some sense of how she was effective.

Researcher: So, almost a kind of parallel process. That you wanted to provide instruction for the supervisee to be reflective on the school process, and wanting them to reflect on client process, but also wanting them to reflect on their own process. My sense of this tape is that you are trying to create a language that shifts from client
focus to client process, and now you even begin to identify
[intern’s] influence on that process on what the function of
counseling relationship is. I don’t know if that was deliberate, or
whether that just kind of happened...

**Supervisor:** I think that just happened, but I think that is my intent.
I don’t know that I specifically thought that process out, but that is
my intent...and a known intent. I just don’t think I knew
(laughter).

**Dimension eleven: Self-generation**

Self-generation in school counseling interns was characterized by an increased
confidence in their professional skills, and enhanced awareness of their positive influences
on student adjustment and growth. It prompted the supervisees to initiate projects,
examples, skills and behaviors that represented not only unmet needs to the population
they were working with, but gaps in their professional development. Characteristic of
clinical independence, supervisors engendered supervisees to reflect on their “visions of
professional learning”. Supervision, therefore, became increasingly more supervisee
directed toward their identified learning goals for professional growth, and less dependent
upon the supervisor to identify learning goals for the school counseling intern.

(Supervisor Interview--Erin)

**Supervisor:** I would say that once you get beyond the survival skill piece
that I do try to go with two things: the interns skill level and
internal locus of control and ability to take the bull by the horns and
function independently. So, I have had student interns who have
either seemed to struggle mastering basic survival skills and desire
ongoing structure working within the system. I would say with
them I am less likely to move them much beyond that. Whereas,
and one of the things I just noticed this week with [intern] that
seemed to be a step, was interested to introduce himself to kids in
the waiting room—that is really neat.
Researcher: What does that mean to you?

Supervisor: To me it is what kind of level of comfort and security in working within the system and just security to say, "Let me introduce myself...". It is a stepping out. An internal locus of control isn't necessarily what I want to say but it is beginning to function a little bit more independently...

Researcher: Without needing as much direction.

Supervisor: Exactly. Today what you will hear on the tape is his asking about doing group counseling for the fall and some of the ideas that he has for that. I responded to some of his ideas and also suggested some other ideas for him to consider with regard to the time frame that he is going to be here. So, I think that even though he had talked about group counseling before I had not heard him language so many specific ideas. In fact, when he first mentioned doing a group it was more like "I know that I should be doing that, but I am really not very confident about that idea....". You could hear the insecurity behind what he was saying. Today I was hearing another step up in security in terms of "I think I could do this or that"....So, I felt like he is much more ready to take that on and make that happen...If I think back to some of the people who seemed to struggle just mastering some of the basic survival skills. Things like pulling up stuff on the computer, making schedule changes....I would think that as they struggle with that, that they would be much less likely, because of the lack of security, to move independently beyond what I would call standard operating procedures. Although......I have been in the field for 24 years, I still at times tend to think people see the way the same way that I do. So, one of my titles is "Dr. Voice in the Wilderness"....it is so interesting, just like the four of us in the department. The new person on the block, but if you would follow her around she is the counselor who works with the ALO team, she meets with the special ed people, she is the one when she first showed up wanted to help the peer helper class with me. Of the three she is the one who did the "we care days"....On the other hand, [older counselor], is very efficient. If you give him something to do he will have it done more quickly than any of the four of us. But if you were to do a time management study, you would see that he has a tremendous amount of down time and sitting there with a pocket book. How does he do that? I can never find time....I am one of those idiots that get involved in things like...(aids community activities)...I don't think any of those kinds of ideas would have
occurred to him to get involved in doing. What is the dynamic at work that some people come into a job setting and it is like, “Tell what to do, when to do it and I will do very efficiently”.

Researcher: But it is dependent on you, rather than what I hear you taking about is the ability to have confidence to expand my view and initiate…

Supervisor: A lot of times this is a…when you use intern, in my mind, is often true for those who just join our staff….Basic operational skills….It is still that spark that I am looking for. That when they leave my supervision I would like to see in them…I would like to have the knowledge that when they get on a staff somewhere they are not going to be field dependent. It is not just going to be tell what to do, when to do, and tell me whether I met your standards. It is going to be—and maybe this is where the internal locus of control piece comes from—it is going to be, not arrogant in your face, but like “here is what I think is important; here is what I want to do; I would like to do not only what you ask me to do, but would hope that it matches what is important to me and if it doesn’t than I will look for something else to match”. For myself the biggest source of my job satisfaction in the last two years is the amount of support for student assistance, peer helpers, high and low element courses, and the community organization piece……

Researcher: You have a very expanded view of the role of the school counselor

Supervisor: If we don’t than the depth and breadth of the problems that we are going to face here will become overwhelming….So, I think you are going to feel under-effective and overwhelmed. You have probably read that little fable about the kids falling in the river. One says I am going to go up and keep them from falling in because only more and more will fall unless we do something to unite the school and community more.

Researcher: Part of what you want in an intern is that they are able to self-generate based on some level of self awareness of here is where I am at with regards to these things I want to generate and how does that fit with the school and community needs as well.

Supervisor: At that point I want to be able to support that person.

Researcher: That is the shift point for you.
**Supervisor:** Exactly. Over the years for those people who are self generators what ever it was they wanted to come up with....I always wanted to engender that spark and hope that would continue to grow and have things they are excited about and enthusiastic about and took ownership for so that self generation is a good word.

**Researcher.** Let me see if I have this. This is interesting. Part of what you're talking about is--I'll use the supervisee--and see if this fits. The one characteristic that seems to be pertinent in developing a school counseling orientation that appears to be effective is being able to kind of look beyond the dissonance. All the supervisees exhibit some sort of transition dissonances. But beyond that to a place where they can have a vision. A vision about where, despite this thrust, despite what's happening, where do I want to go, what things do I want to address. Is that it?

**Supervisor.** I think that's very nicely. In fact, I somewhat hesitate to say this because my school counseling experience is limited to schools, a very small school in Eastern Colorado, and here. There are definitely some school systems where the managers of the system do not want school counselors who have a vision. They want them to be automatons--do what I tell you, when I tell you to do it, how I tell you to do it. But my experience has been generally, managers have been, I guess this is the leadership piece of it, they basically have said, hey, you know what you need to do. As long as there's communication to me about what you need to do, then you go ahead and do it. And time constraints, budgetary constraints, etc. Yeah, vision. Now again, its seemed to me--I wish I could get inside some people's minds--because I see some people who've been in the profession 20, 25 years and I never get an inkling of vision.

