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Supervision in counseling is essential to the personal and professional growth of counselors, and ensures client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). The purpose of this study was to examine supervisees’ perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy, with supervision experiences they have during practicum and/or internship. Specifically, the association these perceived levels of satisfaction, the SWA, and self-efficacy had with supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum or internship) were explored. Additionally, this study investigated how multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) were related to supervisees’ perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy. Participants consisted of 165 graduate students currently enrolled in a CACREP accredited counseling program. These participants also had to be in Practicum or Internship stage of the program and receiving supervision. Three survey instruments, the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ), the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAIT-T), and the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE), were compiled and sent electronically to the participants. This study did not find significance possibly due to limited sample size and low power, but the study did find the participants reported high supervision satisfaction, moderate SWA, and moderate counselor self-efficacy. Also, participants in the internship stage reported higher satisfaction than students in the practicum stage. There was no main effect found for race/ethnicity and religion/spirituality in
regards to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. However, there was a main effect found for gender and counselor self-efficacy.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

In counseling, supervision is the setting where counselor trainees receive feedback about their counseling skills in order to facilitate counselor personal and professional development to ultimately ensure client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). Supervision may be used to help prevent counselor burnout and may also help to reduce stress related to job duties among counselors (Briggs & Miller, 2005). Supervision has been so essential to the counseling profession that development of state regulatory boards, professional credentialing groups, and accrediting bodies have established guidelines to ensure counselor trainees receive an appropriate amount of supervision, supervisor have the qualifications necessary to supervise, and the amount of supervised practice necessary for licensure (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013).

Since supervision is crucial to counselor trainee development, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) has required all students in CACREP-accredited programs to complete practicum and internship field experiences towards the end of their master’s programs. While in practicum and internship students receive weekly individual or triadic supervision that averages one hour per week either from their site or university supervisors, or both. In addition to individual site and university supervision, CACREP requires all students to attend weekly group supervision meetings which are usually led by a faculty member or doctoral student (CACREP, 2009).

Previous research has shown that satisfaction with supervision is an important outcome variable to explore because it ultimately helps facilitate supervisee development as a counselor. Past research has focused on several different supervisee factors associated with supervision satisfaction which included the following: enhanced problem solving ability, clarifying of concerns during supervision, supervisees’ perceived input during supervision, and perceived
relationship quality in supervision (Zarbock, Drews, Bodansky, & Dahme, 2009). Other research has focused on supervisory style (i.e., administrative or clinical) when assessing supervisee satisfaction. Herbert and Trusty (2006) found that supervisees reported they significantly preferred a clinical supervisory style over an administrative supervisory style, meaning they preferred the supervisor to discuss counseling behaviors and processes. Recent qualitative research has explored factors of supervisees that may increase their levels of perceived satisfaction. Norem, Magnuson, Wilcoxon, and Arbel (2006) found six attributes that supervisees possess that may lead to higher perceived levels of satisfaction with supervision: maturity, autonomy, perspicacity, motivation, self-awareness, and openness to experiences. Supervisees’ professional development has also been explored with supervision satisfaction. Foster, Lichtenberg, and Peyton (2007) found when supervisees’ perceived their relationship with their supervisor as weak, they also reported a lower amount of perceived professional development.

The supervisory working alliance (SWA) is most commonly defined as the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee. That relationship between supervisor and supervisee is measured by three characteristics: goals, tasks, and bond (Bordin, 1983). The SWA is considered an important aspect of supervision because it may parallel the relationship between supervisee and client (Patton & Kivlghan, 1997). Research has shown there may be a positive relationship between clients’ perceived working alliance and supervisee perceived SWA, thus supporting the need to explore what factors may contribute to a positive, healthy SWA (Patton & Kivlghan, 1997). One of those factors may be utilizing healthy coping skills. Supervisees who have well developed coping skills and resources have been shown to perceive a significantly stronger working alliance (Gnilka, Chang, & Dew, 2012). Supervisees, who perceive their
supervisory working alliance as strong, often may perceive their working alliance with the client strong as well (Gnilka et al., 2012). Further, Ladany, Ellis, and Friedlander (1999) found that when supervisees’ perceived a strong emotional bond with their supervisor, they also reported having a stronger perceived self-efficacy.

Research has shown that the quality of relationship between supervisor and supervisee is an important predictor of overall satisfaction with supervision, as well as supervisee development. Supervisory style has an impact on supervisors perceived SWA. Supervisors who perceived themselves as warm and friendly during supervision viewed the supervision process as trusting and had a mutual agreement on the tasks of supervision with their supervisees (Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). In addition, supervisors who reported their supervisory style as attractive perceived themselves as having a stronger SWA with their supervisees. In some cases, supervisors’ perceived SWA differs from the supervisees’ SWA. For example, Bilodeau, Savard and Lecomte (2010) found that supervisees rated the SWA as significantly stronger than their supervisors rated the SWA.

Another important process in supervision involves supervisee perceived self-efficacy. Bandura (1977, 1982) defined self-efficacy as the belief in one’s ability to successfully execute a desired task. Bernard and Goodyear (2013) noted that self-efficacy can be considered a supervisee attribute that can change with experience and training. Self-efficacy may be gained through courses and through successfully practicing counseling skills with clients. Thus, the more a supervisee demonstrates their counseling skills with clients the more self-efficacy they may have. Cashwell and Dooley (2001) found that professional counselors who were receiving supervision reported having significantly enhanced counseling skills, more than those counselors
who were not receiving supervision. Thus, counseling self-efficacy may be associated with skill
development.

Research involving perceived self-efficacy in supervision has shown that many factors
can affect the level of supervisee self-efficacy. The type of feedback given from the supervisor
has been shown to affect supervisees' perceived levels of self-efficacy. Positive feedback was
shown to be associated with supervisee self-efficacy, and negative feedback was linked to
increased anxiety in supervisees about their counseling ability (Daniels & Larson, 2001). Self-
reflection may help the supervisee assess their counseling skills accurately and begin to develop
new counseling skills when appropriate, relating to an increase in their self-efficacy.

Multicultural variables also play an important role in clinical supervision. Research has
shown race/ethnicity, gender, and religion/spirituality as being important in supervision
outcomes. There is an increasing amount of supervisors that practice multicultural supervision,
meaning attention to cultural issues is being brought up during supervision sessions (Ancis &
Marshall 2010). The impact of supervisor-supervisee race/ethnicity match is a widely researched
topic in supervision. Discussing similarities and differences in ethnicity resulted in supervisees
reporting higher overall SWA with their supervisors (Gatmon et al., 2001).

Constantine and Sue (2007) explored Black supervisees and their dissatisfaction with
their White supervisors. They found that Black supervisees reported their supervisors made
stereotypical assumptions about them, minimized or avoided discussing racial issues in
supervision, and were reluctant to give performance feedback in fear of being seen as racist.
Black supervisees also were found to have lower levels of satisfaction with supervision than
other races (Constantine & Sue, 2007). The racial identity levels of supervisee and supervisor
have also been explored in supervision research. Dyads with similar high racial identity levels
reported the strongest working alliance and dyads that reported low racial identity development had the weakest working alliance (Bhat & Davis, 2007).

Another variable explored in supervision research is gender. McHale and Carr (1998) found that female supervisors used a more directive style than male supervisors, and supervisee gender did not make a difference on the supervisors’ style. Also, supervisees who had a male supervisor reported contributing less to the supervision session, regardless of their gender. Additionally, when gender similarities are discussed during supervision, supervisees report higher levels of satisfaction (Gatmon et al., 2001).

Finally, religion/spirituality is an important variable that has not fully been explored in supervision literature. Since 92% of Americans reportedly believe in God (Polling Report, 2011), it is safe to say that religion and/or spirituality may play a role during supervision, specifically the degree of religious/spiritual practice. For example, a supervisee may have a client who wants to explore religion/spirituality, or a supervisee may want to explore religion/spirituality with their supervisor. Ripley et al. (2007) found that supervisors reported they inquired about their supervisees religious and spiritual views during supervision, frequently incorporate spiritual issues into supervision, and inquired how committed supervisees were with their own personal religious and spiritual beliefs. Miller and Ivey (2006) suggested that creating an open, honest environment where supervisors disclosed their religious beliefs helped supervisees feel more at ease with the topic and more open to exploring religion/spirituality with their clients.

Overall there has been research done on supervision satisfaction, the SWA, and counselor self-efficacy. Unfortunately, there has been a lack of research integrating these three factors in one study. Also, there has been research conducted on race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of
practice of religion/spiritual affiliation, but there has been a lack of research that integrated all three of those variables and explored their relationship and interactions on supervision outcomes. There is also a lack of research concerning supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and supervisee type (i.e., practicum or internship) and if they are associated with the three factors of satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Finally, there is a lack of research investigating what relationship race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice of religion/spiritual affiliation have with supervision satisfaction, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.

There are many different factors that may affect the supervision process. Combining all three of these multicultural variables may give some insight into the supervision process and some of the uncontrollable variables that may affect satisfaction, SWA, and counselor self-efficacy. Supervision pairings may be more important that previously realized in terms of satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. If supervisor and supervisee type affect the supervision process, this study could help to add evidence on how supervision is conducted for future students. Thus, this study will explore the relationship among supervision satisfaction, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy along with its association with multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of religion/spiritual practice), supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student), and supervisee type (i.e., practicum or internship).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study will be to examine supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy, with supervision experiences they have during practicum and/or internship. Specifically, the association these perceived levels of satisfaction, the SWA, and self-efficacy may have with supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty,
adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum or internship) will be explored. Additionally, this study will investigate how multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) may be related to supervisees’ perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and hypotheses will be used to explore supervisees’ perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and self-efficacy, along with supervisee type (i.e., practicum or internship) and supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student). Additionally, multicultural variables of race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation will be examined in relation to perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 1: What do counselor trainees report with respect to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 1: Counselor trainees will report moderate supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between university supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum and internship students for supervisees’ perceived levels of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 2a: There will be a significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Specifically, supervisees who are assigned a full-time faculty member as their university supervisor will report significantly greater supervisee satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and self-efficacy.
Hypothesis 2b: There will be a significant main effect for student type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Internship students will report significantly higher levels of perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 2c: There will be a significant main effect for student type and university supervisor type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision?

Hypothesis 3a: There will be a significant main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. White supervisees will report significantly higher supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3c: There will be no significant main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3d: There will be no significant interaction effect for multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 4: Are perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a significant main effect for perceived racial/ethnic differences and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Perceived differences will be related to lower supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.
Hypothesis 4b: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be no significant main effect for perceived degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4d: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are given to help specify the most commonly used terms throughout this study. These terms are clarified to increase understanding for the current study.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision, used throughout this study, is defined by Bernard and Goodyear (2013) as

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative and hierarchical, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he, or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession. (p. 7)

Supervision Satisfaction

Supervision satisfaction has been broadly defined by Holloway and Wampold (1983) as the supervisees’ understanding of their actions and interactions while in supervision, their interpretation of their supervisors’ perceived performance and personal characteristics, and the level of ease in expressing their thoughts during supervision. Building upon Holloway and
Wampold’s definition, Ladany et al. (1999) stated satisfaction with supervision is “when the goals and tasks of supervision are clearly understood” (p. 448).

**Supervisory Working Alliance**

SWA refers to the relationship between supervisee and supervisor. Bordin (1983) developed a SWA model which consisted of three characteristics shared between supervisee and supervisor: goals, tasks, and bond. Specifically, the three characteristics are “(1) mutual agreements and understandings regarding the goals sought in the change process; (2) the tasks of each of the partners; and (3) the bonds between the partners necessary to sustain the enterprise” (p. 35).

**Supervisee Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy is defined as an individual’s belief they can perform a certain task (Bandura, 1977, 1982). Supervisee self-efficacy refers to the perceived level supervisees feel competent in providing counseling to clients. Bandura (1982) also suggested that a supervisee who has a higher level of self-efficacy will also have a higher level of task performance. Supervisee self-efficacy will be measured using a counselor self-efficacy instrument.

**Supervisee**

The term supervisee refers to master’s level students who are enrolled in CACREP accredited graduate counseling programs receiving individual, triadic, and/or group clinical supervision.

**Practicum**

The term practicum is defined as the initial clinical experience students have to apply skills and knowledge previously learned in their courses. CACREP requires a minimum of 100
clock hours, with 40 hours being direct service with clients, and 10 hours of group counseling (CACREP, 2009).

**Internship**

The term internship is defined as the clinical experience students have to apply intermediate skills and knowledge previously learned in their courses and in practicum. CACREP requires a minimum of 600 clock hours, with 240 hours being direct service with clients (CACREP, 2009).

**Supervisor**

The term supervisor refers to a full-time faculty member, doctoral student, or adjunct faculty who provides individual, triadic, and/or group clinical supervision for the supervisee.

**Faculty Member**

A faculty member is defined as a full-time professor in a counseling program who teaches master’s and/or doctoral level counseling courses.

**Doctoral Student**

The term doctoral student refers to a student who is currently enrolled in a doctoral-level counselor education program and has completed introductory supervision courses, and who provides supervision for students enrolled in a master’s program.

**Adjunct Faculty**

Adjunct faculty is defined as a part-time faculty member who teaches master’s and/or doctoral level counseling courses.

**Race**
The term race can be defined as a group of people having similar physical features (McAuliffe, 2008). Examples may include, but are not limited to the following: Asian American, African American, Biracial/Multiracial and White/European American.

**Ethnicity**

The term ethnicity, for purposes of this study, is defined as a group of people who have similar origins, geographical locations, similar languages, and customs (McAuliffe, 2008). Examples may include, but are not limited to the following: Hispanic, and Native American.

**Gender**

The term gender is included in this study as an independent variable, has many meanings, and is a fundamental concept of how one may view the world (Hays & Erford, 2009). Gender is defined as “the psychological, social, and cultural features and characteristics that have become strongly associated with the biological categories of male or female” (Gilbert & Scher, 1999, p. 3). Gender may also be a combination of genetics and environment, and also may be constructed by stereotypes society may place upon the different sexes (Doughty & Leddick, 2007).

**Religion**

The term religion is defined as “the feelings, thoughts, experiences, and behaviors that arise from a search for the sacred” and “a search for the non-sacred conducted in a setting or context that is designed to foster the search for the sacred” (Hill et al., 2000, p.66). Examples of religion can include but are not limited to the following: Buddhism, Hinduism, Christianity, and Muslim.

**Spirituality**

Spirituality can be considered personal, developmental, and often difficult to define, as spirituality is unique to each individual and develops over time (Hays & Erford, 2009). The term
spirituality can be defined as "the feelings, thoughts, experiences, and behaviors that arise from a search for the sacred" (Hill et al., 2000, p.66).

Assumptions

Assumptions in research are conditions that are taken for granted and thought to be true by the researcher (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). This study is based on the assumption that participants will respond to the survey items willingly and honestly. Data collection and interpretation of data will be assumed to be accurately recorded. It will be assumed that the CACREP liaison will distribute the surveys to the students' at their university who meet criteria for the study. It will be assumed that CACREP accredited programs currently abide by supervision standards. It will be assumed that supervision meetings will have occurred regularly (i.e., weekly). Also, it will be assumed that supervisees will rate the supervisor they have the most contact with, and will only rate one supervisor while completing the survey items. Additionally, it will be assumed that the instruments used in this study, the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett & Nutt, 1996), the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T; Efstation, Patton & Kardash, 1990), and the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE; Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992) are reliable and valid instruments.

