Chapter 4

Strengthening Counseling Self-Efficacy of Undergraduate Supervisees[1] ⧗

Betül Meydan[2]

M. Soner Akkaya[3]

Abstract

One of the most important elements of counselor education is supervision. In the literature, it is stated that supervisors should determine the supervision model in the process. Developmental supervision models are models that prioritize the developmental needs of supervisees. Some specific characteristics of undergraduate supervisees, such as having rigid thinking and behavior patterns, paying too much attention to the rules, believing that there is only one right way and not being flexible in this regard, not being aware of their strengths and weaknesses, experiencing high anxiety, and having low self-confidence in their skills, indicated that developmental supervision models are appropriate for undergraduate supervisees. Nevertheless, these characteristics also pointed out that counseling self-efficacy of undergraduate supervisees should be strengthened in the supervision. Therefore, in this study, developmental supervision models and the supervision needs of undergraduate supervisees were explained, and then based on developmental supervision models some strategies for strengthening counseling self-efficacy of undergraduate supervisees were discussed.

One of the most important elements of counselor education is supervision. Supervision, which is provided by relatively more experienced professionals (supervisors) to counselor candidates in a regular and time-based evaluative manner (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019), is one of the basic elements that

---

2   Assoc. Prof., Ege University Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences Guidance and Counseling Division, betul.meydan@ege.edu.tr, 0000-0002-9978-6255

3   Expert Counselor, Ege University Institute of Educational Sciences, Guidance and Counseling Division, akkayasoner2021@gmail.com, 0000-0003-1305-6832

determine the quality of counselor education. Studies on supervision (e.g. Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders, 1994, Borders & Brown, 2005; Borders et al., 2014; Campell, 2006; Corey et al., 2010; Watkins, 1997) point out that the quality of the supervisor is important for effectiveness of supervision. In this context, it is stated that supervisors should receive formal supervision training, have knowledge about ethical and legal issues, determine the goals of supervision, establish relationship in accordance with the purpose of supervision, fully fulfill the requirements of the supervisory roles, provide enough feedback and evaluation, have awareness, knowledge, and skills on multiculturalism issues, diversify the supervision methods and techniques, and determine the supervision model.

As one of these requirements, determining the supervision model is one of the less emphasized but very important requirements. In the supervision process, models provide a theoretical structure for what and how supervisors will teach. In this respect, supervisors should advance the supervision process by adhering to a certain supervision model so that the supervision process can achieve its purpose and thus provide more benefit to supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders & Brown, 2005; Corey et al., 2010). In this regard, Hart (1982) expressed this importance by saying, "A person can be a very good supervisor, but if s/he does not base his work on a model, that person does not know anything about the supervision process." On the other hand, Watkins (1997) stated that adhering to a supervision model provides the supervisor with a broad perspective on the supervision relationship, the supervisee's behaviors, resistance, transference and development. In addition, some researchers (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders & Brown, 2005; Corey et al., 2010) emphasized that it is important for supervisors to consider their own style and the needs of the supervisees at the point of determining the supervision model.

Examining the literature, supervision models were classified in various ways by researchers (e.g., Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Campbell, 2000; Campbell, 2006; Corey et al., 2010; Haynes et al., 2003; Wade & Jones, 2015; Watkins, 1977). Among these models, developmental supervision models have an important place. Loganbill, Hardy and Delworth's Model, Integrated Developmental Model, Systemic-Cognitive Developmental Model and Ronnestad and Skovholt's Lifespan Development Model can be given as examples of developmental supervision models. Developmental supervision models are summarized below.

Developmental Supervision Models

Developmental supervision models are models that prioritize the provision of supervision for the developmental needs of supervisees. The focus of developmental supervision models is to ensure the gradual professionalization of supervisees. In line with this focus, it is stated that providing supervision support for supervision needs will be functional and will ensure competence (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders & Brown, 2005; Campell, 2000).

