



Turkish First-Time Supervisees' Counseling Self-Efficacy

Betül MEYDAN¹

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 13 May 2019

Received in revised form: 23 Feb. 2021

Accepted: 27 Feb. 2021

DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2021.92.4

Keywords

clinical supervision, counseling self-efficacy, supervisory style, evaluation within supervision, first-time supervisee.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Supervision has been the subject of considerable research in Turkey in recent years. However, the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision on first-time supervisees' counseling self-efficacy (CSE) has not been examined yet in Turkey, which has remained under-researched. Therefore, the present study sought to investigate the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision on first-time supervisees' CSE levels. **Method:** In this study, participants consisted of 330 first-time supervisees enrolled in Counseling and Guidance Undergraduate Programs at seven public universities in Turkey.

Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales, Supervisory Styles Inventory, Evaluation Process within Supervision Inventory and a demographic information form were used to collect data.

Findings: The results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis demonstrated that goal setting significantly predicted CSE levels of first-time supervisees and alone accounted for approximately 12% of the total variance while attractive supervisory style, interpersonally sensitive supervisory style, task-oriented supervisory style and feedback did not.

Implications for Research and Practice: It is suggested that supervisors should adopt various supervisory styles instead of adopting one dominant supervisory style to strengthen CSE in accordance with supervisees' supervisory needs and expectations. Concerning evaluation within supervision, supervisors should pay much more attention to establish mutual supervisory goals with first-time supervisees in the beginning phases of supervision. Regarding feedback, there is a considerable need for understanding supervisees' feedback expectations from supervisors. Therefore, it is believed that this study will lead researchers to further research involving different variables and using various research methods.

© 2021 Ani Publishing Ltd. All rights reserved

¹ Ege University, TURKEY, e-mail: betull_benzer@yahoo.com, ORCID: orcid.org/0000-00029978-6255

Introduction

Supervision plays a critical role in counselor development. Supervisees gain experiences in counseling skills, strategies, and theories and improve themselves as a proficient counselor through the counseling practices under supervision. Researchers (e.g., Cormier & Nurius, 2003) have indicated that supervisees can still feel themselves as inefficient counselors although they are well-educated; have learned counseling skills, strategies, and theories; and have had an opportunity to work with real clients under supervision. Bandura (1986) argued that just theoretical knowledge and skills are not enough for successful performance and self-efficacy beliefs have an intense effect on motivation and performance.

In the Social Cognitive Model of Counseling Training which is expanded by Larson (1998) from Social Cognitive Theory by Bandura, *counseling self-efficacy* (CSE) is explained as a mediator in the counseling sessions between theoretical knowledge and counseling performance (Larson, 1998). In other words, it is discussed that supervisees' judgements regarding their capabilities and self-perceptions of efficacy affect counseling behaviors and performance (Larson et al., 1992). The literature suggested that several factors, such as counselor trainees' professional developmental levels (Coykendall, 1993), counseling experiences (Kocarek, 2001; Ward, 2001), anxiety levels (Daniels & Larson, 2001), supervision process (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), supervisory working alliance (Humedian, 2002), satisfaction with supervision (Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Ladany et al., 1999), supervisor's *supervisory style* (Robinson, 2001), and supervisor's *feedback* (Phelps, 2009), may have effects on CSE. To sum up, supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision are relevant variables for explaining supervisees' CSE.

Many researchers (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Friedlander & Ward, 1984; Holloway & Wolleat, 1981) have noted that supervisors use a variety of styles, roles, and approaches when working with supervisees. Holloway and Wolleat (1981) defined *supervisory style* as a supervisor's characteristic manner of approaching and responding to supervisees during supervision. Friedlander and Ward (1984) identified three interrelated dimensions of supervisory style, which are attractive style, interpersonally sensitive style and task-oriented style. Developmental supervision models (Loganbill, Hardy, & Delworth, 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981) argued that supervisees at various developmental levels have different supervisory needs and expectations. A clear understanding of these needs and expectations among supervisees can help supervisors for choosing favorable supervision approaches, including favorable supervisory style. Concerning CSE, Cashwell and Dooley (2001) found that there was a positive relationship between supervision and CSE. Taken as a whole, it is logical to examine whether or not the supervisory styles play a role in explaining the CSE.

Regarding *evaluation within supervision*, several supervision theorists and researchers (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Holloway, 1995; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Watkins, 1997) have recognized that evaluation within supervision has an important role in training supervisees. According to Bernard and Goodyear (2019),

an effective evaluation should consist of goal setting and feedback functions to achieve supervisory objectives. As a first function, goals should be specific, related to the supervisory tasks, determined early in the supervisory relationship, should be as a guide for supervisees to plan their progress during supervision process (Bordin, 1983); reexamined and redefined over time (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Talen & Schindler, 1993); and mutually established by supervisor and supervisee (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Bordin, 1983; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001). The second function of effective evaluation is feedback. Studies (Campbell, 2000; Carifio & Hess, 1987; Heckman-Stone, 2003; Hughes, 2012; Karpenko & Gidycz, 2012; Phelps, 2009) have provided strong evidence that feedback is an integral part of supervision. Effective feedback should be balanced, summative and formative, and based on the supervisee's observable behaviors and performance in counseling and supervision (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Carifio & Hess, 1987; Heckman-Stone, 2003; Karpenko & Gidycz, 2012). Feedback should also be objective and specific (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Heckman-Stone, 2003; Karpenko & Gidycz, 2012; Phelps, 2009), timely and systematic (Carifio & Hess, 1987).