Delimitations

Delimitations in research are defined as everything the researcher does not intend to study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The researcher can intentionally focus the study to what is relevant to the problem under investigation. Intentionally limiting what the study will focus on can help to clarify generalizability and who may benefit from the results (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010).
This study will only address supervisees who are still currently enrolled in a master’s level graduate program. This study will not address supervisees who have completed a graduate program and are employed as counselors. Only the supervisor with whom the supervisee has the most contact will be explored, supervisor ratings across modalities will not be explored. Additionally, only counseling graduate programs that are CACREP-accredited will be examined in this study. Programs that are seeking accreditation, but have not been approved will not be a part of this study. This study is also only concerned with supervisees’ perceptions of multicultural variables of their supervisor, not the supervisors’ actual stated cultural identity. This study also only examines supervisees’ perceptions of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Supervisors will not be asked for their experiences with supervision in regards to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Summary

Ultimately, clinical supervision is an essential part of counselor training, and there are many different aspects that can affect the outcome. Ensuring supervisees obtain beneficial supervision is crucial to the development of supervisees counseling skills and establishing proper client care (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). Research has shown satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy to be three factors that have been shown to affect supervision outcomes, as well as multicultural variables. Finally, this study will examine the association between perceived satisfaction, the SWA, and self-efficacy, its association with supervisor and supervisee type, and if there is any perceived relationship with multicultural factors in supervision.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents literature related to supervision satisfaction, SWA, supervisee self-efficacy, and multicultural factors that impact the overall supervision process. First, the importance of clinical supervision is discussed. Then, literature involving supervision satisfaction is provided. Next, the supervisory working alliance is defined and literature examining its importance concerning supervision is presented. This chapter also examines supervisees' levels of self-efficacy in relation with supervision, along with literature that includes all three variables of supervision satisfaction, supervisory working alliance and counselor self-efficacy. Finally, multicultural factors involved in supervision are described: race, gender, and religion/spirituality.

Clinical Supervision

Clinical supervision is an important part of the counseling profession. Bernard and Goodyear (2013) defined clinical supervision as

An intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative and hierarchical, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more senior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he, or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession. (p. 7)

According to Bernard and Goodyear (2013), clinical supervision has two central purposes: “(1) to foster the supervisee’s professional development and (2) to ensure client welfare” (p. 12). It can help the clinician conceptualize client cases and make decisions about
counseling interventions most appropriate for a client. Successful supervision can also be used to prevent counselor burnout and stress reduction, as counselors in training may become anxious, concerned, and overwhelmed about their development into competent professionals (Briggs & Miller, 2005). Supervision can also help counselors in training gain greater insight into counseling theories and techniques that may help to ensure higher quality client care. Ultimately, supervision is best used to improve the quality of care the client receives and the growth and functioning of the supervisee in a professional setting (Crockett, 2011). In counseling, supervision has become very important and professional counseling organizations have developed standards for appropriate practice.

The American Counseling Association (ACA) developed a code of ethics that has a section devoted to supervision, teaching and training that supervisors in the counseling profession are to follow. This section has five subsections that guide supervision practices. ACA (2014) ethical code F.1. relates to Counselor Supervision and Client Welfare and maintains that the supervisor monitor client welfare and supervisee clinical performance. Ethical code F.2 states counselors must be appropriately trained to supervise and participate in continuing education activities. Ethical code F.3 informs supervisors of appropriate supervisor relationship boundaries. Ethical code F.4 explains supervisor responsibilities which include: providing informed consent for supervision, emergencies and absences, termination for supervision, standards for supervisees. ACA Ethical code F.5 explains the procedures for evaluation, remediation, and endorsement for supervisees.

In addition, the CACREP has standards that require students in practicum and internship courses to engage in weekly supervision (CACREP 2009, Section III F). Students are required to participate in, on average, one hour per week of individual and/or triadic supervision usually
performed at their internship site. Also, internship students are required to attend, on average, one and a half hours of group supervision at their university. Students are required to record counseling sessions when appropriate consent is given by the client. The audio or video recordings are to be shown to their site and university supervisors during weekly supervision sessions. The student will be evaluated by the supervisor at the end of the semester, and the student will also evaluate their supervisor. The university supervisor is required to have completed coursework in supervision, is usually a faculty member or a doctoral student in a counselor education and supervision program. The site supervisor could be licensed in any of the following areas: counseling, school counseling, psychology, social work, psychiatry, or marriage and family therapy (CACREP Standards, 2009).

**Supervision Satisfaction**

One of many factors that contribute to successful clinical supervision is supervision satisfaction. This is a widely studied outcome variable in previous literature. Supervision satisfaction is an important outcome variable as it ultimately helps facilitate the supervisees' growth as a counselor. A broad definition of supervision satisfaction proposed by Holloway and Wampold (1983) states many factors contribute to overall satisfaction including supervisees' understanding of their actions and interactions while in supervision, their interpretation of their supervisors' perceived performance and personal characteristics, and the level of ease in expressing their thoughts during supervision. Ladany et al. (1999) built upon Holloway and Wampold's (1983) definition and defined supervisee satisfaction as occurring "when the goals and tasks of supervision are clearly understood" (p. 448).

Fernando (2013) explored supervisor type and supervision satisfaction and self-efficacy. She sampled 85 counseling students enrolled in CACREP accredited graduate programs. These
students received supervision from either a doctoral student or a faculty member. Students reported being more satisfied with their supervision when supervised by a doctoral student than a faculty member. Fernando (2013) also found that students significantly reported higher levels of satisfaction and self-efficacy when paired with a doctoral student supervisor than with a faculty member.

Herbert and Trusty (2006) explored the factors that affect supervision satisfaction in the public vocational rehabilitation program. They conducted a descriptive study and surveyed 104 supervisees and 39 supervisors reported these factors: supervisory style (administrative or clinical), gender, and supervisory roles (administrator, consultant, counselor, evaluator, or teacher). Supervisees reported they significantly preferred a clinical supervisory style over an administrative supervisory style, meaning they preferred the supervisor to discuss counseling behaviors and processes rather than agency policies and procedures (Herbert & Trusty, 2006). In terms of gender, male supervisees reported being more satisfied with supervision than female supervisees. Results also indicated that supervisees who perceived their supervisors in the role of consultant reported a higher level of satisfaction with supervision than any of the other supervisory roles (Herbert & Trusty, 2006).

A variety of other factors can contribute to supervision satisfaction. Norem et al. (2006) conducted a qualitative study whereby 12 supervisors collectively identified six attributes that supervisees possess that may lead to more successful supervision experiences and satisfaction: maturity, autonomy, perspicacity, motivation, self-awareness, and open to experiences. Norem et al. stated maturity in supervisees is “from a variety of life experiences, including exposure to diverse ideas and people, stellar supervisees acquire information and gain understanding of themselves and the counseling profession” (p. 40). Autonomy in supervisees is defined as
"having sufficient self-confidence and self-efficacy to try new behaviors as well as accept and evaluate feedback from others" (p. 40). Supervisee perspicacity is associated with having strong counseling skills, possessing a strong use and understanding of counseling theory, having characteristics associated with wisdom, and using rational processes during counseling. Motivation is described as supervisees exceeding the minimum requirements of supervision, being proactive, and being committed to professional growth and excellence in counseling. Self-awareness is described as supervisees’ ability to identify strengths, weaknesses, and their ability to self-monitor emotional responses of clients and supervisors. Finally, openness to experiences refers to supervisees’ ability to accept and apply feedback and try new techniques and strategies in counseling. Norem et al. provided additional knowledge to what characteristics a supervisee may have in order for supervision to be considered satisfying from the supervisors’ perspective. Norem’s study appears to identify six characteristics a supervisee may have in order to be successful in supervision, but additional factors may play a role in their satisfaction that aren’t being accounted.

Satisfaction with supervision has also been proposed to have three dimensions: overall satisfaction with supervision, satisfaction with the supervisees’ contributions, and satisfaction with the supervisors’ contributions (Zarbock et al., 2009). Satisfaction from supervision can be perceived differently by the supervisee and the supervisor, as each party may have different ideas of what makes supervision satisfying. Zarbock et al. (2009) sampled 37 supervisors and 90 supervisees and found that supervisee and supervisor perceptions differed in terms of supervision satisfaction, in particular that supervisors could not identify what the supervisees were experiencing during the supervision session. Results indicated that the relationship, especially, the emotional bond between the supervisee and supervisor, was reported as the most significant
indicator of satisfaction with supervision (Zarbock et al., 2009). Overall supervisee satisfaction with supervision included problem solving ability, clarifying of concerns during supervision, supervisees' perceived input during supervision, and perceived relationship quality in supervision (Zarbock et al., 2009).

Supervision satisfaction has also been measured in terms of supervisees' perceived professional development (Foster et al., 2007). Foster et al. (2007) sampled 90 supervisees and 90 supervisors and found that when supervisees' perceived a weaker relationship with their supervisors, they also reported lower levels of perceived professional development. However, when supervisors rated supervisee development they did not indicate a relationship between their relationship with the supervisee and perceived supervisee development (Foster et al., 2007). Thus, supervisees' had a different perspective on supervision and rated their own professional development lower than their supervisors.

Previous research has shown that many factors contribute to satisfaction in supervision, including but not limited to, the relationship between supervisor and supervisee, actions in supervision from supervisee and supervisor, and perceived growth from the supervisee. Research has shown that supervisee satisfaction with supervision may differ from supervisors' perception. However, there is a gap in the research on supervision satisfaction exploring how supervisor type, supervisee type, and multicultural variables may affect satisfaction outcomes.

**Supervisory Working Alliance**

The SWA is most often used to describe the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee. This relationship is important to the success of the overall supervision process and the counseling process, as the supervisees' perception of the SWA may be an indicator of clients' perceptions of the counseling relationship (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997).
Bordin (1983) developed a SWA model which he based on the concepts of his therapeutic working alliance model. The model consisted of three characteristics included “(1) mutual agreements and understandings regarding the goals sought in the change process; (2) the tasks of each of the partners; and (3) the bonds between the partners necessary to sustain the enterprise” (p. 35). Thus, the SWA model consists of three characteristics: goals, tasks, and bonds (Bordin, 1983). Bordin defined goals as the mutually agreed upon goals by supervisor and supervisee. Tasks were described as mutual understanding of the tasks the already agreed upon goals will impose upon the supervisor and supervisee. Finally, relational bonds refer to the relationship between supervisor and the supervisee during supervision (Bordin, 1983). The SWA model can be interpreted as the “relational bond that forms between the supervisor and supervisee when they work together to achieve mutual goals through clearly identified tasks” (Bordin, 1983).

The relational or emotional bond between supervisee and supervisor is reported as being the most important part of the SWA (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). In factor analysis involving 185 supervisors and 178 supervisees from graduate programs in clinical psychology and counseling, Efstation et al. (1990) found that supervisors reported three factors that were most important in enhancing supervisee-supervisor bond: a focus on understanding the client, supervisee-supervisor rapport, and identification. Identification referred to the supervisors perceptions of the supervisee ability to relate to the supervisor. Efstation et al. found that supervisees reported two factors that were the most important in order to enhance that bond: a focus on understanding the client and supervisee-supervisor rapport.

The SWA and working alliance may be affected by the amount of overall stress of the supervisee, and amount of coping resources. In a cross-sectional design with 232 counselor
supervisees, Gnilka et al., (2012) found the more stressful a supervisee perceived their life, the less likely they were to form and maintain a beneficial working alliance with clients. Coping resources were defined as the personal characteristics (i.e., self-confidence, knowledge, and mental tension control), and amount of social support (Gnilka et al., 2012). Additionally, supervisees who reported lower levels of stress in their lives and a greater ability to control their environments perceived a stronger SWA with their supervisors (Gnilka et al., 2012).

The SWA can also be described as the way supervisors and supervisees communicate and mutually create tasks and goals to accomplish during the supervision time (Renfro-Michel & Sheperis, 2009). The development of the SWA can be impeded by conflict between the supervisor and supervisee (Quarto, 2003). Quarto (2003) examined 72 supervisees and 74 supervisors from counselor education graduate programs to investigate conflict and control problems associated with supervision. Quarto defined conflict as “one’s perceived refusal to behave in accordance with how another wants one to behave with regard to the process of supervision” (p. 25). The ability to learn and identify with the supervisor was shown to have a positive aspect of the SWA (Quarto, 2003).

Ladany, Walker and Melincoff (2001) conducted a correlational study that investigated 137 supervisors and their perceived supervisory style in relation to the SWA. Supervisory style was defined as attractive, interpersonally sensitive, and task oriented. Attractive was further defined as supervisors perceiving themselves as being warm, open, friendly and supportive. Interpersonally sensitive supervisors were defined as being therapeutic with their supervisees, and task oriented supervisors were defined as being focused and goal oriented (Ladany et al., 2001). Results indicated that supervisors who perceived themselves as warm and friendly during supervision viewed the supervision process as trusting and had a mutual agreement on the tasks
of supervision with their supervisees (Ladany et al., 2001). Supervisors who reported their supervisory style as attractive perceived themselves as having a stronger SWA with their supervisees. Results also indicated that when supervisors perceived their supervisory style as interpersonally sensitive and task oriented, the greater their perceived agreement with supervisees on tasks of supervision.

Patton and Kivlighan (1997) investigated supervisees’ perceptions of the SWA and its association with clients’ perceptions of the counseling session with supervisees. The study included 75 supervisees, 75 clients, and 25 supervisors. Each supervisee was randomly paired with a client and proceeded to engage in a 50 minute recorded counseling session. Immediately after the session, the clients completed the Working Alliance Inventory and gave it to the counselors’ supervisor. The supervisee then met with their supervisor for a one hour supervision session. After supervision, the supervisee completed the Supervisor Working Alliance-Trainee (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). Results showed that the perceived quality of the supervisory relationship as indicated by the SWA relates to the counseling process and relationship with the client (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). Thus, findings indicated a positive relationship between clients’ perceived working alliance and supervisee perceived SWA (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). The supervisor-supervisee relationship, then, could be considered a parallel process with the counselor-client relationship.

Bilodeau et al. (2010) examined for 31 supervisees and 13 supervisors differences in SWA ratings. Supervisees engaged in counseling with a client for 5 to 10 sessions and attended weekly supervision sessions. Immediately after each supervision session the SWAI-T and SWAI-S were completed by supervisee and supervisor, respectively. Supervisees rated the working alliance as significantly stronger than supervisors, and supervisees rated rapport and the
tendency for supervision sessions to be client focused higher than their supervisors. Thus, supervisors and supervisees may perceive the SWA differently even though they are engaged in the same process (Bilodeau et al., 2010).

White and Queener (2003) explored the relationship between SWA and supervisors and supervisees' amount and quality of social supports, as well as supervisees' perceived attachments with their supervisors. They surveyed 67 supervisees and 67 supervisors from CACREP-accredited graduate-counseling programs. The survey packets were administered one week after supervision had completed. Results indicated that, when supervisors and supervisees reported a more favorable working alliance they also reported better quality in other social relationships. These results may lend evidence that the supervisors' positive interpersonal skills may influence the perceived effectiveness of the SWA.

