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Abstract

A Comparison of the Perceptions of the Importance of Formal Supervision Training Between Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors and Non-Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors, explores differences among and between doctoral student and field site professionals who provide supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. All master’s level counseling students in the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) programs participate in a practicum and internship as a requirement for completion of the master’s program in counseling. The field experience occurs in a mental health agency or school, and requires the assistance and mentoring of an on-site supervisor. There is a dearth of literature that assesses the effectiveness of those academically untrained professionals who supervise master’s level counselor trainees. Because counselor supervisors have considerable autonomy regarding how they supervise, this study sought to measure their perceptions of the importance of supervisory training. Recommendations regarding standards for field site supervision of master’s level counselor trainees may significantly contribute to the literature, as well as contributing to a design for formalized site supervisor training. This researcher hopes to contribute to the professional development of the master’s level counselor trainee. By understanding the perceived importance of training to the field site professional providing supervision, informed decisions can be made for placing future master’s level counselor trainees in field site placements with professionals trained in supervision. Additionally, academic institutions can gain significant information that will contribute to the planning and implementation of supervision curriculum for master’s level counseling students.
The primary research question of this study is what importance do counselor supervisors attribute to the training that prepares them to provide effective supervision to master’s level counselor trainees? A 16-item survey, called the Counselor Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ), was developed to help clarify various aspects of the primary research question.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

There are approximately 133 Community Counseling programs, 26 Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy programs, 153 School Counseling programs and 45 Counselor Education and Supervision Doctoral programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) as reported in their 2004 directory. CACREP, organized in 1981, is the accrediting agency responsible for reviewing and evaluating “counseling and student affairs practice” in higher education programs against a set of “nationally recognized standards” (Bobby & Kandor, 1995, p. 1). These CACREP-accredited programs require graduate level field experiences. Referred to as a practicum and/or internship, these experiences require placement at a designated school or agency site.

Field placements typically occur toward the completion of the counseling program, relying heavily on the field site supervisor to guide the master’s level counselor trainee through the myriad challenges encountered during the initial foray into the counseling field.

The importance of the field site experience is highlighted throughout the literature on supervision. Pitts (1992) sees practicum and internship as “consisting of supervised experiences designed to enhance the professional skills of students in counseling” (p. 197). In addition to the experience of the master’s level graduate students working with a field site supervisor, the students receive university-based supervision from counselor educators or doctoral students in the counselor education program.
While some of these field sites are university or college-based and counseling program supervised, a majority of placements rely on agency or school-based counselors to provide on-site supervision. Counseling students from CACREP programs are required to receive a minimum of one hour of face-to-face supervision per week at the field site (CACREP, 2001). A general requirement is that each site supervisor have at least a master’s degree in counseling and two years of experience in the counseling field (CACREP, 2001).

Pitt (1992) believes that “good placement sites are essential to a practicum-internship system. The more programs the counselor education department has, the more varied the kinds of placement sites needed” (p. 198). Schools and mental health agencies are the sites of choice and requirement for the master’s level counselor trainee. Pitt (1992) recommends that field sites be chosen and approved in a way that inspires confidence in the academic setting, ensuring that the student will “have a sound professional experience while working there” (p. 198).

The field site professional oversees the work of the counselor trainee ensuring that each client or student’s welfare is considered. They also have a responsibility to impart knowledge and professional wisdom to the supervisee. The master’s level counseling student and the academic program faculty trust the site professional to commit to the facilitation of the development of counseling competence in the student, following all recommended and appropriate guidelines, set forth by professional and accrediting organizations, as well as university policies and procedures.
Recent attention has addressed the concern that, while these site professionals have been trained in counseling theory and technique, they may not have been trained as supervisors, or as supervisors of counselor trainees. The literature review reflects that supervisors in the counseling field obtain the position of supervisor by advancing through the school or agency ranks, and that supervisory competence may be based on years spent in the counseling field, not on any formalized professional training or academic experience. Haynes, Corey and Moulton (2003) believe that supervisors learn to supervise based on their experience as supervisees. They state, “Supervision is best learned by integrating the theoretical material with your own supervision experiences” (p. xviii).

Campbell (2000) believes that “to be an effective supervisor, the practitioner must develop separate skills from those required for the practice of counseling and psychotherapy. Simply because one is a skilled counselor or psychotherapist does not necessarily mean one will be a good supervisor” (p. 1). An effective supervisor must be able to recognize the varying needs and developmental levels of the supervisee and the most effective methods of supervision.

Falvey (2002) states “supervisors guide the internship experiences of all mental health trainees. They establish the baseline for competent and ethical practice in professional settings. They provide pivotal references to students in clinical training programs, to applicants for licensure, and to practitioners seeking employment or promotion” (p. 5).

Bernard and Goodyear (1998) report that many mental health professionals will supervise at some point during their careers. Traditionally, the emerging supervisor’s
previous experience as a counselor or therapist has served as sufficient preparation for this responsibility. Mental health professionals have assumed they will become supervisors by (1) extrapolating their counseling skills to the supervisory arena and (2) drawing from the experiences they had by participating as trainees themselves. (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Bonney (1994) believes that it is roughly equivalent to learning how to be a therapist by participating as a client and then by modeling the therapist’s behavior. He does not believe that either of these approaches is sufficient basis for becoming a supervisor (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). This author agrees that supervisees and their clients are put at risk when the supervisor does not receive adequate training in the professional art and science of supervision.

Hoffman (1994) characterized the traditional lack of formal training for supervisors as the mental health profession’s “dirty little secret” (p. 25). As others have suggested, (e.g., Pope & Vasquez, 1991; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987), Hoffman (1994) suggested that supervisors who practice without having been specifically trained as supervisors are doing so unethically. The American Counseling Association (ACA) and the American Psychological Association’s (APA) (1992) ethical codes are explicit about the importance of providing only services for which the person has been trained. Stoltenberg and Delworth (1997) asked, “In what other professional area would we allow trainees or professionals to practice without training?” (p. 160). Pope and Vasquez (1991) made this same point when they asserted that “[I] t would be no more ethical to ‘improvise’ supervision if one lacked education, training, and supervised experience than if one were to improvise hypnotherapy, systematic desensitization, or administration of a
Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological test battery without adequate preparation” (p.171) (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

To the extent that supervision training becomes a professional mandate for working as a supervisor, Haley’s (1993) following satirical comments will have increasingly less impact:

Anyone who does therapy without a license is breaking the law. To gain the license, the therapist must listen to a supervisor and pay for the privilege… the supervisor too must be certified, but fortunately, that does not require much. Showing success in teaching therapists how to induce change is not required. All that is needed is many hours of therapist and supervisor sitting and talking together. Any supervisor with a comfortable chair and healthy vocal chords can do that. (p. 52)

One impediment to the development of comprehensive training for supervisors is the belief of many mental health professionals that the primary requisite to become a good supervisor is to have been an effective therapist. (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). The perception that a close relationship between therapy and supervision exists, supports the opinion that supervision training is unnecessary. Supervisors may lack specific training in supervision, but find themselves doing it – and believe they excel at it. (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). The experience of the person who obtains therapy experience with inadequate supervision will develop a sense of professional competence, but likely will perform as a therapist in an inadequate manner. Self-assessments of competence and
actual competence is often independent of one another, for both therapists and supervisors. (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

An important question becomes, how does the general lack of formalized supervision training impact the field site professional while providing supervision to the master’s level counselor trainee? Additionally, how does formalized supervision training on the part of the advanced doctoral level supervisor impact the master’s level counselor trainee?

Kahn (1999) reports that although there has been a recent increase in the volume of research regarding supervision, relatively little research has focused on field-site supervision of master’s level counseling students, particularly school-based counselors. (Kahn, 1999). Kahn’s (1999) research outlines the type and extent of the training the site professionals should receive in supervision, before a prescriptive model of supervision for school counselor trainees can be proposed.

Roberts, Morotti, Herrick and Tilbury, (2001) report that considerable literature exists concerning the importance of supervision, and the role of the supervisor in training the counselors trainee. They believe the literature is lacking in two areas. First, research focuses primarily on supervision and training in university and college settings conducted by university and college personnel for their students (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001). The university personnel also detail the dilemmas and importance of providing programmatic and continuing post degree supervision for school counseling practitioners and the problems associated with such post degree supervision (Roberts, Morotti, & Tilbury Herrick, 2001). Second, attention has been directed specifically to the
unique challenges encountered by the site professional hosting school counseling interns (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001), or other master’s level counselor trainees.

Williamson (1999) described the dilemma facing post-degree school counselor supervision in the workplace by noting that “the lack of standard expectations for counselor supervision may be an obstacle to effective school counseling programs” (p. 7). Directed at the need to assist and support school counselors in their ongoing professional development, particularly in the early years on the job, Williamson’s comment raises a troubling question: What standards exist that specifically aid site professionals in mentoring counseling interns? (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

The American Counseling Association (ACA, 1997) code of ethics offers criteria related to the supervisory relationship, but those guidelines are primarily directed toward counselor educators and counseling training institutions than to the field-site professional (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001). Similarly, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) addresses the role of supervision with interns, but not specifically to field-site professionals (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

The guidelines with the most pertinent applicability to site professionals supervising school counseling interns are the Standards for Counseling Supervisors of the Supervision Interest Network of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (SINACES; 1990). The 11 standards outlined in the SINACES document address general “core areas of personal traits, knowledge and competencies that are characteristic of effective supervisors” (p.30). These standards identify significant areas such as appropriate training and education necessary to be an effective supervisor, working knowledge of the legal and ethical regulatory aspects of the profession,
conceptual knowledge of the therapeutic developmental process, and the importance of having effective evaluative skills (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

The American School Counselor Association (ASCA, 1998) ethical standards do not directly address the subject of the site supervision of school counseling interns. The closest outlining of responsibilities of site professional providing supervision might be interpreted in Section F.2, Contribution to the Profession: “The professional school counselor contributes to the development of the profession through sharing skills, ideas, and expertise with colleagues” (ASCA, 1998). ASCA does state in its position statement on credentialing and licensing that it “strongly endorses and supports the school counselor standards developed by … [the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs; CACREP] encouraging all state education agencies to adopt these professional standards for school counseling credentialing” (ASCA, 1999) (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

CACREP programs utilize standards and guidelines (1999) with a requirement that site professionals providing supervision meet minimum master’s degree requirements “in counseling or a related profession with equivalent qualification including appropriate certifications and/or licenses; a minimum of two years of pertinent professional experience in the area in which the student is completing clinical instruction and knowledge of the program’s expectations, requirements, and evaluation procedures for students” (CACREP, Section III). Section VI, Program Area Standards for School Counseling Programs, Standard D includes the statement that interns are to perform “under supervision of a site supervisor” as defined in Section III of the standards (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).
Freeman and Henry (1996) conducted a nationwide study with counselor educators from CACREP accredited programs. The rationale for studying this population was based on the likelihood that these participants would be considered clinical supervisors due to adherence to the CACREP standards. The study focused on the functions of supervision, methods of delivery, goals of supervision and preferred supervisor roles. The study asked information on supervisory approach but did not question training experience. A number of comments did allude to how to supervise from experience. Examples were, “my approach to supervision has gradually evolved as a result of working with students and attending to what seems to work most effectively,” and “I’ve never studied supervision theory, so I was taught by word-of-mouth to supervise” (Freeman & McHenry, 1996, p. 154). Freeman and McHenry (1996) further state that a small number of participants referenced a supervision theory, model or study, suggesting to them that the study participants may not be interested in the current supervisory literature, may have a lack of supervision training, and may believe that counseling theory translates to supervision and that supervision-specific models are not necessary. (Freeman & McHenry, 1996).

