5-18-2007

Counselor Educators' Perceptions of their Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation

Stephanie F. Hall
University of New Orleans

Recommended Citation

Hall, Stephanie F., "Counselor Educators' Perceptions of their Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation" (2007). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 552.
https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/552

Counselor Educators' Perceptions of their Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Counselor Education

by

Stephanie F. Hall

B. A., University of Kentucky, 1999
M. A., Louisiana Tech University, 2004

May 2007

DEDICATION

With honor and pride I dedicate this dissertation to my mother, Barbara Elizabeth Hall.

Though you could not be here in person, your love and inspiration were with me each and every

day. You taught me to be my own person, to live my life to the fullest, and to show others care

and compassion along the way. You showed me unconditional love and understanding, while

challenging me to be the best person that I could be. You will always be with me. To you, I am

forever grateful.

To Jennifer, your friendship and loyalty have been a constant in my life for as long as I can remember. You have always been one of my biggest supporters. Thank you for your unending friendship and love.

To Bianca, thank you for being a part of my life as a friend, a colleague and a resource. You provided encouragement, support and instrumental feedback during this process. The journey to self discovery that we shared was one that I will never forget, tears and laughter included. I am so happy to have traveled this road with you.

To Dana, you brought love and happiness into my life that has carried me through many trying times. As we have grown together, I have enjoyed each and every step of the way. Thank you for believing in me and teaching me to think outside of the box!

To Kristy, your friendship has been such a wonderful blessing to me during this journey. From our first class together in the doctoral program, you were always someone that I admired and felt a true connection with, and I was so delighted when we began to get to know one another. You have been a great source of support for me, especially during the last year, and I will always be here to return the favor!

To my dear friends Peggy and Dee, thank you for being the amazing people that you are, and for the incredible bond that we forged during our first few years in the doctoral program. Although Katrina separated us physically, I know that spiritually we remain connected. I was truly blessed to have found such wonderful colleagues and friends in you.

To my brother and sister-in-law, Johnathan and Brichelle, thank you for believing in me and supporting me even when times were hard. I will always appreciate your open hearts and open minds. I love you both without measure.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This study examined experiences in doctoral counselor education programs that prepare graduates to teach at the university level, and perceptions of the effectiveness of those experiences. There is an abundance of research in the field of higher education that raises the concern that many Ph.D. graduates are aptly prepared researchers, but are not able to teach effectively. Despite the fact that research in the field points to the problem of inadequate teaching preparation, there has been no known research conducted to examine what experiences in doctoral training are perceived as effective for teaching preparation. The major contribution of this research is that it is the first known empirical work that addresses activities aimed at teaching preparation in counselor education doctoral programs. A researcher designed instrument, the Preparation For Teaching Scale, was used in this study. Pearson product moment correlations were computed to examine relationships between frequency of experiences and ratings of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Results of this study confirm the assumptions present in the literature; several of which include that observation and feedback from faculty, teaching under supervision, being mentored to teach and attending seminars on college teaching are all positively correlated with participants' perceptions of overall teaching preparedness. The collective findings of this research provide a foundation for considerable future research endeavors in both quantitative and qualitative modes. Implications for counselor education and recommendations for further research are presented.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a wealth of literature to support the notion that graduates of Ph.D. programs are adequately prepared to conduct research, but fall short in other areas of faculty preparation such as teaching (Austin, 2002a; Austin, 2002b; DeNeef, 1993; Golde, 2004). Addressing this lack of teaching preparation, Silverman (2003) stated that although teaching is fundamental to a career in higher education, when thinking of doctoral training and the preparation of future faculty, one thinks of research training. Benassi and Fernald (1993) addressed this point, and stated that of the new Ph.D.s who secure academic positions, few have received formal training in the area of teaching. The lack of emphasis on teaching is likely due to the fact that the focus in doctoral programs across disciplines has traditionally been on preparing researchers.

The emphasis on research and the lack of emphasis on teaching represent a serious gap between the qualities that are being sought in new faculty and those that are being taught to doctoral students (Meacham, 2002). Meacham noted that graduate faculty members are primarily researchers and are very good at what they do; but in their own training they were not prepared to be effective teachers.

In most counselor education doctoral programs there is only one course offered on college teaching. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards only suggest the inclusion of a course on college teaching, but do not require it as a part of the curriculum for a doctoral degree in counselor education. The fact that CACREP does not require a course in college teaching indicates that much like other disciplines in higher education, counselor education may be lacking in its attention to teaching preparation.

Attention to teaching preparation is of particular importance in counselor education Ph.D. programs, given the fact that a master's degree in counseling is the terminal degree for practice, and a doctoral degree in counseling is typically pursued in order to enter academia or some type of administrative position. If a doctoral program does not provide instruction in teaching, then the doctoral degree is not adequately preparing graduates to enter the position of faculty member, which assumes a teaching role. In order to address what is being done in counselor education to prepare graduates to teach at the university level, this study examined faculty member's perceptions of experiences during doctoral training and the effectiveness of those experiences in preparing them for teaching.

The Problem in Perspective

Preparation for conducting research is indeed essential to the role of a faculty member. When thinking of doctoral education and the preparation of future academicians, research training comes to mind (Silverman, 2003). In the academy, the ability to generate and publish research is highly valued, with the majority of decisions about tenure and promotion being based on the ability to conduct and publish research as faculty members. Concurrent with this focus on research, is an increasing demand in higher education for new faculty to prove competency in the area of teaching (Austin, 2002b). An increased focus on teaching began with Boyer's (1990) redefinition of scholarship. Boyer underscored the importance of teaching, stating that teaching keeps the flame of scholarship alive. Given this move toward a focus on teaching, it follows that there would be additional pressures on doctoral programs to produce graduates who have an understanding of how to teach adults as well as how to conduct and publish research.

The debate about where to direct resources (teacher training vs. researcher training) is not a new concept. For over one hundred years the academy has struggled with whether doctoral

programs should impart research skills, teaching skills, or both (DeNeef, 1993). The struggle

makes sense, considering that the Ph.D. was introduced in the United States primarily as a

research degree. The problem today lies in the debate over use of program resources. Doctoral

programs in higher education may be unwilling to decrease the emphasis on research training as

a skill, but with an ever growing demand for quality teachers, there is a need for increased

emphasis on teaching that was not there in the past. This intensified demand for competent

teaching skills is evident in the fact that search committees are more frequently requesting

statements of teaching interests, teaching philosophy, and teaching demonstrations as part of the

recruitment process (Warnke, Bethany & Hedstrom, 1999).

The demands on counselor education programs are no different with regard to teaching

preparation than any other disciplines in higher education. In fact, mental health professionals

face additional demands in their training programs. Graduates of counselor education doctoral

programs are not only expected to be adequate researchers and teachers, but also competent

counselors. To address this need, Hosie (1990) and Lanning (1990) proposed the idea of an

educator-practitioner model for counselor education doctoral programs. Hosie believed that

counselor education programs are producing doctoral level practitioners and then expecting them

to fill faculty positions. Further, Hosie maintained that doctoral programs are training students

who have earned master's degrees in counseling (the terminal degree for practice in the field) in

additional counseling courses, making them more competent practitioners but giving them no

additional training in how to teach.

Lanning (1990) went on to address the need for reform in counselor education doctoral

programs and the subsequent emphasis on teaching as a skill. He linked the creation of an

educator-practitioner model to the continual search for a unique professional identity in the field

3

of counseling. According to Lanning, counselor education doctoral programs are being presented as more of the same, providing no definition for a professional that is different from a master's level counselor. In addition, he argued that the counseling profession could make a unique contribution to the field of mental health by producing doctoral graduates who know how to teach the skills and knowledge of counseling to those who wish to be effective practitioners, and also to those who want to be educators.