One of these models is the Loganbill, Hardy and Delworth Model. According to the model developed by Loganbill and colleagues (1982), the supervision process progresses gradually in a continuously repeating cycle. At the same time, eight developmental issues and three stages that the supervisor should emphasize in the supervision process are mentioned. The eight topics are competence, emotional awareness, autonomy, theoretical identity, respect for individual differences, purpose and direction, personal motivation, and professional ethics. The three stages are stagnation, confusion, and integration. In the model, it is emphasized that supervisees can be in any of the three stages in every subject. Thus, it is stated that the role of the supervisor in the model is to evaluate the supervisees' stance in each of the eight topics and to move them to the next stage of development (Loganbill et al. 1982).

In the first stage of the model, the stagnation stage, the main characteristics of supervisees are listed as follows:

- They may either over-idealize their supervisors or find them too indifferent and inadequate.

- They have rigid thinking and behavior patterns defined as black-and-white thinking style, pay too much attention to rules, believe that there is only one right way and cannot be flexible about it, are not aware of their strengths and weaknesses, experience high anxiety, and have low self-confidence in their skills.

In the second stage of the model, the complexity stage, the main characteristics of supervisees are listed as follows:

- They can start to produce solutions to the client's problems and determine an intervention plan.

- They experience conflict between feelings of failure, inadequacy, and competence.

- They experience indecision, disorganization, discomfort, and conflicts. They struggle between feelings of inadequacy and failure and between competence and expertise.

- They believe that the supervisor does not always have the solution. They start to behave subjectively.

- They may feel resentful towards the supervisor in parallel with their decreased dependence on the supervisor.

- They may develop negative feelings towards the supervisor in parallel with the decrease in the supervisor's guidance.

In the integration stage, which is the last stage of the model, the main characteristics of supervisees are listed as follows:

- Self-confidence and awareness are at a high level.

- At this stage, which is characterized as the period of calm after the storm, the client can be conceptualized independently.

- Cognitive understanding and flexibility have been gained.

- They take responsibility for what happens in supervision sessions.

- They neither see the supervisor as omnipotent nor as indifferent or inadequate. On the contrary, they accept that the supervisor may have strengths and weaknesses and take an active role by focusing on making the best use of their supervisor's time and expertise.

The Integrated Developmental Model, as another developmental supervision model, was developed by Stoltenberg (1981). According to this model, the development of supervisees takes place in four stages. In the model, it is stated that there are eight domains to determine which of these stages. These areas are intervention skills, assessment techniques, interpersonal assessment, conceptualization of the client, individual differences, theoretical orientation, treatment plan, goals, and professional ethics (Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg et al., 1998).

Supervisees in the first stage of the model:

- Their dedication and motivation are high. However, their self-confidence and awareness levels are low.

- They are at the basic level. They are inadequate in conceptualizing their clients. Their skills are not at a sufficient level.

- They experience anxiety regarding both the counseling sessions and their evaluations during the supervision process. At the same time, they are more self-focused in these processes.

- They are dependent on their supervisor. They need the counseling sessions and supervision process to be completely structured by the supervisor, in other words, they need to be guided. Therefore, they expect their supervisors to act as teachers. They need prescriptive interventions from supervisors.

- They expect supervisor feedback to be didactic, supportive and awareness based. They need encouragement from supervisors.

According to the second stage of the model,

- Supervisees have higher levels of self-confidence and awareness compared to the first stage.

- Supervisees started to focus more on the process in counseling sessions and supervision.

- During the supervision process, supervisees need for encouragement and structuring gradually decreased.

- Supervisees show less dependence on the supervisor. They have started to gain the ability to act autonomously.

- Supervisees are in a transition period. This is a stormy period. Supervisors need to be flexible, skilled and able to handle it sensitively.

According to the third stage of the model, the main characteristics of supervisees are as follows:

- Their self-confidence and awareness levels have reached a high level and they have gained the ability to act autonomously.

- They have gained the ability to keep their anxieties under control.

- They can focus on their own skills, personal reactions, and internal processes at a higher level.

- They are aware of their own and their client's strengths and weaknesses.

- Supervisors are expected to assume more of a consultant role.

- They have reached a stage where they are more focused on their own style and value their own evaluations.

- In this stage, they focus on themselves again, but unlike in the first stage, they can examine their own role in the client's progress and make

decisions about the client on their own. Since they feel comfortable in the sessions, they can be themselves and act subjectively.