In the supervision literature, goal setting and feedback are significant variables for CSE. For instance, Bandura (1986) claimed that knowing specific strengths and weaknesses in the performance provides an important change in self-efficacy. From this perspective, Watkins (1997) mentioned that evaluation within supervision which focuses on supervisees' specific strengths and weaknesses in their counseling performances and supervision could increase supervisees' CSE. In a review by Kirsch (1986), it has been argued that positive feedback increases supervisees' CSE, whereas negative feedback decreases it. Daniels and Larson (2001) also noted that there was a strong correlation between accurate feedback and the CSE. These findings suggest that when supervisors determine clear goals and provide quality feedback in supervision, supervisees' CSE will increase and strengthen.

Clinical Supervision in Turkey

Counselor education is carried out at undergraduate, master's, and doctoral levels by state and private universities in Turkey (Dogan, 2000; Poyrazli, Dogan, & Eskin, 2013). However, counselors are predominantly trained in four-year undergraduate programs. At the undergraduate level, they are given the opportunity for counseling practices and *receive supervision for the first time* before employment (Aladag & Kemer, 2016a). Thus, it can be claimed that the practicum and supervision experiences at the undergraduate level have a primary role in training counselors in Turkey. Recently, studies on supervision have shown a rapid and considerable increase since the researchers have recognized the critical role of supervision for undergraduate (first-time) supervisees in Turkey.

However, regarding CSE, there is a limited amount of research that investigated the relationship between supervision and CSE (Satici & Turkum, 2015; Pamukcu, 2011) and the effects of supervision on CSE (Koc, 2013; Meydan, 2015) in Turkish supervision literature. For example, a study conducted by Pamukcu (2011) aimed to investigate the predictive value of satisfaction level of supervision in determining CSE levels of first-

time supervisees. Findings indicated that supervision satisfaction significantly predicted the CSE. Similarly, Satici and Turkum (2015) found that supervision satisfaction was a significant predictor for the CSE of first-time supervisees. In another study, Koc (2013) investigated the effects of the Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) based supervision on CSE levels of first-time supervisees. The results pointed out that the effects of IPR based supervision on CSE levels of first-time supervisees were not significant. Accordingly, Meydan's (2015) study also indicated that the effects of the Microcounseling Supervision Model-based supervision on CSE levels of first-time supervisees were not significant.

Reviewing the Turkish supervision literature concerning the independent variables of this study, there were studies that focused on *supervisors' characteristics* (Aladag, 2014; Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011; Denizli, Aladag, Bektas, Cihangir-Cankaya, & Ozeke-Kocabas, 2009; Meydan & Denizli, 2018) and *feedback* (Aladag & Bektas, 2009; Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011; Denizli et al., 2009; Kurtyilmaz, 2015; Meydan & Denizli, 2018). Although these studies did not directly measure the supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision variables, they had certain results regarding these variables. For instance, supervisees preferred to receive supervision from supervisors who are supportive and sincere (Atik, 2017; Denizli et al., 2009; Meydan & Denizli, 2018); positive and tolerant (Atik, 2017); instructive (Denizli et al., 2009); understanding (Aladag, 2014; Atik, 2017; Denizli et al., 2009; Meydan & Denizli, 2018); humorous (Aladag, 2014; Meydan & Denizli, 2018); trustworthy (Aladag, 2014); polite, relieving, caring, soothing, fair, helpful, and respectful (Meydan & Denizli, 2018); open to communication (Buyukgoze-Kavas, 2011) and criticism (Aladag, 2014). However, findings showed that supervisees had certain expectations regarding supervisory feedback. For example, they mostly reported that they need supportive feedback (Aladag & Bektas, 2011; Denizli et al., 2009; Meydan & Denizli, 2018) in a written and verbal format (Aladag & Bektas, 2011; Meydan & Denizli, 2018). Additionally, in Aladag and Bektas's study (2011), first-time supervisees reported that they had difficulty in coping with negative feedback. Similarly, in another study conducted by Kurtyilmaz (2015), evaluation anxiety was an important variable for supervisees' negative feelings toward supervision. According to Atik's study (2017), which was the first study to examine the supervisory style and evaluation within supervision variables directly in Turkish supervision literature, supervisees reported that they mostly had an agreement on supervisory goals with their supervisors, with an initial goal of developing their basic counseling skills during supervision. In terms of feedback, some supervisees mainly reported receiving formative, corrective, and positive feedback from their supervisors, while others reported receiving disruptive feedback, which had a negative intense effect on their CSE (Atik, 2017).

The Purpose of this Study

Supervision has been the subject of considerable research in Turkey in recent years. However, the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision on first-time supervisees' CSE has not been examined yet in Turkey. Given the importance of CSE for supervisees, there is a great need for understanding the role of some variables regarding supervision on first-time supervisees' CSE levels in Turkey. In this context,

the present study sought to investigate the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision on first-time supervisees' CSE levels. To this end, the following research question was posed:

1. To what degree do supervisors' supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision predict first-time supervisees' CSE?

Method

Research Design

The purpose of correlational studies is to investigate the relations among variables without any manipulation (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2005). For this purpose, the correlational research design was used to examine the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision in predicting first-time supervisees' CSE levels.