The lack of preparation for teaching at the doctoral level also extends to the adjustment of graduates in their roles as faculty members. In the event that a graduate receives and accepts an offer for a faculty position, there most certainly will be stress associated with the lack of preparation for essential job duties. Magnuson (2002) conducted a study about the experiences of new counselor educators in their first year that looked at stress and anxiety, satisfaction, and perceptions of connectedness. Results indicated that there seem to be well kept secrets about life as a faculty member that are only revealed after beginning work. Many of the participants in Magnuson's study indicated that they felt unprepared for becoming a faculty member, and reported feeling ill prepared for the expectations placed on them by university administration. The suggestions were made that training was needed to help new professors learn to teach effectively, in addition to preparing them for the other responsibilities that are included in the professoriate (e.g. directing dissertations, advising, etc).

Little is being done to prepare faculty members for the different kinds of work and expectations that they are likely to confront (Austin, 2002b) and this situation can cause anxiety and struggles for new faculty. In the field of counseling, there is a great deal of discussion about the possibility of burn out due to stress when working as a counselor, and this could be a serious risk for unprepared faculty as well. The results of Magnuson's (2002) study indicate that new

4

professors may feel depressed and isolated, disconnected, and anxious about their responsibilities due to the lack of preparation for life as a faculty member. It follows that these complex feelings could contribute to burn out.

Preparation for faculty positions and socialization to life in the academy begin during graduate school. Prior to Magnuson's work, Olsen (1993) wrote about the importance of socialization to the academy occurring during graduate study. She reported that there is a great deal of role anxiety and struggle for junior faculty to define their roles as professors. Lack of knowledge about what the role of a faculty member actually is, combined with inadequate preparation for teaching could not only contribute to burn out, but also to less than adequate job performance. Thus the importance of teaching preparation cannot be ignored.

DeNeef (1993) in arguing that the responsibility of graduate school is to train the whole academic stated that doctoral graduates should not only have the tools to conduct research, but should also be capable of turning this research into challenging and effective teaching. Further, doctoral students are interested in a variety of faculty roles, not just the ability to conduct research (Golde, 2004).

Conceptual Framework

Meacham (2002) identified factors that he believed can prepare doctoral students to teach effectively. Those factors include: being mentored by senior faculty, spending time following faculty through a typical day on campus, participating in high level graduate seminars on teaching and faculty life, preparing a course syllabus and having it critiqued, being supervised in teaching by excellent teachers, engaging in self-assessment and self reflection as a teacher and potential faculty member, and assembling a teaching portfolio that includes a statement of teaching philosophy.

These factors identified by Meacham (2002) support the importance of teaching as part of a doctoral curriculum and offer several suggestions of experiences that might enhance doctoral teacher training. In addition, Boyer's (1990) work identifies the scholarship of teaching as the interaction of research with classroom instruction. Although Boyer's approach is slightly different than Meacham's, he places importance on teacher training by emphasizing the link between research productivity and performance in the classroom. Therefore, Boyer's redefinition of scholarship to include teaching and service activities, which was seen as a turning point in higher education, was successful in drawing attention to the essential task of teaching.

Concurrent with Boyer's redefinition of scholarship, Lanning (1990) produced an educator/practitioner model for counselor education faculty, which addresses the need for teacher training. This model argues for doctoral programs in counselor education to produce graduates who are competent educators and practitioners. The importance of training counselor educators cannot be ignored. It follows that if counselor education doctoral programs are graduating Ph.D. level counselors who have inadequate training in teaching, then this inadequate training will directly affect the quality of training for master's level practitioners, thus negatively impacting the profession as a whole. However, by embracing an educator/practitioner model counselor training will be strengthened. With his writing about this educator/practitioner model, Lanning (1990) began to provide ways in which counselor educators might better prepare doctoral students for the task of teaching.

While there has been much literature in the field of higher education addressing the problems with lack of teaching preparation at the doctoral level (DeNeef, 1993; Golde, 2004; Silverman, 2003;), there has been limited attention to this lack of preparation in counselor education doctoral programs and I found no studies that examined what works in training

6

counselors to be effective teachers. Meacham (2002) offered examples of experiences that could aid faculty members in being more effective, but did not conduct a study to test the impact of those experiences. My study drew on the works of Meacham (2002) and Lanning (1990), with many of the items on the research instrument, the Preparation for Teaching Survey (PFTS), being derived from the literature cited above. These survey items were intended to test the suggestions of those in the field such as Meacham and Lanning, to explore whether graduates of counselor education doctoral programs have had the experiences that they suggest might be beneficial and if so, how effective the graduates perceived those experiences to be in preparing them to teach in higher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine counselor education faculty members' perceptions of the effectiveness of teaching preparation received during their training as doctoral students. The study built on the work of Meacham (2002) and others through the administration of a researcher-designed survey entitled Preparation for Teaching Survey (PFTS), which was distributed electronically to faculty members in CACREP accredited counselor education programs. This survey included items related to the teaching experiences that participants received in their doctoral programs, and included participants' ratings of how effective they believed these experiences to be. In addition to specific survey questions a qualitative section was included to ask for additional information from faculty about what was done or what could have been done during their doctoral training to further prepare them to teach at the graduate level. This section also provided an opportunity for participants to discuss factors that may not have been included in the survey items. Additionally, this study extended the work of others who have addressed the need for attention to teaching preparation (Boyer, 1990; Lanning, 1990;

Magnuson, 2002; Meacham, 2002). In gathering this information, the intention was to gain more insight into what is currently being done to prepare doctoral students to teach, and what can be done to further improve teacher training at the doctoral level.

Significance of the Study

This study is important in its potential to address the gap in the counselor education literature regarding the preparation of counselor educators to teach at the university level. Investigation into the effectiveness of factors that prepare faculty members for teaching is important to those choosing careers in the academy, and is also important to the graduates of counseling programs and the counseling profession as a whole. The need for change in the area of teaching preparation has been repeatedly addressed in the higher education literature (Golde, 2004; Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003), but literature offering empirical evidence about factors that will increase preparedness for those tasks is nonexistent.

The understanding of factors that prepare doctoral graduates to be effective teachers also may inform the training of other doctoral graduates in higher education, and suggest ways in which positive changes can be made for the profession of counseling. The definition of effective methods of teaching preparation for graduates of doctoral programs in counselor education is central to the efforts of the profession to produce highly skilled master's level practitioners, thus strengthening the counseling profession as a whole.

General Research Question

What activities do doctoral counselor education graduates experience that were intended to prepare them to teach in higher education and how do they perceive the effectiveness of those activities for preparing them to teach?

Secondary Research Questions

1. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that teaching a course from start to finish during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

2. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that receiving supervised teaching experience during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

3. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that receiving feedback about teaching during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

4. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that having an opportunity to reflect on feedback about teaching during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

5. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that having an opportunity to attend seminars about college teaching during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

6. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophies during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

Assumptions of the Study

A primary assumption of this research concerns the Preparation for Teaching Survey that was designed for use in this study. In order to conduct exploratory research, the instrument was used to measure participants' ratings of effectiveness of factors influencing teaching preparation in counselor education doctoral programs. This instrument's ability to reflect accurately the effectiveness of factors influencing teaching preparation is assumed.

Delimitations

A discussion of the delimitations is warranted. Delimitations are defined as restrictions imposed by the researcher with the intention of narrowing the scope of a study. The major delimitation of this study is that this survey was distributed only to those faculty members employed by programs that are accredited by CACREP. Therefore, any findings can only be generalized to those employed in programs with CACREP accreditation.

Definition of Terms

The definitions that follow are terms that are used most often in the research. These definitions are presented in an effort to clarify and facilitate the readers' understanding of key concepts in the study.

Teaching

Teaching in a university includes the design and delivery of graduate and undergraduate courses (Boyer, 1990). Additional tasks include developing multiple teaching techniques, reflecting on the use of teaching strategies, and developing a personal philosophy about teaching.