Statement of the Problem

This statement gives support to the concern that if counselor educators themselves are not trained as clinical supervisors, and work in CACREP programs where there is an expectation of professional development, then what is the level of supervisory qualifications in the untrained field site professional providing on-going supervision to the counselor trainee?
As counselor education programs developed and became accountable to national accreditation standards, emphasis on supervision models, supervisory practice and standards of supervision became the focus of internship requirements (Falvey, 2000). Borders, Cashwell & Rotter, (1995); Navin, Beamish, & Johanson, (1995); and Watkins, (1995) believe that graduate training programs and internship sites rarely require or offer formal supervision training. “It is not common practice for supervisors to consult with one another, review the literature on supervision independently, or attend courses on supervision” (Rodenhauser, 1997, p. 539).

While the literature focuses extensively on the importance of supervisory training, and the types of training that should occur, as of this study nothing has been proposed on the impact of the untrained site professional providing supervision to the master’s level counselor trainee.

Purpose of the Study

This study is designed to assess, describe and compare how advanced doctoral level student supervisors who are formally trained in supervision and field site professionals who are not formally trained in supervision perceive or value the importance of supervisory training regarding the provision of supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. This is a quantitative study that gathered and analyzed the opinions of advanced doctoral level university supervisors and school and mental health agency site professionals who each supervise master’s level counseling trainees. A quantitative design was created to allow for the collection and analysis of data to generate as much descriptive information about the elements of the importance of training related to the supervisory tasks described in the research instrument. Little research has
examined the perceptions of the importance of training of doctoral and field site professionals providing supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. Conducting a quantitative study to explore the perceptions of the significance of training is important for several reasons outlined in the significance of the study. Additionally, recommendations for the establishment of training standards for the field site supervision of master’s level counselor trainees are believed by this author to be an important contribution to the supervision literature as well as contributing to a design for formalized site supervisor training.

Significance of the Study

The study compares how formally trained counselor supervisors and non-formally trained counselor supervisors perceive the value of supervisory training and skills in the delivery of services to the master’s level counseling trainee. This study is intended to contribute to the professional development of the master’s level counselor trainee. By exploring the perceived importance of training to the field site professional providing supervision, informed decisions can be made for placing future master’s level counselor trainees in field site placements with professionals trained in supervision. Additionally, academic institutions can gain significant information that will contribute to the planning and implementation of supervision curriculum for master’s level counseling students. The results of this study may contribute to the professional development of the master’s level counselor trainee. An effort will also be made to contact professional organizations with suggested additions to supervisory guidelines.
Research Questions

The research questions addressed in the study are the following: What degree of importance do advanced doctoral level students and field site professionals attribute to the supervisory training and skills that prepare them to provide effective supervision to master’s level counselor trainees? Additionally, what level of supervisory training do each of the studied populations have? The Counselor Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ), a 16-item inventory, was developed to address the research questions.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses were developed to determine the significant differences, if any, among and between doctoral level students’ and field site professionals’ perceptions of the importance and levels of supervisory skills and training required to effectively supervise. The following null hypotheses were tested:

Hypothesis 1.

There is no significant difference in the perceptions of the importance of having supervisory skills between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training.

Hypothesis 2.

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory training between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training.
Hypothesis 3.

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision.

Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

Definitions

For this study, the following definitions were used:

Supervision

Roberts, Morotti, Herrick and Tilbury (2001) define supervision as a formal, contractual relationship between university faculty and other designated members of a specific profession. The purpose of supervision is to foster the professional growth and effectiveness of the counselor in training (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP, 2001) describes supervision as a “tutorial and mentoring form of instruction in which a supervisor monitors the student’s activities in practicum and internship and facilitates the learning and skill development experiences associated with practicum and internship” (Glossary).
On-site supervision

This term refers to the direct, day-to-day observations and contact between the site supervisor and the intern during the internship (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

Supervisors

This term refers to those professionals who are appropriately degreed, licensed or certified to provide mentoring and instruction to trainees desiring to become advanced in their profession. Supervision for graduate student counselor trainees is conjoined between the university or college supervisor and the designated site supervisor to better serve the individual being supervised. (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

The supervisor monitors and evaluates the clinical work of the student while monitoring the quality of services offered to the client. (CACREP, Glossary).

Site Supervisor

CACREP (2001) describes this person as a qualified professional within a field site setting who is responsible for supervising a graduate student’s work at the placement.

Professional

One who has a graduate degree in a field where there is a specialized body of knowledge and in which there is a professional code of ethics. The professional has an obligation to contribute to their field, and contribute to society (P. Bernstein, personal communication, May 13, 2004).

Intern

The term *intern* refers to the trainee receiving supervision in preparation for entry into the counseling profession. The intern is a student at an advanced point in his or her
program of study, usually nearing graduation. Typically, interns spend considerable time on-site counseling clients. (Roberts, Morotti, Herrick & Tilbury, 2001).

Internship

CACREP (2001) defines internship as “a distinctly defined, post-practicum, supervised capstone clinical experience in which the student refines and enhances basic counseling or student development knowledge and skills and integrates and authenticates professional knowledge and skills appropriate to the student’s program and initial postgraduate professional placement” (Glossary).

Practicum

CACREP (2001) sees this as “a distinctly defined, supervised clinical experience in which the student develops basic counseling skills and integrates professional knowledge. Practicum is completed prior to internship” (Glossary).

Competence

This term is described by Haynes, Corey and Moulton (2003) as a proficiency requiring appropriate training and experience in the service delivery of supervision and clinical expertise.

Importance

This is defined by The New Britannica-Webster Dictionary and Reference Guide (1981) as “having great meaning or influence” (p. 447).

Training

This term refers to the process of teaching or to make ready for a skill, also defined by The New Britannica-Webster Dictionary and Reference Guide (1981).
Advanced Level Doctoral Student

This is defined as a counseling student who has reached the third year of doctoral study, having passed oral and written comprehensives.

Perception

The New Britannica-Webster Dictionary and Reference Guide defines perception as “insight, a capacity for comprehension’ (p. 667.)

Summary

This chapter provides a framework for understanding the concerns related to the lack of formalized supervisory training for the field site professional providing supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. Focus was given to the significance of examining advanced doctoral level supervisors’ and field-site professionals’ perceptions of supervisory training. A brief overview of the concerns reflected in the literature and the proposed need for establishing standards of competence for the field site professional providing supervision was provided. The chapter contained the purpose of the study, described the quantitative research design, presented the research questions around which the study was designed, and provided the definitions used in the study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature contains data related to supervisory training recommendations and standards, the importance of supervision in providing quality client care, and the significance of the ethical and legal implications when providing quality supervision. Relatively little, however, has been written about the impact of the untrained counselor educator or field site professional who supervises the counselor or the counselor trainee.

The purpose of this study is to explore advanced doctoral level and field site professionals’ perceptions of the importance of training while supervising counselors in training. This chapter provides a basis for the study by reviewing the existing literature, specifically chosen to highlight pertinent areas of supervisory importance. Emphasis is on the following: a general overview, history and purpose of supervision, ethical and legal considerations, professional organizations positions, client care, needs of the counselor trainee, models of supervision, risk management, supervision tasks, supervisory training recommendations and standards, and the importance and scope of supervision in the counseling profession.

Overview

According to Bernard and Goodyear (1998), less experienced members of the counseling profession have depended on more experienced colleagues to teach the advanced skills necessary to advance in the field. Supervision has been available throughout the history of the counseling profession; but recognition that supervision is a discrete intervention with its own concepts and techniques is new. Fortunately, the
literature related to clinical supervision in the mental health professions is growing rapidly and is increasingly advancing (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Watkins (1997) reports “psychotherapy supervision is a critical if not the most critical facet of the psychotherapy training endeavor” (p. 9). He describes supervision as significant as it provides the supervisee with vital feedback about their performance in the counseling session; offers guidance during periods of confusion; allows for alternative views and perspectives related to client dynamics, interventions and treatment suggestions; and offers a “secure base” (Watkins, 1997, p.3) for the supervisee. Furthermore, supervision contributes to quality care for the client. Watkins (1997) outlines the essentials of effective supervision as: (1) the ability to create a good working relationship with the supervisee, (2) understanding the value and process in providing ongoing feedback and formative evaluation, (3) making a time commitment to the supervisee, (4) enhancing professional development, (5) monitoring quality of professional service, and (6) serving as a “gatekeeper” (Watkins, 1997, p.5) in the event remediation is needed.

Borders and Leddick (1987) report the results of several studies, stating, “The typical supervisor has had little preparation for the role” (p. 1). They believe that the doctoral student may have had a course but little supervision of their supervision, the field site professional has a master’s degree and several years of counseling but no formal or in-service training in supervision, and the counselor educator has probably not been formally trained as a supervisor either. (Borders & Leddick, 1987).

Of significance in the literature is the work done by Borders, Bernard, Dye, Fong, Henderson, and Nance (1991) on the development of a curriculum guide for training
counseling supervisors. They have identified the following core content areas: models of supervision, counselor development, supervision methods and techniques, supervisory relationship, ethical, legal, and professional regulatory issues, evaluation and executive (administrative) skills.

The basis for the development of the curriculum guide is the author’s assertion that supervisor training is an “ethical necessity” (p. 59) and that professionals providing supervision without training are practicing outside of the limits of their competence (Borders et al, 1991).