**Researcher.** Or at least their ability to verbalize something beyond their.

**Supervisor.** Here's what I see, from which I assume there is no vision. And that is, when people aren't knocking at their doors. Are not coming in to ask to see them. I don't see them doing other things. I sometimes see them reading a pocketbook, and I'm going, how can you do that. I'd like to be three of me. . . So I guess it's from that I say. . . Because I was in the military, I definitely saw a mind set there that was pretty foreign to me. And that was that there were a lot of people who felt much more comfortable in a structure where they were being told what to do, when to do it, how to do it, and told whether or not they could . . . standard. Because I think it
relieved them of the responsibility. It takes a whole hell of a lot more responsibility to be a . . . a say, boy, next year I'd really like to work more effectively with my seniors and get my seniors in on a more regular basis for post-high school educational and career planning, because she sees the needs.

**Dimension twelve: Professional risk taking behaviors**

To further enhance supervisee independence, supervisors encouraged supervisees to formally or informally contract for professional change. These changes in practice were often identified through the intern's growing confidence in self-assessment and self generation of those areas or skills needed to enhance his/her professional growth. Often supervisors assisted supervisees in linking case conceptualization processes in supervision to counseling interventions that might represent new or novel counseling strategies. In a supportive and nonjudgmental approach, the supervisors in this study encouraged professional risk taking behaviors providing accessible follow-up supervision and normalization of the learning process in the context of developing a counseling orientation congruent with schools.

(Intern Interview--Tami)

**Researcher:** How have you changed in a way that gives you the sense that you have grown?

**Intern:** I think my change is now in process. The biggest thing for me is my awareness. More up-front about what I am doing therapeutically with clients. I am changing because I am used to working with adults. With kids I feel like they want some form of a structure in there and I tend to be more reflective. Sometimes I think I am changing therapeutically in being more...identifying with them a little bit more than I probably did in the past...I think it is just now happening. Before I think that I was more focused on establishing a relationship and more empathic. A slower process.
A slower form of counseling. Where in school counseling, those processes are there, they just need to be going quicker for me. To have them come in and do some works. Kids come in and want to story-tell and I feel like I need to start setting boundaries around that. Maybe take on a little bit more of an educational piece. Like they are not sure where or what they are supposed to be doing in there (classroom). I don’t like to be that directive so I feel like I am changing in order to facilitate what they need...They just over and over they just want to come in and story-tell. I know they have deep-seated things they come in for and we are not getting to them, and then time runs out. I only have a student for a half hour.

**Researcher:** So, the pressure is not about roles as it is about you wanting to be more therapeutic sooner. More about pace

**Intern** Yes. More about pace and boundaries...Yes. I tend to think that...I tend to believe that the client’s process is part of the story telling and want to work that. I am realizing that time constraints are here and need to push a little bit more.

**Researcher:** Would you say that time constraints has been an influence on that shift in awareness.

**Intern:** Yes. Definitely.

**Researcher:** How has supervision, if at all, helped that shift?

**Intern:** That is where I have come to be aware of my processes. Listening to myself on tapes and getting reflections back from supervisors about what I am doing. They can see my problem with time and setting boundaries too. It just reinforces it for and have had a difficult time with that...I am telling myself that what I want to do with some of these people that talk with what their story-telling may be about and what processes are here and how much time we really need for check and than move into what they want to work on with the amount of time we have left.

**Researcher:** So, about planning the counseling process.

**Intern:** Yes. I don’t feel it is fair to them because their time gets take up so quickly and they are like, “Is this all the time we have? What happened?”. I then feel like they want to move, but I have someone here waiting...so I send them back to class and than they want to come and start all over again with a different story. I think it is hard being in a school....First I think about the individual and
identify where they are at and then I think about what they need regarding my skills and how that is going to work.

Researcher: And then you take a risk...

Intern: Yes I take a risk....First I read and grab a book and get some ideas about techniques. Than I will test them out and see what feedback I get from the client and if they don’t there I may try to reframe it with a different way to see if they go there. Sometimes I let go and sometimes I check in with why they didn’t address it. That is part of me. I am really curious about why things aren’t working. If it is me and how I am framing it or something going on, than I want to deal with it.

(Supervisor Interview--Joanne)

Researcher: What would you say are your goals for--what do you want the intern. . . as a supervisor?

Supervisor: I think confidence in what they’re doing as a counselor. Leaving here, I think of going out and applying for a job and getting a job. Each of the people I’ve worked with has been wonderful and they’ve learned quickly and they’ve been willing to stretch and to try and to grow, and that growth has been really evident during the length of the internship. I would like them to leave feeling confident that they can walk into a job and have enough background of how, in a school job, how the school works, that they can right off the bat offer themselves and offer something to the school. . .

Researcher: So, in some ways, . . . understanding how the school works. . . How do you promote that?

Supervisor: I just do. I haven’t thought about it. I think just listening carefully to them after they’ve been with clients and pushing them to do more. To make phone calls home, to go up and talk it over with the people who do the discipline, to maybe sit down and write a brief plan of where they really want that client to go and how they’re going to get there. I think just kind of nudging them if they’ve gotten to a certain place with a client or with a group. Suggest something that would push them even farther, ask them if they’re ready to do that. If they say no, I’m not going to push them, but I’ll continue to encourage. And I’ve only had that happen a couple of times where they said no. A particular intern said “no,
I'm not ready to do that." But probably by a week later that intern was ready to do that. I just kind of planted the seed that that was where they needed to go, and gear up and get ready, cause that's where you're headed.

Researcher: You provide a lot of encouragement.

Supervisor: I think a part, as you're saying that, a part of what makes that work really well here, or for me, is that there's enough time, or I take the time to really kind of get to know the person personally. So it's an easy working relationship. And also have that happen for the intern and the immediate administrators and the people who eat lunch together so that they feel like they are a comfortable part of the school and the group. And I think that helps.

Researcher: Promoting some of the belonging to the group.

Supervisor: Confidence, what they're able and willing to do.

(Intern Interview--Heather)

Intern: I feel like she really keeps me going and she, I think she pushes me a lot. And I like that. She says "here, you can do this," or "why don't you take this," or "here's 3 kids that need some work on this, what 2 do you want?" She doesn't say, "well, you don't have to do that," or "are you nervous?" she just puts me into the situation and then she's right there if I do need any help. But I'll do it and she'd told me over and over that she's so appreciative that I'm willing to learn and willing to try new things, and that she feels like I've really helped. That just keeps me moving and I feel like she really does have a lot of input in how I feel about each student I work with.

Researcher: So she's pushing you, trying you, and you're willing to do that. How come?

Intern: So I'll learn. I feel like if I wasn't willing, it would just feel not natural and I would feel resistant, and I'm the type of person that wants to get along with my co-workers, and if they see me as a person a team worker it's really important for me too. And the other side is that I do want to learn, I want to get in there and try it so that I can feel more confident when I am looking for work, that I can do this. And then give examples of what I've done, I think that would be helpful. I'm looking at my future, too.
Researcher: So, give you courage to look at some things you hadn't looked at before...

