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ABSTRACT
The authors investigated the relationship between type of group supervision (hybrid model vs. face-to-face) and attitudes toward technology, toward use of technology in professional practice, and toward quality of supervision among a sample of school counseling interns. Participants (N = 76) experienced one of two types of internship supervision: a hybrid model (N= 41) or face-to-face (N= 35). Data analyses indicated that the hybrid model of group supervision was positively related to attitudes toward technology in counselor education, future professional practice, and the overall supervisory experience. Further, differences between the approaches in delivery of supervision showed no effect on perceptions of quality of supervision. Implications for extending the use of technology-mediated supervision to practicing professionals are presented.
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The study of distance learning is a major focus in higher education (Anakwe, 1999; Benigno & Trentin, 2000; Davies & Mendenhall, 1998; DeBourgh, 1999) and an emerging concern among counseling related programs (Alterkruse & Brew, 2000; Bobby & Capone, 2000; Kjosness, 2002). The body of research examining the general satisfaction with distance learning, although mixed (Salas, Kosarzycbi, Burke, Fiore, & Stone, 2002; Smith, 1999), does reflect a consensus about characteristics associated with student satisfaction (DeBourgh, 1999). These include clear course expectations, prompt response to student questions, encouragement of student participation, use of varied instructional techniques, access to the instructor, and timely feedback to students about their work. However, due to limited research, there is less agreement about what characteristics are associated with satisfaction among counselors-in-training concerning technology-mediated supervision (Janoff & Schoenholtz-Read, 1999).

In spite of the limited research, there is growing support for the use of technology in training and supervision (Alpert, 1986; Casey, Bloom, & Moan, 1994; Christie, 1998; Lambert, Hedlund, & Vieweg, 1990; Myrick & Sabella, 1995). Olson, Russell, and White (2001) suggested using technology in supervision to meet the need for outreach to rural areas, for faculty who have limited time to supervise face-to-face, for increasing students’ access to qualified supervisors, and to manage the cost of supervision. Other advantages include removal of time and space restrictions, more time to reflect on information, and a permanent record for later reflection (Hara, Bonk, & Angeli, 2000).

Although there is research on various aspects of technology and supervision (Gamon, Sorlie, Bergvik, & Hoifodt, 1998), much of the investigation has focused on the efficacy of email. In an early study of its use, Myrick and Sabella (1995) suggested that email has a place in supervision by providing students with multiple opportunities for feedback and enhanced reflection. Other researchers found that email is a useful supplement to traditional modes of supervision (Olson, Russell, & White, 2001), increases personal reflection (Clingerman & Bernard, 2004), and “offers a way to know students’ thought processing and development at a level not before practically feasible” (Graf & Stebnicki, 2002, p. 48).

Researchers have also identified several limitations to using technology in supervision. These include concerns over variations in levels of computer skills among users, loss of non-verbal information, limited bonding between supervisor and student, slow response time, lack of confidentiality, and slow band-width speed, to name a few (Hara, Bonk, & Angeli, 2000; Janoff & Schoenholtz-Read, 1999; Myrick & Sabella, 1995; Olson, Russell, & White, 2001). However, Gamon, et al. (1998) found that, paradoxically, the forced limitations of technology-mediated supervision increased the development of insights and communication and enhanced the quality of supervision.

The nature of technology mediated communication is evolving from Web 1.0 tools such as basic email, chat room, threaded discussion, instant messaging and interactive video to Web 2.0 tools such as Skype, blogs, social networking, Wikis, podcasts and Folksonomy (collaborative tagging). However, faculty who are adopting technology into their instruction prefer the hybrid model, defined as a combination of face-to-face meetings and
technology delivered instruction (Young, 2002). In a review of the research on computer-mediated communication, Janoff and Schoenholtz-Read (1999) suggested that a hybrid model of supervision offers benefits such as 1) access to peer and expert supervision when not meeting face-to-face, 2) access to information supplied by the supervisor when not meeting face-to-face, 3) opportunity for equal and evolving participation among all members, and 4) opportunity for other members to observe interactions between supervisor and supervisee.