Borders et al (1991) further assert, “the need for specialized training also has been acknowledged in preparation standards and professional credentials” (p. 59). The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) (1988) requires that doctoral students be trained in supervision in counselor education programs. Training for counseling supervisors is a legal requirement in such states as Texas, Arkansas, and South Carolina, when these supervisors provide supervision for academic, licensure and certain training experiences. (Borders et al, 1991).

Additionally, Borders et al (1991) report, “we are particularly hopeful that the guide will stimulate research on supervision training. Despite a proliferation of research on the supervision process, little attention has been given to the effects of training” (p. 62).

Cohen (2004) discusses the circumstances leading up to the writing he has done on clinical supervision, stating that as a beginning supervisor he “often felt the chaos of my inexperience and lack of knowledge” (p. ix). He believes particularly attention should be paid to the beginning, middle and ending stages of supervision, reflecting such
competencies as developing the relationship, transitioning from dependency to independence and preparing the supervisee for work as an independent professional.

Cohen (2004) further maintains “it takes a certain kind of courage to assume the responsibility of being a clinical supervisor. The welfare of others often depends on what we do, and there is a lot to know in order to do the job well” (p.119). He sees learning to supervise as “a never ending process” (p. 119) and outlines the following areas of focus on becoming an effective and competent supervisor: defining the supervisor role as clinician, manager and facilitator of personal growth; developing the supervisory relationship; achieving cultural, ethical, legal and integrity and competence; designing the supervisory structure and format; determining methods of supervisory assessment and evaluation; and determining the differences between the administrative and clinical supervisory tasks (Cohen, 2004).

Campbell (2000) maintains that just as there is a need for training for counselors and psychotherapists, the same is true for supervisors. She states that the “majority of practitioners who have not received any training in supervision might believe that because they are capable, accomplished, and experienced counselors or therapists, they therefore can supervise. They fail to understand that there is no perfect relationship between being a good therapist and being a good therapist” (p. 2).

Borders and Usher (1992) reported that counselor growth and development is related to supervised, not unsupervised, practice. They made a point of discussing the point that not much is known about the supervision practice or training outside of academic settings.
According to Baronchok and Kunkel (1990), few counselors receive formal supervisory training as part of their academic degree program. An additional concern is that few supervisors receive supervision themselves. Based on this concern, Worthington (1987) believes that supervisors may be passing on the errors of their own supervisory experiences.

Campbell (2000) also expressed a concern about a lack of material available to supervisors who wish to become more effective in their work, especially moving from theory to actual practice. She states that the supervisor is an important “gatekeeper” (p.5) whose role it is to evaluate supervisee competence in the areas of ethics, professionalism and clinical competence.

**History of Supervision**

Bernard & Goodyear (2004) cited Fraym (1999) who suggests formal psychotherapy supervision began in the early 1920s. Leddick and Bernard reviewed the history of supervision in an article written in 1980. They maintained that supervision had been passed over in the counseling literature, and when it had been covered, emphasis was on lack of clarity about the topic. They hoped to draw attention to the need for evaluation and research in the counseling and supervision literature.

Leddick & Bernard (1980) report that supervision in the psychotherapeutic realm began to develop between 1925 and 1930, just as psychoanalysis was coming to the forefront. During the 1930s, two competing views developed concerning the place of “control analysis” (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004, p. 77), which was the term used by psychoanalysts for supervision. One viewpoint of the time was supervision should be a continuation of the supervisee’s psychoanalysis. The other viewpoint was that
supervision should emphasize didactic teaching (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Bernard & Leddick (1980) focused on the work of Eckstein and Wallerstein (1959), which used a chess game metaphor for the process of supervision, referring to the stages as the “opening,” the “mid-game,” and the “end game” (p. 187). The beginning stage marks a time where the supervisor and supervisee assess each other for strengths and weaknesses, determining attribution of authority. The middle stage reflects the potential conflict between supervisor and supervisee, where the supervisor’s role is that of teacher and counselor. In the last stage the supervisor becomes less active and supports the supervisee in becoming more independent. (Leddick & Bernard, 1980). As cited in Bernard & Goodyear (2004), Eckstein and Wallerstein in 1972 were the first to articulate a model that most psychodynamic and other supervisors accepted. They saw supervision as a teaching and learning process (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

As psychoanalysis was joined by the client-centered counseling approaches, supervision also became more nondirective. Supervisors were directed to become more focused on their understanding of the needs of the supervisee. (Leddick & Bernard, 1980).

For Carl Rogers (1957), supervision was a “central and longstanding concern (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). He designed a program of graded experiences that gave the supervisee an opportunity to practice those attributes observed in their supervisors; here the supervisee could learn by example, and the supervisor could maintain a nondirective posture. (Leddick & Bernard, 1980). Rogers was the first to use electronically recorded interviews and transcripts for the purposes of supervision. Prior to, supervision was based on the self-reports of the supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Truax and Carkhuff
(1967) worked to alter Rogers’s early model of supervision by maintaining the facilitative role of the supervisor, but eliminated the modeling behavior. As a result, researchers attempted to study the usefulness of differing supervisor roles. Results were often contradictory, as reported by Leddick & Bernard (1980).

By 1966, the supervision field had three significant models from which to draw: dynamic, facilitative and behavioral. Leddick and Bernard (1980) reported, “with such rapid expansion, the field was chaotic, highly competitive and polarized” (p. 190). They further believe that supervision began to stabilize when the three above listed models began to blend (Leddick & Bernard, 1980). In addition to this stabilization, there were certain “consistencies” (p.193) that crossed most models: supervision should be mandated; supervision is a learning opportunity; a positive supervisory relationship is important; systemic evaluation should be expanded on; and the field of supervision continues to grow (Leddick & Bernard, 1980).

Bernard & Goodyear (2004) attribute Wolpe, Knopp and Garfield (1966) as among the first to outline procedures for behavioral supervision. Systemic, narrative and the constructivist approach to supervision followed. In each model, the role of the supervisor changed, ranging from the consultative role in constructivist supervisor to the editorial role of the narrative approach supervisor.

The developmental models of supervision emerged in the 1950s but were not widely utilized until the 1980s. These models focus on the developmental changes of the supervisee. In 1999 Bernard developed the Discrimination Model to help her supervisees with their initial supervision activities. In this model the role of the supervisor spans
teacher, counselor and consultant, determined by the supervisee’s developmental need (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Carroll (1994) reports there are “two strands” (p.1) in the history and understanding of supervision, one in the United States and one in Britain. They are distinguished by location of training. The United States supervision training occurs primarily in university settings, where in Britain supervision training occurs in the private sector. Carroll (1994) believes the United States has focused on the “conceptual and intellectual pursuit of supervision, while Britain has stressed the practice, the training and the supervision of supervision” (Carroll, 1994, p. 2).

Bernard & Goodyear (2004) report that their work as benefited from supervision literature that has become “increasingly sophisticated and discriminating” (p. xiv). They see more choices to draw from when looking at each facet of supervision than there was a decade ago, highlighting that “some topics still call for far more investigation” (p. xiv).

Ethical and Legal Considerations

In 1993 the first code of supervision ethics was passed in The United States. Created by the Supervision Interest Network, the code outlined the responsibilities of the supervisory role as it differed from other professional roles. Other codes followed from the National Board of Certified Counselors (1998), Approved Supervisor Code of Ethics (1998) and Center for Credentialing and Education (2001). (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Bernard & Goodyear (2004) highlight major ethical issues for counseling supervisors. These include informed consent (for supervisees and clients), dual relationships, competence and confidentiality. They see legal concerns as including malpractice, duty to warn, direct and vicarious liability.
Cormier & Bernard (1982) believed that while clinical supervision was often overlooked in the litigation process, it was the probable “suit of the future” (p. 486). As a result, their focus was on the supervisor’s responsibilities to the counselor as well as the client. They looked at legal and ethical issues, including negligence, due process, vicarious liability and dual relationships. They made recommendations regarding supervisor training that would enhance the supervisor’s ability to handle their professional responsibilities more effectively (Cormier & Bernard, 1982).

Based on the notion that the client has become a “consumer” (p. 486), Cormier & Bernard (1982) believed that accountability in the supervisory area had become a potential legal issue. They saw the positive aspect of this being that the more informed the client, the less likely they would see a therapeutic failure as solely their responsibility.

Of significance in relation to this study, is Cormier & Bernard’s (1982) focus on the fact that “one remarkable oversight in the preparation of supervisors has been the transition from therapist to supervisor” (p. 489). They believe in order for a supervisor to practice more ethically, they have to learn how to transfer their knowledge of the counseling field into the field of supervision. (Cormier & Bernard, 1982).

Positions of Professional Organizations

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2001) “standards are written to ensure that students develop a professional counselor identity and also master the knowledge and skills to practice effectively” (p. 3). CACREP sees the counselor preparation process as the beginning, expecting that professional counselors continue to develop throughout the life of their careers. CACREP has a section in their standards on Clinical Instruction, addressing the practicum and
internship requirements. CACREP sees this experience as “the most critical experience elements in the program” (Section III). The standards do not outline supervisory training requirements for counselor educators or field site professionals providing supervision, only referencing the counseling experience. They do require that students serving as supervisors within the counseling education program must have completed, or are receiving “preparation” in counseling supervision. (CACREP, Section III, 2001).

The American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy (AAMFT) requires a supervisory designation distinct from its level of clinical membership. AAMFT requires its supervisors to complete specific and rigorous training and to submit to a review process of their competencies. Additionally, supervision status must be renewed. The American Association for Pastoral Counseling (AAPC) is the only other mental health profession requiring specific supervisory experience that members have to document in order to reach the diplomate level of membership and be able to supervise independently. (Storm & Todd, 1997).

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) has focused extensively on the curricular requirements of counselor education programs, particularly in response to accreditation. Borders and Leddick (1987) believe that counselor educators must attend to the different skills needed to supervise graduate practicum and internship students, skills that are different than teaching other counseling courses. They also note that as counselor education program graduates move into supervisory positions in their careers, the lack of training or coursework in supervision becomes apparent. (Borders & Leddick, 1987).
The Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors (1993) were created by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) in order to address the responsibilities of counselor educators and counseling supervisors in the area of supervision. These guidelines are broken down into three areas: Client Welfare and Rights, Supervisory Role, and Program Administration Role. Guideline 2.01 states, “Supervisors should have had training in supervision prior to initiating their role as supervisors.” Guideline 2.02 goes on to state, “Supervisors should pursue professional and personal continuing education activities such as advanced courses, seminars, and professional conferences on a regular and ongoing basis. These activities should include both counseling and supervision topics and skills.”