Educator-Practitioner

An educator-practitioner is a skilled counselor who is also equipped with the skills necessary to be an effective counselor educator. The educator practitioner, having previously been trained as a clinician, will be systematically prepared to teach and conduct research at the doctoral level.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

This chapter introduced the research question and created a context for the study by providing a conceptual framework and literature to support the development of an instrument to examine the research question. The second chapter includes a review of relevant literature aimed at providing for the reader a logical path to the author's reasoning behind the need for

examination of the topic. The third chapter includes research methodology including detailed

information about the participants, how the survey instrument was developed, and how data were

analyzed. Chapters four and five include an analysis of the data and a discussion of the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the research and literature related to doctoral level teaching preparation in higher education, and specifically in counselor education. The literature review is divided into several sections including: teaching preparation in higher education, the conflict between preparation of faculty members to teach and institutional expectations of them, the lack of teaching preparation in the field of counselor education, and a discussion of an educator-practitioner model for the training of counselor educators.

Teaching Preparation in Higher Education

The responsibilities of faculty members in higher education have been steadily changing during the last six decades (Austin 2002b; Boyer, 1990), with effective teaching gaining more attention and becoming a more important skill for faculty members to possess (Meacham, 2002). A turning point for teaching occurred with Boyer's work in 1990, when scholarship was redefined to include teaching. Until then, teaching was viewed as something routine, a necessary part of the responsibilities of a faculty member, and not a priority. Boyer attempted to redefine teaching as an art, by writing that teaching was more than just the mere transmission of knowledge from teacher to student, but was also the act of transforming and extending that knowledge. In addition, he maintained that inspired teaching kept the flame of scholarship alive, by way of inspiring future academics, those who would go into the field and become scholars themselves. The connection that Boyer made between inspired teaching and keeping scholarship alive is an important argument for placing more emphasis on teacher training.

With this increased importance placed on teaching, it follows that doctoral training programs would be asked to respond to the need for more skilled teachers. Traditionally,

doctoral programs have prepared effective researchers, but have placed very little emphasis, on

training these students to teach (Silverman, 2003). Silverman, in his article examining the role of

teaching in the preparation of faculty members, argued that although those at doctoral

universities are becoming more concerned about the lack of pedagogical training of new Ph.D.

graduates, there is little being done to remedy the problem.

Silverman (2003) also linked the importance of teaching with the ability to become a

successful scholar, stating that if new faculty members are spending excessive time preparing for

their teaching or being concerned about it due to a lack of training, then the ability to function

successfully as a faculty member, and thus a scholar, will be negatively influenced. In an

attempt to offer practical suggestions about ways in which to begin training teachers at the

doctoral level, he cited three important aspects which included: taking courses in teaching, being

a participant in teaching practica, and receiving mentoring. Silverman stated that the mentoring

and practica would include supervision, sharing of pedagogical resources, promoting

conversations about teaching philosophies, and how instructional decisions are made in certain

courses. For Silverman, mentoring students to teach includes a reciprocal relationship in which

students are comfortable asking for feedback and clarification about teaching duties, beyond the

mere delivery of a lecture.

Prior to the work of Silverman in 2003, Austin (2002a; 2002b) wrote about the lack of

preparation of doctoral graduates for faculty positions in higher education. Austin's

recommendations for reform were based on a four year longitudinal qualitative study that was

performed to examine the graduate experience as preparation for the academic career.

Participants were graduate students who aspired to the professoriate, who held teaching

assistantships, and who were drawn from various disciplines including the humanities, social

13

sciences, sciences, and professional areas such as business. Participants were students at three separate universities, two were large doctoral granting research universities and one was a master's granting institution that primarily prepares teachers. Austin's articles drew on the data from 79 of the participants who were enrolled in the two doctoral granting institutions.

As a result of her findings, she called for reform in the preparation of future faculty. She stated that [doctoral programs] are not adequately preparing graduates to manage the demands, challenges, and expectations that they are likely to face as faculty members. In calling for reform in graduate training, Austin concurred that faculty must be effective teachers, with knowledge about individual learning differences, and wide ranges of teaching strategies. She also reported that most teaching opportunities for doctoral students are offered in response to institutional needs, and seldom present the doctoral student a chance to develop into a competent and experienced teacher. For instance, a doctoral student may be assigned an undergraduate course to teach simply because there is no faculty member available to teach the course. This type of experience provides no room for supervision or feedback. Austin's (2002a) research focused on the overall lack of preparation for the professoriate, of which teaching is a major part.

In Austin's (2002a) writing, it was reported repeatedly by graduate students that there were not regular interactions with faculty where there was feedback given about skills, career choices or the realities of faculty life. As a result, the majority of doctoral students were left to informally observe their environments (i.e. faculty members and peers) to get a picture of life as a faculty member. Participants involved in Austin's research reported receiving mixed messages about how they should be preparing for faculty careers, identifying a dilemma in deciding whether to focus on research preparation or preparation for teaching. Participants in the study reported receiving messages during doctoral training about the importance of teaching. In

addition, they received very little training in how to teach. In summary, the participants reported feeling ill prepared upon graduation for their roles as faculty, felt confused about what was expected of them and valued, and believed that they received conflicting information during their doctoral training.

Austin (2002b) continued her line of inquiry in a second article examining the use of the graduate experience as socialization to the academic career. This article was based on the results of the same research discussed in 2002a. In her writing, Austin stated that graduate school should be the first and most fundamental step in socialization to the academic career. She stated that graduate students experience socialization to several roles at once; the role of graduate student, to academic life and the profession, and to a specific discipline or field. A major part of this socialization process should occur through interaction with faculty, as students learn what it means to be faculty member. Her conclusions are in agreement the notions of Silverman (2003) who suggested mentoring as a part of teacher training and Meacham (2002) who suggested that doctoral students should receive mentoring and close interaction with faculty in order to prepare for the role of teacher.

Austin's (2002b) article relies on the premise that socialization is a dialectical process where people construct their particular roles through interactions with others. In this particular case, doctoral students learn how to become faculty members and learn what is expected of them in academia through interaction with their own professors during graduate study.

The interview data from Austin's (2002b) study revealed that there are many factors that contribute to the development of graduate students as future faculty. It was noted that most graduate students heavily depend on others (such as faculty members and/or peers) to make sense of the graduate school experience. Participants reported a lack of systematic professional

development opportunities, minimal feedback and mentoring from faculty, and very few

opportunities for guided reflection about their experiences during doctoral study. Also, they

reported that teaching experience as a rule was not required for those who aspire to become

faculty members. In addition, when teaching opportunities were present, they were not

organized so that students were able to grow developmentally. There were few instances where

growth was facilitated, with a progression of more complex activities experienced over time. For

instance, students were not given opportunities to observe teaching, to take a small role in the

preparation of course work, or to gain the experience of teaching an entire course.

Another deficit in the experience of participants in Austin's (2002a; 2002b) research was

that they were not offered opportunities for feedback about their teaching and time for self

reflection. Many participants reported that graduate faculty members devote very little time or

effort to helping doctoral students learn to teach, and in fact, some teaching assistants were

discouraged from spending "too much" time on their teaching. One female participant noted the

variety of contradictions that new faculty experienced with regard to teaching, stating that

although there is a heavy emphasis placed on teaching, that most rewards and recognition are

research based. Another male student supported this view, stating that "teaching takes a backseat

to research...research gets the glory." (p.108)

Participants in Austin's (2002b) study offered some recommendations for improving

graduate school as preparation for faculty careers, including: more attention to regular

mentoring, advising and feedback, diverse and developmentally oriented teaching opportunities,

and regular opportunities for guided reflection. These findings highlight the same need for

teaching preparation that is indicated in other research (Golde, 2004; Meacham, 2002;

Silverman, 2003), but again, these authors do not empirically examine factors that influence

good teaching preparation. Austin's findings concur with Meacham's ideas about a need for teaching practica, feedback, reflection and mentoring.