The SWA has been widely researched in previous literature concerning supervision and has yielded important results indicating that it is an important part of the supervision process as well as supervisee growth. The SWA includes the goals, tasks, and bonds agreed upon between the supervisor and supervisee, thus laying out the structure for supervision. The SWA has provided much evidence to support that having a strong SWA can positively affect supervisees' growth as a counselor and improve overall supervision satisfaction. Evidence has also provided support that supervisees and supervisors may often report different perceptions of the SWA. There is a lack of research, however, concerning the SWA and supervisor, supervisee characteristics, and multicultural variables, and how this may affect supervision outcomes. Supervisee self-efficacy is another variable that may affect overall supervision outcomes.

Supervision and Self-Efficacy
Self-efficacy theory can be described as an individual’s belief they have the ability to perform a certain task (Bandura, 1977, 1982). Counselor self-efficacy, or the belief in one’s ability to develop and implement counseling skills, refers to the belief that counselors can effectively help a client (Daniels & Larson, 2001). Self-efficacy is developed throughout a counseling graduate student’s program. It is gained through academic courses and grows substantially during practicum and internship experiences (Halverson, Miars, & Livneh, 2006). Bandura (1982) suggested that if counselors do not receive supervision, their level of self-efficacy will decrease. Thus, based on this theory then, counselor trainees who do not receive supervision will have lower levels of self-efficacy. It is important that counselors develop a high level of self-efficacy during training so when they graduate they may have a higher level of competency and belief in their counseling skills. A higher level of self-efficacy may indicate a higher level of task performance (Bandura, 1977, 1982). Thus, by increasing self-efficacy in counselors in training, their counseling skills will also increase.

Cashwell and Dooley (2001) conducted a survey of 33 professional counselors, where 11 were not receiving supervision, to determine if participating in clinical supervision was related to counselor self-efficacy. They found for those receiving clinical supervision reporting significantly enhanced counseling skills.

Barnes (2004) discussed two approaches that could be used to develop supervisees’ self-efficacy: the self-efficacy enhancement approach and the self-efficacy in context approach. The self-efficacy enhancement approach attempts to raise counselors’ self-efficacy through real counseling experiences, for example a practicum or internship field site. If the supervisee views the field experience as successful, counselor self-efficacy may be dramatically increased (Barnes, 2004). The self-efficacy in context approach attempts to raise supervisees’ self-efficacy
through encouraging self-reflection on their ability to perform counseling-related tasks. The supervisor may use this self-regulatory approach to monitor a supervisees’ self-efficacy level (Barnes, 2004). Accurate self-reflection should occur so the supervisee can assess their counseling skills accurately and develop new counseling skills when appropriate.

In a conceptual article, Steward (1998) discussed how supervisors’ self-efficacy may also play a role in developing supervisees’ levels of self-efficacy. Steward discussed the level of supervisor preparedness may also be important in the supervisees’ development of self-efficacy. Additionally, feelings of inadequacy in being a new supervisor, concerns related to giving appropriate and constructive feedback, and anxiety related to the evaluation process are some of the issues that new supervisors may be dealing with that could interfere with their ability to provide supportive, effective supervision and be related to lower self-efficacy for their supervisees (Steward, 1998). Thus, supervisees were more hesitant in taking risks with clients.

The need for

Supervisor identity development is an important factor in the supervision process, which can have an effect on supervisee self-efficacy as well as the entire supervision process. Pelling (2008) examined the influence of counseling experience, supervisory experience, and training in supervision on supervisor identity development. Supervisor identity development was defined as being influenced by four areas: supervisory experience, counseling experience, supervisory training, and personal/relational variables (Pelling, 2008). This descriptive study included 300 counselors, with the majority of those actively providing supervision. Supervisory experience was an indicator of supervisor identity development, with greater experience conducting supervision relating to a higher level of supervisor identity development. However, counseling experience did not necessarily mean they would be an effective supervisor (Pelling, 2008).
Thus, more experience conducting supervision has a positive relationship with supervisor development.

Daniels and Larson (2001) used a pretest-posttest design to investigate the influence of performance feedback on self-efficacy for 45 participants located in the Midwest. Participants completed a 10-minute mock counseling session and were then asked to estimate their performance. Then an observer gave immediate feedback to the counselor. Positive feedback was associated with increased counselor self-efficacy (Daniels & Larson, 2001). Also, results showed that negative feedback seemed to be related to counselor self-efficacy among novice counselor-trainees and also increase levels of counselor anxiety, as they interpreted negative feedback as a failed experience (Daniels & Larson, 2001).

Service learning has been shown to have a positive effect on counselor trainees’ level of self-efficacy. Service learning “provides for counselor educators to create an immediate linkage between concepts presented in classroom and early field experiences” (Barbee, Scherer, & Combs, 2003, p. 109). Service learning differs from practicum and internship experiences as those typically occur later in the counselor trainees’ program whereas service learning occurs at the beginning of the counselor trainees’ program either through observation or direct participation at an outside site (Barbee et al., 2003). In a correlational study, Barbee et al. (2003) surveyed 113 pre-practicum counseling graduate students to examine their levels of self-efficacy. They compared number of counseling courses completed against their reported levels of self-efficacy, as well as the amount of service learning hours completed. Results indicated a significant positive relationship between number of completed service learning hours and self-efficacy. Barbee et al. also found students reported higher levels of self-efficacy the more counseling courses they had completed. Although few studies exist on the concept of pre-
practicum service learning, initial results are promising and show an increase in professional growth and increased counselor self-efficacy. Therefore supervisee type is important to research due to internship students traditionally being further along in their graduate program than Practicum students.

Overall, supervisee self-efficacy is an important component that can help make supervision a positive experience, for example, self-efficacy can be influenced by feedback received from a supervisor. Self-efficacy can help enhance the supervisees’ beliefs in their counseling skills and identity development, as research has shown that counselors not receiving supervision have lower levels of self-efficacy than those who do receive supervision. Supervisee self-efficacy also plays a role in overall satisfaction with supervision and the supervisory working alliance. Although these studies explore supervisee self-efficacy, there is a lack of research concerning any difference in levels of self-efficacy for supervisor and supervisee type. Additionally, the relationship between supervisee self-efficacy and multicultural variables has not been explored in research.

**Supervision Satisfaction, Supervisory Working Alliance, and Self-Efficacy**

Research has been done to show how all these factors can collectively affect supervision. In a descriptive study, Ladany et al. (1999) examined perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and self-efficacy to better understand how these factors affect the supervision process. They found that 107 supervisees reported one element of the SWA, the emotional bond, was a significant predictor in supervision satisfaction. They also found that supervisees reported, when they perceived a strong emotional bond with their supervisor, reported having a stronger perceived self-efficacy of their own performance.
Cheon, Blumer, Shih, Murphy, and Sato (2008) focused on contextual variables, which included the supervision setting, age, gender, and ethnicity that can affect the SWA and supervision satisfaction. Researchers examined the relationship among these variables as well as environmental variables such as supervision setting and time spent in supervision. In this descriptive study they found for 132 supervisees reported feeling more satisfied with supervision in a private practice setting than in an academic setting. Results also indicated that the SWA was significantly related to satisfaction within supervision, but not contextual variables such as age, gender, and ethnicity (Cheon et al., 2008). Time spent in supervision did not have a significant contribution on supervision satisfaction reported by supervisees. The SWA was shown to be the most important predictor in determining supervision satisfaction (Cheon et al., 2008).

Little research has been conducted on professional counselors in the agency setting and their experiences in terms of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Sterner (2009) explored how SWA plays a role in professional counselors and its relationship to stress and work satisfaction. Supervisees who reported a stronger SWA noted being more satisfied with their job overall with less stress and job burnout (Sterner, 2009).

Petrides, Frederickson and Furnham (2004) focused on agency counselors, emotional intelligence (EI) and the role it may play in developing the SWA. Trait emotional intelligence "refers to a constellation of behavioral dispositions and self-perceptions concerning one’s ability to recognize, process, and utilize emotion-laden information" (p. 278). EI can also encompass personality traits such as “empathy, impulsivity, and assertiveness” (p. 278). Cooper and Ng (2009) also focused on EI, finding higher trait EI among supervisees and supervisors was associated with higher perceptions of the SWA. Higher trait EI in supervisees was not associated
with a higher perceived SWA by the supervisor. More experienced counselors reported higher levels of EI, which was associated with a perceived higher SWA (Cooper & Ng, 2009).

Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) examined supervisory styles, specifically the task oriented, in relation to supervisee satisfaction and perceived self-efficacy among master’s level counseling students. Specifically, they examined 82 students from CACREP accredited counseling programs who were enrolled in internship classes, and used self report questionnaires for insight into supervisee perceived self-efficacy. Results indicated that the task-oriented style of supervision was statistically significant in predicting supervisees’ perceived self-efficacy. Fernando and Hulse-Killacky indicated that the most beneficial supervisory style to adhere to would be a combination of different styles and to vary the approach used in supervision session. This flexibility in supervision styles was also cited as most beneficial with regard to supervisee satisfaction in supervision (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005).

Crockett (2011) examined 210 students from CACREP accredited counseling programs who were currently receiving supervision to explore supervision satisfaction, SWA, and multicultural variables. Results indicated that differences between supervisor and supervisee multicultural variables did not impact supervisee perceived satisfaction with supervision. Interestingly, supervisees who reported their supervisors as being more multiculturally competent reported being more satisfied with supervision (Crockett, 2011). Additionally, supervisees who reported a strong SWA reported a higher level of overall satisfaction with supervision (Crockett, 2011).

Overall, research has shown that satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and self-efficacy affect the supervision process in similar ways. Past research has shown that if there is a strong SWA and high levels of self-efficacy, then overall satisfaction with supervision is likely
to occur from both the supervisor and supervisee. As previous research has shown the relationships SWA, self-efficacy, and supervision satisfaction have, many cultural factors that are present in supervision (e.g., race, gender, religious affiliation) need to be studied to determine their relationship with SWA, supervisee self-efficacy, and overall supervision satisfaction.

**Multicultural Factors**

Multicultural supervision is an important topic in counseling as part of becoming a culturally competent counselor. Leong and Wagner (1994) described multicultural supervision as when supervisors and supervisees examine cultural issues which affect all areas of culturally diverse clients. All supervision dyads may be considered multicultural, as there will be some difference between supervisee and supervisor, and client (McLeod, Chang, Hays, Orr, & Williams, in press). Thus, discussing cultural issues during supervision and facilitating the development of multicultural competence of supervisees, is an important aspect.

**Race and Ethnicity**

Race can be defined as a group of people who have similar physical features, whereas ethnicity can be defined as a group of people who have similar origins, geographical locations, similar languages, and customs (McAuliffe, 2008). Previous literature has shown that race and/or ethnicity of the supervisee and supervisor may play an important role in the SWA and overall satisfaction with supervision (Cook, 1994). Supervisees who discussed similarities and differences regarding their ethnicity reported higher overall SWA with their supervisors (Gatmon et al., 2001). Ancis and Marshall (2010) explored in a qualitative study, cultural issues that may arise in supervision among four doctoral supervisees. Supervisees reported that supervisors were described as open, accepting, and flexible which seemed to positively affect both the supervisory relationship and the clinical relationship (Ancis & Marshall, 2010). Supervisees reported their
supervisors encouraged them to explore the clients' perspective as well as being more self aware in their own cultural biases to become more culturally competent (Ancis & Marshall, 2010).

Racial identity is another aspect of race and ethnicity and can be viewed as a construct that underscores the relationship between individuals belonging to dominant and nondominant cultures and how they view their own race and other races (Bhat & Davis, 2007). Bhat and Davis (2007) explored how the racial identity development of supervisees and supervisors plays a role in SWA and satisfaction with supervision. They randomly assigned 117 participants into dyads and used racial identity questionnaires (i.e., White Racial Identity Attitude Scale [WRIAS (Helms & Carter, 1990)], People of Color Scale [PRIAS Helms 1995a, 1995b], and the Working Alliance Inventory for Supervisors [WAI-S (Bahrick, 1989)]. Results yielded evidence that dyads with similar racial identity levels that were also high reported the strongest working alliance and dyads that reported low racial identity development had the weakest working alliance (Bhat & Davis, 2007).

Constantine and Sue (2007) investigated how racial microaggressions impact the supervision process among Black supervisees that have White supervisors. Racial microaggressions are intentional or unintentional, brief, verbal or behavioral actions that communicate negative messages to people of color (Constantine & Sue, 2007). They identified in a qualitative study seven themes for 10 Black supervisees. The first theme was invalidating racial-cultural issues. Supervisees indicated that their “White supervisors at times tended to minimize, dismiss, or avoid discussing racial-cultural issues in supervision” (p. 146). Supervisees reported that this tendency made them feel frustrated with their supervisors for being uncomfortable in discussing racial issues (Constantine & Sue, 2007). The second and third themes were that their White supervisors made stereotypical assumptions about the Black clients
to their supervisees, and making stereotypical assumptions about the Black supervisee. The fourth theme was reluctance to give performance feedback for fear of being viewed as racist. The fifth theme, focusing primarily of clinical weaknesses, with supervisees feeling they were being targeted because of their clinical deficits and felt they could do nothing right. The sixth theme, blaming clients of color for problems stemming from oppression, identified that White supervisors tended to blame Black clients for their circumstances even if it was beyond their control because of issues of oppression and prejudice, while the seventh theme was offering culturally insensitive treatment recommendations to supervisees (Constantine & Sue, 2007).

Hilton et al. (1995) explored the effects of having supervisors of a different race and their level of support (i.e. high or low) on supervision outcomes. They used 60 White supervisees and matched them with either a White supervisor or an African American supervisor. In this study level of support (i.e., high level) was a significant predictor of supervision satisfaction rather than supervisor race. Supervisees that reported a perceived low level of support from their supervisor, regardless of supervisor race, reported a low level of satisfaction with supervision. Thus, level of support from the supervisor regardless of race may positively influence the SWA.

Adair (2001) explored the relationship between supervisees' perceptions of the level of supervisor self-disclosure and supervisee self-disclosure, supervisees' satisfaction with supervision and, supervisee perception of supervisor attractiveness, expertness, and trustworthiness. Adair (2001) used 47 participants from university college counseling centers who completed demographics and surveys about their supervision experiences. Adair found supervisees of color who were matched with White supervisors were less satisfied with supervision and viewed their supervisors as less trustworthy than White supervisees did that
were matched with a White supervisor. Similarly, Vander Kolk (1974) found Black supervisees anticipated their White supervisors as less empathic, respectful, and congruent in supervision.

Previous research has provided results that race and ethnicity play a role in the supervision process and can affect it in many ways either positively or negatively. Racial differences or similarities may affect how feedback is received by supervisees or interpreted. Also, supervisors who chose to ignore racial elements either present in supervision or in their supervisees' counseling are missing critical elements involved in the supervision process. Unfortunately, there has been a lack of research exploring the relationship between race and ethnicity and supervisee self-efficacy and overall supervision satisfaction.