According to the last stage of the model, the main characteristics of supervisees are as follows:

- Their self-confidence and awareness are at a very high level.

- They have become highly competent in intervention plans, assessment processes and conceptualization skills.

- They are professionalized. They can act in accordance with professional standards.

- They have more equal responsibility with the supervisor.

Another developmental supervision model, the Systemic-Cognitive Developmental Model, was developed based on Piaget's stages of cognitive development (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014). Accordingly, the model consists of four stages: sensory-motor, concrete operations, formal operations, and systemic. According to the first stage of the model, supervisees can observe emotions related to themselves and the client, but they have difficulties when they are faced with emotions that challenge them. According to the second stage of the model, supervisees look at their clients and what the clients tell them from a single point of view and handle all situations with a cause-and-effect relationship. According to the third stage of the model, contrary to the previous stage, supervisees can look at all kinds of situations from different perspectives and exhibit functional attitudes. According to the last stage of the model, the systemic stage, supervisees have high-level thinking skills. However, due to these skills, they may miss small details about the situations (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Rigazio- Digilio & Anderson, 1995).

In Ronnestad and Skovholt's Lifelong Development Model, the focal point is that the professional development process of supervisees continues throughout life and that this process should be focused on. According to the model, this lifelong process consists of six stages. According to the first stage of the model, supervisees tend to help the people around them, but they cannot help them professionally. They approach the people around them sometimes with sympathy and sometimes with empathy, and they mostly give information and advice. According to the second stage of the model, supervisees are beginner students, and their anxiety and dependency are quite high. On the other hand, they have low levels of self-confidence and awareness. According to the third stage of the model, supervisees, although they have made some progress compared to the previous stage, they still have anxieties and focus on themselves rather than the counseling process

and their clients. They cannot be spontaneous due to performance concerns. According to the fourth stage of the model, supervisees are seen as novice professionals. In this context, it is emphasized that they are more autonomous and exploratory. According to the fifth stage of the model, supervisees are seen as experienced professionals. In this context, it is emphasized that they are professionals who can act independently. According to the fifth stage, which is the last stage of the model, supervisees are seen as senior professionals. In this context, it is emphasized that they are authentic counselors who have their own style. In addition, it is stated that supervisees at this stage achieve a high level of satisfaction from the profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 1993).

In summary, generally, the common point emphasized in all developmental supervision models is that the supervisor should shape the supervision process in accordance with the developmental level of the supervisees, that is, depending on their developmental needs. In this context, it would be appropriate to state that developmental supervision models are guides for both supervisors and supervisees.

Supervision Needs of Undergraduate Supervisees According to Developmental Supervision Models

Undergraduate supervisees are in the process of personal and professional change and development. In this process, it is necessary to discover their strengths and weaknesses and to improve their weaknesses by protecting their strengths. In this context, some supervision needs of them come to the fore. In this direction, in the context of developmental models (Bernard & Goodyear, 2014; Borders & Brown, 2005; Campbell, 2000; Loganbill et al, 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997), the main characteristics of undergraduate supervisees can be stated as follows:

- They question their personal tendencies towards the counseling profession.
- They have a low level of awareness of their strengths and weaknesses about the counseling profession and themselves.
- They have low self-confidence.
- They tend to conduct structured counseling sessions.
- They have low level of counseling skills.
- They are inadequate in conceptualizing clients.

- Their motivation for supervision is high. However, their self-efficacy is low and their anxiety is high due to their lack of sufficient experience. They come to supervision prepared to cope with their anxiety and low self-efficacy perceptions.

- They are careful about supervision tasks and responsibilities.

- Due to performance anxiety, they tend to keep the focus on themselves rather than the client in supervision.

- They need encouraging, positive and directive feedback from the supervisor. Therefore, they expect their supervisor to act as a teacher.

- They are dependent on the feedback of the supervisor and, if supervision is group supervision, on the feedback of other group members.

- They either over-idealize their supervisors or find them too indifferent and inadequate.

- They feel safe in the supervision environment with the facilitative interventions of the supervisors.