Although there are various models of supervision that guide the process, most of the research has focused on practice in a clinical setting (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004). Nelson and Johnson suggested that supervision of school counselors should focus primarily on skill building. Others have suggested that supervision should also include consultation (Kahn, 1999) and be organized around several primary functions: clinical, developmental, administrative, and peer supervision (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Henderson, 1994). We have chosen the combination of these recommendations to guide our research.

Like technology-mediated supervision, there is limited research concerning the use of supervision among school counselors (Kahn, 1999) due to 1) the multiple roles school counselors play compared to counselors in clinical settings, 2) the lack of formal training among school supervisors (Nelson & Johnson, 1999), and 3) uncertainty in terms of focus. Therefore, more investigation is needed to guide the growing support of supervision with Web 1.0 and 2.0 tools that include the use of a hybrid model. Our investigation compared two groups of school counseling interns. One group experienced a hybrid model of supervision which included face-to-face, email, and live chat room organized around the ideas proffered by Henderson (1994), Barret and Schmidt (1986), and Kahn (1999); the other group experienced only face-to-face supervision. We investigated three research questions. The first question focused on the degree to which use of the hybrid model of supervision was positively associated with attitudes toward the use of technology in counselor education. Students who classify themselves as “high computer users” have been shown to have more positive attitudes toward technology (Hayes & Robinson, 2000). Thus, our first research hypothesis was: the group experiencing the hybrid model of supervision will report more positive attitudes toward use of technology in counselor education than the face-to-face group.

The second research question focused on the degree to which use of the hybrid model of supervision was positively associated with attitudes about the use of technology in future professional practice. Prior research has suggested that technology is not a neutral influence on the user and may have an impact on future practice (Barnard, 1997). Thus, our second research hypothesis was: interns who participate in the hybrid model of supervision will report more positive attitudes toward use of technology in future professional practice than the face-to-face group.

The third research question focused on the degree to which the two groups differed in their perceptions of the quality of supervision. Although the positive working relationship important to quality supervision is typically established face-to-face (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), much of the research indicates students are equally satisfied with distance learning as they are with face-to-face learning (DeBourgh, 1999). Thus, our third research hypothesis was: the group experiencing the hybrid model of supervision will report no difference in satisfaction with quality of supervision than the face-to-face group.

Method

Participants

Participants were 76 graduate students enrolled in the School Counseling program at a mid-sized Midwestern University accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The study was conducted during their first semester of a two-semester internship. All participants completed the survey at the end of the first semester of their school counseling internship. During the 3 years that data were collected, participants were unaware of the different models used in the research and were assigned to one of two groups based on their enrollment in either the on-campus section of internship which received face-to-face supervision or the off-campus section which received a hybrid model combining technology-mediated supervision with face-to-face meetings. Although a convenience sample was used, because of the method of assignment to experimental groups, there is no reason to believe there were prior differences in attitude toward technology among group members.
The technology-mediated groups, with 41 participants, received group supervision by means of a combination of online supervision using WebCT (10 meetings) and face-to-face meetings (5 meetings). The other groups, made up of 35 participants, received all of their supervision face-to-face. Surveys were given to participants at the end of their first semester of internship. In order to insure complete anonymity of participants, the surveys contained no identifying information.

Demographic data, such as gender, ethnic background, and professional status were collected from participants. The majority of the participants were female (N=63), 12 were male, and one participant did not respond. Seventy-one participants were white (not of Hispanic origin), two were black (not of Hispanic origin); and three did not respond. Due to the homogenous sample, the demographics were not factored in the statistical analyses.