Intern: And when I felt like I did something wrong, or not wrong, I wouldn't put it that way. Something that I didn't feel comfortable with, something that didn't feel good afterwards. I don't know if the student felt it or not, but just for me, I felt really comfortable telling her "this is what I said," or "could you listen to this?" And I feel like they need to hear the worst so they can help you get to your best. I feel like I almost want to show her my weaknesses, expecting her to go, oh my gosh, but instead she works with me on it and it's always really positive. It helps me feel comfortable showing her my weaknesses. She helps me . . . really encouraging.

Researcher: You're uncertainties really kind of drove the supervision.

Intern: Like I said before, it wasn't like, okay, I'm going to prepare you how to work with the students, she just would have me work with student and then I would go to her with my uncertainties or my weaknesses or let her know what worked and what didn't work. I think that's where most of the supervision came from, it didn't come from getting prepared, it came from just working with a situation that already happened and then I would learn from that. And I would hope that that's not really hurting the client, but I really don't see how you can prepare for what they're going to say. You never know what they're gong to come in with.

Researcher: So the process of your experience was to be aware, or try to be aware...about uncertainties, or anxieties about that experience at some point bring that back to supervision, process that, explore, express that with the supervisor and . . . the situation. It's really a cycle. Does that typify your experience?

Intern: Yes. That's what it's like. And then I get excited for the new meeting with the student and try that and also I try to bring things like that to my internship trying new things that I've learned from other people than [university supervisor].

Summary

Due to the lack of research and practice of school counseling supervision, an in-depth understanding of on-site supervision experiences of school counseling interns was a
necessary step to fully comprehend the relevant and crucial aspects contributing to the acquisition of school counseling skills and development of a professional identity. While maintaining the rigor of a qualitative design and inductive analysis, the study explored the perceptions of how the school counseling intern and supervisor interpret the learning processes associated with trainee development.

The results of the study indicated that the on-site school supervision process of the supervisory dyads was a distinct developmental progression based on the learning needs of trainees. In the first phase of on-site supervision, supervisors assisted trainees in orienting to the contextual urgency of the school climate and disparity perceived between the university and context of their internship. Addressing this emotional and cognitive dissonance of trainees by their accessibility, support and collegiality, supervisors enhanced the level of trust within the supervisory relationship as perceived by trainees. The establishment of a trusting supervisory relationship provided a context in which supervisees were willing to disclose uncertain school counseling experiences. Through process observations, illustrative examples and reflective modeling, the supervisors developed a reflective dialogue with supervisees to enhance case conceptualization and treatment planning skills. As the trainees' conceptual complexity increased, the final phase of on-site supervision development encouraged clinical independence. This was characterized by supervisors encouraging self assessment process, self generation of professional visions, and professional risk taking behaviors of their school counseling trainees.
CHAPTER 6
IMPLICATIONS

The Inceptive Research Questions: Developmental On-Site School Counseling Supervision

Developmental constructs to counseling supervision suggest that supervisee growth is contingent on creating and maintaining an optimal supervisory context (Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; Loganbill et al., 1982). Guided by inceptive research questions that sought to discover the influence on-site school counseling supervision had on trainee development and what dynamics of supervision supported current models of counseling supervision, the results of this study support the application of developmental constructs to the school counseling supervision experience relevant to the study’s participants. Supervisors provided a trusting context conducive for supervisee growth and adapted their approaches to the shifting developmental learning needs of their supervisees. The findings portrayed on-site school counseling supervision as a sequential relationship focused on facilitating the conceptual and clinical development of school counseling interns in their struggles to transform dissonant internship counseling experiences into meaningful professional schemas. Consistent with developmental theorists who contend that supervisors must have a range of styles to assist the counselor’s movement through definable stages (Littrell et al., 1979; Stoltenberg, 1981; Loganbill et al., 1982; Yogev, 1982; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987), school counseling internship on-site supervision was also characterized by a reflective cycle of interaction. The experience between the supervisor and supervisee shifted and flowed in a reflective cycle focused on the needs and
learning processes of the trainee. Focused on twelve dimensions pertinent to supervisee learning, the supervisory relationship was not static but changed in concert with supervisee development. This clearly illustrates the essence of matching supervision to the needs and experiences of supervisees proposed by cross theoretical models of counseling supervision (Littrell et al., 1979; Stoltenberg, 1981; Loganbill et al., 1982; Yogev, 1982; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987).

The implications of these results not only support the application of developmental counseling supervision theory to the on-site supervision of school counseling interns, but also suggest the importance of counseling supervision to the growth of school counseling professionals. Although unique in its context, function, and clientele served, school counselors can benefit from supervision practices afforded other counseling specialties. This addresses the isolation of school counselors as they receive little or no counseling supervision (Borders, 1991; Borders & Roberts, 1993; Sutton & Page, 1994). It also provides a link to the larger counseling community. Focused on the learning needs specific to counseling professionals and founded on developmental principles applicable across counseling specialty areas, the results of this study suggest that counseling supervision has become a unifying bridge in a profession recently criticized for its growing fragmentation (Myers, 1995; Hosie, 1995).

Having evolved into numerous counseling specialties (addictions, career, college, community, gerontological, marriage and family, mental health, rehabilitation, and school counseling), the ACA continues to struggle with maintaining the diversity and breadth of counseling roles while sustaining the professional and political strength gained through greater unity. Without a comprehensive plan “guaranteeing” professional unity (Myers,
1995; Hosie, 1995), specialties represent ACA’s rich heritage for diversity while continuing to be a source for fragmentation. This is summarized by Hosie (1995) who wrote:

The counseling profession has, for so long, depended on the activities and satisfaction of the needs of ACA divisions to produce progress that it appears counselors may be locked into that model for advancement of the profession. Yet, that model for action is what some...are concerned about. That model appears to include the independent drive for further autonomy by divisions. That drive for autonomy can be one of differentiation and separatism and be divisive to attempts to solidify the profession. (p. 117).

By identifying the presence of developmental processes relevant to the growth of on-site school counseling supervision and school counseling trainees, the results of this study suggest that school counselors can benefit from a developmental model. The application of these principles across counseling specialties indicate that counseling supervision facilitates a “general” foundation of counseling knowledge and preparation specific to various counseling contexts. Consistent with the philosophical and historical roots of the counseling profession, and grounded in a human developmental framework emphasizing wellness and prevention, cross theoretical models of counseling supervision link counselors to an overall profession while engendering their membership to a particular counseling specialty while promoting their professional development.