Research Sample

Criterion sampling method (Patton, 1990) was preferred for participant selection. In Turkey, presently, there are 60 bachelor's programs (Higher Education Program Atlas, 2018). In a recent study (Aladag & Kemer, 2016b), the findings showed that some first-time supervisees had counseling experiences with real clients, whereas others had counseling experiences with only peers. Moreover, concerning the supervision process, the same study found that undergraduate counseling programs used different supervision methods and techniques. Since quantity and quality of counseling and supervision experiences are essential for the CSE (e.g., Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Kocarek, 2001; Ward, 2001), the data of the present study was obtained from first-time supervisees who met the criteria of having counseling experience at least with one *real client* and receiving group supervision from the *same supervisor during the entire semester*. Eventually, a sample of first-time supervisees ($n = 330$) from seven voluntary state universities, which met the eligibility criteria during the fall semester of the 2017-2018 academic year participated in this study. Participants consisted of 242 women (71.9%) and 88 (28.1%) men. The mean age of first-time supervisees was 21.77 ($SD = .96$). Participants' counseling experiences ranged from four to 22 counseling sessions under supervision within the Individual Counseling Practice course. None of the participants had any counseling or supervision experiences before attending the Individual Counseling Practice course.

Research Instruments and Procedures

Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales, Supervisory Styles Inventory, Evaluation Process within Supervision Inventory and a demographic information form were used to collect data. The relevant information for data collection instruments is presented below.

Counselor activity self-efficacy scales. Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales (CASES) was developed by Lent, Hill, and Hoffman (2003) and translated into Turkish by Pamukcu and Demir (2013). The CASES comprises three subscales (*Helping Skill*

Self-Efficacy, Session Management Self-Efficacy, and Counseling Challenges Self-Efficacy) with 41 items to assess the counselor's CSE level. The CASES rated on a 10-point Likert-type scale (0 = *no confidence*, 9 = *complete confidence*). Higher scores indicate higher perceptions of CSE. The CASES has shown to have enough construct validity and convergent validity evidence. Internal consistency of the Turkish version of the CASES was .96, and internal consistency estimates were .88 for the Helping Skill Self-Efficacy subscale; .95 for the Session Management Self-Efficacy subscale; and .95 for Counseling Challenges Self-Efficacy subscale (Pamukcu & Demir, 2013). The internal consistency of the scores obtained in the present study for the CASES total scale was .95; for Helping Skill Self-Efficacy subscale .86; for Session Management Self-Efficacy subscale .94; and for Counseling Challenges Self-Efficacy subscale .91.

Supervisory styles inventory. Supervisory Styles Inventory (SSI) was developed by Friedlander and Ward (1984) and translated into Turkish by Atik (2017). The SSI is used to describe supervisees' perceptions of their supervisors' supervisory styles. The SSI is a self-report instrument that consists of 33-items with eight filler items. The SSI includes three subscales: the *Attractive* subscale, the *Interpersonally Sensitive* subscale, and the *Task-Oriented* subscale. Each subscale comprises of single and descriptive adjective items, which are rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not very*, 7 = *very*). Respondents are asked to indicate to what degree the item describes their supervisor's supervisory style. Turkish version of SSI has shown to have the same dimensional factor structure with the original form of the SSI; and also, strong convergent validity, test-retest reliability, and acceptable divergent validity and concurrent validity characteristics. Internal consistency of the Turkish version of SSI was .95, and internal consistency estimates were .92 for the *Attractive* subscale; .93 for the *Interpersonally Sensitive* subscale; and .91 for the *Task-Oriented* subscale (Atik, 2017). The internal consistency of the scores obtained in the present study for the SSI total scale was .97; for the *Attractive* subscale .92; for the *Interpersonally Sensitive* subscale .92; and for the *Task-Oriented* subscale .91.

Evaluation process within supervision inventory. Evaluation Process within Supervision Inventory (EPSI) was developed by Lehrman-Waterman and Ladany (2001) and translated into Turkish by Atik and Yildirim (2017). The EPSI aims to examine evaluation practices in clinical supervision. The Turkish version of the EPSI consists of 12-items with two subscales titled *Goal Setting* and *Feedback*. Items are rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores for the *Goal Setting* subscale indicate higher efforts for establishing the goals during the supervision process. Higher scores for *Feedback* subscale indicate a higher prevalence of feedback during supervision. Turkish version of EPSI has acceptable construct validity, convergent validity, and concurrent validity evidence. Internal consistency of the Turkish version of the EPSI was .92, and internal consistency estimates were .85 for the *Goal Setting* subscale and .89 for the *Feedback* subscale (Atik & Yildirim, 2017). The internal consistency of the scores obtained in the present study for the EPSI total scale was .91; for the *Goal Setting* subscale .89 and the *Feedback* subscale .83.

Demographic information form. The demographic information form consisted of two sections: a) personal information about supervisee and b) personal information about counseling and supervision experiences of the supervisee. In the first section, demographic information regarding first-time supervisees' gender, age, and university were obtained. In the second section, information about the quantity of counseling sessions and the quantity and format of supervision were gathered.

In October 2017, the researcher made the announcement of the study by sending an e-mail to supervisors from separate state universities, which met the eligibility criteria of this study. The announcement e-mail informed supervisors about the purpose of the study with an informed-consent form and requested their supervisees' participation in this study. Twenty-nine supervisors from seven state universities accepted to ask their supervisees' participation in this study. The researcher distributed the cover letter, informed-consent forms for supervisees, an envelope, and hard copies of the instruments to voluntary supervisors through the mail. The cover letter described the purpose of the study and stated that data collection instruments should be placed in an envelope for confidentiality. Supervisors informed first-time supervisees about the purpose of the study, ensured their willingness for participation, and obtained written informed-consent forms. Thus, voluntary first-time supervisees completed the instruments anonymously within nearly fifteen minutes in their classes at the end of the fall semester. Supervisors put data collection instruments and informed-consent forms into the envelope and mailed them back to the researcher. All instruments were returned in December 2017.