Instruments

The Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Trainee Form was developed to measure the relationship between supervisor and trainee on two subscales, Rapport and Client Focus (Efstathion, Patton, & Kardash, 1990), and supported in research on supervision (Chen and Bernstein, 2000; Patton and Kivlighan, 1997). There were 19 items on this inventory using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “almost never” to 7 = “almost always.” The Rapport subscale consists of 12 items and the Client Focus subscale is made up of 7 items. Trainees were asked to indicate the frequency of specific characteristics (for example “I feel comfortable working with my supervisor”) within the supervisory relationship and to rate accordingly. Confirmatory factor analytic techniques supported the three-factor and two-factor structures for the supervisor and trainee version of the SWAI (Gold, 1993). Further, convergent and discriminant validity for the supervisee form of the SWAI was supported in statistically significant correlations with scales of the Supervisory Styles Inventory (Friedlander & Ward, 1984) and the Personal Reactions Scale – Revised (Holloway & Wampold, 1983). Cronbach’s alpha indicating internal consistency was calculated for the Trainee scales with alpha coefficients of .90 for Rapport and .77 for Client Focus (Efstathion, Patton, & Kardash, 1990).

The Supervision Questionnaire was developed to measure the trainee’s satisfaction with their supervisory experience (Ladany, Hill, & Nutt, 2004; Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, & Nyguyen, 1979). The questionnaire consisted of eight items using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “excellent” to 4 = “poor.” This survey includes items such as “How would you rate the quality of the supervision you have received?”, and “Did you get the kind of supervision you wanted?” Originally derived from the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (Larsen et al., 1979), this questionnaire was found to be related to supervisee nondisclosure with previous research reporting the SSQ to be alpha = .96 (Ladany et al., 2004). In a study by Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, and Wolgast (1999), internal consistency was reported as alpha = .97.

The Web-Based Distance Group Satisfaction Survey (Roberts, Powell, & Fraker, 2002) used a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “strongly agree” to 5 = “strongly disagree.” The survey is made up of 3 subscales: 1) Perceptions of the Usefulness of Technology in Professional Practice (8 items), 2) Perceptions of the Usefulness of Technology in Counselor Education (6 items), and 3) Perceptions of the Effectiveness of On-line Supervision (16 items). Participants were asked to indicate the answer that most likely fit their current thoughts or feelings on the topic. This unpublished 33 question survey (Roberts et al., 2002) was designed using a pilot group (N= 43) to measure students’ perceptions of the effectiveness of online supervision (Cronbach’s alpha = .91), students’ perception of the usefulness of technology in professional practice (Cronbach’s alpha = .63), and student’s perceptions of the usefulness of technology in counselor education (Cronbach’s alpha =.82).

Procedure

All participants were enrolled in a semester long internship (15 meetings) in school counseling in which they received group supervision. Data were collected over a three year period. Two of the researchers using identical syllabi taught both the technology-mediated and face-to-face sections over the course of data collection. Students were required to email “cases” to the faculty member and classmates one week prior to discussion to allow for advanced reflection. Students in the technology-mediated group used either WebCT “live chat” or met face-to-face to discuss the cases. In the hybrid model section, the class began with a face-to-face meeting followed by
approximately 2 technology-mediated classes for every face-to-face class. In total, there were 5 face-to-face meetings and 10 technology-mediated meetings.

**Data Analyses**

To test the three working hypotheses, scores were compared between the online and face-to-face supervision groups. ANOVAs were performed to analyze the relationship between the hybrid model of supervision and attitudes toward current and future practice using technology. In addition, ANOVAs were also performed to analyze the relationship between the hybrid model of supervision and attitudes toward the quality of supervision. Following the ANOVAs, power analyses were conducted.

**Results**

Table 1 contains the descriptive statistics for the present study. All instruments administered in the present study were found to have moderate-to-high reliability estimates, ranging from .66 to .93 for alpha coefficient estimates and ranging from .71 to .90 for split-half reliability estimates. Substantially higher correlations among the respective subscales of the Working Alliance measure and the Satisfaction Survey over the correlations with other measures, including the Supervision Questionnaire, suggested that the three constructs under investigation (i.e., satisfaction with the quality of supervision, working alliance, and satisfaction with the use of technology) were relatively independent of one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Split Half †</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervision Quest.</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rapport</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Client Focus</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Subscale 1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Subscale 2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Subscale 3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† = split half reliability estimates were corrected for length using the Spearman-Brown formula.