Gender

Gender is another factor that has been shown to have an impact on supervision outcomes from previous literature. Gender is defined as "the psychological, social, and cultural features and characteristics that have become strongly associated with the biological categories of male or female" (Gilbert & Scher, 1999, p. 3). Gender may have different meanings, can be the tool for how one views the world, and can be a social construct of stereotypes society places upon each gender (Hays & Erford, 2009; Doughty & Leddick, 2007) In a conceptual article, Smeby (2000) described how supervisors' gender may play a role in the success of graduate students, and females may be more likely to succeed if they receive supervision from a female supervisor. Smeby defined success as finishing a graduate program. Smeby suggested that female supervisors may be better able to understand issues female students are concerned about. Gender can also play a role in the communication styles and patterns between supervisee and supervisor (Doughty & Leddick, 2007). In a conceptual article, Doughty and Leddick (2007) state in
supervision, there is a tendency for female supervisors to be more relationship oriented than male supervisors, whereas male supervisors tend to be more task oriented.

McHale and Carr (1998) explored whether gender had an effect on the style a supervisor used during supervision and the supervisory relationship. Supervisor gender had a statistically significant effect on whether a supervisor used a directive style or not. Female supervisors used a directive style more often than did male supervisors, and interestingly, the gender of the supervisee did not show any effect on the style the supervisor used (McHale & Carr, 1998). Another finding was that supervisees, regardless of their gender, who had male supervisors, contributed less input to supervision discussions (McHale & Carr, 1998).

Granello (2003) focused on communication patterns between supervisor and supervisee and the effect gender has on the supervisory relationship. Different communicative styles of both male and female supervisees can impact the supervisory relationship. Supervisors of both genders were more likely to accept and build on the suggestions of female supervisees and asked for more opinions, analysis, and evaluations of counseling from their male supervisees. Male supervisees also gave significantly more suggestions to their supervisors, as where female supervisees gave more praise to their supervisors (Granello, 2003).

When gender similarities and differences are discussed during supervision, supervisees reported higher levels of overall satisfaction with supervision (Gatmon et al., 2001). They also found that a significant positive correlation existed between the SWA and the quality of the discussions of ethnic and gender similarities and/or differences in supervision (Gatmon et al., 2001). Another finding from this study was that it was more important to have the discussion of cultural variables during supervision than the actual matching of the supervisee and supervisor. Overall, Gatmon et al. (2001) found that, when cultural variables were discussed in supervision
sessions, supervisees reported significantly higher satisfaction with supervision and an enhanced SWA.

Creating a gender sensitive environment in supervision could help to ease the discussion of gender differences and similarities. Supervisors who engaged in processing supervisees' gender related transference and countertransferences reported a stronger emotional bond with their supervisees (Walker, Ladany, & Pate-Carolan, 2007). Supervisees who discussed gender related issues with their supervisors reported an overall stronger SWA (Walker et al., 2007). When supervisors made comments that showed gender bias and assumptions toward supervisees, the supervisees reported as having a perceived weaker SWA, and did not agree on supervision goals and tasks (Walker et al., 2007).

Gender is another cultural factor that has been explored in previous research that plays a role in the supervision process. Research has shown that gender may affect how much supervisees disclose and interact with their supervisors during supervision, as well as the perceived SWA. Discussing gender differences or similarities between supervisor and supervisee as well as supervisee and client during supervision has shown to be an important aspect in creating a stronger SWA. More research should be conducted to provide insight into supervision satisfaction with gender similarities and differences between supervisor and supervisee.

Religion and Spirituality

Previous literature has lent evidence that religion may also play a role in supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. According to a Gallup poll of 1000 adults in the United States, as many as 92% of Americans reported they believe in God (Polling Report, 2011). It makes sense, then, to assume that at some point a supervisee will come into contact with a client
or supervisor that brings religion and/or spirituality into the counseling session or supervision setting. Spirituality often is difficult to define as it is personally constructed by the individual, is unique, and may develop and grow over time (Hays & Erford, 2009). Spirituality has been defined as “the feelings, thoughts, experiences, and behaviors that arise from a search for the sacred” (Hill et al., 2000, p.66). Religion was defined as the same as spirituality with the addition of “a search for the non-sacred conducted in a setting or context that is designed to foster the search for the sacred” (p. 66). One notable distinction between religion and spirituality is that religion is most often an organized, with specific rituals and practices, and often defined by its boundaries, whereas spirituality is considered an attribute of an individual and is very subjective in nature (Berkel, Constantine, & Olsen, 2007).

The level of development of a supervisee’s or supervisor’s religious or spiritual beliefs can limit or enhance the amount, frequency, and depth of discussions during clinical supervision (Ripley, Jackson, Tatum, & Davis, 2007). Ripley et al. (2007) conducted a qualitative study with 22 supervisors with five scenarios of supervision when supervisees had dilemmas regarding religion and/or spirituality. Seven supervisors suggested they would discuss with the supervisee their role as a mental health counselor and not that of a spiritual or religious advisor. Five supervisors stated they would rely on educational books regarding religion as a tool during supervision. Six supervisors called for limitations of clients the supervisee should work with, for example clients whose religious beliefs are similar. The remaining supervisors stated they would help their supervisee in various ways to promote client needs and perspective. Overall supervisors also reported they inquired about their supervisees religious and spiritual views during supervision, frequently incorporate spiritual issues into supervision, and inquired how committed supervisees were with their own personal religious and spiritual beliefs.
Whether or not supervisors disclose their own religious and/or spiritual beliefs also has provided evidence which relates to supervisees perceptions of what should be discussed during supervision. For example, if supervisors disclosed their religious beliefs supervisees reportedly felt more comfortable discussing religion and spirituality during supervision (Miller & Ivey, 2006). Creating an environment in the supervision setting makes it appropriate to discuss religion and spirituality issues may help to put supervisees at ease. When supervisees are at ease, they reported being more open and willing to bring up religion and spirituality issues with their clients and/or themselves (Miller & Ivey, 2006). Another interesting finding reported was that supervisees perceived male supervisors as addressing religion more often than female supervisors during clinical supervision (Miller & Ivey, 2006).

Although there has been significantly less research done on incorporating religious and/or spiritual beliefs during supervision than other cultural factors, there have been studies that confirm this is an important aspect to discuss as supervisors. Research has shown that discussing religion during supervision may make it easier for supervisees to open up about their beliefs and be aware of how that may or may not affect their counseling skills and style.

Overall there has been research on supervision satisfaction, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy and their interactions and relationships. There has been a lack of research integrating the three factors in one study. Also, there has been research conducted on race and ethnicity, gender, and religion and spirituality, but there has been a lack of research that integrated all three of those variables and explored their relationship and interactions on supervision outcomes. Finally, there is a lack of research investigating what relationship race and ethnicity, gender, and religion and spirituality have with supervision satisfaction, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

As counseling graduate students begin working with clients during their practicum and internship, they receive supervision from more senior members of the profession. In some cases supervision can be a productive, enriching experience whereby supervisees can further enhance and develop their counseling skills. In other cases, unfortunately, supervision may have negative effects on their clinical skills, resulting in less professional growth (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001). Variables that have been shown in the literature to influence the supervision process and outcome include supervision satisfaction, SWA, supervisee self-efficacy, and multicultural factors (i.e., race and ethnicity, gender, and degree of religion/spirituality practice).

This study examined supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy during practicum and/or internship. Little attention has been given in previous literature about supervisor differences in supervision and the impact they may have based on supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum or internship) and perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy. Additionally, this study explored the impact race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of religious/spirituality practice had on supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.

Research Design

This study was a quantitative non-experimental survey design. A survey design was utilized so inferences were made from a sample of the population, thus making the results more generalizable to the population (Creswell, 2009). A potentially positive aspect of survey research may be the data collected can then be generalized to supervisees who are similar to the
participants of this study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The data also give insight into what multicultural variables play a role in supervision. A potentially negative part of survey research is that it relies on self report, meaning the participants report what they believe to be true, at that moment in time, or what they believe the researcher wants to hear (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010). The supervision, SWA, and self-efficacy variables were measured in relation to multicultural variables that included race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of religious/spirituality practice.

Data were collected via an online survey. One advantage of using online surveys is the low cost required to produce the survey. Survey sites vary in price and some are free to produce an online survey. Online surveys also time efficient. Data is stored online and can be exported quicker to other programs reducing time analyzing results. Online surveys also have the ability to reach a larger population than conducting face-to-face interviews, which could also increase diversity in potential participants. Finally, interviewer bias is reduced in online surveys. Participants can answer the questions by themselves and more respond more openly. One disadvantage of using online surveys is the inability for clarification. In surveys, there is a set amount of questions and rarely leaves a spot for the participant to ask questions or elaborate.

Variables

The independent variables included the following: supervisee type (i.e., practicum or internship); supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student); supervisee race, ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious and/or spiritual affiliation; and perceived differences between supervisor and supervisee for race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious and/or spiritual affiliation. The dependent variables were supervision satisfaction, supervisory working alliance, and supervisee self-efficacy which were measured by the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (Ladany, Hill,
Corbett, & Nutt, 1996), the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990), and the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992), respectively.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and hypotheses were investigated in this study:

**Research Question 1:** What do counselor trainees report with respect to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

**Hypothesis 1:** Counselor trainees will report moderate supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

**Research Question 2:** What is the relationship between university supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum and internship students) for supervisees’ perceived levels of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

**Hypothesis 2a:** There will be a significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Specifically, supervisees who are assigned a full-time faculty member as their university supervisor will report significantly greater supervisee satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2b:** There will be a significant main effect for student type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Internship students will report significantly higher levels of perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2c:** There will be a significant main effect for student type and university supervisor type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.
Research Question 3: What is the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision?

Hypothesis 3a: There will be a significant main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. White supervisees will report significantly higher supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3c: There will be no significant main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3d: There will be no significant interaction effect for multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 4: Are perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a significant main effect for perceived racial/ethnic differences and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Perceived differences will be related to lower supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be no significant main effect for perceived degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4d: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.
Participants

Participants consisted of graduate students enrolled in CACREP-accredited counseling programs across the United States. CACREP-accredited programs were chosen because they have been through the accreditation process, which ensures appropriate knowledge and skills are standardized by the counseling profession. Accreditation also ensures that the program is professionally and financially stable (CACREP, 2009). To be eligible to participate, graduate students were currently enrolled in the field practice part of their counseling program, practicum and/or internship. The students also received regular supervision, in some format, from a faculty member or doctoral student at their university. Students received regular supervision, in some format, from their site supervisor at their practicum and/or internship site. For purposes of this study, actual supervisor multicultural characteristics were not asked, only what supervises perceived their supervisors as. This researcher was only interested in perceived differences from the supervisee perspective. This is also addressed in future research also.

Of the CACREP schools contacted, 165 graduate students participated and completed a survey. To triangulate whether the students' programs were accredited, 161 (99%) students indicated their program was CACREP accredited, 1 (1%) indicated they were unsure (3 did not provide an answer). Further, 103 participants (62%) indicated their program had a doctoral program and 85 (52%) of the 103 participants that were in a program which had a doctoral program reported the doctoral students provided supervision.

Eighty-Five (52%) reported they were internship students, 44 (27%) were practicum students, and 33 (20%) reported they were unsure. (3 did not respond). Participants were asked to identify if they ever provided counseling prior to their practicum and/or internship experience, and 113 (70%) participants responded with no and 49 (30%) responded with yes. Those who
indicated previous counseling experience noted they had a mean of 3.83 years of experience and standard deviation \(= 3.67\). Previous counseling experience was not factored into analysis for this study.

Of the 165 participants, 135 (82%) reported they identified as female, 26 (16%) as male, 1 (1%) as transgendered (3 did not provide an answer). For participant race/ethnicity, the following responses were given: 125 (77%) as White/European American, 18 (11%) identified as African American, 5 (3%) as Asian American, 8 (5%) as Hispanic, 6 (4%) as multiracial, (3 did not provide an answer). For religion/spirituality, the following responses were given: 113 (70%) as Christian, 41 (25%) identified as other, 4 (2%) identified as Buddhist and 4 (2%) as Jewish (3 did not provide an answer). The other responses consisted of: Holistic, Wicca, Pagan, Quaker, Not Sure, Atheist, not religious, Agnostic, Spiritual-not religious, Unitarian Universalist, and Roman Catholic. Participants reported that 66 (41%) were practicing their religion/spirituality, 53 (33%) reported somewhat practicing, 43 (27%) did not currently practice their religion/spirituality, and (3 did not provide an answer).

**Supervisor Demographics**

Participants were asked to identify demographics they perceived about their supervisors. When asked about type of supervision received from their supervisor, 53 (32%) reported they received group only, 41 (25%) reported they received individual and group, 25 (15%) participants reported they received individual only supervision, 14 (9%) received individual, triadic, and group, 10 (6%) received triadic only, 5 (3%) received individual and triadic, 1 (1%) received triadic and group (1 did not provide a response). Participants stated that 81 (49%) of their supervisors were full-time faculty members, 39 (24%) were doctoral students, 29 (18%) were adjunct faculty members, and 16 (10%) did not provide a response.
When asked about gender, participants reported 107 (65%) as female, 41 (25%) were male, one (1%) as transgendered, and 16 (10%) did not respond. Race/ethnicity of university supervisors was reported by participants as: 115 (70%) as White/European, 19 (12%) African American, 5 (3%) as Asian American, 5 (3%) as multiracial, 3 (2%) as Hispanic, 2 (1%) responded as other with responses of Middle Eastern and unsure (16 did not respond). Religion/Spirituality of university supervisors was reported by participants as: 88 (53%) unsure, 56 (34%) Christian, 1 (1%) Jewish, 1(1%) Buddhist, 3 (2%) did not provide an answer but noted religion was never discussed (16 did not respond). When asked if their supervisors were practicing their religion/spirituality participants responded with the following: 109 (66%) as unsure, 31 (19%) as practicing, 5 (3%) as somewhat practicing and 4 (2%) as non-practicing (16 did not respond).

Procedure

The primary researcher submitted the research proposal for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval through the Darden College of Education. This study was considered exempt according to IRB 6.2 exemption rule as the intention of this study was to examine students' perceived experiences during clinical supervision, which every student receives in a CACREP accredited counseling graduate program while they are enrolled in either practicum or internship classes. This study also used a survey method to gain demographic information anonymously from participants. Upon approval, the primary researcher collected data.

Participants were selected using convenience sampling. The primary researcher accessed all 594 CACREP accredited schools through the CACREP website. An email was sent to the CACREP liaison for each university, which explained the purpose and asked for their assistance in distributing an email to their students. CACREP liaisons were asked to distribute an email
that included a letter of invitation (Appendix A) to students in their programs. The letter of
invitation included the informed consent document (Appendix B) as well as criteria for
participation and a link to the survey packet. After two weeks, a follow-up email was sent to the
CACREP liaisons as a reminder to help increase participation in this study.

The online survey contained a demographic sheet (Appendix C), the Counseling Self-
Estimate Inventory (COSE) (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992)
(Appendix D), the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ) (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt,
1996) (Appendix E), and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T)
(Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990) (Appendix F). Upon completion of the questionnaire,
participants were thanked for their participation and given the option of entering into a drawing
to win one of three $100.00 gift cards.

Instrumentation

Demographic sheet. A demographic sheet (Appendix C) was given to the participants
on the same link as the questionnaires. The demographic sheet provided information to the
researcher and included questions about race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to
religious/spiritual affiliation, supervisor type, and student type.

Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire. The Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire
(SSQ) was utilized to measure overall supervision satisfaction (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt,
1996). The SSQ is similar to the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ; Larsen, Attkisson,
Hargreaves, & Nguyen, 1979), with the difference being that the words counseling and services
were replaced with supervision. The SSQ utilizes a four point scale ranging from low (1) to high
(4). The SSQ asked participants to rate their satisfaction with supervision on various aspects.
The SSQ consists of 8 items, with a total score ranging from 8 to 32, with higher scores
indicating a higher level of satisfaction (Ladany et al., 1996). For purposes of this study a score of 8 to 20 suggests low satisfaction with supervision, 21 to 26 suggests moderate satisfaction, and scores 27 to 32 represent a high satisfaction. An example question from this questionnaire is, "If you were to seek supervision again, would you come back to this supervisor?" The SSQ has shown to be negatively related to supervisors' perceived ethical violations during supervision, as well as, supervisee nondisclosures when they had negative reactions to their supervisors (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999b; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996). Two studies that used the SSQ have shown the internal consistencies to be .96 and .97 respectively (Ladany et al., 1999a; Ladany, Walker, & Melinoff, 2001). Internal consistency for the current sample was .854.

**Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee.** To assess the supervisee-supervisor working alliance the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T) was used (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). The SWAI-T was used to measure how the supervisee perceived the supervisory relationship (Efstation et al., 1990). The SWAI-T was further revised and developed from the Working Alliance Inventory, which measured the relationship between counselor and client (WAIS; Horvath & Greenberg, 1989).

The SWAI-T has 19 items with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) almost never to (7) almost always. Two subscales emerged from the trainee version: client focus and rapport. The client focus subscale refers activities in supervision that put an emphasis on their clients, and how better to work with them in sessions (Efstation et al., 1990). An example from the client focus subscale is, "My supervisor encourages me to take time to understand what the client is saying and doing." The rapport subscale refers to the perceived relationship between the
supervisor and supervisee in supervision (Efstation et al., 1990). An example item from the rapport subscale is “I feel comfortable working with my supervisor.”

Several studies have used Cronbach’s alpha to establish internal consistency for the SWAI-T, which include .97 overall, .88 for the client subscale, and .97 for the rapport subscale with inter-item correlations ranging from .35 to .71 for the client subscale and from .32 to .91 for the rapport subscale (Efstation et al., 1990; Patton & Kivlighan, 1997; White & Queener, 2003). For the purposes of this study, any response ranging from 1.00 to 2.99 will be considered low, 3.00 to 5.99 will be considered moderate, and anything 6.00 or 7.00 will be considered high.

Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. To assess the counselor self-efficacy beliefs, the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE) was employed (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992). The COSE has 37 items with a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (6) strongly agree. The total score represents the counselor’s level of self-efficacy beliefs, as where higher scores indicate greater counselor self-efficacy. The level of self-efficacy is delineated into five factor scores: micro-skills, handling of process, difficult client behaviors, cultural competence, and awareness of personal values (Larson et al., 1992). The overall score a counselor receives represents the counselor’s beliefs in his or her ability to counsel in the immediate future. For purposes of this study, scores of 1.00 to 2.99 are considered low, scores 3.00 to 4.99 are considered moderate, and scores of 5.00-6.00 are considered high.

The first factor, labeled microskills (12 items), reflects the quality and relevance of a counselor’s responses. An example from the questionnaire is “I am confident that the wording of my interpretation and confrontation responses will be clear and easy to understand.” The second factor, process (10 items), is operationally defined as an integrated set of actions that are
reciprocally determined by the client and the counselor (Larson et al., 1992). An example from the questionnaire is “I am worried that my interpretation and confrontation responses may not over time assist the client to be more specific in defining and clarifying the problem.” The third factor (7 items), difficult client behaviors, includes both the knowledge and skills required in dealing with challenging client issues such as suicidality, a lack of motivation, indecisiveness, alcoholism, and silence. An example from the questionnaire is “I am unsure as to how to deal with clients who appear noncommittal and indecisive.” The cultural competence factor (4 items) pertains to competence with respect to ethnic groups and social class. An example from the questionnaire is “I will be an effective counselor with clients of a different social class.” The fifth factor (4 items) reflects the counselor’s self-awareness of his or her personal biases (Larson et al., 1992). An example from the questionnaire is “I feel that I will not be able to respond to the client in a non-judgmental way with respect to the client’s values, beliefs, etc.” The COSE and its five factors showed appropriate reliability and validity in previous literature, with test-retest reliability for the COSE measure was $r = .87$, and internal consistency was $\alpha = .93$ (Larson et al., 1992). Convergent validity evidence suggests that supervisee self-efficacy is positively related to higher self-esteem, positive outcome expectancies, and greater satisfaction with classroom performance. The COSE is negatively related to the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielberger, 1983) to trait anxiety and negative affect (Larson et al., 1992).

**Data Analysis**

Data was analyzed using statistical software (PASW Statistics 18.0). Data for the independent variables were collected from the demographic sheet, and descriptive statistics were computed for these variables (race/ethnicity, gender, degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation, perceived cultural difference). Additionally, descriptive statistics
were used to organize data regarding the dependent variables (i.e., SWA, supervision satisfaction, supervisee self-efficacy). These descriptive data were used to address the research questions. Inferential statistics were used to address research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. Specifically, the following research questions were tested with these statistical tests:

Research Question 1: What do counselor trainees report with respect to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Descriptive statistics, specifically mean and standard deviation, were calculated to report overall level of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between university supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum and internship students for supervisees’ perceived levels of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?.

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine research question 2.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision?

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine research question 3.

Research Question 4: Are perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?
For this research question, a difference variable was created to show the perceived differences in multicultural variables between supervisee and supervisor. This difference variable was then analyzed by using a three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA).

Validity Threats

Internal validity in a research study refers to “the extent to which its design and the data it yields allow the researcher to draw accurate conclusions about cause-and-effect and other relationships within the data” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010, p. 97). External validity in a research study is defined as “the extent to which its results apply to situations beyond the study itself” (Leedy & Ormrod, 2010, p. 99). An internal validity threat refers to anything that interferes with the experiences of the participants so that the researcher cannot make inferences about the data (Creswell, 2009). An external validity threat occurs when the researcher makes incorrect inferences about the data and applies those inferences to other populations, settings, or situations (Creswell, 2009).

A potential internal validity threat of this study could have involved the measures. This study combined three assessments having 64 items total and also used a demographic sheet. Thus, a maturation threat in this study is that participants could have experienced fatigue while completing and the answers towards the end of the survey. Additionally, the instruments and demographic information rely on self reporting. Social desirability effect could have had an influence on participants’ responses, as some may have wanted to be seen in a more favorable way. Some participants could have inflated responses on each of the instruments. Additionally, participants could have misinterpreted their supervisors’ demographic information (i.e. race/ethnicity, gender, degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) as this study is
only measuring perceived differences. Actual supervisor cultural characteristics were not investigated.

Another threat to internal validity was due to selection bias. The researcher only invited students who were enrolled in CACREP accredited counseling programs, which may predispose them to have better overall experiences with clinical supervision thus resulting in higher satisfaction scores. Also, all CACREP liaisons may not send out the invitation email to their students resulting in a smaller sample size. Finally, those that volunteered to participate are not representative of all practicum and internship students.

A potential external validity threat of this study could be concerning generalizability to other populations, and settings. The participants for this study were recruited from CACREP-accredited graduate programs, but students not enrolled in CACREP-accredited graduate programs may have different experiences with supervision, so these results may not be applied to those programs. This study only gathered data from both university and site supervision, but did not examining the differences between site and university supervision.

Contributions

This study added to the existing body of research on clinical supervision and supervisee perceptions. One of the focuses of supervision in counseling is to promote the growth of the counseling supervisee. This study helped provide some insight into what cultural factors play a role in creating a strong working alliance during supervision, increasing counselor self-efficacy, and ultimately being satisfied with supervision. Results from this study provided insight into which cultural factors supervisors should integrate into the supervisory sessions, or which cultural factors need left out.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS

This chapter provides both descriptive demographic data of the participants and the quantitative results of the study. First, demographic data of the participants will be explained. Next, each research question will be addressed and the findings will be explained.

Statistical Analysis

Research Question 1: What do counselor trainees report with respect to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 1: Counselor trainees will report moderate supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Supervision Satisfaction, measured by the SSQ, had 138 participants, a minimum range of 1.75 and maximum range of 3.00. The SSQ had a mean of 2.4312 with a standard deviation of .18128. The SWA, measured by the SWAI-T, had a minimum range of 2.15 and a maximum range of 7.00. The SWAIT had 137 participants complete, a mean of 5.8774 and standard deviation of .95719. Counselor self-efficacy, measured by the COSE, had 131 participants complete, a minimum range of 3.29 and a maximum range of 4.23. The COSE had a mean of 3.6879 and standard deviation of .20040. In regards to the normality of the three standardized tests used in this study, the SSQ had a skewness = -.531 and kurtosis = 1.724, indicating it is positively skewed and had participants responses clustered around several different numbers, The SWAI-T had a skewness = -1.332 and kurtosis = 1.802, meaning it was positively skewed and also had clusters of responses, and the COSE had a skewness = .380 and kurtosis = .026, indicating it is considered an approximately normal distribution. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics.
Overall, counselor trainees reported high supervision satisfaction. Question number one on the SSQ states "How would you rate the quality of the supervision you have received?"

When answering question number one, the mean response was 1.6377, with 1 meaning Excellent and 2 meaning Good. Question number seven on the SSQ states "In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the supervision you have received?" When answering question number seven on the SSQ the mean response was 1.6159, with 1 being Very Satisfied and 2 being Mostly Satisfied. The average score reported by participants on this assessment was a 27.

As previously stated, a score of 8 to 20 suggests low satisfaction with supervision, 21 to 26 suggests moderate satisfaction, and scores 27 to 32 represent a high satisfaction.

As previously stated for the SWAI-T, any response ranging from 1.00 to 2.99 will be considered low; 3.00 to 5.99 will be considered moderate, and anything 6.00 to 7.00 will be considered high. Overall, counselor trainees reported moderate satisfaction with their supervisory working alliance. On the scale of 1 meaning almost never and 7 meaning almost always, the average response to all questions was 5.877. The lowest average response given was 4.9562 on question eleven "My supervisor treats me like a colleague in our supervisory sessions." The highest average response given was 6.4307 on question two "My supervisor welcomes my explanations about my client's behavior."
Finally, counselor trainees reported moderate levels of self-efficacy. For the COSE, scores of 1.00 to 2.99 are considered low, scores 3.00 to 4.99 are considered moderate, and scores of 5.00 to 6.00 are considered high. Responses ranged from one to six, with one meaning strongly disagree and 6 meaning strongly agree. The mean of responses was 3.59 with 3 meaning somewhat disagree and 4 meaning somewhat agree. The highest average response was 5.0534 on question 28. "When working with ethnic minority clients I am confident that I will be able to bridge cultural differences in the counseling process."

In summary, hypothesis 1 was partially supported. Participants found moderate levels of satisfaction with their supervisory working alliance and their level of self-efficacy in supervision. Participants did not report moderate levels of satisfaction with supervision; they reported high levels of supervision satisfaction. The average total score reported by participants was 27 which as previously stated falls into the high range for this questionnaire.

**Research Question 2:** What is the relationship between university supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum and internship students for supervisees' perceived levels of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 2a: There will be a significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Specifically, supervisees who are assigned a full-time faculty member as their university supervisor will report significantly greater supervisee satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and self-efficacy.

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine research question 2. Table 2 shows the output. There was no main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction $F = 1.180, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .019$, SWA, $F = .614, p > .05$, partial
\( \eta^2 = .010 \), or self-efficacy, \( F = .007, p > .05 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .000 \). In summary, hypothesis 2a was not supported, as there was no main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 2b: There will be a significant main effect for student type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Internship students will report significantly higher levels of perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

This hypothesis was partially supported. There was no main effect found for student type and SWA, or self-efficacy. There was however, a main effect found for student type and supervision satisfaction, \( F = 3.740, p < .05 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .059 \), Power = .675. Specifically, internship students, \( M = 2.46 \), were slightly more satisfied with their supervision than practicum students, \( M = 2.38 \).

Hypothesis 2c: There will be a significant main effect for student type and university supervisor type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

There was no main effect found for student type and university supervisor type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SupStatus</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PracInternNA</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>3.740</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupStatus * PracInternNA</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corrected Total & SWAIAVE & 108.150 & 128 \\
SSAVE & 4.278 & 128 \\
COSEAIVE & 5.156 & 128 \\

Research Question 3: What is the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision?

Hypothesis 3a: There will be a significant main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. White supervisees will report significantly higher supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine research question 3. Table 3 displays the data below. There was no main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction $F = 1.672, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .072$, SWA $F = .978, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .044$, or self-efficacy, $F = 1.026, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .046$. Hypothesis 3a was not supported, as there was no main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

There was no main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction $F = .578, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .011$, SWA $F = .327, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .006$, or self-efficacy $F = 1.328, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .024$. Hypothesis 3b was supported, as there was no main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3c: There will be no significant main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.
There was no main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, or self-efficacy; thus hypothesis 3c was supported. F = .258, p > .05, partial $\eta^2$ = .008, SWA F = .810, p > .05, partial $\eta^2$ = .015, or self-efficacy F = 2.437, p > .05, partial $\eta^2$ = .044.

Hypothesis 3d: There will be no significant interaction effect for multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

There was no main effect for any of the multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, or self-efficacy.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.328</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>4.379</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicingrel</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Race</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>1.661</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.201</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Practicingrel</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race * Practicingrel</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>2.582</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>1.566</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender * Race * ##</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>SWA</td>
<td>108.150</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>4.278</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAVE</td>
<td>5.156</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4: Are perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a significant main effect for perceived racial/ethnic differences and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Perceived differences will be related to lower supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine research question 4. A difference variable was created for the perceived demographics of participants' supervisors in order to correctly analyze the data. There were 150 difference variables used for gender, 145 for race/ethnicity, 150 for religion/spiritual affiliation, and 40 for degree of practice relating to religious/spiritual affiliation. Table 4 displays the MANOVA below. There was no main effect for perceived racial/ethnic differences and supervision satisfaction $F = 1.846, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .060$, SWA $F = 1.921, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .062$ and self-efficacy. $F = .763, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .026$. Hypothesis 4a was not supported.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived gender and supervision satisfaction $F = .016, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .001$, SWA $F = .713, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .024$. There was a main effect for perceived gender and self-efficacy, $F = 5.942, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .170$, Power = .65. Hypothesis 4b was partially supported, as there was a main effect for perceived gender and self-efficacy, but no main effect for gender and satisfaction or SWA.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be no significant main effect for perceived degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

There was no main effect for perceived degree of practice to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction $F = .837, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .028$, SWA $F = .003, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$, and self-efficacy $F = 1.048, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .035$. Hypothesis 4c was supported as no
significant main effect was found for perceived degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4d: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4d was partially supported. There was no main effect for race/ethnicity and for perceived degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. However, there was a main effect for perceived gender and self-efficacy, $F = 5.942, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .170$, Power = .65.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Observed Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GendDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>5.942</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>1.921</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.846</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PracDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenDiff * RaceDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenDiff * PracDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaceDiff * PracDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GenDiff * RaceDiff * PracDiff</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>SWAIAVE</td>
<td>33.066</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSAVE</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COSEAIVE</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This study examined supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy during practicum and/or internship. Additionally, this study explored the impact race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of religious/spirituality practice had on supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy. In this chapter, a summary of findings will first be given. Next, the findings will be compared to findings of previous research. Then, implications for counselors and supervisors will be addressed. Finally, future research directions will be discussed.