Data Analysis

In this study, descriptive statistics were utilized to describe characteristics of first-time supervisees. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used for examining the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision in predicting first-time supervisees' CSE levels. The data analysis was conducted using SPSS 23.0.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Before stepwise multiple regression analysis, assumptions were tested. *Normality* of the sample was tested by skewness and kurtosis values. As evidence for the normality, skewness and kurtosis values were observed between -1 and +1 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). *Multicollinearity* was tested by VIF and tolerance values. VIF value should be less than 10, and Tolerance value should not be more than .10 (Keith, 2015). Findings regarding VIF and tolerance values indicated that the assumption of multicollinearity was satisfied. For *linearity* assumption, on the scatter plot, a linear relationship was observed not to be violated. For the *independence of residuals* assumption, no values between -3 and +3 were observed based on Durbin-Watson Critical Values Table (Field, 2009). The *homoscedasticity* was checked by the residual scatter plot of dependent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Figures

showed that the homoscedasticity was satisfied. Since the assumptions were assured, stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted with 330 first-time supervisees.

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to investigate whether supervisors' supervisory styles (attractive, sensitive, and task-oriented), goal setting, and feedback scores predict first-time supervisees' CSE levels. Table 1 presents the findings of stepwise regression analysis.

Table 1

Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for CSE

Variable	R	Adjusted R ²	ΔR^2	ΔF	B	Std. error	Std. β	t	p
N=330		R ²							
Counseling Self-Efficacy									
(Constant)					162.70	11.30		14.40	.000*
Goal Setting	.35	.12	.12	46.13	2.25	.33	.35	6.79	.000*

As shown in Table 1, goal setting score was the sole significant predictor for CSE levels of first-time supervisees. Goal setting alone accounted for approximately 12% of the total variance. The regression equation with goal setting was significant, $R^2 = .12$, adjusted $R^2 = .12$, $F_{(1, 328)} = 46.13$, $p < .000$.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

This study aimed to investigate the role of supervisory styles and evaluation within supervision on first-time supervisees' CSE levels. The results indicated that only the goal setting was a significant predictor of first-time supervisees' CSE levels of whereas attractive supervisory style, interpersonally sensitive supervisory style, task-oriented supervisory style, and feedback did not statistically predict the CSE of first-time supervisees.

Regarding CSE and supervisory styles, the findings indicated that attractive style, interpersonally sensitive style and task-oriented style did not statistically predict the CSE of first-time supervisees. Previous studies had controversial findings for the CSE and the supervisory styles variables. Contrary to this study's findings, Fernando and Hulse-Killacky (2005) found that the supervisory styles were significant predictors of supervisees' perceived self-efficacy. Similarly, Lorenz (2009) indicated that supervisory styles statistically predicted the CSE of counseling practicum students. However, in a study conducted by Steward, Breland and Neil (2001), the findings pointed out that the attractive supervisory style was negatively associated with novice supervisees' self-evaluations and interpersonally sensitive and task-oriented supervisory styles were not significant predictors for novice supervisees' self-

evaluations. This finding is consistent with the current study's findings. One possible explanation for these findings can be that if first-time supervisees in this study perceive their supervisors as highly skilled and expert in counseling and supervision because of their own intense anxiety like many first-time supervisees (Loganbill et al., 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981), this may be the reason for them to perceive their counseling ability and efficacy as inadequate. Previous studies found that anxiety is one of the hindering variables for CSE (Barbee, Scherer, & Combs, 2003; Daniels & Larson, 2001; Friedlander, Keller, Peca-Baker, & Olk, 1986; Larson et al., 1999; Lorenz, 2009). In this context, it is suggested that supervisors should integrate various interventions (Stoltenberg, 1981) and supervisory styles in accord with supervisees' supervisory needs to help them cope with their anxiety and improve their CSE.

Another finding of this study was that goal setting significantly predicted the CSE of first-time supervisees while feedback did not. Within developmental supervision models (Loganbill et al., 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981), it is proposed that first-time supervisees experience performance and evaluation anxiety and the negotiation regarding the supervisory goals may increase their anxiety (Loganbill et al., 1982; Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2003; Stoltenberg, 1981). Since anxiety is one of the hindering factors for CSE (Barbee et al., 2003; Daniels & Larson, 2001; Friedlander et al., 1986; Larson et al., 1999; Lorenz, 2009), it is quite understandable that goal setting reduces anxiety of first-time supervisees and strengthens their CSE in this study.

The most unexpected finding concerning the evaluation within supervision is that feedback was not as a significant predictor for the CSE of first-time supervisees. Supervision theorists and researchers (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019; Kirsch, 1986; Lehrman-Waterman & Ladany, 2001; Phelps, 2009; Watkins, 1997) asserted that feedback is crucial for CSE. According to the Social Cognitive Model of Counseling Training, Larson (1998) stated that CSE is based on four principal sources: mastery, modeling, social persuasion, and affective arousal. Social persuasion is one of the powerful sources for the CSE and includes the supervisor's feedback. Larson (1998) noted that supervisees perceive supervisors as experts, and their feedback is the most powerful determinant for the CSE. However, Larson (1998) also emphasized that inappropriate, negative, unsupportive and inadequate amounts of feedback have an intense negative effect on the CSE. Researchers (Carifio & Hess, 1987; Daniels & Larson, 2001; Larson, 1998; Ward, 2001) suggested that behavioral, supportive, positive, timely, changeable, specific, constructive, clearly understood, systematic, structured and adequate amounts of feedback must be provided for supervisees. Additionally, in Turkey, previous studies found that first-time supervisees needed supportive (Aladag, 2014; Aladag & Bektas, 2011; Denizli et al., 2009; Meydan & Denizli, 2018; Zeren & Yilmaz, 2011), written and verbal (Aladag & Bektas, 2011; Meydan & Denizli, 2018), constructive and adequate amounts (Aladag, 2014; Meydan & Denizli, 2018), formative, corrective and positive (Atik, 2017) feedback. However, Atik (2017) also found that some first-time supervisees received disruptive feedback, which had negative effects on their CSE. Researchers (Aladag & Bektas, 2009; Harris,