According to these basic characteristics, what supervisors can do in line with the professional needs of undergraduate supervisees can be listed as follows:

- Be a mirror in terms of their professional interests, abilities, and skills.

- Raise their self-awareness, self-confidence, and self-efficacy perceptions.

- The effectiveness of supervision should be increased for them to acquire professional knowledge, skills and awareness and to make self-evaluation. In this context, their concerns in supervision should be addressed and they should be helped to keep the focus on themselves in supervision. In addition, more positive, encouraging, guiding and exploratory feedback should be provided in supervision rather than negative feedback. Finally, they should be given the ability to conduct counseling sessions autonomously or independently without becoming dependent on themselves.

As a result, some characteristics of undergraduate supervisees, such as having rigid thinking and behavior patterns defined as black-and-white thinking style, paying too much attention to the rules, believing that there is only one right way and not being flexible in this regard, not being aware of their strengths and weaknesses, experiencing high anxiety, and having low self-confidence in their skills, stand out. However, considering that

each supervisee is unique, it should be kept in mind that the frequency and intensity of these characteristics may vary and may vary individually. In this respect, individual differences of supervisees should be taken into consideration. As a result, it is also worth underlining that supervision and therefore the supervisor has a key role in meeting all these needs that arise in line with the developmental characteristics of supervisees.

Counseling Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is the basic component of Social Learning Theory and was first proposed by Bandura (1977). The concept of self-efficacy, which has been the subject of research in many different fields of expertise, has become a frequent subject of research in the field of counseling to understand why some counselors with the same level of knowledge and skills do not perform similarly in counseling practices and why some of them conduct more effective counseling sessions while others conduct less effective counseling sessions. For example, Larson and Daniels (1998) emphasized that in order for a counselor to conduct effective counseling sessions, he/she should be able to use helping skills effectively, fulfill the tasks of the session, and cope with the difficulties brought by the clients, and stated that a counselor/ psychological counselor candidate who feels competent in these areas will have a high level of counseling self-efficacy, will have lower anxiety in coping with difficulties, and will provide more effective help in supervised practices.

In the Social Learning Model of Counselor Education developed by Larson (1998), the concept of self-efficacy was adapted to counselor education as counseling self-efficacy and defined as "a counselor's belief in his/her abilities to conduct an effective counseling session with a client in the near future". From this point of view, counseling self-efficacy is an important mediating variable between what the counselor knows and his/her ability to conduct sessions.

Larson (1998) further argued that this mediating variable is influenced by four main sources of counseling self-efficacy: expertise, modeling, social persuasion, and affective arousal. The source of expertise is related to the counselor's ability to conduct the session, the source of modeling is related to taking a supervisor as an example by watching video or audio recordings, the source of social persuasion is related to the supervisor's encouraging and supportive feedback, and affective arousal is related to the concerns of the counselor, especially the first counseling sessions with clients (Larson, 1998). When these sources are examined, it is seen that expertise is related to skills, techniques, interventions and behaviors, modeling and verbal

persuasion are related to the supervisor, and affective arousal is related to the counselor and the client.

In this context, it can be stated that the counselor, the client, and the supervisor have an important influence on the development of the counseling self-efficacy level of the counselor. In the literature, it is accepted that the main character in the development of counseling self-efficacy level is the counselor, and it is stated that personal characteristics and actions are the two factors affecting counseling self-efficacy. The factors related to the client are the client's readiness for change and treatment outcomes (Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998).

Another character in the development of the counselor's counseling self-efficacy level is the supervisor. The contribution of supervisors to this development is in the form of modeling, verbal persuasion and providing effective feedback. Therefore, it would be appropriate to emphasize that counselor education and supervisors have an important role in the development of counselor trainees' counseling self-efficacy (Larson, 1998; Larson & Daniels, 1998). As a result, in this context, it is thought that the interventions of supervisors have a key role in the development of counseling self-efficacy perceptions of counselor trainees.