Summary of Findings

This study examined supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy during practicum and/or internship. Supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum or internship) were also examined with perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy. Additionally, this study explored the impact race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of religious/spirituality practice had on supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.

This study had a limited sample size and thus the results cannot be generalized to other populations. All 594 CACREP accredited counseling programs were invited to participate in this study. Of those that responded (N = 162) the majority reported being of the White/European race, 125 (76%) and female 135 (82%). The participants (N=149) reported their supervisors as being 115 (70%) as White/European, and 107 (65%) as female. Therefore participants and their supervisors had similar demographics, which is consistent with previous studies.
Research question one examined what was reported with respect to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and counselor self-efficacy. Overall, this study found high supervision satisfaction, moderate SWA, and moderate counselor self-efficacy reported by participants. This study was consistent with previous findings that indicated the SWA was significantly related to satisfaction within supervision (Cheon et al., 2008). Although this study did not find significance, which could possibly be due to low power and sample size among many other reasons, participants reported high supervision satisfaction and a moderate SWA. Additionally, this study was consistent with previous research by Crockett (2011) where supervisees who reported a strong SWA reported a higher level of overall satisfaction with supervision.

Research question two examined the relationship between university supervisor type and student type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was no significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. However, there was a main effect for student type and supervision satisfaction that does correspond with previous research findings. Barbee et al. (2003) found students reported higher levels of self-efficacy the more counseling courses they had completed. This study was consistent with these findings, as participants who indicated they were in the internship stage of their program reported slightly higher supervision satisfaction ($M = 2.46$), than practicum students, ($M = 2.38$). Students in the internship stage of their program have typically completed the majority of their courses.

Research question three examined the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision. This study agreed with research from Gatmon et al. (2001) in regards to ethnicity similarities between
supervisor and supervisee. Supervisees who discussed similarities and differences regarding their cultural variables reported higher overall SWA with their supervisors (Gatmon et al., 2001). This study did not address whether the differences were discussed during supervision sessions specifically, but the participants perceived their supervisors as having similar cultural characteristics and reported high supervision satisfaction, moderate levels of self-efficacy and moderate perceived working alliance. This study supported previous research by Crockett (2011) that indicated differences between supervisor and supervisee multicultural variables did not impact supervisee perceived satisfaction with supervision. There were no significant findings with regards to differences in multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in this study.

Gender did play a role in this study, as it did in some previous research. Herbert and Trusty (2006) found male supervisees reported being more satisfied with supervision than female supervisees. An interesting finding reported in previous research was that supervisees perceived male supervisors as addressing religion more often than female supervisors during clinical supervision (Miller & Ivey, 2006). This study is consistent with previous research findings, as 65% of supervisors were female and reported high supervision satisfaction. In this study, it can be assumed that religion/spirituality was not frequently discussed during supervision due to participants' high number of unsure responses given regarding religion/spirituality. Participants reported 59% were unsure of their supervisors' religion/spirituality and 73% were unsure if they were practicing or not.

Religious/Spiritual affiliation was the last multicultural variable to be examined in terms of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was no main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction found in this study.
There was not a lot of research examining the effect of religion/spirituality with supervision satisfaction, SWA, or self-efficacy. The majority of previous research examined the amount of discussions supervisees had with their supervisors regarding religion/spirituality. In this study, participants reported 53% of supervisees were unsure of their supervisors' religious/spiritual affiliations; meaning discussions about this topic were not taking place during supervision.

Research question four examined if perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Again, there was no main effect found with perceived differences in two of the multicultural variables (race/ethnicity and degree of perceived religious/spiritual affiliation) associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was however, a main effect found for gender and counselor self-efficacy, which may need further exploring in future research. As supervisors were not asked to participate in this study their actual demographics were not reported. This study found that supervisees perceived their supervisors to be similar in race/ethnicity and gender and reported moderate to high supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Religion/spirituality was difficult to measure as the majority of participants reported they were unsure of their supervisors' religion/spirituality.

Implications for Supervision

Smeby (2000) described how supervisors' gender might play a role in the success of graduate students, and females may be more likely to succeed if they receive supervision from a female supervisor. This study provided some support for this concept. The majority of participants in this study reported being female and perceived their supervisors as being female also. In this study, 83% of participants identified as female and 72% perceived their supervisors as female along with reporting a high level of supervision satisfaction, moderate SWA, and
moderate levels of self-efficacy. There was a main effect found for gender and counselor self-efficacy in this study. As self-efficacy is somewhat related to confidence as a counselor, one could infer that the higher the self-efficacy the more confident the counselor, thus more likely to succeed if they have a similar gender as their supervisor. The participants in this study reported high supervision satisfaction, moderate supervisory working alliance and moderate levels of self-efficacy. Thus, one could infer from this study that female students receiving supervision from a female supervisor could have more success and satisfaction with their supervision. Further research would be necessary to test gender matching and supervision satisfaction.

Overall high levels of supervision satisfaction reported by participants could have been related to another factor besides one of the independent variables tested in this study. Participants could have had an inflated sense of satisfaction due to numerous outside factors. Students who are dissatisfied with supervision, perceive a low SWA, or have low counselor self-efficacy, may not have filled out the survey. More can be learned from research accessing dissatisfaction with supervision and some of the causes.

Another implication for supervision is related to the amount of time in a counseling program leads to greater supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Students taking internship are most likely nearing the end of their time in a counseling program. Students in Practicum more than likely still continue to have a few courses left to take in their program. Internship students reported being more satisfied with their supervision than Practicum students that may suggest students further along in the program report greater satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Implications for practice may be to examine when Practicum is taken in the course of a student's graduate program. If students report greater satisfaction the further along in the program they are, this may provide evidence to postpone when students take Practicum until
immediately before internship. Or students may be required to finish all counseling courses before beginning Practicum and Internship experiences.

Research question two examined university supervisor type and student type in regards to the relationship with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was no significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. In this study roughly half of the participants reported their program had access to doctoral students conducting supervision and half did not. Participants reported moderate to high supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy even though only half had access to doctoral students. This result could be interpreted that whether a faculty member or doctoral student is providing supervision the outcome is still moderate to high supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. This could lead to more CACREP accredited programs allowing doctoral students to provide supervision to the masters students. Further research would be needed to examine this concept.

Research question three examined the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision. This study did not address whether the differences were discussed during supervision sessions specifically, but the participants who perceived their supervisors as having similar ethnic characteristics and reported high supervision satisfaction, self-efficacy and perceived working alliance. Participants reported similar race/ethnicity and gender as they perceived about their supervisors. For example, 125 (77%) of participants identified as White/European and reportedly perceive their supervisors as White/European, 115 (70%). Participants reported 135 (82%) identified as being female and perceived 65% of their supervisor to identify as female. One could infer that the
similarities between supervisee and supervisor created the higher levels of satisfaction, self-efficacy and working alliance. Implications for practice could include matching of these multicultural characteristics at some point for students in their graduate program, although further research would be needed to add evidence to this claim.

Gender did not play a significant role in this study for supervision satisfaction and SWA. However, there was a significant finding for gender and self-efficacy in this study. This could be due to the fact that the majority of participants were female, 135 (82%), and also reported their supervisors as female as well, 107 (65%). Thus one could infer that having the same gender as a supervisor could possibly enhance counselor self-efficacy. Counselor self-efficacy is important as it can influence overall satisfaction and success as a counselor. Implications for practice could include supervisee-supervisor gender matching during one semester throughout the course of their program to possibly facilitate counselor self-efficacy.

Religious/Spiritual affiliation was the last multicultural variable to be examined in terms of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was no main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction found in this study. Participants reported 53% of supervisees were unsure of their supervisors' religious/spiritual affiliations; one could infer that discussions about this topic were not taking place during supervision. The results may have been different if supervisees were more aware of what religious/spiritual affiliation their supervisors identified as.

Research question four examined if perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Again, there was no main effect found with perceived differences in multicultural variables associated with perceived supervision satisfaction and SWA. Although there was no main effect found for
race/ethnicity and degree of practice related to religion/spirituality, there was a main effect found for gender and counselor self-efficacy. As supervisors were not asked to participate in this study their actual demographics were not reported. One interpretation for this could be that future research is needed to examine and compare actual supervisor demographics with supervisee perceived demographics. This study found that supervisees perceived their supervisors to be similar in race/ethnicity and gender and reported moderate to high supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Religion/spirituality was difficult to measure as the majority of participants reported they were unsure of their supervisors' religion/spirituality. This could be due to religion/spirituality not being discussed during supervision sessions. Also, all of the above implications should be considered tentatively given the low power and sample size of this study.

Limitations

This study had several limitations. The first limitation of this study is the small sample size. Almost 600 CACREP accredited programs were contacted to participate and 165 students responded to the survey. Of those 165 participants who chose to participate, not all 165 completed all parts of the survey. Due to the limited number of responses, power and effect size were smaller, thus resulting in no significance being detected among variables. With a larger sample size there may have been some significant results found as in previous research multicultural variables of race/ethnicity did yield significant results (Ancis & Marshall 2010; Crockett, 2011; Gatmon et al., 2001). In this study, participants identified as being of the White/European race, 83% as female, and 70% as Christian. The participants perceived their supervisors as identifying as 77% White/European race, 72% as female, and 59% as Christian.
Therefore, there was little to no diversity among participants in this study. Results may have been different if a diverse sample of participants were surveyed.

Another limitation was this study examined perceived supervisor demographic differences. Actual supervisor demographics were not obtained. Supervisors were not asked to participate in this study. Interestingly, supervisees perceived their supervisors to have similar race/ethnicity and gender as they did. In this study, participants identified as being of the White/European race, 83% as female, and 70% as Christian. The participants perceived their supervisors as identifying as 77% White/European race, 72% as female, and 59% as Christian. Therefore, there was little to no diversity among perceived differences among supervisee and supervisor.

There was also no differentiation between site and university supervisors in this study. Participants were not asked to identify whether the supervisor they were referring to in this study was their site or university supervisor. This study also only invited students who were involved in CACREP accredited counseling programs. Counseling programs that were not accredited were not considered for this study. A similar limitation for this study is that 20% of participants reported they were unsure if they were in Practicum or Internship. There could have been a clarification question added to address why participants were unsure and if they were actively involved in some form of supervision at the time of this study.

Another limitation of this study was when participants were asked about their type of supervision (i.e. individual, group, or triadic). Participants were not asked to pick only one form to identify and comment on. Participants were involved in more than one type of supervision at the time of the survey. For example, participants indicated they were involved in individual and group at the same time. Responses could have been different if participants were asked to pick
one type of supervision and comment on that type. Also, there were 165 returned surveys and of those returned 162 chose to disclose information about their demographics, 149 chose to report perceived supervisor characteristics, 131 answered the SWAI-T, 138 answered the SSQ, and 137 participants answered questions on the COSE. In addition, when participants were asked about perceived supervisor religion/spirituality, 59% reported they were unsure and 73% reported they were unsure if their supervisors were practicing religion/spirituality. This made it difficult to analyze data regarding perceived religion/spirituality. Also, participants could have been given the choice of answering if discussions of perceived differences were taking place during supervision to help clarify some of the unsure responses. Thus, results could have been different if participants were asked to complete all sections of the survey and demographics so number of participants would stay consistent throughout.

Also, instrumentation used in this study were self-reporting surveys. These types of data collection tools can sometimes be affected by social desirability bias. Participants may report what they think the researcher wants to find. Social desirability effect could have had an influence on participants’ responses, as some may have wanted to be seen in a more favorable way. Some participants could have inflated responses on each of the instruments. For example the COSE is a good predictor of counseling beliefs, it may not predict actual counselor behavior in-session. The best indicator of counselor self-efficacy would be a combination of counseling beliefs and actions in-session (Kozina, Grabovari, Drapeau, 2010).

Future Research

Based on the results of this study future research could be done in several different directions. As this study had a limited population, further research could be done to attempt to gain more participants in order to possibly find significance in these variables. For example,
sending out multiple requests to invite participants, instead of just two requests as this study. Research could be done in determining which type of supervision (i.e. group, individual, or triadic) provides the most satisfaction from counselors. In this study, most participants listed they were involved in several different types of supervision during the same semester. This study did not have participants delineate their supervision type if they were receiving more than one type (i.e. group and triadic or individual and triadic).

Future research needs to be done comparing perceived differences in supervision between supervisee and supervisor. For this study, the researcher was only interested in the supervisees’ perceived differences and/or similarities with their supervisor. Actual supervisor demographics were not reported. A study could be to examine perceived differences with actual supervisor demographics to compare the accuracy of supervisees’ perceptions.

Another direction for future research could be examining the differences in supervision satisfaction in regards to supervisor type (university or site). In CACREP accredited programs counseling students are required to engage in supervision at their internship or practicum site and at their university. As participants were not asked to identify which supervisor (university or site) they were referring to in this study, there may be differences in satisfaction with their supervision.

Future research could also be done in the area of having discussions about differences and similarities in cultural variables between supervisor and supervisee during supervision. As an overwhelming majority of participants in this study indicated they were unsure about their supervisors religious/spiritual affiliation, research could investigate if having conversations about differences/similarities in ethnicity, gender, and religion/spirituality have an impact on the supervisory relationship, satisfaction, and counselor self-efficacy.
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Abstract

Supervision in counseling is essential to the personal and professional growth of counselors, and ensures client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013). The purpose of this study was to examine counselor trainees’ perceived satisfaction with supervision, the supervisory working alliance (SWA), supervisee self-efficacy, and its relationship to supervisor and student type and multicultural factors. The study did find the participants reported high supervision satisfaction, moderate SWA, and moderate counselor self-efficacy. Also, participants in the internship stage reported higher satisfaction than students in the practicum stage. There was no main effect found for race/ethnicity and religion/spirituality in regards to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. However, there was a main effect found for gender and counselor self-efficacy.
The Relationship among Counseling Supervision Satisfaction, Counselor Self-Efficacy, Working Alliance and Multicultural Factors

Clinical supervision is aimed towards ensuring client welfare (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013) while helping to prevent counselor burnout (Briggs & Miller, 2005). Several variables have been examined in the literature with respect to the supervision experience: satisfaction with supervision, supervisory working alliance (SWA), counselor self-efficacy, and multicultural variables such as race/ethnicity, gender, and religion/spirituality.