2007; Larson et al., 1992; Meydan, 2015; Meydan & Denizli, 2018) pointed out that receiving sufficient time of feedback was as important as its quality. For example, Harris (2007) found a positive relationship between sufficient time of feedback and CSE. As a result, it can be claimed that the literature makes it clear why feedback did not predict the CSE of first-time supervisees in this study. In this study, the content, the quality and the frequency of the feedback are not measured. Evaluating previous studies regarding feedback and CSE and this study's findings together, it seems that supervisors' feedback did not have desired qualifications and content for supervisees in this study. Also, it is not known whether or not supervisors spent sufficient time of feedback for supervisees in this study. Insufficient time of feedback could have also hindered the CSE of supervisees in this study.

Limitations

There are some potential limitations of the present study. One limitation could be related to variables that have an effect on CSE. CSE levels of supervisees may be influenced by variables outside of supervisor and supervision process, such as client's and supervisee's own demographic and personal characteristics. However, in this study, the variables with reference to CSE were limited with supervisor and supervision variables.

Implications for Research and Practice

Several implications for research and practice can be presented based on the findings of the present study. Supervision within Individual Counseling Practice course is a requirement for Guidance and Counseling Undergraduate Programs in Turkey (Council of Higher Education, 2018). During this course, supervisees receive supervision for the first time. Through supervision, they develop a stronger foundation of CSE. Therefore, this study's findings are applicable to counselor training in Turkey.

The first major finding of this study is that none of the three supervisory styles predict the CSE of first-time supervisees. If this is the case for first-time supervisees, it is suggested that supervisors should adopt various supervisory styles instead of adopting one dominant supervisory style to strengthen CSE in accordance with supervisees' supervisory needs and expectations. Therefore, supervisors should keep in mind that one of their primary responsibilities is to understand what the supervisees' individual supervisory needs are and to find the most effective style and role. Furthermore, supervisors should consider that supervisees may have different individual supervisory needs and expect from their supervisors to adopt different supervisory styles and roles throughout the supervision process.

Concerning evaluation within supervision, the major finding of this study is that goal setting was a significant predictor for the CSE of first-time supervisees. This finding provided for supervisors to pay much more attention to establish mutual supervisory goals with first-time supervisees in the beginning phases of supervision. However, the final and the most unexpected finding from this study is that feedback did not predict first-time supervisees' CSE. This finding suggests that there is a

considerable need for understanding supervisees' feedback expectations from supervisors. In other words, we do not exactly know the quality and quantity of feedback received from supervisees in Turkey. Investigating the characteristics, amounts, and time of feedback for Turkish first-time supervisees would give clues to supervisors about what supervisees expect and need concerning feedback.

Eventually, it is hoped that these results will be useful for supervisors and counselor educators in Turkey to conduct effective supervision and strengthen their supervisees' CSE. Moreover, it is believed that this study will lead researchers to further research involving different variables and using various research methods.

References

- Aladag, M. (2014). Psikolojik danisman egitiminin farkli duzeylerinde bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulaması supervizyonunda kritik olaylar [Critical incidents in individual counseling practicum supervision across different levels of counselor education]. *Ege Education Journal*, 15(2), 428-475.
- Aladag, M., & Kemer, G. (2016a). Clinical supervision: An emerging counseling specialty in Turkey. *Clinical Supervisor*, 35(2), 175-191. doi:10.1080/07325223.2016.1223775
- Aladag, M., & Kemer, G. (2016b). *Psikolojik danisman egitiminde bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulaması ve supervizyonunun incelenmesi [The examination of individual counseling practicum and its supervision in counselor education]*. Izmir, Turkey: Ege University, Directorate of Scientific Research Projects.
- Atik, Z. (2017). *Psikolojik danisman adaylarının bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulaması ve supervizyonuna ilişkin degerlendirmeleri [Counselor candidates' evaluation of individual counseling practicum and supervision]* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Atik, Z. E., & Yildirim, İ. (2017). Supervizyonda Degerlendirme Sureci Envanteri Türkçe Formu'nun gecerlik ve guvenirlik çalisması [Validity and reliability of Turkish Form of the Evaluation Process within Supervision Inventory]. *Ege Education Journal*, 18(1), 146-173.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Barbee, P. W., Scherer, D., & Combs, D. C. (2003). Prepracticum service-learning: Examining the relationship with counselor self-efficacy and anxiety. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 43(2), 108-119.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2019). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. MA: Pearson.
- Bordin, E. S. (1983). A working alliance-based model of supervision. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 11(1), 35- 4. doi: 10.1177/0011000083111007
- Buyukgoze-Kavas, A. (2011). Bireysel ve grupla psikolojik danisma uygulamalarına yonelik bir degerlendirme [An evaluation regarding individual and group counseling practicums]. *Turkish Educational Sciences Journal*, 9(2), 411-432.