Conflict Between Expectations and Preparation

Meacham (2002) wrote about the lack of preparation for teaching at the doctoral level and its impact on the education of students in higher education. He reported that the qualities being sought in new faculty and those being taught in doctoral programs are very different. Therefore, institutions hiring new faculty are seeking applicants with strong teaching backgrounds, while doctoral programs are not preparing their graduates to teach. He further reinforced the notion of a lack of teacher training by stating that graduate faculty are primarily researchers, and are very good at what they do, but they have not been prepared to be effective teachers. He suggested that possible remedies to this inadequate preparation include offering opportunities for mentoring, opportunities for future faculty to follow faculty through a typical day on campus, opportunities to participate in high level graduate seminars and courses on college teaching, preparing a course syllabus and having it critiqued, being supervised in teaching, engaging in self-assessment and self-reflection as a teacher, and assembling a teaching portfolio.

The problem of inadequate teaching preparation is pervasive throughout the field of higher education, having been addressed frequently in the literature (Benassi & Fernald, 1993; DeNeef, 1993; Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003) and there is some agreement about what might remedy the problem. The gap in the research occurs when the question arises "what is being done about the problem?" Golde (2004) addressed this gap by writing about the responsibility of doctoral programs for the preparation of future faculty. He reported that for nearly every role performed by faculty, there is a large gap between the proportion of students indicating interest

in certain faculty activities, such as teaching, and the proportion being prepared for those activities. He further clarified that the gap is small for research, but much larger for teaching and service roles.

DeNeef (1993) also addressed a need for reform with regard to the preparation of future faculty to teach. She wrote an article based on her experiences participating in a project with the American Association of Colleges which involved participation in a two year colloquium held on her university campus. She discussed her participation in this project as institutional coordinator, and what was revealed to her about the problems in graduate education. As a result, her article called for a change in faculty preparation and development, argued for better teacher training, maintaining that the graduate school should be training graduates who not only have the tools and experience to do research, but who can turn that training into effective teaching. DeNeef drew these conclusions based on informal conversations with faculty who showed a disinterest in teaching, and who reported that they were trained to be researchers.

In addition, Benassi and Fernald (1993) wrote about the importance of preparing students to be both researchers and teachers. This literature reviewed a doctoral program in psychology at the University of New Hampshire, which provided dual training in teaching and research. Benassi and Fernald reported that few doctoral graduates have received formal training in teaching, and that this is a significant problem in the preparation of future faculty. According to these authors, most professors spend more time teaching than doing research, but still receive very little training in an area that occupies so much of their time. Again, the literature suggests that (a) teaching is important, (b) institutions want to hire competent teachers, and (c) that teacher training at the doctoral level is inadequate.

Lack of Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education

There is also literature specific to the field of counselor education addressing the lack of teaching preparation at the doctoral level. In a qualitative study conducted by Carter, Bowman, Kher, Bowman, Jones and Tollerud (1994) full time counselor educators holding associate or professor ranks were questioned about satisfaction with teaching specific courses. The sample of 200 consisted of 100 males and 100 females. The instrument was designed to collect demographic data, information about what classes were satisfying or dissatisfying to teach, and included open ended questions about the structure and reward systems in place with regard to teaching. To address counselor educators' satisfying and dissatisfying teaching experiences, it was recommended by the authors that doctoral programs consider how well they train their students to teach, because only 43% of respondents reported feeling "very well" prepared to teach, while only 21% of respondents actually had a course related to teaching.

In another examination of counselor educators, Magnuson (2002) conducted a mixed methods study involving thirty eight new assistant professors. Participants were asked to complete both midyear and end of year questionnaires. The questionnaires included Likert-type items and open ended questions that were aimed at addressing stress, anxiety, satisfaction, and perceptions of connectedness. The follow up questions addressed what might contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Examples of questions in the survey are as follows: "How would you characterize your first semester as an assistant professor of counselor education?" and "What circumstances have been most challenging or difficult for you?" Magnuson reported that participants in her study frequently cited a lack of preparation for faculty roles as a source of stress during their first years as new professors. One participant in her study was quoted as saying that "better preparation in the nuts and bolts of professors at the graduate student level

would be most helpful. It seems that there are well-kept secrets which are only revealed after

you start work (p. 316)." Another participant reported that "many aspects about teaching at the

university level are not openly discussed in counselor education programs (p. 316)." These

findings provide further support for the fact that teacher preparation in counselor education

doctoral programs is not consistent with the need for junior faculty to have effective teaching

credentials.

Educator-Practitioner Model

An important piece that advocated for change in teaching preparation is Lanning's (1990)

conceptual article during which he argued for the development of an educator/practitioner model

for counselor education doctoral students. He posited that training counselor educators as

"educator practitioners" would create an identity separate from those graduates of doctoral

programs in other mental health professions. He defined an educator-practitioner as "one who is

a skilled counselor and also is systematically prepared to perform the tasks of an educator."

Lanning (1990) stated that:

> Most of us would disagree with the arts and sciences model of preparing people to be
> college and university professors. That model assumes that if one completes the
> doctorate in a discipline, then he or she is also qualified to be a professor and teach others
> in the discipline. No preparation other than excellence in the discipline is necessary (p.
> 166).

Lanning (1990) believed that counselor education doctoral programs should include at

least one practicum in college teaching, and should provide instruction in teaching as a

prerequisite to participating in the practicum. The focus of a program that prepares educator-

practitioners would be to produce better educators, with considerable practitioner skills.

According to Lanning, counselor education doctoral programs are currently presented as more of

the same, and provide no difference between a masters' level counselor and a doctoral level

professional. He reported that the counseling profession's unique contribution to the field of mental health could be to produce practitioners that are competent educators as well.

Similarly, Hosie (1990) discussed the need for better teacher training in counselor education doctoral programs. His terminology is slightly different than Lanning's, as he discussed a scientist practitioner model of counselor educator preparation. This scientist practitioner model includes an internship in teaching, writing, and research. He reported that the field is producing doctoral level practitioners and expecting that these graduates will obtain positions in higher education. As a point of consideration, he stated that the emphasis on clinical practice at the doctoral level is a barrier to training for higher education because these resources could be spent training students to teach.

Conclusion

In order to implement Lanning's (1990) plan for the creation of educator-practitioner models of counselor educator preparation, there must first be research to conclude what factors in teacher training actually contribute to the preparedness of graduates to teach. It is my hope, that the current study will be a step in that direction. Lanning's (1990) work constitutes a major portion of the conceptual framework for this study in addition to the significant contributions of Austin (2002a; 2002b), Meacham (2002) and Silverman (2003), who suggested experiences that might be helpful in preparing doctoral students to teach. These suggestions were the basis of many survey items included in the PFTS. In an attempt to explore and further define ways to prepare doctoral graduates adequately for the role of teaching, the current study employed the PFTS to survey counselor educators employed in CACREP accredited counselor education programs about factors in their doctoral training that contributed to effective teaching preparation.

The parallel between the literature in counselor education and the field of higher education in general, lies in the fact that there are plenty of writers stating that there is a need for reform and better teacher training, some even offering suggestions about how to better train graduates; however, there has been no research to date to support ways to actually begin training better teachers. Therefore, the gap in higher education and in counselor education more specifically, can begin to be approached in the current study, through the administration of the PFTS which was used to empirically define factors that contribute to effective teaching preparation.

As previously stated, the works of Austin (2002a; 2002b), Meacham (2002) and Silverman (2003) contributed to the creation of items for the PFTS. Although none of the authors mentioned provided empirical evidence for the factors that they suggested to improve teacher training, they highlighted several areas from which to draw potential survey items. Some of those areas include: mentoring, teaching practica, supervision, reflection about teaching, discussions about teaching philosophy and designing courses. Upon the administration of this survey and respective data analysis, findings may point to better training of counselor educators and generalize to the teaching preparation of all doctoral level graduates. Chapter three includes an in depth discussion of the methodology involved in this study.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Chapter Three contains the methodology employed in this study. The organization of this chapter includes subsections that present the purpose of the study, the research question, hypotheses, participant selection characteristics, instrumentation, the data collection plan and methods of data analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research study was to examine counselor education faculty members' perceptions of their doctoral level preparation for teaching and their perceptions of the effectiveness of various activities intended to prepare them to become teachers.