*p < .05 (2-tailed); ** p < .01 (2-tailed).

Analysis of Variance results are presented in Table 2 addressing each of the three research questions under investigation. Our first research question focused on the degree to which use of the hybrid model of supervision was positively associated with attitudes toward use of technology in counselor education. Subscale 3 of The Web-Based, Distance Group Satisfaction Survey (Roberts, et al., 2002) was used to determine perceptions of usefulness of technology in counselor education. A one-way ANOVA was computed comparing the means of the hybrid model of supervision group (M = 9.46, SD = 2.76) and the face-to-face supervision group (M = 12.71, SD = 2.90). The analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between the means of the two groups (F(1,74) = 25.06, p < .001, η = .50). Thus, our hypothesis was supported, indicating that use of the hybrid model of supervision was in fact positively related to attitudes toward use of technology in counselor education.

Our second research question focused on the degree to which use of the hybrid model of supervision was positively associated with attitudes toward use of technology in future professional practice. Subscale 2 of The Web-Based, Distance Group Satisfaction Survey (Roberts, et al., 2002) was used to determine perceptions of usefulness of technology in future professional practice. The one-way ANOVA computed indicated a significant difference between the hybrid model of supervision group (M = 9.56, SD = 2.72) and face-to-face supervision group (M = 12.71, SD = 3.16) (F(1,74) = 21.87, p < .001, η = .48). Thus, our hypothesis was supported, indicating that use of the
hybrid model of supervision was positively associated with attitudes toward use of technology in future professional practice.

Table 2. Analysis of variance results, including Cohen’s effect size (ES) f-values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>η (η2)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>ES(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web-Based, Distance Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Survey: Subscale 1</td>
<td>1/74</td>
<td>28.94</td>
<td>.53 (.28)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Survey: Subscale 2</td>
<td>1/74</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>.48 (.23)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Survey: Subscale 3</td>
<td>1/74</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>.50 (.25)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Working Alliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 1: Rapport</td>
<td>1/65</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.14 (.02)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale 2: Client Focus</td>
<td>1/65</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.20 (.04)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Questionnaire</td>
<td>1/74</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03 (&lt;.01)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our third research question focused on the degree to which the two groups differed in their perceptions of the quality of supervision. We predicted that use of the hybrid model of supervision would result in no significant difference between groups on perceptions of quality of supervision. Subscales 1 and 2 of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Trainee Form (Efstation, Patton, & Kardash, 1990), the Supervision Questionnaire (Ladany, et al., 2004), and Subscale 1 of The Web-Based Distance Group Satisfaction Survey (Roberts, et al., 2002) were used to determine attitudes toward quality of supervision.

The one-way ANOVA computed on the Rapport subscale of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Trainee Form indicated no significant difference between the hybrid model of supervision group (M = 6.53, SD = 0.58) and face-to-face group (M = 6.37, SD = 0.69) groups (F(1,65) = 1.08, ns, η = .14). Thus, our hypothesis was supported, indicating that participants in the hybrid model of supervision group did not significantly differ from the face-to-face group in their perceptions of supervisory rapport.

The one-way ANOVA computed on the Client Focus subscale of the Supervisory Working Alliance Inventory: Trainee Form indicated no significant difference between the hybrid model of supervision group (M = 6.39, SD = 0.66) and face-to-face group (M = 6.09, SD = 0.90) groups (F(1,65) = 2.48, ns, η = .20). Thus, our hypothesis was supported, indicating that participants in the hybrid model of supervision group did not significantly differ from the face-to-face group in their perceptions of supervisory client focus.

The one-way ANOVA computed on the data collected from the Supervision Questionnaire indicated no significant difference between the hybrid model of supervision group (M = 29.44, SD = 3.52) and face-to-face group (M = 29.20, SD = 3.87) groups (F(1,74) = .08, ns, η = .03). Thus, our hypothesis was supported, indicating that students experiencing the hybrid model of supervision did not significantly differ from students experiencing face-to-face supervision in terms of satisfaction with supervisory experience.