- Campbell, J. M. (2000). *Becoming an effective supervisor: A workbook for counselor and psychotherapist*. USA: Routledge.
- Carifio, M. S., & Hess, A. K. (1987). Who is the ideal supervisor? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 18, 244-250.
- Cashwell, T. H., & Dooley, K. (2001). The impact of supervision on counselor self-efficacy. *The Clinical Supervisor*, 20, 39-47.
- Council of Higher Education (2018). Guidance and counseling undergraduate programs. Retrieved June 21, 2018, from http://yok.gov.tr/documents/10279/41805112/Rehberlik_ve_Psikolojik_Danismanlik_Lisans_Programi.pdf
- Cormier, S., & Nuriou, P. S. (2003). *Interviewing and change strategies for helpers: Fundamental skills and cognitive behavioral interventions*. (5th ed.). Pacific Grove: Thomson-Brooks/Cole.
- Coykendall, S. J. (1993). *The relationship between counselor self-efficacy and developmental level during an eleven-week supervisory relationship* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.
- Daniels, J. A., & Larson, L. M. (2001). The impact of performance feedback on counseling self-efficacy and counselor anxiety. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 41, 120-130.
- Denizli, S., Aladag, M., Bektas, D. Y., Cihangir-Cankaya, Z., & Ozeke-Kocabas, E. (2009, October). *Psikolojik danisman egitiminde bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulaması ve supervizyonu: Ege Üniversitesi örneği [Individual counseling practicum and supervision in counselor education: The example of Ege University]*. Paper presented at the annual National Conference of Guidance and Counseling, Adana, Turkey.
- Dogan, S. (2000). The historical development of counselling in Turkey. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling*, 22, 57-67.
- Fernando, D. M., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2005). The relationship of supervisory styles to satisfaction with supervision and the perceived self-efficacy of master's level counseling students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 44, 293-305. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6978.2005.tb01757.x
- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(4), 541-557. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.541
- Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS (and sex and drugs and rock 'n' roll)* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2005). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- 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, 73-77. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.33.1.73

- Friedlander, M. L., & Ward, L. G. (1984). Development and validation of the Supervisory Styles Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*(4), 541-557.
- 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.
- Heckman-Stone, C. (2003). Trainee preferences for feedback and evaluation in clinical supervision. *The Clinical Supervisor, 22*(1), 21-33. doi:10.1300/J001v22n01_03
- Higher Education Program Atlas (2018). *Rehberlik ve psikolojik danismanlik programi bulunan tum universiteler [Universities where have guidance and counseling undergraduate programs]*. Retrieved June 21, 2018, from <https://yokatlas.yok.gov.tr/lisans-bolum.php?b=10172>.
- Holloway, E. L. (1995). *Clinical supervision: A systems approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Holloway, E. L., & Wolleat, P. L. (1981). Style differences of beginning supervisors: An interactional analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 373-376.
- Hughes, J. (2012). Practical aspects of supervision: All you ever wanted to know but were too afraid to ask. In I. Fleming & L. Steen (Eds.), *Supervision and clinical psychology: Theory, practice, and perspectives* (pp. 184-206). Hove, UK: Routledge.
- Humeidan, M. A. (2002). Counseling self-efficacy, supervisory working alliance, and social influence in supervision. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 63*(03).
- Karpenko, V., & Gidycz, C. A. (2012). The supervisory relationship and the process of evaluation: Recommendations for supervisors. *The Clinical Supervisor, 31*(2), 138-158. doi: 10.1080/07325223.2013.730014
- Keith, T. (2015). *Multiple regression and beyond: An introduction to multiple regression and structural equation modeling* (2nded.). New York, London: Routledge.
- Kirsch, I. (1986). Early research on self-efficacy: What we already know without knowing we knew. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*(3), 339-358.
- Koc, I. (2013). *Kişiler arasi sureci hatirlama teknigine dayali supervizyonun psikolojik danisman adaylarinin psikolojik danisma becerilerine, ozyeterlik ve kaygi duzeylerine etkisi [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, Izmir, Turkey.
- Kocarek, C. H. (2001). *Understanding the relationships among counseling self-efficacy, anxiety, developmental level, course work, experience, and counselor performance*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
- Kurtyilmaz, Y. (2015). Counselor trainees' views on their forthcoming experiences in practicum course. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 61*, 155-180. doi:10.14689/ejer.2015.61.9

- Ladany, N., Ellis, M. V., & Friedlander, M. L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy, and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*(4), 447-455. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1999.tb02472.x
- Larson, L. M. (1998). The social cognitive model of counselor training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*(2), 219-273.
- Larson, L. M., Clark, M. P., Wesely, L. H., Koraleski, S. F., Daniels, J. A., & Smith, P. L. (1999). Videos versus role plays to increase counseling self-efficacy in prepractica trainees. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*(4), 237-248.
- Larson, L. M., Suzuki, L. A., Gillespie, K. N., Potenza, M. T., Bechtel, M. A., & Toulouse, A. L. (1992). Development and validation of the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39* (1), 105-120.
- Lehrman-Waterman, D., & Ladany, N. (2001). Development and validation of the Evaluation Process within Supervision Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(2), 168-177. doi:1037//0022-0167.48.2.168
- Lent, R. W., Hill, C. E., & Hoffman, M. A. (2003). Development and validation of the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy Scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 97-108.
- Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*(1), 3-42.
- Lorenz, D. C. (2009). *Counseling self-efficacy in practicum students: Contribution of supervision* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University.
- Meydan, B. (2015). Bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulamasinda Mikro Beceri Supervizyon Modeli'nin etkililiginin incelenmesi [Examining the effectiveness of Microcounseling Supervision Model in individual counseling practice]. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal, 5*(43), 55-68.
- Meydan, B., & Denizli, S. (2018). Turkish undergraduate supervisees' views regarding supervisory relationship. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 1-24. doi: 10.14689/ejer.2018.74.1
- Pamukcu, B. (2011). *The investigation of counseling self-efficacy levels of counselor trainees* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Pamukcu, B., & Demir, A. (2013). Psikolojik Danisma Oz-Yeterlik Olcegi Turckce formunun gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi [The validity and reliability study of the Turkish version of Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale]. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 4*(40), 212-221.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Phelps, D. L. (2013). *Supervisee experiences of corrective feedback in clinical supervision: A consensual qualitative research study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marquette University.
- Poyrazli, Ş., Dogan, S., & Eskin, M. (2013). Counseling and psychotherapy in Turkey: Western theories and culturally inclusive methods. In R. Moodly, U. P.