Strengthening Counseling Self-Efficacy of Undergraduate Supervisees: An Evaluation in Terms of Developmental Supervision Models

In addition to the theoretical courses at the undergraduate level, practicum courses are of great importance for the development of supervisees' counseling self-efficacy. It should be emphasized that it is important to continue these practices under supervision. In this direction, it is stated that supervision is an important determinant in the development of counseling self-efficacy of supervisees (e.g. Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Ko & Rodolfa, 2005; Larson, 1998; Ruslau, 1998; Whitaker, 2004).

Supervision includes many components. Some of these components include the supervision relationship, methods and techniques, quality of feedback, duration, and supervision model (e.g. Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Borders, 1994, Borders & Brown, 2005; Borders et al., 2014; Campell, 2006; Corey et al., 2010; Watkins, 1997). Among these components, it is the supervision model (e.g. Loganbill et al., 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997) that provides a theoretical background for supervisors on what and how to teach.

In terms of developmental supervision models, it is recommended to conduct supervision in line with the developmental needs of supervisees. In this respect, supervisors are expected to provide effective feedback, establish a qualified supervision relationship, allocate sufficient time for supervision, and determine appropriate supervision methods and techniques in line with the needs of supervisees (Loganbill et al., 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997).

In this context, firstly, it is important to provide feedback based on the developmental needs of supervisees (Ramani & Krackov, 2012). As stated in developmental supervision models (e.g. Loganbill et al. 1982; Ronnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981), counselor trainees' motivation, anxiety level, skills, and even their potential to accept and apply feedback differ according to their developmental needs and competencies. In this respect, it is of great importance for the development of counseling self-efficacy that supervisors provide feedback by considering the developmental characteristics and supervision needs of them (Daniel & Larson, 2001; Fickling et al., 2017; Friedlander et al., 1986; Hogan, 1964; Stoltenberg, 1981; Whittaker, 2004).

Undergraduate superviees need feedback on various supervision foci such as counseling skills, process skills, intervention skills, problem assessment skills, counseling relationship, self-evaluation, ethical and professional responsibility, personal awareness, professional self-care, and multiculturalism. Therefore, supervisors' providing feedback to undergraduate supervisees by determining the foci they need may have positive effects on their counseling self-efficacy. In addition, addressing the concerns of supervisees who are highly motivated, trying to get maximum efficiency from the supervision process, but experiencing anxiety about being evaluated both in counseling sessions and in the supervision process, and providing more positive, encouraging, guiding and exploratory feedback rather than negative feedback may strengthen their self-efficacy (Daniels, 1997; Daniels & Larson, 2001). As the supervision process progresses and supervisees' developmental levels and their counseling self-efficacy increase, it may be appropriate to use a balance of directive, supportive, corrective, exploratory and confrontational feedback (Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997). Such feedback may increase the effectiveness of supervision, strengthen the supervision relationship, decrease the anxiety of supervisees and strengthen their counseling self-efficacy.

In addition to supervisor feedback, it is important to provide supervision with sufficient time for the development of supervisees' counseling self-

efficacy. Studies (e.g., Coşgun & Ilgar, 2004; Harris, 2007; Kocarek, 2001; Larson et al., 1992; Tang et al., 2004) indicate that allocating sufficient time to first-time supervisees positively affects their counseling self-efficacy. In addition, the number of counseling sessions influences the development of supervisees' counseling self-efficacy. As the number of counseling sessions increases, counseling self-efficacy becomes stronger (e.g. Barbee et al., 2003; Kocarek, 2001; Larson, 1998; Leach et al., 1997; Melchert et al., 1996; Pamukçu, 2011; Tang et al., 2004; Ward, 2001). Therefore, in terms of duration, both the increase in practices and the increase in supervision time for practices strengthen counseling self-efficacy.

Another important factor in the development of supervisees' counseling self-efficacy is supervision methods and techniques. Supervision techniques should be consistent with the developmental needs of supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Campbell, 2006). For example, if supervision foci is counseling skills in feedbacks given through transcription, feedback can be provided on such as counseling relationship, process skills, or interventions through video recording when the supervision meeting. The main point here is to meet the supervisee's supervision needs by using more than one supervision technique. Similarly, meeting the needs of supervisees should be prioritized in the selection of supervision method (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Campell, 2006). For example, if the supervisee needs individual supervision, individual supervision should be used. When proceeding based on supervision needs, the counseling self-efficacy of the supervisees will be strengthened.