General Research Question

What activities do doctoral counselor education graduates experience that were intended to prepare them to teach in higher education and how do they perceive the effectiveness of those activities for preparing them to teach?

Secondary Research Questions

Based on the literature, the following specific research questions were generated from the main research question:

1. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that teaching a course from start to finish during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

2. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that receiving supervised teaching experience during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

3. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that receiving feedback about teaching during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

4. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that having an opportunity to reflect on feedback about teaching during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

5. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that having an opportunity to attend seminars about college teaching during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

6. To what extent do doctoral counselor education graduates perceive that having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophies during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education?

Hypotheses

The research hypotheses in this study are as follows:

1. The number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

2. The number of courses taught under the supervision of a full time faculty member is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

3. Receiving feedback about teaching more frequently during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

4. Frequency of being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

5. Frequency of attending seminars on college teaching during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

6. Frequency of having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

Participant Characteristics

Participants in this study were counselor educators who are teaching in doctoral and master's level training programs that are accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Participants were identified by using a list of CACREP accredited counseling programs obtained from the CACREP website (www.cacrep.org). Once the programs were identified as CACREP accredited, faculty members' e-mail addresses were gathered from the individual program websites and entered into an e-mail list. This list contained only the e-mail addresses of the faculty members, and no other identifying information. Participants for the study were then contacted by e-mail with a mass e-mail message. One thousand and sixty two e-mails were sent, and two hundred and sixty two participants completed the survey (a response rate of 24.6%); however, 60 responses were discarded because those participants reported having a doctoral degree in psychology instead of counselor education. Personal information (sex, ethnicity, tenure status, type of program, and type of institution in which participants are currently employed) was collected in order to provide descriptive information about the participants of this study. These variations in the demographic makeup of respondents may contribute to differences in ratings. A personal information sheet showing a complete listing of the characteristics collected can be found in Appendix A.

Of those participating, 74 were male (36.6%) and 128 were female (63.4%). Participants' indicated that their ethnicities were as follows: 14 were African American (6.9%), 6 were Asian American (6%), 164 were Caucasian/European American (81.2%), 4 were Hispanic (2.0%), 3 were Native American (1.5%) and 10 indicated an ethnicity of other (5%). When answering the tenure status item, 101 participants indicated that they were tenured (50%), 88 participants were in tenure track positions (43.6%) and 12 participants were in non-tenure track

positions (5.9%). Of those participating, 78 were employed in master's only programs (38.6%), 121 were employed in combined (master's and doctoral) programs (59.9%). When surveyed about the type of institution that they were employed in, 14 responded that they were employed in private institutions (6.9%), while 188 responded that they were employed in public institutions (93.1%). In terms of academic rank, 49 participants held the rank of professor (24.3%), 61 held the rank of associate professor (30.2%), 90 held the rank of assistant professor (44.6%), and 2 held the rank of lecturer (1.0%).

Instrumentation

No known study has examined the experiences in counselor education doctoral programs that prepare graduates to teach in higher education. There has been a great deal of speculation in the literature about what experiences might contribute to effective teaching preparation (Golde, 2004; Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003), however no known study has examined the experiences that doctoral counselor education graduates had during their doctoral training that were intended to prepare them to teach. In addition, no known study has examined doctoral counselor education graduates' perceptions of the effectiveness of those experiences.

Preparation for Teaching Survey

I developed the PFTS specifically for use in this study. The purpose of conducting research with this instrument was to determine how well counselor educators believe that certain experiences during doctoral training prepared them for teaching in higher education. The PFTS is a 58-item survey that employs a 7-point Likert scale with anchored responses on both ends of a continuum. There are two variations for this scale, with one including responses ranging from *never* to *very frequently* and the other including responses from *not at all effective* to *very effective.* The first nine items request personal information and asked participants to identify

themselves by characteristics such as sex, ethnicity, tenure status, academic rank, and number of years as a faculty member. The remaining 48 items of the survey asked participants two types of questions: how often certain events occurred during their doctoral training, and how effective they believed those events were in preparing them for teaching. These items were developed based on experiences that were cited in the literature and the conceptual framework as tasks that might better prepare doctoral graduates for teaching. Items generated from specific pieces of literature are presented in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1.

Silverman, 2003 Taking courses in teaching, being a participant in a teaching practicum, being mentored, sharing of resources with faculty, supervision, discussions about teaching philosophy, and discussions about why instructional decisions are made in courses.	**Items Generated From Silverman's Work** Item Numbers: 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 37.
Austin (2002a; 2002b) Supervision, feedback about teaching, time for reflection on feedback about teaching, observing others teaching, participation in designing a course, teaching an entire course, gaining knowledge about individual learning	**Items Generated From Austin's Work** Item numbers: 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35.

differences.	
Meacham (2002) Preparing a course syllabus, engaging in self-assessment, completing a teaching portfolio.	**Items Generated From Meacham's Work** Item numbers: 14, 15, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42.

Figure 1. This figure includes a description of all items generated from the literature.

In addition, 16 items were included that were generated during the expert panel review of the survey and during conversations with dissertation committee members. The items include numbers 26, 27, 36, 43, and 44-57. An online version of the PFTS can be viewed at: http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?A=138192666E23982 (see paper copy in Appendix B).

Expert Panels Used in Instrument Development

Members of an expert panel were interviewed in a focus group style to review survey items for content validity. The expert panel consisted of four university professors who identified themselves as follows: two Caucasian female pre-tenure assistant professors; an African American female pre-tenure assistant professor; and an African-American male tenured associate professor. The expert panel suggested omitting three questions which were unclear or irrelevant, and changing the wording of item number 37 from "the process of grading" to "their approaches to grading." In addition, a suggestion was made to ask participants to list all degrees held. These changes were implemented. The panel members stated that the remainder of the items was acceptable.

Further instrument development included administering the survey to a second expert panel of volunteers. Nine volunteers were given instructions about accessing the online version of the PFTS. Participants were asked to provide feedback about the clarity of survey items and

the ease of survey completion. No changes were made to the instrument as a result of this administration.

Participants in a second expert panel consisted of five females and four males with eight classifying themselves as Caucasian and one as African American. Five identified themselves as pre-tenure, and four identified themselves as non-tenure track. Participants were employed in master's only programs and master's/doctoral programs, with six employed by public institutions and three employed by private institutions. Means and standard deviations that were calculated suggested that there was adequate variability for quantitative analysis. These descriptive statistics are included in Appendix C.

Data Collection

All procedures and protocols related to data collection were reviewed and approved by the University of New Orleans Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB) (see approval letter in Appendix E). Following the approved guidelines, data were collected from a volunteer sample drawn from the population of all counselor educators who are employed as full-time faculty in CACREP accredited programs.

According to the directory of programs listed on the CACREP website, there are 184 programs accredited nationally. Once these programs were identified, e-mail addresses of faculty were obtained from the individual program websites. These e-mail addresses were entered into a mailing list that contained no other identifying information. Potential participants received an e-mail message containing a brief description of the study, a statement about confidentiality and consent to participate and directions for accessing the PFTS via surveymonkey.com. A sample of this message appears in Appendix D.

Data were anonymously collected through surveymonkey.com. The (PFTS) was created using this online service and a secure link was created through which access to the survey was granted. While the participants were identifiable via e-mail addresses prior to administration of the survey, the PFTS does not contain any questions that could reveal identity and the online data collection service does not provide any means of identification of participants.