- Gielen, & R. Wu (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling and psychotherapy in an international context* (pp. 404–414). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Robinson, J. K. G. (2001). *Relationships between perceived supervisory styles and counseling students' self-efficacy in practicum* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Carolina.
- Rønnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2003). The journey of the counselor and therapist: Research findings and perspectives on professional development. *Journal of Career Development, 30*(1), 5-44. doi: 10.1177/089484530303000102
- Satici, B., & Turkum, A. S. (2015, October). *Psikolojik danisman adaylarının psikolojik danisma ozyeterlik algilarinin supervizyon yasantilari ve mizah tarzları acısından incelenmesi [Investigation of counseling self-efficacy of counselor trainees in terms of humor styles and supervision experience]*. Paper presented at the annual National Conference of Guidance and Counseling, Mersin, Turkey.
- Steward, R. J., Breland, A., & Neil, D. M. (2001). Novice supervisees' self-evaluations and their perceptions of supervisor style. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 41*, 131-141. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6978.2001.tb01277.x
- Stoltenberg, C. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 59–65. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.28.1.59
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Talen, M.R., & Schindler, N. (1993). Goal-directed supervision plans: A model for trainee supervision and evaluation. *The Clinical Supervisor, 11*, 77-88.
- 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. (1997). *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision*. New York: Willey.
- Zeren, G. S., & Yilmaz, M. S. (2011, October). *Bireyle psikolojik danisma uygulaması dersini alan öğrencilerin supervizyona bakış açıları: Yeditepe Üniversitesi örneği [Perspectives of trainees toward supervision in individual counseling practicum: The example of Yeditepe University]*. Paper presented at the annual National Conference of Guidance and Counseling, Izmir, Turkey.

Türkiye’de Lisans Düzeyinde Süpervizyon Alan Adayların Psikolojik Danışma Özyeterlikleri

Atf:

Meydan, B. (2021). Turkish first-time supervisees’ counseling self-efficacy. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 61-78, DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2021.92.4

Özet

Problem Durumu: Psikolojik danışmanların yetiştirilmesinde süpervizyon kritik öneme sahiptir. Süpervizyon alan adaylar süpervizyon altında gerçekleştirdikleri psikolojik danışma uygulamaları sayesinde psikolojik danışma becerilerinde, stratejilerinde ve kuramlarında deneyim kazanmakta ve kendilerini profesyonel bir meslek elemanı olarak yetiştirmektedirler. Süpervizyonun sunduğu bu olanaklara rağmen nitelik ve nicelik açısından benzer eğitimlerden geçen psikolojik danışman adaylarının kendilerini aynı düzeyde yeterli hissetmedikleri bilinmektedir. Bu noktada, kuramsal bilgi ve becerilerin psikolojik danışma uygulamalarında başarılı olmak için yeterli olmadığı; özyeterlik inancının motivasyon ve performans üzerinde önemli bir etkisi olduğu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Alanyazında psikolojik danışman adaylarının gelişimsel düzeylerinin, psikolojik danışma deneyimlerinin, süpervizyonun, süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzının ve geribildirimlerinin süpervizyon alan psikolojik danışman adaylarının özyeterlik düzeylerini etkilediği bulunmuştur. Türkiye’de psikolojik danışman eğitimi incelendiğinde, söz konusu eğitimin devlet üniversiteleri ve özel üniversitelerde lisans, yüksek lisans ve doktora düzeyinde yürütüldüğü ve bununla birlikte, lisans eğitiminin alanda çalışacak psikolojik danışmanları yetiştirmede büyük öneme sahip olduğu görülmektedir. Dört yıllık lisans eğitimi incelendiğinde, psikolojik danışman adayları süpervizyon altındaki ilk psikolojik danışma uygulamalarını bu aşamada gerçekleştirmektedirler. Dolayısıyla, Türkiye’de psikolojik danışma yetiştirmede lisans eğitimi oldukça önemli bir role sahiptir. Bu öneme dayalı olarak, son yıllarda Türkiye’deki süpervizyon araştırmalarında önemli ve hızlı bir artış olduğu dikkat çekmektedir. Söz konusu araştırmalar incelendiğinde, ağırlıklı olarak çeşitli süpervizyon modellerinin psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliği üzerindeki etkilerinin incelendiği ve psikolojik danışma özyeterliği ile süpervizyon memnuniyeti arasındaki ilişkilerin çalışıldığı görülmektedir. Süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzları ve geribildirim ise araştırmalara yeni konu olmaya başlamıştır. Önceki araştırmaların genellikle süpervizörün kişisel ve mesleki özelliklerini incelediği ve geribildirim niteliğine ilişkin beklentilerle ilgili nitel bulgular olduğu görülmektedir. Ancak, süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzlarının ve süpervizyondaki değerlendirme süreçlerinin süpervizyon alan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterlikleri üzerindeki rolünün henüz araştırmalara konu olmadığı dikkat çekmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Türkiye’de süpervizyon son yıllarda araştırmalara sıkça konu olmaktadır. Ancak, süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzlarının ve süpervizyondaki değerlendirme süreçlerinin Türkiye’de süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterlikleri üzerindeki rolü henüz araştırmalara konu olmamıştır. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın amacı, süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzlarının ve süpervizyondaki değerlendirme süreçlerinin Türkiye’de süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterlikleri üzerindeki rolünü incelemektir. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, bu araştırmanın problem cümlesi şu şekildedir; *süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzı ve süpervizyondaki değerlendirme süreçleri Türkiye’de süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerini ne düzeyde yordamaktadır?*