The Emergent Research Questions: Supervision as Context for Learning

The initial findings of the study prompted a focus of inquiry that sought to discover what interactional dynamics in on-site supervision contributed to the growth of school counseling interns. In response to these emergent research questions, the results of
the study portrayed school counseling supervision as a cyclical interaction seeking to aid supervisees as they reflect on uncertain counseling experiences in supervision and subsequently reentering the counseling context with a meaningful change in perception or practice. This has been previously demonstrated through the research of Neufeldt, Karno & Nelson, (1996) and Worthen & McNeill (1996). These authors contended that counseling supervision stemmed from a causal condition of uncertainty which is addressed in the supervisory relationship where a reexamination of professional assumptions assists the supervisee in developing a metaperspective of the counseling process. In support of these findings, this research implies that whether it is contextual, conceptual, or clinical, the uncertainty experienced by school counselor trainees provided the learning dissonance necessary for developing advanced conceptual and clinical skills (see Appendix I). The following is an excerpt from an interview with an on-site supervisor illustrating this process rooted in her own experience:

(Supervisor Interview--Ilda)

**Researcher:** How would you describe your role as an on site supervisor?

**Supervisor:** The site provides experiences and I act as kind of a filter to judge whether or not the intern is ready for that experience, and what I've always thought about my style is that I tend to kind of toss people in to the deep end and then watch to see if they can swim. But I do try to, I have a fairly good intuitive sense of things that might blow or go awry or be real difficult and I would tend to steer an intern away from either a situation that might do that or more . . . about parts of a situation. I guess I consider myself kind of a filter. For what goes in and also I try to check in briefly afterwards with any counseling session or other encounter that there might have been with a parent or teacher or just in supervision or something. To see if the intern felt that they ran into snags or perhaps . . .
Researcher: So you're really wanting them to bring their experience to supervision?

Supervisor: I guess that I begin with the assumption that they have counseling skills and what they don't have is much experience. And what I offer is years of experience so that I can foresee what difficulties there might be. And maybe I'm just more accustomed to the way things might fall out.

Researcher: Could you say more about that filter piece. It sounds like that is the essence of your supervision. . . . the context experience . . . supervision. How do you address their uncertainties? Or their reaction to the experience . . .

Supervisor: Interns often express apprehension prior to going in to counseling or a phone call or something. And so we might talk about what they fear and play through a worst case. I often will provide a quick summary of what my approach would probably be and I also, if I know that an intern has. . . . When I worked with [previous intern], I knew that she had some real difficulties with taking on a role that would look at all like a supervisor. And part of her thing was that she had been a coach which was a very different role from a counselor and so she was trying to break that. And then school counseling you often are in the role of someone who is clearly supporting the rules of the school and may even be supervising to see that they're upheld. So once I knew about that issue of conflict for her, that was something that became part of the filter in working with her. That this particular case might bring up that issue.

Researcher: So would it be fair to say that part of your filtering was trying to identify--what might be, not a barrier or resistance, but somehow some piece, some issue that is . . .

Supervisor: Yeah. I don't know if it's standing in the way so much as it's the area that the intern has already perceived that they have the most learning to do in.

Researcher: Is that generated by the supervisee or by you or by both of you?

Supervisor: I think it's generated by the intern. I've developed a very personal relationship with every intern. I guess with the exception of one, who wasn't on location. I had one intern who was a full-time teacher at a Middle at the time and could only have his intern
experience after school hours, which was difficult. He saw clients and he did some things with an outside agency. With him I certainly had the least sense of how he operated. With interns who've been on site I guess we become--we develop a personal relationship and it's strong enough that --and I'm also a person who pretty readily . . . my weaknesses or fears or concerns. The relationship has revealed a lot about what they need to work on or think will be difficult.

Researcher: That part of what builds the trust and sustains the trust is the willingness of each of you to share your own . . .

Supervisor: I certainly have never had a sense that any of my interns feared me. However worried about what I thought about them, they feel easy about coming to me . . .

Furthermore, the importance of establishing a trusting supervisory relationship was perceived by the participants as necessary to promote supervisee self directed learning. This is in support of previous research that contends that the supervisory relationship must maintain an atmosphere of trust (Kennard et. al, 1987; Carey et. al, 1988; Piercy, 1990) and emotional support (Wark, 1995; Worthen & McNeill, 1996; Heppner, 1994) to. As concluded by Worthen & McNeill (1996):

It appears that these three identified elements of sensed inadequacy need to be activated to set the stage for openness to supervisory input and new learning to occur. It also appears that these elements can be activated by naturally occurring events within the counseling or supervisory relationship or the supervisors strategic interventions. What is clear from this study is that this sensed inadequacy preceded the good supervision experiences...However, without a positive supervisory relationship that invited openness to learning, it is likely that learning from this anxiety-arousing experience would have been minimized. (p. 29).

The results of this study, therefore, imply that not only is dissonance necessary for trainee learning, but that the quality of this learning is contingent on the level of richness co-constructed through the interactions of the participants (Sexton & Whiston, 1994).
Utilizing a supervisory relationship to review intentionality, beliefs, and base assumptions surrounding a disorienting professional event can aid in clarifying patterns and themes necessary for learning. A counseling supervisor, therefore, is challenged to “create a learning context that will enhance supervisee skill in constructing relevant frames of reference from which to devise effective strategies in work with clients” (Holloway, 1990, p. 177). Representative of a “constructed interaction,” this relationship provides a container where active learning occurs and knowledge on how counseling theory is adapted to the school context. These deliberate interventions of supervisors in orienting supervisees to the multiple contextual demands, while establishing a trusting relationship in order to specifically facilitate conceptual process for promoting patterns of clinical independence in trainees, suggest the presence of an operating pedagogy specific to the on-site supervision of school counseling trainees. Since the effects of specific supervisory interventions have been largely unknown (Holloway & Neufeldt, 1995), the findings from this study encourage supervisors to understand the principles of pedagogy, learn the skill of supervision, and apply these methods with their supervisees. Furthermore, utilizing reflective learning theory as a foundation for this pedagogical development is consistent with the model of supervision as illustrated in this study. It also links the principles of pedagogy to theory.

There are a variety of terms related to reflective learning including reflective inquiry (Ross, 1989), critical reflection (VanMannen, 1992), and critical self-reflection (Mezirow, 1994). Described in teacher education literature as primarily a problem solving paradigm (Ross, 1989; Van Mannen, 1992), reflective practice has been interpreted in a variety of ways (Stuessy & Naizer, 1996). First defined by Dewey (1933) as “active,
persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends..." (p. 9), professional reflectivity is essentially the meta-management of concentration, comprehension, and affect (Lebow, 1995). This is paralleled by Wilson, Shuylman, & Richert (1987) who contend that the reflective professional must reconstruct the events, emotions, and accomplishments of a professional experience.