Data Analysis

Categories were created to contain items related to preparedness for teaching. Descriptive statistics were then computed for items including means and standard deviations. Due to the structure of responses, Pearson product moment correlations were calculated in order to examine whether relationships existed between certain activities during doctoral training and perceptions of overall preparedness for the task of teaching.

Hypothesis #1:	The number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.
Data Analysis:	A Pearson product moment correlation was used to correlate number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student to perceived levels of overall preparedness (1 to 7 rating scale) for the task of teaching.
Hypothesis #2:	The number of courses taught under the supervision of a full time faculty member is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.
Data Analysis:	A Pearson product moment correlation was used to correlate number of courses taught while receiving supervision from full time faculty to perceived levels of overall preparedness (1 to 7 rating scale) for the task of teaching.

Hypothesis #3:	Receiving feedback about teaching more frequently during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.
Data Analysis:	A Pearson product moment correlation was used to correlate how often participants received feedback about their teaching to perceived levels of overall preparedness (1 to 7 rating scale) for the task of teaching.
Hypothesis #4:	Frequency of being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.
Data Analysis:	A Pearson product moment correlation was used to correlate how often participants were given opportunities to reflect on feedback about their teaching to perceived levels of overall preparedness (1 to 7 rating scale) for the task of teaching.
Hypothesis #5:	Frequency of attending seminars on college teaching during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.
Data Analysis:	A Pearson product moment correlation was used to correlate how often participants attended seminars on college teaching to perceived levels of overall preparedness (1 to 7 rating scale) for the task of teaching.
Hypothesis #6:	Frequency of having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

Data Analysis: A Pearson product moment correlation was used to correlate how often

participants had discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy to

perceived levels of overall preparedness (1 to 7 rating scale) for the task of

teaching.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

The aim of this study was to assess the extent to which certain activities during counselor education doctoral training were perceived by participants to be effective with regard to preparing them for teaching. Additionally, the relationships between the aforementioned preparatory activities and overall perceived preparedness for the task of teaching were examined. These activities were examined through the use of a 58-item survey instrument designed by the researcher. This chapter first contains a presentation of all participant responses to survey items on preparedness, including a separate diagram and table for the last survey item (which includes qualitative responses to an open ended question about preparation). Next, a table is presented that includes all Pearson product moment correlations that were computed to compare survey items. Finally, a summary of the data and respective analyses is presented.

The first table in this chapter, Table 1 (shown below) includes the number of participant responses, means, and standard deviations for each item on the survey (with the exception of 14 items which are included in other tables). For items included in Table 1, participants were asked to indicate the number of times that they had engaged in a certain activity (with responses to this item ranging from one time to twenty times) or they were asked to respond based on a Likert-type scale from one to seven. These scales with ratings from one to seven were formatted in one of two ways: (a) ranging from not at all effective to very effective or (b) ranging from never to very frequently. Items 1-9, 24, 26, 40, 41 and 58 were not included in Table 1 due to the format of each question. Items 1-9 contained personal information about participants and are displayed

in Chapter Three. Frequencies for items 24, 26, 40, and 41 and qualitative responses for item 58 are each displayed in their own respective tables.

Table 1.
Number of participant responses, means and standard deviations for each item

Item	N	M	SD
10. Times You Participated In Designing a Course	153	3.20	3.23
11. Rating of Effectiveness For Course Design	149	5.40	1.58
12. Times You Taught an Entire Course	148	4.91	4.91
13. Ratings of Effectiveness For Teaching an Entire Course	146	6.02	1.34
14. Times You Designed a Course Syllabus	138	3.70	3.95
15. Ratings of Effectiveness For Syllabus Design	139	5.89	1.29
16. Times You Taught a Course Under the Supervision of a Full Time Faculty Member	151	3.12	3.37
17. Ratings of Effectiveness for Teaching Under Supervision	151	5.60	1.50
18. How Often You Had Discussions with Faculty About Your Teaching Philosophy	195	3.49	1.93
19. Ratings of Effectiveness for Discussions About Teaching Philosophy	146	4.76	1.77
20. How Often Faculty Shared Teaching Resources With You	194	4.06	2.11

Table 1 (continued).
Number of participant responses, means and standard deviations

Item	N	*M*	*SD*
21. Ratings of Effectiveness for Sharing of Resources	154	5.12	1.65
22. How Often You Discussed With Faculty Why Instructional Decisions Are Made	195	3.44	2.00
23. Ratings of Effectiveness for Discussion of Why Instructional Decisions are Made	137	4.81	1.75
25. Ratings of Effectiveness for Participating in a Teaching Practicum	91	5.56	1.72
27. Ratings of Effectiveness for Taking Courses in College Teaching	88	1.34	0.75
28. How Often Did You Receive Feedback from Faculty About Your Teaching Skills?	190	3.73	1.93
29. Ratings of Effectiveness for Receiving Feedback from Faculty About Your Teaching	155	5.00	1.77
30. How Often Were You Provided With Opportunities to Reflect On Feedback About Your Teaching?	188	3.89	2.09
31. Ratings of Effectiveness for Reflecting on Feedback About Your Teaching	148	5.00	1.73
32. How Often Did You Observe Teaching?	189	3.14	2.02

Table 1 (continued).
Number of participant responses, means and standard deviations

Item	N	*M*	*SD*
33. Ratings of Effectiveness for Observing Teaching	129	4.91	1.64
34. How Often Did You Have Discussions with Faculty About Individual Learning Differences?	190	2.92	1.82
35. Ratings of Effectiveness for Discussions with Faculty About Individual Learning Differences	122	4.59	1.68
36. How Often Did You Have Conversations with Faculty About Grading?	190	3.22	1.86
37. Ratings of Effectiveness for Conversations with Faculty About Grading	142	4.52	1.68
38. How Often Did You Engage In Self Assessment with Regard to Teaching?	190	4.55	2.25
39. Ratings of Effectiveness for Engaging in Self Assessment With Regard to Teaching?	158	5.41	1.64
42. Ratings of Effectiveness for Developing a Teaching Portfolio	31	4.96	1.83
43. How Often Did You Deliver a Lecture in the Classroom?	187	4.87	2.00
44. Ratings of Effectiveness for Delivering a Lecture	173	5.37	1.73

Table 1 (continued).
Number of participant responses, means and standard deviations

Item	N	*M*	SD
45. How Often Did You Grade Exams?	187	4.14	2.26
46. Ratings of Effectiveness for Grading Exams	147	4.95	1.67
47. How Often Did You Grade or Provide Feedback on Written Assignments?	183	4.29	2.20
48. Ratings of Effectiveness for Grading or Providing Feedback On Written Assignments	154	5.29	1.68
49. How Often Did You Prepare Course Assignments?	185	4.27	2.27
50. Ratings of Effectiveness for Preparing Course Assignments	150	5.46	1.60
51. How Often Did You Attend Seminars on College Teaching?	186	1.95	1.47
52. Ratings of Effectiveness for Attending Seminars on College Teaching	73	4.34	1.83
53. How Often Did You Engage in Conversations with Other Students About Teaching?	183	4.31	2.10
54. Ratings of Effectiveness for Conversations with Other Students About Teaching	155	5.06	1.69
55. How Often Were You Able To Ask Faculty Members Questions About Teaching?	183	4.44	2.08

56. Ratings of Effectiveness for Asking Faculty Members About Teaching	159	5.17	1.65
57. Overall Preparedness for Teaching	185	4.91	1.86

Note. Participants were allowed to skip items, thus resulting in different Ns for each item. In addition, all items are numbered exactly as they appear on the survey. The following items are not included, and appear in separate tables: Items 1 through 9 (personal information, included in Chapter Three) and items 24, 26, 40, 41 and 58, displayed in tables below. Item 52 has a small N due to the fact that it is based on item 51 responses, and thus is a subset of item 51.

Item 24 on the survey asked participants whether or not they participated in a teaching practicum. There were 91 responses of yes, 104 responses of no, and seven participants did not answer this item. The frequency of respondents and percentages of each respective response are displayed in Table 2 (shown below).