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu araştırma korelasyonel bir araştırmadır. Araştırmanın katılımcıları Türkiye’nin yedi farklı devlet üniversitesinde Eğitim Fakültesi Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık lisans programına kayıtlı ve Bireyle Psikolojik Danışma Uygulaması dersini alan 330 psikolojik danışman adaydır. Katılımcıların 242’si kadın (%71.9) ve 88’i (%28.1) erkektir. Yaş ortalamaları 21.77’dir ($SS = .96$). Veri toplama aracı olarak Psikolojik Danışma Özyeterlik Ölçeği, Süpervizörlük Tarzları Envanteri, Süpervizyonda Değerlendirme Süreci Envanteri ve kişisel bilgi formu kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen veriler, betimleyici istatistikler ve aşamalı çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Elde edilen bulgular, amaç oluşturma puanlarının süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerini yordamada anlamlı bir yordayıcı olduğunu göstermiştir. Amaç oluşturma tek başına toplam varyansın %12’sini açıklamıştır.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Öneriler: Bu çalışmada, süpervizörün süpervizörlük tarzlarının ve süpervizyondaki değerlendirme süreçlerinin Türkiye’de süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterlikleri üzerindeki rolünün incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda, amaç oluşturma süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterlikleri yordamada anlamlı bir yordayıcı olduğu; ancak, çekici, kişilerarası ilişkilerde duyarlı ve görev yönelimli süpervizörlük tarzlarının ve süpervizör geribildiriminin süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterlikleri yordamada anlamlı bir yordayıcı olmadıkları bulunmuştur. Araştırmanın bulgularına dayalı olarak gelecek araştırmalara ve uygulamaya dönük öneriler geliştirilmiştir. Öncelikle, Bireyle Psikolojik Danışma Uygulaması dersi kapsamında verilen süpervizyon Türkiye’de Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Lisans Programlarında zorunlu bir derstir. Bu ders kapsamında, psikolojik danışman adayları ilk kez süpervizyon altında psikolojik danışma uygulamaları gerçekleştirmektedirler. Süpervizyon sayesinde süpervizyon alan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerinin güçlendiği düşünüldüğünde, bu araştırma sonuçlarının Türkiye’de psikolojik danışman adaylarının lisans eğitimlerine uygulanabileceği düşünülmektedir. Bununla birlikte, bu araştırmada üç

süpervizörlük tarzının hiçbiri süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerini anlamlı düzeyde yordamamıştır. Bu durumda, lisans düzeyinde süpervizyon veren süpervizörlerin tek bir süpervizörlük tarzını benimsemektense psikolojik danışman adaylarının süpervizyondan beklentilerine ve gelişimsel olarak ihtiyaçlarına dayalı olarak farklı süpervizörlük tarzlarını benimsemeleri ve harmanlayarak süpervizyon vermeleri önerilmektedir. Zaten süpervizörlerin temel sorumluluklarından birinin süpervizyon alan psikolojik danışman adayının ihtiyaç ve beklentilerini anlamak olduğu düşünüldüğünde, süpervizörlük tarzlarını psikolojik danışman adaylarının beklenti ve ihtiyaçlarına cevap verecek şekilde bireyselleştirmeleri kıymetli olacaktır. Süpervizyonda değerlendirme süreçleri açısından, amaç oluşturmanın süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerini yordamada anlamlı bir yordayıcı olduğu düşünüldüğünde, süpervizörlerin süpervizyon sürecinin başında psikolojik danışman adaylarıyla birlikte ortak süpervizyon amaçları belirlemelerinin önemli olduğuna inanılmaktadır. Bununla birlikte, bu çalışmada süpervizyonda değerlendirme süreçleri açısından geribildirim süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerinin anlamlı bir yordayıcısı olmaması şaşırtıcı bir bulgu olmuştur. Bu durum, süpervizörlerin süpervizyonda geribildirim vermelerine rağmen söz konusu geribildirim süpervizyon alan psikolojik danışman adaylarının ihtiyaç ve beklentilerine uygunluğu ve bununla birlikte nicelik ve nitelik açısından yeterli olup olmaması konusunda soru işaretleri ortaya çıkarmıştır. Dolayısıyla, süpervizyonda süpervizörün verdiği geribildirim nitelik, nicelik ve zamanlama açısından özelliklerinin incelenmesinin bir ihtiyaç olduğu düşünülmektedir. Son olarak, bu çalışma Türkiye’de süpervizyon altında ilk uygulamalarını yapan psikolojik danışman adaylarının psikolojik danışma özyeterliklerini yordamada süpervizörle ilişkili değişkenleri inceleyen ilk çalışmalardan biri olsa da gelecek çalışmalarda farklı değişkenler ve araştırma desenleri kullanılarak bulguların genişletilmesi ve derinleştirilmesi önerilmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Klinik süpervizyon, psikolojik danışma özyeterliği, süpervizörlük tarzı, süpervizyonda değerlendirme, lisans düzeyinde süpervizyon alan aday.