**Client Care**

Bernard & Goodyear (2004) define the purpose of supervision as two-fold: (1) “To foster the supervisee’s professional development” and (2) “To ensure client welfare” (p. 12). The latter reflects the supervisor’s primary function as working to assist the counselor monitor the welfare of the client. As cited in Bernard & Goodyear (2004), Loganbill et al. (1982) saw this as the supervisor’s “paramount responsibility: (p. 13).

Bernard & Goodyear (2004) believe that the “original purpose of clinical supervision was to monitor client welfare” (p. 14). Only later did supervision shift to include monitoring the professional development of the supervisee as well.

Storm & Todd (1997) report that supervisors must attend to the level of responsibility they hold in regard to the client services that their supervisees provide. Supervisors face the continually challenge of monitoring their responses so that the needs of the client are met and that the supervisee’s professional development is supported.
Needs of the Counselor Trainee

Hess (1987) states that a student in a training program is assigned or selects a supervisor as part of their field experience. There is an implication that the supervisor is competent, interested and trustworthy. Dysfunctional supervision can occur when these qualities (Carifio & Hess, 1987) are lacking in the supervisor.

A 1993 article by Ronnestad and Skovholt examined the existing literature to determine the relevant issues in the supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students, with focus on the impact of utilizing a developmental perspective. They believed that most of the research on supervision could be found in the academic or internship setting (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). They concluded that most of the research is done with supervisors of limited professional experience, i.e., graduate students. At the beginning stage the counselor trainee is eager to perform professionally and may be disappointed by the supervisor that does not teach them specific skills (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993). Ronnestad and Skovholt (1993) stated, “The general tendency of beginning students is to want high levels of structure and direction in their training (p. 397).

Ronnestad and Skovholt (1993) focused on the parallel process present when a supervisor has limited professional experience, especially in the area of performance anxiety. They report, “Inexperienced supervisors, who, for example, are not aware of and have not previously professionally handled the process of projective identification, may easily and quickly resort to giving suggestions as to how to act, instead of engaging in the more difficult task of dwelling on the understanding and unraveling the complexity that is being expressed” (p. 398).
Ronnestad and Skovholt ((1993) saw the challenges of supervising an advanced level student as consisting of the dual dilemma of feeling confident and professionally vulnerable at the same time. The student at this level has not yet integrated the information received from many supervisory sources into their own professional behavior. They see the necessity for supervisory focus on the areas of: the student’s developmental needs; communicating supervisory competencies and limitations; supervisory goals, methods and focus; and, opportunities provided by the work setting (Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993).

An important question for the counselor trainee is what they identify as important expectations of the supervision process and supervisory characteristics. A study by Friedlander & Snyder (1983) demonstrated that counselor trainees, across experience levels, expected supervisors to be significantly more trustworthy than expert, more expert than attractive, and more evaluative than supportive.

A study by Cross and Brown (1983) showed that the beginning trainee was more focused on supervision tasks and methods, while the more experienced trainee looked to the relationship aspects of the supervisory process. Cross and Brown (1983) recommended future research focus on determining whether a supervisor can recognize that shifts in supervisory style are needed at different trainee levels.

**Record Keeping**

Of increasing importance in the counseling field is the need for efficient and appropriate documentation. Documenting the supervision process, while similar to the process of recording case notations, is unique in its requirements.
Agreement of confidentiality, supervision record, supervision log, a clinical reporting form, informed consent, permission to tape and present in supervision, are a few of the documents needed by the master’s level counselor trainee during the field site experience. Of concern, is the lack of proper record keeping by the formally untrained field site professional. Not only does inadequate documentation contribute to poor role modeling, it can create ethical and legal dilemmas.

The Standards for the Ethical Practice of Clinical Supervision (1999) state that the supervisor must “keep and secure” all supervision records (NBCC, 1999). The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) does not directly reflect supervisory record keeping in its standards, but recommends that the supervisor oversee the appropriate record keeping of the supervisee in relation to the client. It is interesting to note, that while other supervisory standards minimally address the record keeping needs of the supervisory process, the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) provides the most extensive guidelines on documentation and recording, including the importance of a written supervision record between the supervisor and the supervisee (NASW, 1994).

Models of Supervision

Cormier & Bernard (1982) saw that another way to insure supervisory competence was for the supervisor to become proficient in the use of a variety of supervision models, placing special focus on the fit between the supervision model and the on-going needs of the supervisee and the client.

Storm and Todd (1997) report “sophisticated supervisors” (p. 85) are clear about their own supervisory philosophy as well as knowledgeable about the variety of
supervision models available for use in the supervisory process. The competent supervisor is able to effectively work from and communicate this supervisory philosophy to the supervisee and watch the emergence of the supervisee’s own philosophy of supervision.

Leddick (1994) reports that three types of supervision models have emerged: developmental, integrated and orientation-specific models. While supervisors are encouraged to develop their own personal models of supervision, all should include vital elements such as: providing a safe supervisory relationship, attending to issues of competence and integrity, focus on supervisory goals, techniques, styles, strategies, understanding the supervisor/supervisee roles and characteristics, outcomes, and the sequence (stages) of supervision.

Risk Management

Falvey (2002) focused on the increasing concerns regarding the clinical and managerial risks that supervisors may incur when overseeing the treatment of clients with whom they have little or no contact. These risks are particularly important when supervising counselor trainees. These concerns led Falvey (2002) to review the ethical, legal and supervision literature and create a supervision organizer and risk management tool for clinical supervisors. She believes that although supervisors attend to the professional development of their supervisees, they are also responsible for attending to ethical codes, standards of conduct, legal statues, and licensing regulations. (Falvey, 2002). Field site professionals providing supervision to graduate student counselor trainees often have to monitor the academic compliance requirements of their supervisees. This creates another level of supervisory competence that must be addressed.
Falvey (2000) expressed concern about “assumed versus assessed competence” (p. 5). She described several training problems that existed for several generations of supervisors: lack of clarity regarding the differences between supervision and case management; assuming a clinical position with a supervisee instead of a supervisory role; sporadic and informal conversations about clients as opposed to supervisory sessions; and using the supervisory power differential to direct the supervisee away from their own emerging supervisory theory, in favor of the supervisor’s theoretical choice.

Woody (1997) believes a professional provides high quality services to benefit society and the profession. Substandard practice is unprofessional and subject to censure. He stated within the last two decades the number of lawsuits against mental health professionals has escalated (Woody, 1997). Most of these lawsuits are based on negligence; positing that if the standard of care has been compromised. Litigation contributes to concern about untrained professionals providing inadequate supervision to counselor trainees, jeopardizing the acceptable standard of care in their service to the trainee and, ultimately, to the client.

Tasks of Supervision

The trainee may be more aware of the field than the supervisor, largely because of his or her more recent training. Some trainees have described supervisory experiences in which they have reversed roles with their supervisors and provided supervision to their supervisors. The National Association of Social Workers (NASW), in the Guidelines for Clinical Social Work Supervision (1994), describes the most extensive qualifications for supervisors in all of the professional standards reviewed. In addition to educational qualifications, the NASW guidelines specifies training in
supervision, participation in professional development, experience and expertise with specific populations, understanding of services available in the community, expertise in diversity issues and various methods of practice.

Some of the tasks of supervision (Holloway, 1999) include teaching counseling skills, case conceptualization, professional role and practice, emotional awareness, and self-evaluation. To attend to the teaching tasks and supervisory functions listed above, what level of training, professional and self-awareness must the supervisor have? What happens to the supervisory process when the supervisor does not have the basic qualifications needed to effectively supervise? These questions are not well addressed in the literature.

The field site professional’s lack of expertise in utilizing different types of supervision is also a concern. The use of audio and videotapes, trainee reports, direct observation, and live supervision are methods designed to enhance the supervisory process and enrich the supervisee’s experience of supervision, and may not be utilized by the field site professional.

Holloway (1999), in her description of the systems approach to supervision (SAS), describes the “supervisor factor”. She reports that the ideal supervisor is one who demonstrates high levels of empathy, understanding, unconditional positive regard, flexibility, concern, attention, investment, curiosity and openness (Carifio & Hess, 1987). Additionally, SAS examines an additional five factors as relevant to the supervisor’s importance: professional experiences in counseling and supervision, expectations concerning roles for the supervisor and supervisee, theoretical orientation to counseling, cultural characteristics such as race, ethnicity and gender, and self presentation.
Albott (1984) reports, in his review of the psychotherapy supervision literature, that supervision is a teaching procedure, and that the goal of supervision is to learn how to become a psychotherapist. Other assumptions that have guided the nature and direction of supervision include the beliefs that (a) supervisory skills are derived from a combination of having been supervised and having some clinical practice experience, and, (b) that models and theories of psychotherapy are sufficient bases for understanding how supervisees learn. (Albott, 1984). The literature of psychotherapy supervision is now sufficient not only to challenge the latter two beliefs but also to provide theoretical structures on which to base research (Watkins, 1995).

Rodenhauser (1997) wrote that clinical knowledge and expertise, a consolidated professional identity and enthusiasm for teaching are prerequisites for effective psychotherapy supervision. New supervisors would benefit from knowledge of the problems usually encountered in the transition from supervisee to supervisor. Granet, Kalman and Sacks (1980) see these as problems with inexperience, competition, identity and administrative matters. New supervisors are not only usually inexperienced clinically, they frequently have no exposure to instructional methodology regarding the supervisory process (Rodenhauser, 1997).

Watkins (1997) states, “If psychotherapy supervision is really all that important, then why is training in how to supervise and become a supervisor so limited?” (p. 604). Though being the ultimately responsible party in the supervisor-supervisee-patient triad, supervisors typically receive little or no training in how to supervise and do supervision (Rodenhauser, 1995; Watkins, 1992). “We would never dream of turning untrained therapists loose on needy patients, so why would we turn untrained supervisors loose on
those untrained therapists who help those needy patients?” (Watkins, 1997, p.604). Watkins (1997) believes that until the supervisor undergoes the same rigorous training that a therapist does that the supervisor’s supervision effort will be compromised, as well as the therapy efforts of their supervisees.