Table 2.
Responses to Item 24 "Did you participate in a teaching practicum?"

Response	Frequency	% of Participants
Yes	91	46.7
No	104	53.3
Total	202	100.00

Item 26 asked participants to indicate how many courses in college teaching they took during doctoral study. This particular item was chosen to give some indication of how many courses in college teaching are typically being offered in doctoral programs in counselor

education. Table 3 includes frequencies for how many courses in college teaching were taken, as well as percentages of participants who responded to each option (none, one, two, three, four, or five). As shown below, the majority of responses (N=100) indicated that no courses in college teaching were taken. That is, over 50% of respondents indicated that they had no formal coursework in college teaching.

Table 3.
Responses to item 26 "How many courses in college teaching did you take?"

Response	Frequency	% of Participants
None	100.0	53.5
One	68.0	36.4
Two	13.0	7.0
Three	3.0	1.6
Four	2.0	1.1
Five	1.0	0.5
Total	202	100.0

Item 40 on the survey asked participants if they were encouraged to develop a teaching portfolio during doctoral study. The frequency distribution is displayed below in Table 4, along with the percentage of participants answering yes or no to this item. Responses indicate that the vast majority of participants (164) were not encouraged to develop a teaching portfolio during doctoral study. Participants were asked if they were encouraged to develop a teaching portfolio in order to assess what faculty members were doing to help prepare students for the role of

teaching. Participants may or may not have developed a teaching portfolio without any

encouragement from faculty.

Table 4.
Responses to item 40 "Were you encouraged to develop a teaching portfolio?

Response	Frequency	% of Participants
Yes	25	13.2
No	164	86.8
No Response	13	
Total	202	100.0

Item 41 asked participants if they were provided assistance in developing a teaching

portfolio. Of those who chose to respond to this item, a very small number (18), less than 10%,

indicated that they were provided assistance in developing a teaching portfolio (see Table 5). In

the previous table, there is an indication that 25 people were encouraged to develop a teaching

portfolio, while the table below contains information indicating that 76 participants actually

developed one. This information implies that many participants developed a teaching portfolio

on their own, without encouragement or assistance from faculty.

Table 5.
Responses to item 41 "Were you provided assistance in developing the portfolio…?"

Response	Frequency	% of Participants
Yes	18	9.6
No	58	30.9
Not Applicable	112	59.6
No Response	14	
Total	202	100.0

Item 58 asked for participants to respond to a qualitative inquiry about other activities that they believed might have been helpful during doctoral training to prepare them for teaching as a faculty member. Of the total 202 people completing the survey, 76 participants chose to respond to this item. Table 6 provides an in depth look at the themes, including quotes from participants to demonstrate how themes were identified. To analyze the set of data, I read participants' responses, attending carefully to their endorsement of meaningful preparatory activities, and for activities that were lacking in their teaching preparation. I assigned codes based on patterns among responses, identified initial categories, and then continued to read and reorganize the data, moving the categories to increasingly higher levels of abstraction. It appears that overall, participants desired a more structured approach to teacher training, involving mentoring, a teaching practicum with supervision, observation and feedback from faculty, and more courses on college teaching. The two themes that were most apparent were a desire for mentoring and a desire for participation in a teaching practicum, with 17 participants indicating a desire for mentoring and 15 participants indicating a desire for a teaching practicum.

Table 6.
Themes from responses to question 58

Question: Please provide any additional information about activities or experiences during your doctoral training that would have better prepared you for teaching as a faculty member:

Themes	Supporting Quotes
1. Mentoring	(1) "I would have appreciated more opportunities to have a mentored teaching assistantship rather than being used by faculty to free their lecture time." (2) "Better Mentoring" (3) "Mentorship by faculty in the areas of teaching, research and service" (4) "More mentorship into the role"
2. A Teaching Practicum/Internship and Supervision	(1) "A formalized teaching internship requiring all aspects of course delivery for a college or university setting" (2) "A required teaching practicum under supervision that dealt with all of the elements of teaching, from course design through assessment" (3) "More time could have been spent [during a teaching practicum] talking about the role of instructor, grading, assessing goals and objectives, creating assignments and engaging adult learners" (4) "A teaching practicum would have definitely been beneficial to me. Given the fact that what I primarily do is teach, it's odd that so little time is devoted to teaching that art while in a counselor education program." (5) "A supervised teaching seminar for all doctoral students who are instructors of record"

Table 6 (continued).
Themes from responses to question 58

Question: Please provide any additional information about activities or experiences during your doctoral training that would have better prepared you for teaching as a faculty member:

Themes	Supporting Quotes

| 3. More Courses on Teaching | (1) "Taking an actual course on college teaching" (2) "Additional coursework on teaching" (3) "Needed a class or several seminars on teaching including teaching methods, syllabus development, grading, classroom/student management" (4) "I felt that having classes about pedagogy and teaching approaches would have been so helpful and needed." (5) "I knew a lot about counseling but learned little regarding how to teach in a university setting. Could have used instruction on how to develop lecture approaches to teaching." |
| 4. Observation and Feedback from Faculty | (1) "I would have liked to have more observation and feedback from my faculty members……I could have used feedback and assistance on setting up a syllabus, grading, etc., that I had to struggle with learning on my own" |

Research Hypotheses and Respective Analyses

Research Hypothesis One

There were six research hypotheses at the outset of this study; results of data analyses regarding these hypotheses are included in Table 7. The first hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. A Pearson product moment correlation was utilized to examine this hypothesis, correlating item number 12 to item number 57 of the survey. A positive correlation was found (r (114)= .300, $p <$.001, $r^{2=}$.09) indicating a significant linear relationship between number of courses taught from start to finish and ratings of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was small (.09), indicating that 9% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student. Those participants reporting more courses taught as a doctoral student rated themselves as better prepared for the task of teaching.

Research Hypothesis Two

The second research hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught under the supervision of a full time faculty member is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness. To examine this hypothesis, a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to correlate item 16 to item 57. A positive correlation was found (r (140)= .297, $p<$.001, $r^{2=}$.08) indicating a significant linear relationship between number of courses taught under supervision and ratings of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was small (.08), indicating that 8% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by number of courses taught under supervision as a doctoral

student. Those participants reporting more courses taught under supervision rated themselves as more prepared, overall, for the task of teaching.

Research Hypothesis Three

Research hypothesis three stated that receiving feedback about teaching more frequently during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Data analysis supported this hypothesis, with a Pearson product moment correlation between items 28 and 57 yielding a strong positive correlation of (r (182)=.547, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.29), indicating a significant linear relationship. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.29), indicating that 29% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by receiving feedback about teaching as a doctoral student. Those participants reporting more frequent feedback from faculty about teaching rated themselves as more prepared overall for the task of teaching.

Research Hypothesis Four

Research hypothesis four stated that the frequency of being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. This hypothesis was also supported by the results of a Pearson product moment correlation between item 30 and item 57, which produced a strong positive correlation (r (180)=.550, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.30), indicating that a significant linear relationship exists. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.30), indicating that 30% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching as a doctoral student. Those reporting more opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching rated themselves as more prepared overall for the task of teaching.

Research Hypothesis Five

Research hypothesis five stated that the frequency of attending seminars on college teaching during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. A Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to examine the possibility of a relationship between items 51 and 57. This analysis yielded a positive correlation (r (183)=.259,p<.001, $r^{2=}$.06), indicating a significant linear relationship. The effect size of this correlation was small (.06), indicating that 6% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by the frequency of attending seminars on college teaching as a doctoral student. Those participants who reported attending more seminars on college teaching rated themselves as more prepared overall for the task of teaching.

Research Hypothesis Six

Research hypothesis six stated that the frequency of having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. A Pearson product moment correlation was computed to examine the possibility of a relationship between items 18 and 57, and this analysis yielded another positive correlation (r (183)=.478,p<.001, $r^{2=}$.22), indicating a significant linear relationship between the two items. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.22), indicating that 22% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by the frequency of having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy as a doctoral student. Those having had more discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy rated themselves as more overall prepared for the task of teaching.