The one-way ANOVA computed on the data collected from the Web-based, Distance Group Supervision survey indicated a significant difference between the hybrid model of supervision group (M = 54.39, SD = 11.55) and face-to-face group (M = 68.94, SD = 11.99) (F(1,74) = 28.94, p < .001, η = .53). Thus, our hypothesis was rejected using this subscale since results indicated that use of the hybrid model of supervision was in fact positively associated with attitudes toward the quality of supervision.

**Effect Size and Power Analyses**

Traditionally, statistical analyses of empirical findings test the proposition that the phenomenon under investigation is either present or not in the population (Cohen, 1988). This is accomplished by testing the null hypothesis positing that the phenomenon does not exist in the population, after which it is rejected or not. However, such results say little about the actual results found in the study. For instance, if the null hypothesis is rejected, are the “significant” findings small, medium, or large? Moreover, what is the likelihood that the results found in one sample would subsequently be found in other samples from the same population? These questions can be addressed by the investigation of a nonzero effect size and power analyses.
In the present study, Cohen’s (1988, pp. 274-288) $f$-value was used as the effect size index; $f$-values were determined using Cohen’s tables. An effect size was evaluated as follows: $f < .10$ as no effect, $.10 \leq f < .25$ as a small effect, $.25 \leq f < .40$ as a medium effect, and $f \geq .40$ as a large effect size. Each of the three Satisfaction Survey subscales yielded large effect size values (i.e., .61, .55, and .58, respectively). Both Supervisory Working Alliance subscales (i.e., Rapport and Client Focus) produced small effect size values (i.e., .15 and .20, respectively), and the Supervision Questionnaire yielded no effect size (i.e., .03).

Power analyses were conducted only for large effect-size findings (i.e., Satisfaction Survey subscales 1, 2, and 3). To minimize the capitalization on chance due to the multiple statistical tests, power analyses were conducted at the Type I error rate of $\alpha = .01$. Results of the power analyses showed a very high power for all three subscales (i.e., power exceeding .995). Thus, for each Satisfaction Survey subscale, one would expect to reject the null hypothesis in 99 out of 100 random samples from the present population studied.

**Discussion**

Results of the study indicated that the technology-mediated group had more positive attitudes about the use of technology in counselor education than the face-to-face group (hypothesis 1). These results support earlier research (Hayes & Robinson, 2000) which found that “high computer users” were shown to have more positive attitudes toward technology than those not classified that way. As mentioned in the procedure section, the hybrid model consisted of a 2:1 ratio between technology-mediated and face-to-face supervision giving students consistent experience over time with technology. The fact that there was consistency may have alleviated some of the limitations of the use of technology in supervision identified by Olson, Russell and White (2001). For instance, slowness in responding to supervisees’ consultation questions becomes a moot point when groups meet weekly. Moreover, another limitation, that computer-mediated communication can overwhelm the student and instructor with endless opportunities to interact (Hara, Bonk, & Angeli, 2000), was not experienced by the technology-mediated group. This may have been a result of specific time frames used for both face-to-face and technology-mediated chat room discussions.

Similarly, hypothesis 2 was supported; that is, the hybrid model of supervision was positively associated with attitudes toward use of technology in future professional practice. The benefits of the hybrid model, which includes opportunity for equal and evolving participation among all members (Janoff & Schoenholtz-Read, 1999) may have influenced the technology-mediated group to envision themselves as users of technology in the future. Although the face-to-face group also experienced equal and evolving participation, they did not use technology to do so; thus any attitude toward technology in future professional practice would not be substantiated by actual experience. Also, the technology-mediated group had the opportunity to experience the development of insights and communication as a result of the hybrid model of supervision (Gamon, Sorlie, Bergvik, & Hoifodt, 1998), and most likely assumed that this type of communication would be possible in the future.