**Supervisor Development and Training**

Bernard and Goodyear (1998) report that counseling supervision has some uniqueness as a field of preparation and practice. The competencies that are required for effective supervision are acquired through a sequential combination of training and experience, which generally include the following:

1. Graduate training in a counseling program;
2. Successful supervised experience as a professional counselor;
3. Credentialing in one or more of the following areas: certification by a state department of education, licensure by a state as a professional counselor, and certification as a National Certified Counselor, Certified Clinical Mental Health Counselor, Certified Rehabilitation Counselor, or Certified Career Counselor;
4. Graduate training in counseling supervision including coursework, seminars, laboratory course, and supervision practicum and internship experiences;
5. Continuing professional development specific to supervision theory and practice (e.g., conferences, workshops, self-study); and
The supervisor’s primary functions are to teach those with less experience and to support their professional development, serve as consultants to experienced colleagues, and to assist at all levels in the provision of effective counseling services. These responsibilities require personal and professional maturity accompanied by a broad perspective on counseling that is gained by extensive, supervised counseling experience. (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Bernard and Goodyear (1998) further explain that training for supervision generally occurs during advanced graduate study or continuing professional development. They believe that supervisor training in the pre-service stage is also important. The understanding of basic methods and procedures will enhance students’ performance as counselors, support their participation in the supervision process, and provide a useful framework for future study (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Summary

The literature reflects a review of a myriad of authors and researchers who maintain the importance of supervision and appropriate formal training in supervision. Notable in the research is the absence of information about the impact of untrained supervisors on the counselor and the counseling process. References to potential unethical practice and legal challenges, as well as sufficient risk management are discussed extensively. Also absent is information about the impact of untrained field site professional on the master’s level counselor trainee, as well as these professionals’ self-perception of their competence in the absence of formal training in supervision. The following study will attempt to shed some light on these concerns.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter defines the methodology that investigated the research question: What degree of importance do advanced doctoral level students and field site professionals attribute to the supervisory training and skills that prepare them to provide effective supervision to master’s level counselor trainees? Additionally, what level of supervisory training does each of the studied populations have? The Counselor Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ), a 16-item inventory, was developed to address the research questions.

A non-experimental design and a survey measured the responses regarding supervision and training by field site supervisors and advanced level doctoral students. Surveys are utilized to describe the attitudes, beliefs and behaviors of a population (Patten, 2004). A sample, drawn from the population, is studied and inferences are made to the general population from the data collection. This study attained data utilizing 16-item questionnaire, the Counselor Supervision Questionnaire.

The Counseling Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ) was created for the purposes of this study in conjunction with an expert in the field of research design. The CSQ surveyed the advanced level doctoral students at Duquesne University and the field site professionals who supervise master’s students enrolled in practicum and internship at Duquesne University during the Spring and Summer of 2004. The results compared the perceptions of doctoral students and field site professionals regarding the importance of supervisory training.
A research hypothesis is a prediction of the outcome of a study. The prediction may be based on an educated guess or a formal theory (Patten, 2004). Hypotheses were generated regarding the relationship between perceptions of importance of training in supervision among advanced level doctoral students and the field site professionals providing supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. A pre-experimental study is appropriate because nothing in the following hypotheses suggests that treatments will be given.

The purpose of the study is to compare the perception of importance of formal training in supervision by those who have had the training and those who have not.

**Hypotheses**

*Hypothesis 1.*

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training.

*Hypothesis 2.*

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory training between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training.

*Hypothesis 3.*

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision.
Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision.

Participants

The participants in this study were fifteen advanced doctoral students in the Counselor Education doctoral program at Duquesne University during the 2003-2004 academic year, at the third year level or above in their academic program. Also participating in the study was a sampling of field site professionals providing supervision to the master’s level practicum and internship counseling students. Participants were those who chose to respond to the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ). Duquesne University has a list of 290 site supervisors. Twenty-six field site supervisors were chosen to participate in an attempt to make each sample equal. Participation was voluntary. Some of the field site professional participants were school counselors; some were counselors in mental health agencies. Qualifications to be a field site professional providing supervision for Duquesne University’s Counselor Education Program is based on the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Program’s (CACREP) standards. Participants were chosen to reflect two sample populations. The advanced doctoral students in Duquesne University’s Counselor Education Program receive formal training in supervision. The field site professional may or may not have received any formal supervisory training.
Instrumentation

The validity of the instrument used in any study is an important factor. An instrument is valid to the extent that it measures what it is supposed to measure and performs the functions it is supposed to perform (Patten, 2004).

A search indicated that an assessment instrument was not available to measure perceptions of importance regarding training in supervision. Therefore, the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ) was developed. Face validity was established by basing the CSQ on the Supervisory Code of Ethics of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). Content validity, based on the appropriateness of the contents of the instrument, was established; once again by referencing the ACES standards regarding issues of importance in supervisory conduct and by having faculty experts in the field of supervision and counselor education evaluate the instrument. These faculty members offered direction and suggestions that contributed to clarifying the content and purpose of the instrument.

The CSQ was designed only to collect data pertinent to this instrument. As the CSQ was exclusively used for this study, it is not intended to predict future outcomes. The Counseling Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ) is a two-part survey. The first part entitled “Demographics” requires that the respondents answer yes or no to having had university training to become supervisors.

The second part of the CSQ is “Question Responses” and directs respondents to respond to each question two times. The first set of responses is the respondent’s opinion of how important each item is for their role as a supervisor. The second response is their opinion of how well trained they are in each area. A forced checklist with a range of
frequencies was provided. Field site professionals and doctoral students were directed to indicate their responses according to a five point Likert Scale ranging in value from no importance or no training to very important or a great deal of training. The purpose of this section of the instrument was to gather information related to the importance of supervisory skills as well as the amount of training received in that area. When developing the instrument, the contributing faculty member selected 10 of the current program doctoral students to complete the questionnaire as a pilot to determine if there was retest reliability. The 10 students were given the instrument during April of 2004 and were retested one month later. This determined a correlation coefficient of .833, indicating a high level of test-retest reliability.

Procedure

In conjunction with this researcher’s dissertation committee, a self-administered questionnaire was constructed and was implemented using the tailored design method for mail surveys as described by Dillman (2000). Care was taken to minimize measurement error by presenting the draft survey to the committee members, all counselor educators, before finalizing the instrument. All suggestions from the counselor educators, one of whom is an expert in testing and evaluation procedures, were implemented.

A cover letter (Appendix D) was developed detailing participants’ rights and protections, assuring confidentiality of identity and accessibility of participants to study the results.

The Duquesne University Counselor Education program provided a list of past and present field site supervisors, as well as a list of advanced level doctoral students. The questionnaire was distributed to the sample population in two ways. The advanced
level doctoral students were handed a copy of the cover letter, disclosure and questionnaire in person when possible. Attached to the questionnaire was a cover letter which explained the purpose of the study and a disclosure of informed consent.

Random samples of field site supervisors were mailed a copy of the cover letter, disclosure and Counselor Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ) to their site addresses. An effort was made to reduce non-response error by offering a personal request note for participation to all respondents, whether contacted in person or by mail. Included in the mailing was a stamped, pre-addressed, return envelope.

A total of 49 questionnaires were distributed in all. Thirty-nine were returned for an overall response rate of 80%.

Research Design

There was no randomization or control group with this pre-experimental posttest only control group design and no independent variable was manipulated. The surveyed responses were used to determine an analysis of variance (ANOVA). Efforts were made to maximize the responses of all those surveyed in order to gain a sufficient number to study.

Analysis

An ANOVA method of analysis was used to determine if there is a significant difference between “area of importance” and “experience of training” for both of the sample populations to determine if there was a significant difference on each supervisory area surveyed between the doctoral students and the field site supervisors. A t-test for independent samples was used to determine if there were significant differences on
hypotheses one and two; a t-test for dependent samples was used to determine if there was a significant difference on hypotheses three and four.

Limitations

According to Patten (2001), “all methods of collecting data have strengths and weaknesses” (p.1). She sees questionnaires as an “efficient way to collect data” (p.1) that provides responses that can be easily scored and analyzed (Patten, 2001). A disadvantage can be a low response rate, the questionnaire can be moved through quickly without much thought and are not always responded to accurately leading to missed sections or a respondent not answering to certain questions (Patten, 2001). Patten (2001) also believes that respondents may be swayed by “social desirability” (p.3), tending to give answers that they think the researcher wants to see.

Summary

This investigation was a non-experimental study of the perceptions of importance of supervisory function and training experience. The data gathered was based upon responses to a questionnaire developed using the Supervisory Code of Ethics of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) as a guide. This study provides a step toward contributing to the research on the impact of the non-formally trained field site supervisor of masters level counselor trainees. This study has the potential to propagate further research in this area and contribute to the continuing professional development of the field site supervisor and doctoral level counselor supervisor.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to describe how advanced doctoral level student supervisors and untrained field site professionals perceive the importance of skills and training when providing supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. The intent of the research was to implement a quantitative study, gathering and analyzing these perceptions to examine the differences among and between the advanced doctoral level university supervisors and school and mental health agency site professionals who provide supervision to master’s level counseling students. A quantitative design was chosen in order to allow for the gathering and analyzing of data that would generate as much descriptive information on the elements of the importance of training related to the supervisory tasks described in the research instrument.

This study reviewed and analyzed data collected from administering a 16-point questionnaire to advanced doctoral level students and field site supervisors regarding their perceptions of the importance of a variety of supervision tasks gleaned from the ACES Ethical Standards. Additionally, collected and reviewed were data regarding both samples’ training experience in each of the supervisory areas presented. The data was reported and analyzed across three supervisory groups: doctoral students with supervisory training, site supervisors with training and site supervisors without training.

This chapter will present the results of the statistical analyses of the data. Each hypothesis is restated; the results of the analyses are presented in narrative form and are also presented in a table. Conclusions for each hypothesis are stated and a summary concludes this chapter.
Hypotheses

Hypotheses were developed to explore the significant differences among and between doctoral level students’ and field site professionals’ perceptions of the importance of supervisory training related to the tasks of supervision. The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

Hypothesis 1.

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training.

An independent samples t-test was used to conduct the analysis of the data collected for this hypothesis. The average score on the “Skills” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ) for the supervisors who have formal training was 61.37 with a standard deviation of 4.05. The sample size was 16. The average score on the “Skills” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire for the supervisors who have not received formal training was 60.00 with a standard deviation of 4.23. The sample size was 22.

The t-ratio was calculated to be 0.929 with a probability of 0.359 for 36 degrees of freedom (see Table One). The hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training is accepted at the 0.05 alpha level of confidence.
Table 1

Perceptions of the Importance of Having Supervisory Skills Between Counseling Supervisors Who Have Received Formal Training in Supervision and Counseling Supervisors Who Have Not Received Formal Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors with Formal Training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.37</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors without Formal Training</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Hypothesis 2._

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory training between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training.