In conclusion, supervision, which is the basis of counselor education, should be provided effectively to train qualified counselors with high counseling self-efficacy levels. Undergraduate supervisees have high levels of dependency and anxiety, low levels of personal and professional awareness and counseling self-efficacy (Loganbill et al., 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981; Stoltenberg et al., 1998; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997). In this respect, supervisors, who have a key role in meeting needs of supervisees and in developing their counseling self-efficacy, should first pay attention to determining a supervision model (Atik et al., 2014; Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2018; Koç, 2013; Meydan, 2015; Tümlü & Ceyhan, 2021). At this point, since developmental supervision models focus on the developmental needs of the supervisees and suggest that feedback, supervision methods and techniques, time and relationship should be structured from this perspective, it is thought that developmental supervision models are very important in the development of counseling self-efficacy of undergraduate supervisees.

REFERENCES

Atik, Z. E., Arıcı, F. & Ergene, T. (2014). Süpervizyon modelleri ve modellere ilişkin değerlendirmeler. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 5*(42), 305-317.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.

Barbee, P. W., Scherer, D. & Combs, D. C. (2003). Prepracticum service-learning: Examining the relationship with counselor self-efficacy and anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 43, 108–119.

Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (3th ed.). MA: Pearson.

Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2014). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (5th ed.). MA: Pearson.

Bernard, J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (6th ed.). MA: Pearson.

Borders, L. D. & Brown, L. L. (2005). *The new handbook of counseling supervision*. (2th ed.). NJ: Lahaska/Lawrence Erlbaum.

Borders, L. D. (1994). *The good supervisor*. ERIC Clearinghouse.

Borders, L. D., Glosoff, H. L., Welfare, L. E., Hays, D. G., DeKruyf, L., Fernando, D. M. & Page, B. (2014). Best practices in clinical supervision: Evolution of a counseling specialty. *The Clinical Supervisor, 33*(1), 26-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/07325223.2014.905225

Campbell, J. (2006). *Becoming an effective supervisor: A workbook for counselors and psychotherapists* (4th ed.). Taylor/Francis Group

Campbell, J. M. (2000). *Becoming an effective supervisor.* New York: Taylor/Francis Group.

Cashwell, T. H. & Dooley, K. (2001). The impact of supervision on counselor selfefficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 20(1), 39-47

Corey, G., Haynes, R. H., Moulton, P. & Muratori, M. (2010). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide* (2th ed). Springer Publishing Company.

Coşgun, S. & Ilgar, M. Z. (2004). *Rehberlik ve psikolojik danışmanlık deneyimi çalışmalarının adayların özyeterlilik algılarına etkisi* (Sözlü sunum). 13. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, Malatya.

Daniels, J. A. & Larson, L. M. (2001). The impact of performance feedback on counseling self-efficacy and counselor anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*(2), 120-130. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01276.x

Daniels, J. A. (1997). *The influence of performance feedback and casual attribution upon ratings of counseling self-efficacy* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska.

Eryılmaz, A. & Mutlu, T. (2018). Gelişimsel kapsamlı süpervizyon modeline ilişkin psikolojik danışman adaylarının görüşlerinin incelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 17*(65), 123-141. https://doi.org/10.17755/esosder.306932

Fickling, M. J., Borders, L. D., Mobley, K. A. & Wester, K. (2017). Most and least helpful events in three supervision modalities. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 56(4), 289-304. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12086

Friedlander, M.L., Keller, K.E., Peca-Baker, T.A. & Olk, M.E. (1986). Effects of role conflict on counselor trainees' self-statements, anxiety level, and performance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33*(1), 73–77. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.33.1.73

Gould, L. J. & Bradley, L. J. (2001). Evaluation in supervison. In L. J. Bradley & N. Ladany (Ed.), *Counselor supervision: Principles, process, and practice* (pp. 271-303). Taylor/Francis.

Harris, L. L. (2007). *An examination of the counseling self-efficacy of master's level rehabilitation counselor-in-training* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Iowa.

Hart, G. M. (1982). *The process of clinical supervision*. MD: University Park Press.