By articulating the deliberate use of thematic observations, reflective modeling, and illustrative examples to assist in shifting the supervisory dialogue from content to a thematic language and awareness, supervisors in this study illustrate reflective learning principles in action. This is consistent with Mezirow (1994) who contended that meaningful learning occurred only through self-examination of assumptions, patterns of interactions, and the operating premises of action. This emphasis on critical self-reflection by supervisors articulates the essence of transformational learning highlighted by a reflective and cyclical interaction. This is summarized by Tremmel (1993) who pictured the reflective learning process as a "...working together in a dance-like pattern, simultaneously involved in design and in playing various roles in virtual and real worlds, while at the same time remaining detached enough to observe and feel the action that is occurring, and to respond" (p. 436). Schon (1987) mirrors this in his definition of professional reflectivity as knowing-in-action and explains, "When the practitioner reflects-in-action in a case he [she] perceives as unique, paying attention to phenomena and surfacing his [her] intuitive understanding of them, his [her] experimenting is at once exploratory, move testing, and hypothesis testing. The three functions are fulfilled by the very same actions" (p. 72). Thus, supervisees are encouraged to reflect, through deliberate
pedagogical interventions, on their internship experiences where situations do not present
themselves as givens but are constructed from events that are puzzling, troubling, and
uncertain (Schon, 1983).

The recognition of emotional discomfort in response to professional experiences
highlights the findings of the study's results and provides a bridge for understanding the
reflective dynamics necessary to critically analyze base assumptions and beliefs about
clients, change, and one's practice. It frames the interrelationship between on-site
supervision development and the learning experiences of school counselor trainees as a
process of meaningful reconstructing experience, where the supervisor utilizes a repertoire
of understandings, images, and actions to address uncertain school intern experiences so
that problem solving interventions are generated. The learning dimensions representing
the development of clinical independence in school counseling supervisees clearly illustrate
reflective learning principles. By emphasizing the self assessment of competency, the
generation of independent goals for professional growth and systemic change, and a
willingness to take appropriate professional risks relative to their learning, school
counseling supervision sought the answer to fundamental questions, such as: (a) What do
I do?; (b) How do I do it?; and (c) What does this mean for both myself as a professional
and those whom I serve? This appears central to what Schon (1987) illustrates as moving
“...into the center of the learning situation, into the center of [our] own doubts” (p. 83).
Mezirow (1994) maintains this is necessary for shifting to a higher order of conceptual
processing, where reflective practice lies in construing and appropriating a new or revised
interpretation of the meaning of one's experience as a guide to action (Mezirow, 1994;
Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993).
Although describing reflective qualities such as self-monitoring (Haverkamp, 1994), self-instructional cognitions (Borders et al., 1988; Morran, 1986), and conceptual development (Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982; Martin et al., 1989; Cummings, 1990), counseling supervision research has provided little in the way of identifying reflective strategies for enhancing the growth and development of supervisees. Although specific to the participants and the context in which they were observed and interviewed, the results of this study address this gap in the literature. Supervisors deliberately utilized thematic observations, reflective modeling, and illustrative examples to promote a reflective and process-oriented supervisory dialogue. By increasing patterns of conceptual complexity, school counseling supervisors sought to increase trainees' confidence in assessing their level competency, generate professional development experiences, and promote their willingness to engage in professional risk taking behaviors. Each of the supervisors in the study identified these dimensions as characteristic of independent school counseling professionals and the intent of their role as on-site supervisors. Wrapped in a blanket of trust and accessibility, supervisees perceived on-site supervision as a central force in transforming the pressures associated with their internship experience into a schematic understanding for guiding their role as future school counselor professionals.

The model of on-site supervision outlined in this study, therefore, provides a tentative window into identifying and developing pedagogical principles specific to school counseling supervision. It is hoped that future research will investigate the facilitative interventions utilized by supervisors in this study to better understand how reflective learning theory can be linked to dynamics of school counseling supervision and subsequent supervisor training. As an inherent context for learning, identifying pedagogical processes
in counseling supervision represents a deliberate research agenda seeking to investigate how supervision is done, rather than what it merely is.
CHAPTER 7
RECOMMENDATIONS

Minimizing the Learning Curve

"You have such a high learning curve when you get to the internship site, because most of it [the school context] is a foreign language". This comment from an on-site supervisor is evidence of the transitional dissonance experienced by all the supervisees in the study. It was as if they were experiencing a different culture for the first time. The language, customs, and interactions were unsettling and vastly unfamiliar. Struck by student, faculty, parent, and community demands, the school intern was quickly cast into an atmosphere ripe for both learning and anxiety. Although a level of dissonance is necessary for meaningful learning (Caine, 1994; Kolb, 1984; Mezirow, 1994), university counseling programs can assist on-site supervisors in contextually orienting the intern to the school climate and, thereby, enhance the development of the on-site supervision relationship.

Recommendation One: Preliminary exposure to counseling models and issues relevant to school counseling

As a strategy to reduce the initial learning curve of school counselor trainees, a preliminary exposure to counseling models applicable to the school context is recommended. As one on-site supervisor stated:

You have to somehow step into their [supervisees] frame in order to really understand how they are seeing things and understanding their perspective and that you are doing it in the context here [school]...The
Practicums at the university are based on an agency model where you have a 50 minute hour...It is real nice and tidy, but it is not how it is in the school. It is, but shrunken. You have got to go far more fast paced and more incisive...and you have got to be more directive. You really have to be. (Supervisor Interview--Shannon).

It is this discrepancy between university counseling preparation and the school internship context that can be more directly addressed with counselors-in-training prior to their entry into the school context. As summarized by the university supervisor in the study, “…Although we say these things you need to do as a counselor, the reality is this: when you are in a school that has 600 students and you are one of two counselors, a lot of that stuff sounds good in a text book, but it doesn’t work real well”. In addition to CACREP standards consistent with school counselor preparation, exposure to models and issues relevant to the school context must be provided. This may include an introduction to brief therapy models and systemic paradigms of change, child and family counseling approaches, and social service case-management approaches. Addressing procedures related to academic testing and interpretation, special education, and school administration with school counselor trainees prior to their internship experience might also serve to reduce the initial level of cognitive dissonance in school counselor trainees. This may be further enhanced by providing inductive experiences to the school context and school counseling departments/services. Shadowing experiences in concert with relevant preliminary course-work may better serve to accelerate the learning curve and professional development of school counselor-trainees upon entering their internship experience.
A Collaborative Model of Internship Supervision

On-site supervisors in this study met with their university counterparts typically at the beginning and end of the quarter to determine the progress of the school counseling trainee. This gap in communication not only maintained the pattern of isolation already experienced by school counselors (Sutton et al., 1994), but led to on-site and university supervisors establishing differing goals and objectives for the internship experience of school counseling trainees. This triangulated the interns by placing them between disparate expectations and evaluation criteria. As stated by a school intern:

The expectations and tasks at the site are much different than the expectations and tasks of what you would do in a session here at the university, or what they [university supervisors] would expect, or what they would see. Here [at the university] it is your counseling relationship and what is happening in the session and this is what counseling should look like. In my supervision site, I see that my supervisor likes what I do because I think that he wishes he were doing more of that [increased time with students]. But, what happens in reality is that...his counseling might be ten minutes because a kid comes in due to an F in a class, or a question about a scholarship, or...brochures for the awards night. So, lots of things that are actually happening in the office are not necessarily things that they would like to see here [university], yet we are in internships and need to follow-through with what we are doing there. I am not finding it necessarily discouraging...it is real realistic to look at that....but, when we come back here [university] what we get credit for is the one tape for every credit, so really I get credit or not credit for my [internship hours] based on tapes that I have that are passing tapes for this term. I don't get credit for going to every Monday morning meeting and sitting in and being involved or for....whatever....going to the day-care center so that I get acquainted with the teen-parent program. (Intern Interview--Nancy).
Recommendation Two: Consistent and ongoing follow-up with the on-site supervisor

Five of the six supervisors in the study expressed a desire for more frequent communication and follow-up with the university supervisor. Although focused on more effectively assisting school counselor trainees in the internship, the chance to collaborate with the university supervisor appeared just as important. In a process similar to their trainees, on-site supervisors identified that any support and feedback on their role and skills as on-site supervisors would be helpful and beneficial to their own professional growth. As expressed by an on-site supervisor:

...Being a supervisor and having interns...I'm getting better at it the more I do. And the more I really get clear in my own head what the role is, because--actually, now that I'm saying it out loud, I don't know that it was ever described to me, what my role would be. I sort of made it up as I went along. And so I think my own level of working with interns and what I feel would be helpful for them has grown. And I think I probably do a better job with them now than I did 3 years ago when I got my first intern...Because I think I have a clearer sense of what I need to do to really help and encourage that person. I was really going blindly at the first ...so I don't know if there'd be some sort of way to connect a little bit more with OSU and maybe, rather than just a 15 minute conversation with the supervisor there...may be a little bit more orientation.

(Supervisor Interview--Joanne).

Although serving the purpose to coordinate the internship experience of school counseling trainees, a more collaborative relationship between the university and on-site supervisors may serve to support the role acquisition and development of school counselors as supervising professionals. It provides an opportunity to provide training, support and direction for on-site supervisors in their service of overseeing the learning experience of university counseling students. Furthermore, it ostensibly withdraws the intern from being the mediator between supervision sites and lessens the isolation felt by
on-site supervisors from other school counseling professionals. As stated by the university supervisor in the study:

...I would like to see a lot more connections between campus and the schools. I think we come at it from a different perspective. We see our roles as different, and I think they are different. But in reality, I rely on those people in the field. They're the day-to-day, hands on, support people who contribute most to the growth of the students I work with. I don't think they see their role as that. I guess for me one of the things would be for me to take the time. When I've done follow-ups this last quarter and gone out and talked to principals and supervisors and people who are now working in the field, across the board, that's what they say. It's so great to have more connection, to sit down with the supervisor from campus to talk about what's going on in the field, to talk about the things they struggle with. Because now as we have it set up, I go out and say “what are your goals for the internship?” and the intern talks about that and I go out and exit them and say “which of these goals did you achieve, [and] which would you have liked to achieve and didn't achieve?”...and we have a nice conversation. But I never—except now I find myself doing this periodically and it's very rewarding for all of us—engage with the supervisor and talk about what's going on in their lives as counselors at a school. What are the issues they deal with? What are the struggles they have? How do we relate as professional peers relative to that? How do we help students interface with that? We do very little of that. We do an exit and we do an entrance and some of us do a touch base every quarter. But still, there's so much more that we could gain from a broadening of that professional relationship between the supervisor in the field and the supervisor here. And providing training. We just set those people free. We say, supervise an intern. Most of those supervisors I work with in the field have no training in supervision. It's not that they don't do a good job, but I think they feel a void there, too. Sort of like we set them free and don't provide them much support. And I really grow when I find I have a few supervisors that I use a lot so I know them pretty well. And I never go to exit or enter an intern that we don't have a conversation either while the intern is there or before or after about what's going on with them professionally and where they are and what we see at this end and how we can interface with those...But that's only with a very few people I work with. I would certainly broaden that (University Supervisor Interview—Erika).

Ironically, the experience of on-site supervisors was similar to the results of how school counseling interns experienced on-site supervision. Each experienced a period of
dissonance associated with assuming a new role, and questioned their competency in meeting the demands confronted within the new context. Through ongoing exposure to the new tasks, however, the conceptual understanding of their new role increased. This facilitated their clinical development as independent professionals (school counselor and supervisor). Moreover, it is clear that this professional growth largely occurred independently from any formal or direct guidance from the university counselor training program or faculty. As stated by an on-site school counseling supervisor:

There's not a whole lot of collaboration that happens. I see the bigger piece of supervision that happens for interns happens more with me than happens with the University cause they typically do not spend a lot of time in the field with interns. They do not spend time visiting with me on the phone about how the intern is progressing here. That rarely happens. The first time the University person is here, and then we wrap up [end of quarter]. Other than that there really is not a whole lot of collaboration, unless the intern really struggles (Clint).

This lack of collaboration between the training institution and on-site school counseling supervisors may in part be due to the gratefulness the university internship supervisor expressed for the willingness of practicing school counselors to assume the added responsibility of on-site supervision with no compensation for their efforts. Understanding the value of an internship experience for trainees, little demands were made of on-site supervisors willing to provide a training site and periodic student monitoring. As expressed by the university supervisor:

I don't think we work the---myself personally, or any of us---work with the on-site supervisor very well. Because, my perception, when I place a person in the field, is that I am asking them to, essentially out the goodness of their heart, to take on someone for a long period of time. At least on the up-front time period, give a lot of their energy and time to orientating and getting clients for. So, I think we ourselves as basically asking for free service from those people and don't feel...it is sort of like the same the parallel process the supervisee has with the supervisor, I
don't feel I can say a lot to the supervisor in the field about the way they do supervision. I am grateful to have them there as a support person that allows my student to have the opportunity to do the work. I interact with them on the phone, and when I am sitting in their offices with them, but I don't make a lot of effort to shape what they do as long as I feel my students are getting supervision...Ideally, I would love to expect that they are going to provide counseling supervision. But, I think we have to change our model tremendously for that to happen and do a lot toward the training of our supervisors. To also lobby school districts to allow supervisors, those that are supervising for us, to have some time---flex time---so that could take...legitimately have time in their day to provide supervision. Because, now they already have a full time job that takes up their full day without an intern, and now we are adding an additional amount of work for them. Especially in the...it is very front loaded. The hope is that at the end they get benefit because the intern knows and needs minimal supervision. But, at the front end it is big time commitment for someone who already has a full-time job and gets no pay and no release time to provide a place of support for the intern to develop (University Supervisor Interview—Erika).