An independent sample t-test was used to conduct the analysis of the data collected for this hypothesis. The average score on the “Training” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire for the supervisors who have formal training was 55.69 with a standard deviation of 8.16. The sample size was 16. The average score on the “Training” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire for supervisors who have not received formal training was 49.79 with a standard deviation of 12.18. The sample size was 22.
The t-ratio was calculated to be 1.48 with a probability of 0.148 for 36 degrees of freedom (see Table Two). The hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory training between counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision and counseling supervisors who have not received formal training is accepted at the 0.05 alpha level of confidence.

Table Two
Perceptions of the Importance of Having Supervisory Training Between Counseling Supervisors Who have Received Formal Training in Supervision and Counseling Supervisors Who Have Not Received Formal Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors with Formal Training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.69</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors without Formal Training</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Hypothesis 3._

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision.

A dependent samples t-test was used to conduct the analysis of the data collected for this hypothesis. The average score on the “Skills” subscale of the Counseling
Supervision Questionnaire for the supervisors who have formal training was 61.37 with a standard deviation of 4.05. The average score on the “Training” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire for these same supervisors who have formal training was 55.69 with a standard deviation of 8.16. The sample size was 16.

The t-ratio was calculated to be 2.41 with a probability of significance <0.05 for 15 degrees freedom (see Table Three). The hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of importance of training for counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision is rejected. These supervisors who have been trained perceive having the skills for conducting supervision to be more important than the training to conduct supervision.

Table Three
Perception of Counseling Supervisors With Training of the Importance of Having Supervisory Skills and Having Supervisory Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Skills</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61.37</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Training</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.69</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 alpha level
Hypothesis 4.

There is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision. There is no significant difference among and between the scores of advanced doctoral level counselors regarding each supervisory area presented.

A dependent samples t-test was used to conduct the analysis of the data collected for this hypothesis. The average score on the “Skills” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire for the supervisors who have not received formal training was 60.00 with a standard deviation of 4.23. The average score on the “Training” subscale of the Counseling Supervision Questionnaire for these same supervisors who have formal training was 49.79 with a standard of 12.18. The sample size was 22.

The t-ratio was calculated to be 3.65 with a probability of significance <0.01 for 21 degrees of freedom (see Table Four). The hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of the importance of training for counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision is rejected. These supervisors who have not received formal training perceive having the skills for conducting supervision to be more important than having the training to conduct supervision.
Table Four

Perception of Counseling Supervisors without Training of the Importance of Having Supervisory Skills and Having Supervisory Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Skills</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Training</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 alpha level

Summary

An analysis of the data indicated there is no significant difference in the perceptions of the importance of having counseling supervision skills between counselors who have formal supervisory training and those who do not have formal supervisory training. Similarly, there is no significant difference in the perceptions of the importance of having counseling supervision training between counselors who have formal supervisory training and those who do not have formal supervisory training. Both groups of counseling supervisors, those who have formal training and those who do not perceive having the skills to be more important than the need for the formal training.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to describe how advanced doctoral level student supervisors and formally untrained field site professionals perceive the importance of training when providing supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. The intent of the research was to implement a quantitative study, gathering and analyzing these perceptions to examine the differences among and between the advanced doctoral level university supervisors and school and mental health agency site professionals who provide supervision to master’s level counseling students. A quantitative design was chosen in order to allow for the gathering and analyzing of data that would generate as much descriptive information on the elements of the importance of training related to the supervisory tasks outlined in the research instrument.

This study reviewed and analyzed data collected from the administration of a 16-item questionnaire to advanced doctoral level students and field site supervisors regarding their perceptions of the importance of a variety of supervision tasks gleaned from the ACES Ethical Standards. Additionally, collected and reviewed was data regarding both samples’ training experience in each of the supervisory areas presented.

The data was reported and analyzed across two supervisory groups: doctoral students with supervisory training and site supervisors who do not have formal training. The results of the study are reported in the following section.
Conclusions

Importance of Supervisory Skills.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills between counseling supervisors that have been formally trained and those who have not been formally trained. This hypothesis was supported by the results of the study, no significant differences were found. It was found that both populations sampled feel similarly regarding the importance of having supervisory skills. This was a positive and hopeful finding. The literature supports the significance of having sufficient supervisory skills to lead the counseling supervisee to higher level of proficiency in their work. Articulated by Campbell (2000), “to be an effective supervisor, the practitioner must develop separate skills from those required for the practice of counseling and psychotherapy” (p. 1). It should be stated that the maximum score on this item is 64 and both groups had average scores above 60; it is obvious that both groups perceive that having supervisory skills are important.

Importance of Training in Supervision.

Hypothesis 2 stated that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory training between counselor supervisors that have been formally trained and those who have not been formally trained. This hypothesis was supported by the results of the study, no significant differences were found. Again, a positive and hopeful finding. As stated in the literature review, Watkins (1997) believes that until the supervisor undergoes the same rigorous training that a therapist does, the supervisor’s effort will be compromised, as well as the therapy efforts of their supervisees. Overall, both samples in the study seem to recognize the value of training in
supervision. It should be stated that the maximum score on this item is 64 and both groups had average scores above 50; it is obvious that both groups perceive that having supervisory training is important.

Importance of Training and Supervisory Skills.

Hypothesis 3 stated that there is no significant difference in the perception of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perception of importance of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have received formal training in supervision. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of the study, significant differences were found. These results contribute to the professional and ethical concerns that are reflected in the literature. How does this lack of perceived importance of supervisory skills impact the performance of the supervisor, the guidance the supervisee receives and ultimately, the welfare of the client? A possible explanation for the finding may be due to variation in the doctoral student sample. Given that the sample of advanced doctoral students were selected from the same university counselor education doctoral program where they have received similar training in supervision, this finding suggests that the differences may be attributed the responses gathered from varying cohort members in varying stages of their doctoral candidacy, as well as having been exposed to varying counselor educators’ viewpoints on supervision training. The results of this hypothesis may also indicate the developmental growth of the doctoral program since its inception. The field site supervisors’ responses may reflect a lack of professional development in this area. Further study is recommended in this area.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there is no significant difference in the perception
of the importance of having supervisory skills and the perceptions of having supervisory training among counseling supervisors who have not received formal training in supervision. This hypothesis was not supported by the results of the study, significant differences were found. This has both positive and concerning implications. Those untrained counselor supervisors who indicated strong support for supervisory training reflect an awareness of the significance of training. Those who scored lower on this part of the questionnaire reflect a sample of the population who would benefit from some professional development in this area. Given that the sample selected was drawn from field site supervisors representing different types of field placements, it is understandable that these formally untrained counseling supervisors might have varying perceptions regarding the importance of training in supervision. Additionally, the literature suggests that most supervisors gain their supervisory position on the basis of having been a good therapist (Freeman & McHenry, 1996).

It was believed by this researcher that the non-formally trained supervisors would have put less emphasis on the importance of supervisory training when compared to the importance of having the skills. This is further supported by the literature that indicates a typical supervisor’s rise to the position is based on experience as a counselor not being trained as a supervisor. It was also anticipated that the formally trained supervisors would value supervision training based on their experiences of transferring training knowledge to the supervisory experience. This assumption seemed reasonable yet the data does not support this anticipated result.
Discussion and Limitations.

Limitations exist in all methods of collecting data because each method has its weaknesses and strengths. While the use of questionnaires is an efficient way to collect data, and can be easily scored and analyzed, there are several disadvantages to their use. Disadvantages could include a low response rate, they moved through quickly without much thought and are not always responded to accurately. Additionally, sections are missed or certain questions are not responded to. While the response rate of this study was significant, an 80% return rate, certain questionnaires were returned missing whole pages of responses. Some questionnaires had a response to the first part of a question but not the second part. Some questions were skipped altogether.

A second limitation may exist due to non-response error. The data is limited to those who chose to respond and does not indicate the perceptions of those who did not return the questionnaire. Additionally, the use of any questionnaire carries the risk of responses driven by “social desirability” (Patten, 2001). The respondents, realizing that the questionnaire might be examined in light of their supervisory relationship with Duquesne University may have based their responses on a desire to present well as a continuing site supervisor.

Another limitation was an unexpected number of positive responses to the demographic question “Have you received any training at a university in supervision” from the site supervisors were discerned. It is believed by this researcher, based on the number of therapists with master’s degrees who are site supervisors and the general lack of supervision coursework at the master’s level, this question may have been misread to
reflect “training at a university.” This led to the creation of an unanticipated sampling group.

The sampling method used in this study was a convenience sample approach, in which the counseling supervisors used in the study were chosen from an existing pool of university doctoral and field site supervisors. The results of the study are also limited to that pool of respondents. This form of sample selection may create a bias against counseling supervisors in the general population, creating another limitation. Additionally, the smaller the sample size, the greater the chances are that a sampling error will occur. This contributes to the greater possibility of a Type II error, where the null is not rejected when it’s false.

The most significant limitation to the study is the inability to generalize the results to a larger population of doctoral level supervisors and field site supervisors.

Implications for Professional Development.

This study was intended to contribute to the professional development of the doctoral student supervisor, field site supervisor and master’s level counselor trainee. By exploring the perceived importance of supervisory skills and of training, as well as levels of the training experience of the field site professional and doctoral level supervisor providing supervision to the master’s level counselor trainee, recommendations can be made regarding levels of supervisory competence. Academic institutions may gain important information that will contribute to the planning and implementation of supervision curriculum for the master’s level counselor trainee and add to the existing supervision curriculum of the doctoral student in counselor supervision. Ultimately, the welfare of the client may be positively impacted by professional development in the area
The addition to the curriculum of supervision for the master’s level counselor trainee will increase the likelihood that future field site supervisors will have some formalized training in supervision. This training will provide the next generation master’s level trainee with a more integrated supervisory experience during their practicum and internship, as well as creating a more ethical level of professional practice on the part of the supervisor. This may lead the academic institution to have more confidence in the field placements of the master’s level counselor trainee. Lastly, continued study of recommended training materials may contribute to the creation of post-master’s supervisory training workshops that may be offered to field site supervisors by the academic institution.

It is also recommended by this researcher that all applicable professional organizations, such as the American Counseling Association (ACA), the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) and the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), take advantage of the extensive research and guidelines available that outline recommendations for training in supervision and expand their supervisory requirements and ethical standards in this area. Field site supervisors should be required to have, at least, the equivalent of one three-credit course in supervision before being qualified to supervise a master’s level trainee. Applicable professional organizations should be encouraged to offer more professional development workshops in the areas related to supervisory practice. Phasing in these requirements will be recommended. As concerning as lack of formal training on the part of the field site supervisor is, these are still the professionals that the academic institute
turns to for assistance in placing master’s level counselor trainees in field site experiences.