Haynes, R., Corey, G. & Moulton, P. (2003). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brookes/Cole.

Ko, S. F. & Rodolfa, E. (2005). Psychology training directors' views of number of practicum hours necessary prior to internship application. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,* 36(3), 318-322.

Koc, İ. (2013). *The effect of supervision with interpersonal process recall on the counseling skills, self-efficacy and anxiety levels of counselor trainees* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ege University.

Kocarek, C. H. (2001). *Understanding the relationships among counseling self-efficacy, anxiety, developmental level, coursework, experience, and counselor performance* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University.

Ladany, N., Friedlander, M.L. & Nelson, M.L. (2005). *Critical events in psychotherapy supervision an interpersonal approach*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Larson, L.M. & Daniels, J.A. (1998). Review of the counseling self-efficacy literature. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(2), 179–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000098262001

Larson, L.M. (1998). The social cognitive model of counselor training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(2),219–273. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000098262002

Leach, M. M., Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W. & Eichenfield. G. A. (1997). Selfefficacy and counselor development: Testing the integrated developmental model. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 37 (2), 115-124.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E. & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(1), 3–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000082101002

Melchert, T. P., Hays, V. L., Wiljanen, L. M. & Kolocek, A. K. (1996). Testing models of counselor development with a measure of counseling self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling and Development,* 74(6), 640-644.

Meydan, B. (2015). Bireyle psikolojik danışma uygulamasında Mikro Beceri Süpervizyon Modeli'nin etkililiğinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 5*(43), 55-68.

Pamukcu, B. (2011). *The investigation of counseling self-efficacy levels of counselor trainees* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University.

Ramani, S. & Krackov, S.K. (2012) Twelve tips for giving feedback effectively in the clinical environment. *Medical Teacher*, 34(10), 787-791. https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159x.2012.684916

Rigazio-DiGilio, S. A. & Anderson, S. A. (1995). A cognitive-developmental model for marital and family therapy supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 12 (2), 93-118.

Ronnestad, M.H. & Skovholt, T.M. (1993). Supervision of beginning and advanced graduate students of counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 71(4), 396-405. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1993.tb02655.x

Ruslau, M. G. (1998). *An examination of self-efficacy in master's level counselor trainees* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University.

Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*(1), 59-65. https://doi.org10.1037/0022-0167.28.1.59

Stoltenberg, C.D. & McNeill, B.W. (1997). *IDM supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists.* Routledge.

Stoltenberg, C.D. & McNeill, B.W. (2010). *IDM supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists.* Routledge.

Stoltenberg, C.D., McNeill, B.W. & Delworth, U. (1998). *IDM supervision: An integrative developmental model for supervising counselors and therapists.* Jossey Bass.

Tang, M., Addison, K. D., LaSure-Bryant, D., Norman, R., O'Connell, W. & StewartSicking, J. A. (2004). Factors that influence self-efficacy of counseling students: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44(1), 70–80.

Tümlü, G.Ü. & Ceyhan, E. (2021). Bireyle Psikolojik Danışma Uygulaması Süpervizyonunun Yapılandırılması: Bir Eylem Araştırması. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 46*(208), 293-319. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2021.9364

Ülker-Tümlü, G. (2019). *Bireyle psikolojik danışma uygulaması süpervizyonunda Ayrıştırıcı Süpervizyon Modeli'ne dayalı grup süpervizyonu sürecinin yapılandırılması* (Doktora Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi). Ulusal Tez Merkezi.

Wade, J. C. & Jones, J. E. (2015). *Strenght- Based Clinical Supervision: A positive psychology approach to clinical training.* Springer Publishing Company.

Ward, J. E. (2001). *An exploration of the development of counseling self-efficacy during the supervision process; including the dynamics of counselor development, the supervisory relationship, satisfaction with supervision, and experience* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Illinois University.

Watkins, C. E. (Ed.). (1997). *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision*. Wiley.

Whittaker, S.M. (2004). *A multi-vocal synthesis of supervisees' anxiety and self-efficacy during clinical supervision: Meta-analysis and interviews* (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University). ProQuest Dissertations and Thesis Global.