This is in stark contrast to the experience of on-site supervisors in this study who expressed a desire for increased university follow-up beyond the initial orientation and summary visits provided by the university faculty. In a field already receiving minimal counseling supervision (Borders, 1991; Borders & Roberts, 1994; Sutton & Page, 1994), a deliberate effort by counselor training institutions to provide ongoing relationships with on-site school counseling internship supervisors is warranted. This may not only lessen their expressed isolation, but also provide a bridge for supporting and enhancing their professional development.

Furthermore, as leaders in the field, counselor educators need to advocate for appropriate supervisory practices for school counseling professionals afforded other counseling specialties, and training for on-site school counseling supervisors. The results of this study suggest that a collaborative on-site supervisory relationship enhanced the growth of trainees while providing service to students. A similar professional relationship
is needed between on-site and university supervisors while addressing the learning needs of interns.

Summary

It is recommended that counselor education programs provide preliminary exposure to the school counseling context and relevant counseling models while maintaining ongoing follow-up and support with on-site school counseling supervisors. It is also recommended that counselor educators training school counselors be more active in aligning supervising experiences for practicing school counselors. The response of on-site supervisors in this study indicate the potential benefits of increased supervisory support regarding their roles as on-site supervisors and school counseling professionals.
CHAPTER 8
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although providing a depth of data and interpretative analysis pertaining to the on-site supervision of school counseling interns, the results of this study need to be considered in light of several methodological weaknesses. First, the simultaneous collection and analysis of data might have been enhanced by a longer period of exposure to the context under investigation. School counseling internships are often longer than a single academic quarter. Although four of the five school counselor interns planned on extending their school counseling internship an additional quarter, this study examined only their initial internship experience. Moreover, the extended length of exposure might have also increased the rapport with the research participants necessary in collecting a breadth and depth of qualitative data (Kvale, 1996; Berg, 1995; Patton, 1990). Secondly, the study failed to address multicultural influences in the supervisory experience of school counseling interns. Although serving a multicultural population, it is unclear what impact ethnic and cultural history might have played in the supervisory process. Since the researcher and the participants in the study primarily represented the major operating culture (white European), undo bias may have unwittingly influenced the absence of emerging multicultural themes in the collection and analysis of data. Lastly, this study represented an initial effort to better understand the dynamics associated with school counseling supervision. As such, transferability of the results beyond the participants and context of this study is unwarranted. Only with increased counseling supervision research
and a growing body of evidence to school counseling preparation, can contemplating the transferability of this study's results be considered.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION

The strength of this study assertions, however, rest with its (a) recruitment of multiple participants, (b) its use of multiple sources of data collection over the length of one academic internship quarter, and (c) the emergent chain of evidence coded and categorized into a thematic presentation of results. This not only increased the validity and trustworthiness of the study’s results hampering previous qualitative studies in counseling supervision (Frontman & Kunkel, 1994; Borders et. al, 1988; Worthen & McNeill, 1996; Wark, 1995; Ladany et al., 1996), but provided a richness of data for analysis and thematic interpretation. By identifying phases of on-site school counseling supervision, dimensions characterizing each phase, and a reflective cycle central to the interactive dynamics between supervisors and supervisees (see Appendix F), the results of this study illustrate a model for understanding the initial on-site supervision experience of school counseling interns.

Also, it is believed that this study may serve to stimulate further investigation into pedagogical processes pertinent to school counselor training and on-site supervision. Utilizing dimensions of thematic observations, illustrative examples, and reflective modeling, on-site supervisors demonstrated deliberate interventions to enhance the learning processes of their interns. Within a supportive and trusting relationship, the on-site supervision experience of school counselor trainees demonstrated that becoming a school counselor is “more than reading and applying techniques” (Dobson & Shaw, 1988, p. 164). It requires a dyadic supervisory relationship focused on facilitating and
encouraging the growth of interns toward becoming independent school counseling professionals. Further research is needed, therefore, to more fully examine these instructional strategies in the context of school counselor preparation and on-site supervision. The field of counselor education can benefit from an alignment to instructional designs that define unique learning environments for trainees and counselors essential for "constructing relevant frames of reference from which to devise effective strategies in work with clients" (Holloway, 1995, p. 177).

Furthermore, a research agenda focused on investigating school counselor preparation may highlight the absence of counseling supervision for school counseling professionals. Lather (1986) indicated that, "Insofar as we have come to see that evolving an empowering pedagogy is an essential step in social transformation, does not the same hold true for our research approaches?" (p. 263). Should not a practice (counseling supervision) deemed crucial for professional development and client welfare in community counseling be afforded to school counselors? As counselor educators and social critical advocates in the field of counseling, research into the field of school counselor preparation needs to illustrate both critical analysis and enlightened action.


APPENDICES
Appendix A

*Qualitative Design Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Decided Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the primary purpose of the study?</td>
<td><em>Type of research</em>: Basic Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Focus</em>: Questions deemed important by the discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Desired Results*: Contribution to theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Key Assumptions*: The world is patterned; these patterns are knowable and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Standard for Judging*: Rigor of research, universality and verifiability of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the focus of the study?</td>
<td>An in-depth understanding of the contextual interactions and phenomenological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>processes associated with that context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the units of analysis?</td>
<td>The units of analysis are the supervisory dyads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will be the sampling strategy?</td>
<td>Purposeful Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What types of data will be collected?</td>
<td>Qualitative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What types of controls will be exercised?</td>
<td>Naturalistic Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What analytical approach</td>
<td>Grounded analysis (constant comparison)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will validity be addressed?</td>
<td>Triangulation, multiple data sources, multiple perspectives, peer debriefers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Issues</strong></td>
<td>Fixed times within an emergent research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical Issues</strong></td>
<td>Informed consent, human subject approval, reflexive researcher journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Camera, video and audio-tapes, supplies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Mr./Ms. Supervisor:

I am Ph.D. candidate in Counselor Education at [university] and am writing to request your participation in a research project for my dissertation. The purpose of this study is to investigate the on-site supervision experience of school counseling interns. Your role as an on-site supervisor is vital in understanding the dynamics associated with trainee professional development. Therefore, I am contacting all supervisors who will be working with school counseling interns this spring to invite their participation. Your intern [name] has already agreed to join in this research project.

Knowing and respecting how busy you are, I want to emphasize that the time commitment will be reasonable (approximately three hours during the next ten weeks), and that your schedule will be the driving force for scheduling our sessions. I want to video tape three "typical" supervision sessions over the course of the next 10 weeks; one toward the end of this month (April 28th-May 2nd), one toward the middle of May (12th-16th) and a final taped session toward the end of the school year (June 9th-13th). What I am asking you to consider is 1) your willingness to have three of your supervision sessions taped, and 2) a one-hour reflective interview following each taped supervision session. The interviews are informal and independent from the supervisee. They will focus on your experience of the supervision session and any perceptions you may have regarding the professional development of the trainee. These interviews can take place at your school site (I will make all necessary equipment arrangements), and again, these three sessions will be worked around your schedule.