Hypothesis 3 was also supported. With the exception of one subscale, there was no significant difference between groups on perceptions of quality of supervision. This finding supports DeBourgh’s (1999) research which indicated that the satisfaction of students experiencing distance learning was not significantly different from students receiving face-to-face learning. Moreover, it appears that the results found in the Roberts et al. (2004) subscale substantiates earlier research (Gamon, Sorlie, Bergvik, & Hoifodt, 1998) which found that the hybrid model of supervision actually may enhance the quality of supervision.

Given these findings, the hybrid model of supervision may be the answer to the need for outreach to rural areas and for increasing students’ access to qualified supervisors (Olson, Russell, & White, 2001). Likewise, adopting a hybrid model of supervision appears to address one the limitations, namely, that technology-mediated relationships can take longer to form than face-to-face relationships (Hara, Bonk, & Angeli, 2000; Myrick & Sabella 1995). In acknowledging that a positive working relationship is critical (Ladany, Ellis, & Friedlander, 1999), we suggest that the initial meeting be held face-to-face, which will enable the students to meet and interact with the supervisor. At the same time, students will be able to begin their own bonding process with each other. The initial meeting can also address other identified limitations such as confidentiality and ethics, particularly as they relate to supervision via the internet. Moreover, these topics can be discussed not only during face-to-face meetings, but also in the weekly chat–room discussions.
Our research indicates that the hybrid model of supervision is a positive experience for students. But it will likely become a negative experience if students are not trained adequately or if the supervisors lack access to computer support (Janoff & Schoenholtz-Read, 1999). We found that after students receive information about the chat-room process (during the first meeting), it is important to hold a “practice” session, where students and supervisor meet informally. This allows both supervisor and students to confirm that the process is working and allows them to address any technical difficulties before supervision occurs. Also, it is necessary for the supervisor to have computer support in case any problems arise during the live chat-room time. All of these necessary arrangements must be made before the first face-to-face meeting so that the technology aspect of the chat runs as smoothly as possible and the focus can remain on supervision.

As with any study, ours has limitations. The Midwestern location and homogeneity of participants may limit the applicability of the research to other areas. Two of the surveys are unpublished and although pilot studies were initially done on the Web-Based Distance Group Supervision Survey (Roberts, et al., 2002) more work is needed to ensure its validity and reliability. Future studies of the hybrid model of supervision might include measures of satisfaction among practicing school counselors. It may be that school counselors in rural areas will feel less alienated from colleagues if they participate in a weekly chat.

Conclusion

One of the important findings of this study is that school counseling interns who experienced technology-mediated supervision were more satisfied with their experience than were the interns who met face-to-face with their supervisor. Additionally, interns in the technology-mediated group were more likely than the face-to-face group to have a positive attitude toward the use of technology in professional practice. Counselor Educators can use the hybrid model of supervision to show students how they can seek supervision or consultation about the varied kinds of issues they will be facing when they are working as school counselors. For example, our hybrid model of supervision includes discussion of cases and situations similar to the primary functions suggested in previous research: clinical, developmental, and administrative tasks (Barret & Schmidt, 1986; Henderson, 1994) as well as case conceptualization skills (Butler & Constantine, 2006).

These findings have implications for school counseling interns as well as practicing professionals. This not only includes school counselors, but also other fields such as health (e.g., nursing, medical and psychology training) and education (e.g., student teaching). The importance for supervision has been recognized by school counselors and other professionals. It is particularly important that these professionals utilize emerging technologies including Web 2.0 tools for supervision, especially for those who live in rural areas and have little access to colleagues. However, communication in a cyber environment is not without problems. The hybrid model used in this study addresses the concerns of some researchers about the difficulty of establishing the interpersonal connectedness required for effective communication absent face-to-face communication (Wilczenski & Coomey, 2006). Thus, if practicing professionals who utilize supervision make use of technology for establishing connections, they might be better served if they also included occasional face-to-face meetings.
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