Recommendations for Further Research.

This study was an initial attempt to explore the perceptions of importance related to skills and training in supervision. The generalizability of the results of this study should be determined by replicating the study with larger samples. Replication of this study is encouraged to more accurately describe the training experience and levels of importance assigned to supervisors of the master’s level counselor trainee, as well as counselor supervisors in general.

Additional research should be conducted on each of the supervisory areas presented on the 16-point Counselor Supervision Questionnaire. Each question represents an important and potentially overlooked area in the training of the counseling supervisor.

Of interest to this researcher is a further look at the impact of the untrained supervisor on the master’s level counselor trainee. Issues of potential liability and adherence to ethical standards, such as practicing beyond the limits of one’s competence should also be researched.

Summary

Although this study found no significant difference in the perceptions of importance of having counseling supervision skills and no significant difference in the perceptions of the importance of having counseling supervision training between those counselors who have formal supervision training and those who do not, it is believed by this researcher that the study confirmed some of the concerns facing academic institutions as they seek to place their master’s level counselor trainees in appropriate supervisory
experiences. These concerns include exposing the master’s level counselor trainee to ineffective supervision and potential ethical and legal challenges. The supervision literature reflects a concern that supervisees pass on the mistakes of their supervisors, ultimately affecting the welfare of the client. The majority of respondents confirmed the importance of the surveyed supervisory areas and did indicate some gaps in their training. It is the hope of this researcher that the results of this study bring into sharper focus the need for adequately trained counselor supervisors. It is also hoped that this study creates the opportunity and desire for future research in this area.
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Preamble:

The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) is composed of people engaged in the professional preparation of counselors and people responsible for the ongoing supervision of counselors. ACES is a founding division of the American Counseling Association for (ACA) and as such adheres to ACA’s current ethical standards and to general codes of competence adopted throughout the mental health community.

ACES believes that counselor educators and counseling supervisors in universities and in applied counseling settings, including the range of education and mental health delivery systems, carry responsibilities unique to their job roles. Such responsibilities may include administrative supervision, clinical supervision, or both. Administrative supervision refers to those supervisory activities, which increase the efficiency of the delivery of counseling services; whereas, clinical supervision includes the supportive and educative activities of the supervisor designed to improve the application of counseling theory and technique directly to clients.

Counselor educators and counseling supervisors encounter situations, which challenge the help given by general ethical standards of the profession at large. These situations require more specific guidelines that provide appropriate guidance in everyday practice.
The Ethical Guidelines for Counseling Supervisors are intended to assist professionals by helping them:

1. Observe ethical and legal protection of clients’ and supervisee rights;

2. Meet the training and professional development needs of supervisees in way consistent with clients’ welfare and programmatic requirements; and

3. Establish policies, procedures, and standards for implementing programs.

The specification of ethical guidelines enables ACES members to focus on and to clarify the ethical nature of responsibilities held in common. Such guidelines should be reviewed formally every five years, or more often if needed, to meet the needs of ACES members for guidance.

The Ethical Guidelines for Counselor Educators and Counseling Supervisors are meant to help ACES members in conducting supervision. ACES is not currently in a position to hear complaints about alleged non-compliance with these guidelines. Any complaints about the ethical behavior of any ACA member should be measured against the ACA Ethical Standards and a complaint lodged with ACA in accordance with its procedures for doing so.

One overriding assumption underlying this document is that supervision should be ongoing throughout a counselor’s career and not stop when a particular level of education, certification, or membership in a professional organization is attained.
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS:

Applied Counseling Settings – Public or private organizations of counselors such as community mental health centers, hospitals, schools, and group or individual private practice settings.

Supervisees – Counselors-in-training in university programs at any level who working with clients in applied settings as part of their university training program, and counselors who have completed their formal education and are employed in an applied counseling setting.

Supervisors – Counselors who have been designated within their university or agency to directly oversee the professional clinical work of counselors. Supervisors also may be persons who offer supervision to counselors seeking state licensure and so provide supervision outside of the administrative aegis of an applied counseling setting.

1. Client Welfare and Rights

1.01 The Primary obligation of supervisors is to train counselors so that they respect the integrity and promote the welfare of their clients. Supervision should have supervisees inform clients that they are being supervised and that observation and/or recordings of the session may be reviewed by the supervisor.

1.02 Supervisors who are licensed counselors and are conducting supervision to aid a supervisee to become licensed should instruct the supervisee not to communicate or in any way convey to the supervisee’s clients or to other parties that the supervisee is himself/herself licensed.
1.03 Supervisors should make supervisees aware of clients’ rights, including protecting clients’ right to privacy and confidentiality in the counseling relationship and the information resulting from it. Clients also should be informed that their right to privacy and confidentiality will not be violated by the supervisory relationship.

1.04 Records of the counseling relationship, including interview notes, test data, correspondence, the electronic storage of these documents, and audio and videotape recordings, are considered to be confidential professional information. Supervisors should see that these materials are used in counseling, research, and training and supervision of counselors with the full knowledge of the clients and that permission to use these materials is granted by the applied counseling setting offering service to the client. This professional information is to be used for full protection of the client. Written consent from the client (or legal guardian, if a minor) should be secured prior to the use of such information for instructional, supervisory and/or research purposes. Policies of the applied counseling setting regarding client records also should be followed.

1.05 Supervisors shall adhere to current professional and legal guidelines when conducting research with human participants such as Section D-1 of the ACA Ethical Standards.

1.06 Counseling supervisors are responsible for making every effort to monitor both the professional actions, and failures to take action, of their supervisees.
2. CLIENT WELFARE AND RIGHTS

Inherent and integral to the role of supervisor are responsibilities for:

a. Monitoring client welfare;

b. Encouraging compliance with relevant legal, ethical, and professional standards for clinical practice;

c. Monitoring clinical performance and professional development of supervisees; and


2.01 Supervisors should have had training in supervision prior to initialing their role as supervisors.

2.02 Supervisors should pursue professional and personal continuing education activities such as advanced courses, seminars, and professional conferences on a regular and ongoing basis. These activities should include both counseling and supervision topics and skills.

2.03 Supervisors should make their supervisees aware of professional and ethical standards and legal responsibilities of the counseling profession.

2.04 Supervisors of post-degree counselors who are seeking state licensure should encourage these counselors to adhere to the standards for practice established by the state licensure board of the state in which they practice.
2.05  Procedures for contacting the supervisor, or an alternative supervisor, to assist in handling crisis situations should be established and communicated to supervisees.

2.06  Actual work samples via audio and/or video tape or live observation in addition to case notes should be reviewed by the supervisor as a regular part of the ongoing supervisory process.

2.07  Supervisors of counselors should meet regularly in face-to-face sessions with their supervisees.

2.08  Supervisors should provide supervisees with ongoing feedback on their performance. This feedback should take a variety of forms, both formal and informal, and should include verbal and written evaluations. It should be formative during the supervisory experience and summative at the conclusion of the experience.

2.09  Supervisors who have multiple roles (e.g., teacher, clinical supervisor, administrative supervisor, etc.) with supervisees should minimize potential conflicts. Where possible, the roles should be divided among several supervisors. Where this is not possible, careful explanation should be conveyed to the supervisee as to the expectations and responsibilities associated with each supervisory role.

2.10  Supervisors should not participate in any form of sexual contact with supervisees. Supervisors should not engage in any form of social contact or interaction, which would compromise the supervisor-
supervisee relationship. Dual relationships with supervisees that might impair the supervisor’s objectivity and professional judgment should be avoided and/or the supervisory relationship terminated.

2.11 Supervisors should not establish a psychotherapeutic relationship as a substitute for supervision. Personal issues should be addressed in supervision only in terms of the impact of these issues on clients and on professional functioning.

2.12 Supervisors, through ongoing supervisee assessment and evaluation, should be aware of any personal or professional limitations of supervisees which are likely to impede future professional performance. Supervisors have the responsibility of recommending remedial assistance to the supervisee and of screening from the training program, applied counseling setting, or state licensure those supervisees who are unable to provide competent professional services. These recommendations should be clearly and professionally explained in writing to the supervisees who are so evaluated.

2.13 Supervisors should not endorse a supervisee for certification, licensure, completion of an academic training program, or continued employment if the supervisor believes the supervisee is impaired in any way that would interfere with the performance of counseling duties. The presence of any such impairment should be gin a
process of feedback and remediation wherever possible so that the supervisee understands the nature of the impairment and has the opportunity to remedy the problem and continue with his/her professional development.

2.14 Supervisors should incorporate the principles of informed consent and participation; clarity of requirements, expectations, roles and rules; and due process and appeal into the establishment of policies and procedures of their institutions, program, courses, and individual supervisory relationships. Mechanisms for due process appeal of individual supervisory actions should be established and made available to all supervisees.

3. Program Administration Role

3.01 Supervisors should ensure that the programs conducted and experiences provided are in keeping with current guidelines and standards of ACA and its divisions.

3.02 Supervisors should teach courses and/or supervise clinical work only in areas where they are fully competent and experienced.

3.03 To achieve the highest quality of training and supervision, supervisors should be active participants in peer review and peer supervision procedures.

3.04 Supervisors should provide experiences that integrate theoretical knowledge and practical application. Supervisors also should provide
opportunities in which supervisees are able to apply the knowledge they
have learned and understand the rationale for the skills they have acquired.
The knowledge and skills conveyed should reflect current practice,
research findings, and available resources.

3.05 Professional competencies, specific courses, and/or required
experiences expected of supervisees should be communicated to them in
writing prior to admission to the training program or
placement/employment by the applied counseling setting, and, in case of
continued employment, in a timely manner.

3.06 Supervisors should accept only those persons as supervisees who meet
identified entry level requirements for admission to a program of
counselor training or for placement in an applied counseling setting. In
the case of private supervision in search of state licensure, supervisees
should have completed all necessary prerequisites as determined by the
state licensure board.

3.07 Supervisors should inform supervisees of the goals, policies,
theoretical orientation toward counseling, training, and supervision model
or approach on which the supervision is based.

3.08 Supervisees should be encouraged and assisted to define their own
theoretical orientation toward counseling, to establish supervision goals
for themselves, and to monitor and evaluate their progress toward meeting
these goals.
3.09 Supervisors should assess supervisees’ skills and experience in order to establish standards for competent professional behavior. Supervisors should restrict supervisees’ activities to those that are commensurate with their current level of skills and experiences.