The interviews will be completely confidential. Anonymity of all participants is painstakingly protected and reviewed so that all information will be presented in a matter where no individual response can be identified. Furthermore, your ongoing reactions to the analysis and accuracy of its portrait of trainee development will provide a valuable contribution to the final product (of which a final copy will be provided you).

It is hoped that this research will not only add to the literature pertaining to school counseling preparation, but also provide an opportunity for participants to increase their
professional understanding of the intern supervision experience. It is sponsored by [my university] and supervised by my major advisor.

Following the university and departmental approval of this research proposal (April 15th), I will be contacting you to discuss your willingness to participate in this study. I look forward to your response. If you have any questions before I call, feel free to contact me.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Colin C. Ward
Doctoral Candidate
Appendix C

Sample Interview Guide

On-site School Counseling Supervisors: Third round of semi-structured Interviews

Question One

How would you describe your experience as an on-site school counseling supervisor? What do you see as your role(s) in this process with the intern and the university?

Question Two

What would you say have been the "benchmarks" of supervisee growth and learning during [intern’s] school counseling internship?

Question Three

How would you describe your process with the intern? What were your goals?

Question Four

What did you try to do in supervision to promote intern development and growth?

Question Five

What might you recommend that might have improved the supervision/internship experience of the trainee during this last quarter?
Appendix D

**Sequence of Data Collection and Analysis**

1. **Process observation of the phenomenon** (Observation of the Supervision Process)
   - Transcription of the Data
   - Identifying Units of Meaning (To the intent of the study)
   - Developing Categories with Rules of Inclusion (Constant Comparative)
     - Link to Raw Data
     - Negative Case Analysis
     - 5 X 8 index cards
     - Creating an Interview Guide

2. **Semi-structured interview of participants** (Interpretation of the Supervision Process)
   - Transcription of the Data
   - Identifying units of Meaning (To the intent of the study)
   - Developing Categories with Rules of Inclusion (Constant Comparative)
     - Link to Raw Data
     - Negative Case Analysis
     - 5 X 8 index cards

3. **Analysis for Themes/Patterns** (Process Observations with Semi-structured Interviews)
   - Within Individual Lives (Constant Comparative)
     - Supervisees
     - Supervisors
     - Process of Supervision
   - Between Individual Lives (Constant Comparative)
     - Supervisees
     - Supervisors
     - Process of Supervision

4. **Development of Outcome Propositions** (if possible)
   - Link to Categories and Rules of Inclusion (Constant Comparative)
   - Verification of Analysis
     - Peer Auditing (Plausibility of Results)
     - Participant Auditing (Accuracy of Experience)

5. **Repeat Process**
Appendix E

INTERNSHIP JOURNALS

Reflective Questions

The purpose of this professional journal is to reflect on your process of growth and development as a school counselor during this internship experience. You should plan to write weekly. The journal is intended to be open ended, with the questions below serving only as a reflective guide.

Journals are confidential and will not be shared with either your on-site supervisor, university supervisor, or your peers. Analysis will occur with your identity autonomous from the collected data (i.e. journals). Please feel free to call me at 757-7692 if you have any questions regarding this process. Thanks again for participating.

1. Describe an uncertain counseling experience
   - What were you aware of feeling?
   - How did you interpret this experience?

2. What will be different about you when you are more on track with this experience?
   - Perspective (Self-Talk)
   - Skills (Techniques)
   - Knowledge (Theory)
   - Role Acquisition (Professional Identity)

3. How have you, or are you, planning for this professional development?
   - Peer consultation
   - University Supervision
   - On-site supervision
• Reading and review

• Other

4. What experiences of on-site supervision have or are helpful in this professional development and growth?

*Adapted from Mezirow (1994)
Appendix F

A Model of On-Site School Counseling Supervision

Supervisory Reflective Cycle of Interaction

Disorienting School Counseling Experience
Supervisee is anxious with a perceived sense of professional inadequacy

Supervision Relationship
Supervisor is nonjudgmental, supportive and validating

Supervisor Intervention
Supervisor seeks to expand supervisee conceptual complexity to promote clinical independence

in Supervisee Perception and/or behavior on reemergence to context
Supervisee links supervision experience to clientel/context

1. Contextual Urgency
Constraints of Time (Brevity/Pace)
Multiple Role Demands

2. Site Disparity
University vs. On-site

3. Ethical Awareness
Ambiguity in translating ethics to site

4. Accessability
Supervisor availability

5. Support
Supervisor support and encouragement

6. Collegiality
Supervisor modeling and disclosure

7. Thematic Observations
Dialogue shift from content to process

8. Reflective Modeling
Interpretation of intern's cases

9. Illustrative Examples
Examples from clinical experience

10. Self Assessment
Reassessment of theory & Skills

11. Self Generation
Initiating projects, experiences, and/or skills

12. Professional Risk Taking
Contract for Professional Change

Twelve Dimensions of Supervisee Experience

Phases of On-Site Supervision Development

CONTEXTUAL ORIENTATION
[Supervisee experience of Cognitive & Emotional Dissonance in adjustment to the School Internship Climate]

ESTABLISHING TRUST
[Experience of trust central to supervisees willing to address dissonant internship experiences]

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT
[Supervisors promoting advanced conceptual complexity through thematic and reflective dialogue]

CLINICAL INDEPENDENCE
[Supervisors facilitating supervisee autonomy]

EMERGENT DISCOVERY

INCEPTIVE DISCOVERY
### On-Site School Counselor Trainee Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASES OF SUPERVISION DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>DIMENSIONS OF SUPERVISEE LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXTUAL ORIENTATION</td>
<td>1. Contextual Urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTABLISHING TRUST</td>
<td>2. Site Disparity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ethical Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Accessability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>7. Thematic Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Reflective Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Illustrative Examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLINICAL INDEPENDENCE</td>
<td>10. Self Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Self Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Professional Risk Taking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE THEORETICAL REALIGNMENT OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOL COUNSELOR TRAINEES

Phases of School Counseling Supervision

CONTEXTUAL ORIENTATION

Abandonment of Theory with a Preoccupation with relevant counseling techniques

ESTABLISHING TRUST

Integration of new skills within a developing and evolving conceptual foundation

CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Synthesis of the new repertoire of counseling skills and related counseling theory to the role and function of school counseling

CLINICAL INDEPENDENCE

Descriptive Process of Supervisee Theoretical Realignment
Appendix I

The Reflective Cycle of On-Site School Counseling

Uncertain School Counseling Experiences

- Contextual Dissonance
- Conceptual Dissonance
- Clinical Dissonance

Contextual Urgency

- Site Disparity
- Reflective Modeling
- Ethical Awareness

- Illustrative Examples
- Professional Risk Taking

Accessability

Support

Collegiality

A Trusting Supervisory Relationship