With respect to satisfaction with supervision, Holloway and Wampold (1983) stated many factors contribute to overall satisfaction, including supervisees’ understanding of their actions and interactions while in supervision, their interpretation of their supervisors’ perceived performance and personal characteristics, and the level of ease in expressing their thoughts during supervision. Ladany et al. (1999) built upon Holloway and Wampold’s (1983) definition and specifically defined supervisee satisfaction as occurring “when the goals and tasks of supervision are clearly understood” (p. 448). Further, Herbert and Trusty (2006) noted supervisees with a clinical supervisory style and whose supervisors emphasized a consultant role and identified as male were more associated with supervision satisfaction as important among supervisors and supervisees. Crockett (2011) found that cultural differences between supervisor and supervisee did not impact supervisee perceived satisfaction with supervision. Interestingly, supervisees who reported their supervisors as being more multiculturally competent reported being more satisfied with supervision (Crockett, 2011).

Finally, supervision satisfaction has also been measured in terms of supervisees’ perceived professional development (Foster, Lichtenberg, and Peyton, 2007). Specifically, they sampled 90 supervisees and 90 supervisors and found that when supervisees’ perceived a weaker
relationship with their supervisors, they also reported lower levels of perceived professional
development.

SWA is most often used to describe the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee. This relationship is important to the success of the overall supervision process and the counseling process, as the supervisees’ perception of the SWA may be an indicator of clients’ perceptions of the counseling relationship (Patton & Kivlighan, 1997). Bordin (1983) developed a SWA model, which he based on the concepts of his therapeutic working alliance model: “(1) mutual agreements and understandings regarding the goals sought in the change process; (2) the tasks of each of the partners; and (3) the bonds between the partners necessary to sustain the enterprise” (p. 35). The literature indicates that there is an association between supervision with satisfaction and SWA. Specifically, Crockett (2011) found that supervisees who reported a strong SWA reported a higher level of overall satisfaction with supervision.

Counselor self-efficacy, or the belief in one’s ability to develop and implement counseling skills, refers to the belief that counselors can effectively help a client (Daniels & Larson, 2001). Self-efficacy is developed throughout a trainee’s academic courses and grows substantially during practicum and internship experiences (Halverson, Miars, & Livneh, 2006), with a higher self-efficacy indicating a higher level of task performance (Bandura, 1977, 1982; Cashwell & Dooley, 2001).

Multicultural variables such as race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religion/spirituality have been examined in the supervision literature. For example, Ancis and Marshall (2010) explored in a qualitative study cultural issues that may arise in supervision among four doctoral supervisees. Supervisees reported that supervisors were described as open, accepting, and flexible which seemed to positively affect both the supervisory relationship and
the clinical relationship. Supervisees reported their supervisors encouraged them to explore the clients’ perspective as well as being more self aware in their own cultural biases to become more culturally competent (Ancis & Marshall, 2010).

When gender similarities and differences are discussed during supervision, supervisees reported higher levels of overall satisfaction with supervision (Gatmon et al., 2001). They also found that a significant positive correlation existed between the SWA and the quality of the discussions of ethnic and gender similarities and/or differences in supervision (Gatmon et al., 2001). Another finding from this study was that it was more important to have the discussion of cultural variables during supervision than the actual matching of the supervisee and supervisor. Overall, Gatmon et al. (2001) found that, when cultural variables were discussed in supervision sessions, supervisees reported significantly higher satisfaction with supervision and an enhanced SWA.

Herbert and Trusty (2006) explored the factors that affect supervision satisfaction in the public vocational rehabilitation program. In terms of gender, male supervisees reported being more satisfied with supervision than female supervisees. Results also indicated that supervisees who perceived their supervisors in the role of consultant reported a higher level of satisfaction with supervision than any of the other supervisory roles (Herbert & Trusty, 2006).

Cheon, Blumer, Shih, Murphy, and Sato (2008) focused on contextual variables, which included the supervision setting, age, gender, and ethnicity that can affect the SWA and supervision satisfaction. Results also indicated that the SWA was significantly related to satisfaction within supervision, but not contextual variables such as age, gender, and ethnicity (Cheon et al., 2008). Time spent in supervision did not have a significant contribution on supervision satisfaction reported by supervisees. This study was consistent with previous
findings that indicated the SWA was significantly related to satisfaction within supervision (Cheon et al., 2008).

In a correlational study, Barbee et al. (2003) surveyed pre-practicum counseling graduate students to examine their levels of self-efficacy. They compared number of counseling courses completed against their reported levels of self-efficacy, as well as the amount of service learning hours completed. Results indicated a significant positive relationship between number of completed service learning hours and self-efficacy. Barbee et al. (2003) also found students reported higher levels of self-efficacy the more counseling courses they had completed.

Overall there has been research on supervision satisfaction, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy and their interactions and relationships. There has been a lack of research integrating the three factors in one study. Also, there has been research conducted on race and ethnicity, gender, and religion and spirituality, but there has been a lack of research that integrated all three of those variables and explored their relationship and interactions on supervision outcomes. Finally, there is a lack of research investigating what relationship race and ethnicity, gender, and religion and spirituality have with supervision satisfaction, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.

**Method**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to examine supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, the SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy, with supervision experiences they have during practicum and/or internship. Specifically, the association these perceived levels of satisfaction, the SWA, and self-efficacy may have with supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum or internship) were
explored. Additionally, this study investigated how multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) may be related to supervisees' perceived satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and supervisee self-efficacy.

**Research Questions**

**Research Question 1:** What do counselor trainees report with respect to supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

**Hypothesis 1:** Counselor trainees will report moderate supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

**Research Question 2:** What is the relationship between university supervisor type (i.e., full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, or doctoral student) and student type (i.e., practicum and internship students) for supervisees' perceived levels of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

**Hypothesis 2a:** There will be a significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Specifically, supervisees who are assigned a full-time faculty member as their university supervisor will report significantly greater supervisee satisfaction with supervision, SWA, and self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2b:** There will be a significant main effect for student type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Internship students will report significantly higher levels of perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

**Hypothesis 2c:** There will be a significant main effect for student type and university supervisor type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.
Research Question 3: What is the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision?

Hypothesis 3a: There will be a significant main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. White supervisees will report significantly higher supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3b: There will be no significant main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3c: There will be no significant main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 3d: There will be no significant interaction effect for multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Research Question 4: Are perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy?

Hypothesis 4a: There will be a significant main effect for perceived racial/ethnic differences and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Perceived differences will be related to lower supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4b: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived gender and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4c: There will be no significant main effect for perceived degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4d: There will be no significant interaction effect for perceived multicultural variables and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy.
Participants and Procedures

Participants were selected using convenience sampling. The primary researcher accessed all 594 CACREP accredited schools through the CACREP website. An email was sent to the CACREP liaison for each university, which explained the purpose and asked for their assistance in distributing an email to their students. CACREP liaisons were asked to distribute an email that included a letter of invitation to students in their programs. The letter of invitation included the informed consent document as well as criteria for participation and a link to the survey packet. After two weeks, a follow-up email was sent to the CACREP liaisons as a reminder to help increase participation in this study.

The online survey contained a demographic sheet, the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE) (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992) (Appendix D), the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ) (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996) and the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T) (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). Upon completion of the questionnaire, participants were thanked for their participation and given the option of entering into a drawing to win one of three $100.00 gift cards.

Participants consisted of graduate students enrolled in CACREP-accredited counseling programs across the United States. CACREP-accredited programs were chosen because they have been through the accreditation process, which ensures appropriate knowledge and skills are standardized by the counseling profession. Accreditation also ensures that the program is professionally and financially stable (CACREP, 2009). To be eligible to participate, graduate students were currently enrolled in the field practice part of their counseling program, practicum and/or internship. The students also received regular supervision, in some format, from a faculty
member or doctoral student at their university. Students received regular supervision, in some format, from their site supervisor at their practicum and/or internship site.

Of the CACREP schools contacted, 165 graduate students participated and completed a survey. To triangulate whether the students' programs were accredited, 161 (99%) students indicated their program was CACREP accredited, 1 (1%) indicated they were unsure (3 did not provide an answer). Further, 103 participants (62%) indicated their program had a doctoral program and 85 (52%) reported the doctoral students provided supervision. Table 1 provides sample demographics.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisee Characteristics</th>
<th>Perceived Supervisor Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>85 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum</td>
<td>44 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 did not respond</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 (54%) Full-time Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 (26%) Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 (16%) Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 did not respond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135 (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 did not respond</td>
<td>16 did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 (72%) Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (28%) Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%) Transgender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European</td>
<td>125 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans</td>
<td>18 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Americans</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 did not respond</td>
<td>16 did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 (77%) White/European</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (13%) African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3%) Asian American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3%) Multiracial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (2%) Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (1%) Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion/Spirituality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>113 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 did not respond</td>
<td>16 did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 (59%) Unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 (38%) Christian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%) Jewish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1%) Buddhist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (2%) religion was never discussed</td>
<td>16 did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicing Religion/Spirituality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing</td>
<td>66 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat practicing</td>
<td>53 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not practicing</td>
<td>43 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 did not respond</td>
<td>16 did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 (73%) unsure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (21%) practicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (3%) somewhat practicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (3%) non practicing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentation

**Demographic sheet.** A demographic sheet was given to the participants on the same link as the questionnaires. The demographic sheet provided information to the researcher and included questions about race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation, supervisor type, and student type.

**Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire.** The Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ) was utilized to measure overall supervision satisfaction (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996). The SSQ utilizes a four point scale ranging from low (1) to high (4). The SSQ consists of 8 items, with a total score ranging from 8 to 32, with higher scores indicating a higher level of satisfaction (Ladany et al., 1996). The SSQ has shown to be negatively related to supervisors’ perceived ethical violations during supervision, as well as, supervisee nondisclosures when they had negative reactions to their supervisors (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999b; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996). Two studies that used the SSQ have shown the internal consistencies to be .96 and .97 respectively (Ladany et al., 1999a; Ladany, Walker, & Melincoff, 2001). Internal consistency for the current sample was .854.

**Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee.** To assess the supervisee-supervisor working alliance the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory-Trainee (SWAI-T) was used (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990). The SWAI-T was used to measure how the supervisee perceived the supervisory relationship (Efstation et al., 1990).

The SWAI-T has 19 items with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) almost never to (7) almost always. Several studies have used Cronbach’s alpha to establish internal consistency for the SWAI-T, which include .97 overall, .88 for the client subscale, and .97 for the rapport subscale with inter-item correlations ranging from .35 to .71 for the client subscale.
and from .32 to .91 for the rapport subscale (Efstathiou et al., 1990; Patton & Kivlighan, 1997; White & Queener, 2003). For the purposes of this study, any response ranging from 1 to 2 will be considered low, 3 to 5 will be considered moderate, and anything 6 or 7 will be considered high.

**Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory.** To assess the counselor self-efficacy beliefs, the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE) was employed (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel; & Toulouse, 1992). The COSE has 37 items with a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (6) strongly agree. The total score represents the counselor’s level of self-efficacy beliefs, as where higher scores indicate greater counselor self-efficacy. The level of self-efficacy is delineated into five factor scores: micro-skills, handling of process, difficult client behaviors, cultural competence, and awareness of personal values (Larson et al., 1992). The overall score a counselor receives represents the counselor’s beliefs in his or her ability to counsel in the immediate future. For purposes of this study, scores of 1 to 2 are considered low, scores 3 to 4 are considered moderate, and scores of 5-6 are considered high.

The COSE and its five factors showed appropriate reliability and validity in previous literature, with test-retest reliability for the COSE measure was \( r = .87 \), and internal consistency was \( \alpha = .93 \) (Larson et al., 1992). Convergent validity evidence suggests that supervisee self-efficacy is positively related to higher self-esteem, positive outcome expectancies, and greater satisfaction with classroom performance. The COSE is negatively related to the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielberger, 1983) to trait anxiety and negative affect (Larson et al., 1992).

**Findings**

**Counselor Trainees’ Supervision Satisfaction, SWA, and Self-Efficacy**
Research question 1 involved examining the descriptive data of the three dependent variables. Overall, counselor trainees reported high supervision satisfaction. Supervision Satisfaction, measured by the SSQ which had a mean of 2.4312 with a standard deviation of .18128. Overall, counselor trainees reported moderate satisfaction with their supervisory working alliance. The SWA, measured by the SWAI-T, had a mean of 5.8774 and standard deviation of .95719. Finally, counselor trainees reported moderate levels of self-efficacy. Counselor self-efficacy, measured by the COSE, had a mean of 3.6879 and standard deviation of .20040.

**Supervisor and Student Type and Supervision Satisfaction, SWA, and Self-Efficacy**

A two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine research question 2. There was no main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction ($F = 1.180, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .019$), SWA ($F = .614, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .010$), or self-efficacy ($F = .007, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$). There was no main effect found for student type and SWA, or self-efficacy. There was however, a main effect was found for student type and supervision satisfaction, ($F = 3.740, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .059$), Power = .675. Specifically, internship students ($M = 2.46, SD = .017678$) were slightly more satisfied with their supervision than practicum students ($M = 2.38, SD = .20403$). There was no main effect found for student type and university supervisor type with supervision satisfaction, ($F = 1.180, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .019$), SWA ($F = .614, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .010$), or self-efficacy ($F = .007, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .000$).

**Supervisee Multicultural Variables and Supervision Satisfaction, SWA, and Self-Efficacy**

A three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine research question 3. There was no main effect for race/ethnicity and supervision satisfaction ($F = 1.672, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .072$), SWA ($F = .978, p > .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .044$), or self-efficacy ($F = 1.026, p$...
There was no main effect for gender and supervision satisfaction (F = .578, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .011$), SWA (F = .327, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .006$), or self-efficacy (F = 1.328, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .024$). There was no main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction (F = .258, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .008$), SWA (F = .810, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .015$), or self-efficacy (F = 2.437, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .044$).

**Perceived Cultural Differences and Supervision Satisfaction, SWA, and Self-Efficacy**

A difference variable was created to analyze data reported by supervisee's regarding supervisor multicultural characteristics. This new difference variable was then analyzed using a three-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) for research question 4. There was no main effect for perceived racial/ethnic differences and supervision satisfaction (F = 1.846, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .060$), SWA (F = 1.921, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .062$) and self-efficacy (F = .763, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .026$). There was no significant interaction effect for perceived gender and supervision satisfaction (F = .016, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .001$), SWA (F = .713, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .024$). There was a main effect for perceived gender and self-efficacy (F = 5.942, p < .05, partial $\eta^2 = .170$), Power = .65. There was no main effect for perceived degree of practice to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction (F = .837, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .028$), SWA (F = .003, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .000$), and self-efficacy (F = 1.048, p > .05, partial $\eta^2 = .035$).

**Discussion**

Of those that responded ($N = 165$) the majority reported being of the White/European race, 125 (76%) and female 135 (82%). The participants reported their supervisors as being 115 (70%) as White/European, and 107 (65%) as female. Therefore participants and their supervisors had similar demographics, which is consistent with previous studies. Overall, participants reported high supervision satisfaction, moderate SWA, and moderate counselor self-
efficacy reported by participants. This study was consistent with previous findings that indicated the SWA was significantly related to satisfaction within supervision (Cheon et al., 2008). Although this study did not find significance possibly due to low power and sample size, participants reported high supervision satisfaction and a moderate SWA. Additionally, this study was consistent with previous research by Crockett (2011) where supervisees who reported a strong SWA reported a higher level of overall satisfaction with supervision.