3.10 Supervisors should obtain practicum and fieldwork sites that meet minimum standards for preparing student to become effective counselors. No practicum or fieldwork setting should be approved unless it truly replicates a counseling work setting.

3.11 Practicum and fieldwork classes would be limited in size according to established professional standards to ensure that each student has ample opportunity for individual supervision and feedback. Supervisors in applied counseling settings should have a limited number of supervisees.

3.12 Supervisors in university settings should establish and communicate specific policies and procedures regarding field placement of students. The respective roles of the student counselor, the university supervisor and the field supervisor should be clearly differentiated in areas such as evaluation, requirements, and confidentiality.

3.13 Supervisors in training programs should communicate regularly with supervisors in agencies used as practicum and/or fieldwork sites regarding current professional practices, expectations of students, and preferred models and modalities of supervision.
3.14 Supervisors at the university should establish clear lines of communication among themselves, the field supervisors, and the students/supervisees.

3.15 Supervisors should establish and communicate to supervisees and to field supervisors specific procedures regarding consultation, performance review, and evaluation of supervisees.

3.16 Evaluations of supervisee performance in universities and in applied counseling settings should be available to supervisees in ways consistent with the Family Rights and Privacy Act and the Buckley Amendment.

3.17 Forms of training that focus primarily on self-understanding and problem resolution (e.g., personal growth groups or individual counseling) should be voluntary. Those who conduct these forms of training should not serve simultaneously as supervisors of the supervisees involved in training.

3.18 A supervisor may recommend participation in activities such as personal growth groups or personal counseling when it has been determined that a supervision has deficits in the areas of self-understanding and problem resolution which impede his/her professional functioning. The supervisors should not be the direct provider of these activities for the supervisee.

3.19 When a training program conducts a personal growth or counseling experience involving relatively intimate self disclosure, care should be taken to eliminate or minimize potential role conflicts for faculty and/or
agency supervisor who may conduct these experiences and who also serve as teachers, group leaders, and clinical directors.

3.20 Supervisor should use the following prioritized sequence in resolving conflicts among the needs of the client, the needs of the supervisee, and the needs of the program or agency. Insofar as the client must be protected, it should be understood that client welfare is usually subsumed in federal and state laws such that these statutes should be the first point of reference. Where laws and ethical standards are not present or are unclear, the good judgment of the supervisor should be guided by the following list.

a. Relevant legal and ethical standards (e.g., duty to warn, state child abuse laws, etc.);

b. Client welfare;

c. Supervisee welfare;

d. Supervisor welfare; and

e. Program and/or agency service and administrative needs.
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Counselor Supervisor Questionnaire
Counselor Supervisor Questionnaire

Below are list several statements that have been derived from the Supervisory Code of Ethics of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. Please respond to each item TWO times. The first set of responses is your opinion of how important this item is for your role of supervisor. The second response is your opinion of how well trained you are in each area. Responses will be based on the use of a scale where 0-5: 0=no importance or no training, to 5=very important or a great deal of training (a great deal of training meaning university coursework and supervised internship)

Have you had any training at a university in supervision? ______ Yes ______ No

Answer each question TWO times, circling the most appropriate option reflecting your perception, using the following scale:

0 = no importance or no training
1 = somewhat important or some training
2 = fairly important or fair amount of training
3 = moderately important or moderate amount of training
4 = very important or a great deal of training

1. Supervisors should have had training in supervision prior to initiating their role as supervisors.

   Importance 0 1 2 3 4
   Training 0 1 2 3 4

2. Supervisors should pursue professional and personal continuing education activities such as advanced courses, seminars, and professional conferences on a regular and ongoing basis.

   Importance 0 1 2 3 4
   Training 0 1 2 3 4

3. Supervisors should know how to make their supervisees aware of professional and ethical standards and legal responsibilities of the counseling profession.

   Importance 0 1 2 3 4
   Training 0 1 2 3 4
4. Supervisors should know how to encourage their counseling supervisees to adhere to the standards for practice established by the state licensure board of the state in which they practice.

| Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Training   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

5. Supervisors know how to establish procedures, and communicate them to the supervisee, for contacting the supervisor, or an alternative supervisor, when the supervisee needs assistance in handling crisis situations.

| Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Training   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

6. Supervisors should know how to review actual work samples via audio and/or videotape or live observation in addition to case notes.

| Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Training   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

7. Supervisors should know how to review the supervisee’s case notes as a regular part of the ongoing supervisory process.

| Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Training   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

8. Supervisors of counselors should know how to conduct the supervisory session when meeting face to face with their supervisees.

| Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Training   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

9. Supervisors should know how to provide feedback to supervisees using a variety of forms of evaluation.

| Importance | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Training   | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
10. Supervisors who have multiple roles (e.g., teacher, clinical supervisor, administrative supervisor, etc.) with supervisees should, where possible, be able to minimize potential conflicts.

Importance  0  1  2  3  4  
Training     0  1  2  3  4  

11. Supervisors should know that they should not participate in any form of social or sexual contact, or other relationships that would compromise the supervisor-supervisee role.

Importance  0  1  2  3  4  
Training     0  1  2  3  4  

12. Supervisors should know that they are not to establish a psychotherapeutic relationship with the supervisee as a substitute for supervision.

Importance  0  1  2  3  4  
Training     0  1  2  3  4  

13. Supervisors should know how to conduct ongoing supervisee assessment and evaluation in order to be aware of any personal or professional limitations of supervisees, which are likely to impede future professional performance.

Importance  0  1  2  3  4  
Training     0  1  2  3  4  

14. Supervisors should know how to make clear and professional recommendations to supervisees who may need remedial assistance or screening from the applied counseling setting.

Importance  0  1  2  3  4  
Training     0  1  2  3  4  

15. Supervisors should know how to make both positive and negative recommendations for employment, training and/or state licensure.

Importance  0  1  2  3  4  
Training     0  1  2  3  4  
16. Supervisors should know how to incorporate the principles of informed consent and participation; clarity of requirements, expectations, roles and rules; and due process and appeal into the establishment of policies and procedures with their supervisees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cover Letter
Dear Participant:

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation titled: A Comparison of the Perceptions of the Importance of Formal Supervision Training Between Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors and Non-Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors. This study is being completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education, in the Counselor Education Program at Duquesne University.

As someone who has participated as a counselor supervisor for one or more of our practicum or internship students, I would like to request your participation in a project that seeks to improve the quality of the supervision provided to our students. Your participation will contribute to the depth of literature regarding supervision and to the creation of continued supervisory training opportunities in the Counselor Education Program at Duquesne University.

There will be no risk to you as a participant and your total anonymity will be guaranteed. Your name will never appear in any survey or research instrument. No identity will be made in the data analysis. All written material will be stored in a locked file in the researcher’s office. All materials will be destroyed at the completion of the study. You are under no obligation to participate in this study and you are free to withdraw your consent to participate at any time.

Please take approximately 5 minutes to complete the Counselor Supervisor Questionnaire. All responses will remain confidential. I appreciate your return of the questionnaire to me using the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed in this packet. If there are any further questions, I can be reached at 412-310-5737.

Thank you for your time and consideration when completing this questionnaire. I truly appreciate your help!

Sincerely,

Maura Krushinski
Ed.D. Candidate

Nicholas J. Hanna
Dissertation Chair
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INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS

TITLE: A Comparison of the Perceptions of the Importance of Formal Supervision Training Between Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors and Non-Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors.

INVESTIGATOR: Maura Krushinski, M.S.Ed.
5816 Darlington Rd.
Pittsburgh, PA  15217
(412) 310-5737

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:
Dr. Nicholas J. Hanna (Chair)
Dr. Paul Bernstein
Dr. Joseph Maola
Duquesne University, Counselor Education Program

SOURCES OF SUPPORT: This study is being performed as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree in Counselor Education and Supervision at Duquesne University.

PURPOSE: You are being asked to participate in a research project that will explore the importance of training supervision related to certain supervisory tasks. Each participant is asked to fill out a brief survey, taking approximately five minutes. Please circle the response to each question next to the response to each question that best represents your answer. Return the survey in the addressed, stamped envelope provided.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: It is highly irregular for a research subject to experience discomfort during or following this type of research. Your participation will help contribute to the professional literature, and explore an area that remains under-investigated. Please know, by returning this survey, you are consenting to voluntarily participate in this research. To ensure confidentiality, subjects are selected at random, and names are not used on returned surveys. No identity will be made in data analysis. All written materials will be stored in a locked file in the researcher’s office. All protocols will be destroyed at the completion of the research.

RIGHT TO DRAW: You are under no obligation to complete the survey or participate in this study. You will receive no compensation for your participation.
RESULTS AND QUESTIONS: A summary of the results of this research will be furnished to you, at no cost, upon request by emailing krushinski@duq.edu. If you any questions, you may call Dr. Paul Richer, Chair of Duquesne University Institutional Review Board (412-396-6326).
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Abstract
A COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF FORMAL SUPERVISION TRAINING BETWEEN FORMALLY TRAINED COUNSELOR SUPERVISORS AND NON-FORMALLY TRAINED COUNSELOR SUPERVISORS
Maura F. Krushinski
Doctor of Education, December 2004
Duquesne University
Chair: Nicholas J. Hanna, Ph.D.

A Comparison of the Perceptions of the Importance of Formal Supervision Training Between Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors and Non-Formally Trained Counselor Supervisors explores differences among and between doctoral student and field site professionals who provide supervision to master’s level counselor trainees. All master’s level counseling students in the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) programs participate in a practicum and internship as a requirement for completion of the master’s program in counseling. The field experience occurs in a mental health agency or school, and requires the assistance and mentoring of an on-site supervisor. There is a dearth of literature that assesses the effectiveness of those academically untrained professionals who supervise master’s level counselor trainees. Because counselor supervisors have considerable autonomy regarding how they supervise, this study sought to measure their perceptions of the importance of supervisory training. Recommendations regarding standards for field site supervision of master’s level counselor trainees may significantly contribute to the literature, as well as contributing to a design for formalized site supervisor training. This researcher hopes to contribute to the professional development of the master’s level counselor trainee. By understanding the perceived importance of training to the field site professional providing supervision, informed decisions can be made for placing future master’s level counselor
trainees in field site placements with professionals trained in supervision. Additionally, academic institutions can gain significant information that will contribute to the planning and implementation of supervision curriculum for master’s level counseling students. The primary research question of this study is what importance do counselor supervisors attribute to the training that prepares them to provide effective supervision to master’s level counselor trainees? A 16-item survey, called the Counselor Supervision Questionnaire (CSQ), was developed to help clarify various aspects of the primary research question.