Research question two examined the relationship between university supervisor type and student type with supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was no significant main effect for university supervisor type and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. However, there was a main effect for student type and supervision satisfaction that does correspond with previous research findings. Barbee et al. (2003) found students reported higher levels of self-efficacy the more counseling courses they had completed. This study was consistent with these findings, as participants who indicated they were in the internship stage of their program reported slightly higher supervision satisfaction ($M = 2.46$), than practicum students, ($M = 2.38$). Students in the internship stage of their program have typically completed the majority of their courses.

Research question three examined the relationship among supervisee multicultural variables (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, and degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation) and supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy in supervision. This study agreed with research from Gatmon et al. (2001) in regards to ethnicity similarities between supervisor and supervisee. Supervisees who discussed similarities and differences regarding their ethnicity reported higher overall SWA with their supervisors (Gatmon et al., 2001). This study did not address whether the differences were discussed during supervision sessions.
specifically, but the participants perceived their supervisors as having similar ethnic characteristics and reported high supervision satisfaction, self-efficacy and perceived working alliance. This study supported previous research by Crockett (2011) that indicated differences between supervisor and supervisee multicultural variables did not impact supervisee perceived satisfaction with supervision. Although this study’s participants and supervisors had similar cultural characteristics, what small differences they reported did not affect how satisfied with supervision they were.

Gender played an important role in previous research and in this study, gender also played a role as there was a significant finding for gender and self-efficacy. Herbert and Trusty (2006) found male supervisees reported being more satisfied with supervision than female supervisees. An interesting finding reported in previous research was that supervisees perceived male supervisors as addressing religion more often than female supervisors during clinical supervision (Miller & Ivey, 2006). In this study, participants reported that religion/spirituality was not frequently discussed during supervision. Seventy percent of participants identified as Christian and reported 88% were unsure of their supervisors’ religion/spiritual preference. This supports previous research findings, as 65% of supervisors were female.

Religious/Spiritual affiliation was the last multicultural variable to be examined in terms of supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. There was no main effect for degree of practice related to religious/spiritual affiliation and supervision satisfaction found in this study. There was not a lot of research examining the effect of religion/spirituality with supervision satisfaction, SWA, or self-efficacy. The majority of previous research examined the amount of discussions supervisees had with their supervisors regarding religion/spirituality. In this study, participants reported 59% of supervisees were unsure of their supervisors’ religious/spiritual
Research question four examined if perceived differences in multicultural variables significantly associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Again, there was no main effect found with perceived differences in multicultural variables associated with perceived supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. As supervisors were not asked to participate in this study their actual demographics were not reported. This study found that supervisees perceived their supervisors to be similar in race/ethnicity and gender and reported moderate to high supervision satisfaction, SWA, and self-efficacy. Religion/spirituality was difficult to measure as the majority of participants reported they were unsure of their supervisors' religion/spirituality.

Limitations

The first limitation of this study is the small sample size. Due to the limited number of responses, power and effect size were smaller, thus resulting in no significance being detected among variables. With a larger sample size there may have been some significant results found. The majority of participants who responded to the survey reported they were of the White/European race/ethnicity. Also, a majority of the participants reported being female and perceived their supervisors to be female as well. A majority of participants reported being Christian when asked about religion/spirituality. Therefore, there was little to no diversity among participants in this study. Results may have been different if a diverse sample of participants were surveyed.

Another limitation was this study examined perceived supervisor demographic differences. Actual supervisor demographics were not obtained. Supervisors were not asked to
participate in this study. Interestingly, supervisees perceived their supervisors to have similar race/ethnicity and gender as they did. There was little to no diversity among perceived differences among supervisee and supervisor. There was also no differentiation between site and university supervisors in this study. Participants were not asked to identify whether the supervisor they were referring to in this study was their site or university supervisor. This study also only invited students who were involved in CACREP accredited counseling programs. Counseling programs that were not accredited were not considered for this study.

Another limitation of this study was when participants were asked about their type of supervision (i.e. individual, group, or triadic). Participants were not asked to pick only one form to identify and comment on. Participants were involved in more than one type of supervision at the time of the survey. For example, participants indicated they were involved in individual and group at the same time. Responses could have been different if participants were asked to pick one type of supervision and comment on that type.

Conclusion

This study provided some insight into counseling supervision and multicultural factors that also play a role in counselor satisfaction, self-efficacy, and working alliance. Those who provide supervision for graduate counseling students need to be aware of such factors involved in supervision and how they impact the entire process. There is clearly a need for further research conducted into the supervision process to examine supervisors’ input on the topics of satisfaction, self-efficacy, and working alliance.
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Dear Student:

I am a doctoral student in Counselor Education at Old Dominion University. As a counseling student in a CACREP-accredited university currently doing practicum and/or internship field experience, and receiving supervision, I need your assistance with this study. The purpose of this study is to increase knowledge of certain multicultural variables, counselor self-efficacy, supervisory working alliance, and overall satisfaction within the supervision environment.

I would like to take this time to invite you to participate in this study, which is voluntary and anonymous. If you choose to participate your responses will not in any way be reported back to your supervisor or school. If you agree to participate in this study you will complete questions regarding demographic information, the Counselor Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE), the Supervisory Working Alliance-Trainee (SWAI-T) form, and the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ). Please note that you may discontinue participating in this survey at any time.

Below is a link to a survey, which will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. To thank you for your participation, there will be an option at the end to enter into a drawing to win one of three $100.00 gift cards. To ensure confidentiality, your email addresses will not be attached to the information you provide. The results of this survey will be analyzed, and the data will be included in the dissertation.

If you have any questions of this particular study, or what is expected from you as a participant, then please contact me at jbrid017@odu.edu or my dissertation chair, Danica Hays, Ph.D. at dhays@odu.edu.

Thank you for your time and support,

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bridges, M.A., LPC (IL), NCC
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

PROJECT TITLE

The Relationship among Counseling Supervision Satisfaction, Counselor Self-Efficacy, Working Alliance and Multicultural Factors

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH STUDY

Several studies have been conducted looking into the subject of counseling supervision and perceived levels of satisfaction, supervisory working alliance, and supervisee self-efficacy. None of them have explained the relationship of multicultural variables, supervisee and supervisor type with perceived levels of satisfaction, supervisory working alliance, and supervisee self-efficacy. The purpose of this study is to increase knowledge of certain multicultural variables, counselor self-efficacy, supervisory working alliance, and overall satisfaction within the supervision environment.

RISKS AND BENEFITS

This study poses very minimal risks to the participants. One risk may be discomfort when asked to reflect upon your supervisory experience. A benefit for participating in this study includes gaining awareness of multicultural variables that may or may not play a role in supervision.

COSTS

The researchers want your decision about participating in this study to be absolutely voluntary. Yet they recognize that your participation may pose some time inconvenience. In order to thank you for your time in completing the survey items, you will have the option to enter into a random drawing to win one of three $100.00 gift cards. Email addresses will be removed from the survey responses to ensure confidentiality.

NEW INFORMATION

If the researchers find new information during this study that would reasonably change your decision about participating, then they will give it to you.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The researchers will take all reasonable steps to keep private information, such as survey responses and email addresses (if you decide to enter the drawing) confidential. The researcher will not connect your responses to any items on the surveys to your email address. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, and publications; but the researcher will not
identify you. Of course, your records may be subpoenaed by court order or inspected by
government bodies with oversight authority.

WITHDRAWAL PRIVILEGE

It is ok for you to say no. Even if you say yes now, you are free to say no later, and walk away
or withdraw from the study at any time. Your decision will not affect your relationship with Old
Dominion University, or your current university.

COMPENSATION FOR ILLNESS AND INJURY

If you say yes, then your consent in this document does not waive any of your legal rights.
However, in the event of harm, injury, or illness arising from this study, neither Old Dominion
University nor the researchers are able to give you any money, insurance coverage, free medical
care, or any other compensation for such injury. In the event that you suffer injury as a result of
participation in any research project, you may contact me at 309-360-2268 or jbrid017@odu.edu,
my dissertation chair, Dr. Danica Hays at 757-683-6692 or dhays@odu.edu, or the Old
Dominion University Office of Research IRB chair at 757-683-3460 at Old Dominion
University, who will be glad to review the matter with you.

VOLUNTARY CONSENT

By clicking the next button, you are saying several things. You are saying that you have read
this form or have had it read to you, that you are satisfied that you understand this form, the
research study, and its risks and benefits. If you have any questions later on, please contact the
researchers.

And importantly, by clicking the next button, you are telling the researcher yes, that you agree to
participate in this study and that you have read and understood the informed consent document.

Sincerely,

Jennifer D. Bridges, M.A., LPC (IL), NCC
Doctoral Student
Counseling and Human Services
Old Dominion University
110 Education Building
Norfolk, VA 23529
Jbrid017@odu.edu

Danica G. Hays, PhD, LPC, NCC
Department Chair / Associate Professor
Counseling and Human Services
Old Dominion University
110 Education Building
Norfolk, VA 23529
dhays@odu.edu
APPENDIX C
DEMOGRAPHIC SHEET

Program Information:
Is your program CACREP accredited: Yes No
Is there a master’s and doctoral program: Yes No
If there is a doctoral program, do the doctoral students provide supervision?
Yes No

Supervisee Demographics:
Gender: Male Female Transgender
Level: Practicum Internship
If you are in Internship, how long since you’ve been in practicum? 

Race/Ethnicity:
African American Asian American Hispanic Native American
White/European American Biracial/Multiracial Other not specified

Religious/Spiritual Orientation:
Buddhist Christian Hindu Jewish Muslim
Other not specified

Are you: Non-practicing Somewhat practicing Practicing
Do you have any previous counseling experience: Yes No
If yes, how much (in months or years)? 

University Supervisor perceived Demographics:
Gender: Male Female Transgender
Status: Faculty member Doctoral Student Adjunct faculty
Race/Ethnicity:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>White/European American</th>
<th>Biracial/Multiracial</th>
<th>Other not specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Religious/Spiritual Orientation:**

Buddhist  Christian  Hindu  Jewish  Muslim

Other not specified

**Are they:**  Non-practicing  Somewhat practicing  Practicing
APPENDIX D

Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE) (Larson, Suzuki, Gillespie, Potenza, Bechtel, & Toulouse, 1992)

On a scale ranging from 1 “Strongly Disagree” to 6 “Strongly Agree”, please rate the following items according to the extent to which you agree that the items reflect an accurate estimate of how you would perform in a counseling situation at the present time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>When using responses like reflection of feeling, active listening, clarification, probing, I am confident I will be concise and to the point.</td>
<td>I am likely to impose my values on the client during the interview.</td>
<td>When I initiate the end of a session I am positive I will be in a manner that is not abrupt or brusque and that I will end the session on time.</td>
<td>I am confident that I will respond appropriately to the client in view of what the client will express (e.g., my questions will be meaningful and not concerned with trivia and minutia).</td>
<td>I am certain that my interpretation and confrontation responses will be concise and to the point.</td>
<td>I am worried that the wording of my responses like reflection of feeling, clarification, and probing may be confusing and hard to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel that I will not be able to respond to the client in a nonjudgmental way with respect to the client’s values, beliefs, etc.</td>
<td>I feel that I will respond to the client in an appropriate length of time (neither interrupting the client or waiting too long to respond).</td>
<td>I am worried that the type of responses I use at a particular time, i.e., reflection of feeling, interpretation, etc., may not be the appropriate response.</td>
<td>I am sure that the content of my responses, i.e., reflection of feeling, clarification, and probing, will be consistent with and not discrepant from what the client is saying.</td>
<td>I feel competent that I will appear confident and earn respect of my client.</td>
<td>I am confident that my interpretation and confrontation responses will be effective in that they will be validated by the client’s immediate response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel that the content of my interpretation and confrontation responses will be consistent with and not discrepant from what the client is saying.</td>
<td>I may not be able to maintain the intensity and energy level needed to produce client confidence and active participation.</td>
<td>I am confident that the wording of my interpretation and confrontation responses will be clear and easy to understand.</td>
<td>I am not sure that in a counseling relationship I will express myself in a way that is natural without deliberating over every response or action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. I am afraid that I may not understand and properly determine probable meanings of a client's nonverbal behaviors.

19. I am confident that I will know when to use open and closed ended probes, and that these probes will reflect the concerns of the client and not be trivial.

20. My assessments of client problems may not be as accurate as I would like them to be.

21. I am uncertain as to whether I will be able to appropriately confront and challenge my client in therapy.

22. When giving responses, i.e., reflection of feeling, active listening, clarification, probing, I am afraid that they may not be as effective in that they won't be validated by my client's immediate response.

23. I do not feel that I possess a large enough repertoire of techniques to deal with the different problems my client may present.

24. I feel competent regarding my abilities to deal with crisis situations which may arise during counseling sessions—e.g., suicide, alcoholism, abuse, etc.

25. I am uncomfortable dealing with clients who appear unmotivated to work toward mutually determined goals.

26. I may have difficulty dealing with clients who do not verbalize their thoughts during the counseling session.

27. I am unsure as to how to deal with clients who appear noncommittal and indecisive.

28. When working with ethnic minority clients I am confident that I will be able to bridge cultural differences in the counseling process.

29. I will be an effective counselor with clients of different social class.

30. I am worried that my interpretation and confrontation responses may not over time assist the client to be more specific in defining and clarifying the problem.

31. I am confident that I will be able to conceptualize my client's problems.

32. I am unsure as to how I will lead my clients towards the development and selection of concrete goals to work toward.

33. I am confident that I can assess my client's readiness and commitment to change.

34. I feel I may give advice.

35. In working with culturally different clients I may have a difficult time viewing situations from their perspective.

36. I am afraid that I may not be able to effectively relate to someone of lower socioeconomic status than me.
APPENDIX E

Satisfaction with Supervision Questionnaire (SSQ) (Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996)

Please respond to each of the items below regarding your experience with your supervisor (the SAME SUPERVISOR you referred to when answering questions in previous sections) over the entire course of your work together. Indicate your responses by clicking on the appropriate box.

1. How would you rate the quality of the supervision you have received?
   1. Excellent 2. Good 3. Fair 4. Poor

2. Did you get the kind of supervision you wanted?
   1. No, definitely not. 2. No, not really. 3. Yes, generally. 4. Yes definitely.

3. To what extent has this supervision fit your needs?
   1. Almost all of my needs have been met. 2. Most of my needs have been met. 3. Only a few needs have been met. 4. None of my needs have been met.

4. If a friend were in need of supervision, would you recommend this supervision to him/her?
   1. No, definitely not. 2. No, I don’t think so. 3. Yes, I think so. 4. Yes, definitely.

5. How satisfied are you with the amount of supervision you have received?

6. Has the supervision you received helped you to deal more effectively in your role as a counselor or therapist?
   1. Yes, definitely 2. Yes, generally 3. No, not really 4. No, definitely not

7. In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the supervision you have received?

8. If you were to seek supervision again, would you come back to this supervisor?
   1. No, definitely not. 2. No, I don’t think so. 3. Yes, I think so. 4. Yes, definitely.
APPENDIX F

Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory - Trainee Version (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990)

Please indicate the frequency with which the behavior described in each of the following items seems characteristic of you and your work with your supervisor (the SAME supervisor you referred to when answering the questions in the previous sections). Click the appropriate box next to each item to indicate your response (1-7), where 1 = “Almost Never” and 7 = “Almost Always.”

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