In addition to hypothesis testing, 15 post hoc analyses were done to examine relationships among the variables in this study. Upon examination of the data, it appeared that there were adequate relationships among item responses to warrant further analyses. All of the correlations computed on these data (including the hypotheses discussed above) are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7.
Results of Pearson product moment correlations for selected items correlated to perceived overall preparation

Variables	Overall Preparation for Teaching	
	r	*p*
10. Times You Participated In Designing a Course	.264	.003
12. Times You Taught an Entire Course	.300	.001
14. Times You Designed a Course Syllabus	.188	.042
16. Times You Taught a Course Under the Supervision of a Full Time Faculty Member	.297	<.001
18. How Often Did You Have Discussions with Faculty About Your Teaching Philosophy?	.478	<.001
20. How Often Did Faculty Share Teaching Resources with You?	.492	<.001
22. How Often Did You Discuss With Faculty Why Instructional Decisions Are Made?	.512	<.001
28. How Often Did You Receive Feedback from Faculty about Your Teaching Skills?	.547	<.001

Table 7. (continued).
Results of Pearson product moment correlations for selected items correlated to perceived overall preparation

Variables	Overall Preparation for Teaching	
	r	*p*
30. How Often Were You Provided With Opportunities to Reflect On Feedback about Your Teaching?	.550	<.001
32. How Often Did You Observe Teaching?	.401	<.001
34. How Often Did You Have Discussions with Faculty About Individual Learning Differences?	.418	<.001
36. How Often Did You Have Conversations with Faculty About Grading?	.464	<.001
38. How Often Did You Engage In Self Assessment with Regard to Teaching?	.569	<.001
43. How Often Did You Deliver a Lecture in the Classroom?	.486	<.001
45. How Often Did You Grade Exams?	.409	<.001
47. How Often Did You Grade or Provide Feedback on Written Assignments?	.481	<.001
49. How Often Did You Prepare Course Assignments?	.520	<.001
51. How Often Did You Attend Seminars on College Teaching?	.259	<.001

Table 7. (continued).
Results of Pearson product moment correlations for selected items correlated to perceived
overall preparation

| | Overall Preparation for Teaching | |
Variables	*r*	*p*
53. How Often Did You Engage in Conversations with Other Students about Teaching?	.561	<.001
55. How Often Were You Able To Ask Faculty Members Questions about Teaching?	.622	<.001

Post hoc analyses included 15 additional correlations which are discussed by the order in which they appear in Table 13. First, a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to correlate item 10 to item 57. A positive correlation was found (r (126)= .264, p =.003, r^2=.06) indicating a significant linear relationship between number of times participating in course design and ratings of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was small (.06), indicating that 6% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by frequency of participating in course design as a doctoral student. Those who participated in designing courses more frequently rated themselves as more prepared for the task of teaching.

Next, a Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to correlate item 14 to item 57, and a positive relationship was found (r(115)=.188, p<.05, r^2=.03). This result indicates a significant linear relationship between number of times participants' designed course syllabi and their perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was small (.03), indicating that 3% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by number of times participants designed course syllabi as doctoral students.

When a Pearson product moment correlation was computed with items 20 and 57, another significant relationship was found, (r (182)= .492, $p<.001$, $r^{2=}.24$), indicating a positive relationship between how often faculty shared teaching resources with participants (as doctoral students) and their perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.24), indicating that 24% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often faculty shared teaching resources with participants.

A similar result was found when correlating item 22 to item 57. Frequency of discussing why instructional classroom decisions are made was positively correlated with perceived overall preparedness for teaching (r (183)=.512, $p<.001$, $r^{2=}.26$). The effect size of this correlation was medium (.26), indicating that 26% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by frequency of discussing why instructional classroom decisions are made.

Observing teaching was positively correlated with overall preparedness for teaching (items 32 and 57), with a result of (r (182)=.401,$p<.001$, $r^{2=}.16$). Participants who observed teaching more frequently reported higher levels of preparedness overall for teaching.   The effect size of this correlation was medium (.16), indicating that 16% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants were able to observe teaching.

Yet another significant correlation occurred when examining items 34 and 57 (r (183)=.418, $p<.001$, $r^{2=}.17$), indicating a significant linear relationship between frequency of having discussions with faculty about individual learning differences and perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.17), indicating that

17% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by frequency of having discussions with faculty about individual learning differences.

Having conversations with faculty about grading (item 36) also correlated positively (r (183)=.464, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.21) with overall preparedness for teaching (item 57), indicating that participants who reported having more frequent conversations about grading rated themselves as more prepared overall to teach. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.21), indicating that 21% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by frequency of having conversations with faculty about grading.

Item 38, engaging in self-assessment with regard to teaching (assessing their own teaching skills) had a very strong relationship with item 57, overall teaching preparation when a Pearson product moment correlation was computed (r (183)=.569, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.32). This indicated that those participants who participated in self assessment more frequently felt more prepared overall for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.32), indicating that 32% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants engaged in self-assessment with regard to teaching.

A Pearson product moment correlation was computed to examine the relationship between how often participants delivered a lecture in the classroom (item 43) with overall preparedness for teaching (item 57), producing a positive correlation (r (185)= .486, p <.001, $r^{2=}$.23). This indicates that those participants who delivered lectures in the classroom more often rated themselves as more prepared overall for teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.23), indicating that 23% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants delivered lectures in the classroom as doctoral students.

A significant relationship was found between how often participants reported grading exams (item 45) and their ratings of overall preparedness for teaching (item 57). This indicates a significant linear relationship (r (185) = .409, p <.001, $r^{2=}$.16). Participants who graded exams more often during doctoral study rated themselves as more prepared overall for the task of teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.16), indicating that 16% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants reported grading exams as doctoral students.

A similar result was found when a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to examine the relationship between how often participants graded or provided feedback on written assignments (item 47) with item 57, overall teaching preparation (r (181)= .481, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.23). This significant linear relationship indicates that those participants who graded or provided feedback on written assignments more often rated themselves as more highly prepared overall for the task of teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.23), indicating that 23% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants graded or provided feedback on written assignments as doctoral students.

In addition a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to correlate items 49 (How often did you prepare course assignments?) with item 57 (overall preparedness for teaching), and a very significant correlation was found (r (183) =.520, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.27). This implies that those who prepared course assignments more often during doctoral study rated themselves as more prepared overall for the task of teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.27), indicating that 27% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants prepared course assignments as doctoral students.

Another highly significant result was found when a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to examine the relationship between how often participants engaged in conversations with other students about teaching (item 53) and overall preparedness for teaching (item 57). This positive correlation (r (181) =.561, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.31) indicates that those who had more frequent conversations with other students about teaching also rated themselves as more prepared overall for the task of teaching. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.31), indicating that 31% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants had conversations with other students about teaching as doctoral students.

Finally, a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to correlate how often participants were able to ask faculty members questions about teaching (item 55) with perceived overall preparedness for teaching (item 57), and this analysis yielded the strongest correlation of all (r (180)=.622, p<.001, $r^{2=}$.38). This indicates that those participants who were more frequently able to ask faculty members questions about teaching rated themselves as more highly prepared for teaching, overall. The effect size of this correlation was medium (.38), indicating that 38% of the variance in self ratings of overall teaching preparedness could be accounted for by how often participants were able to ask faculty members questions about teaching as doctoral students.

All correlations computed and presented in Table 7 between items were significant. Positive correlations among these items ranged from (r (136)=.188, p =.042 to (r(181)= .622, p <.001); indicating a wide range of variability among the strength of the positive correlations. The majority (16 out of 21) of the correlations produced a correlation coefficient of .401 or above; indicating that most correlations were highly significant.

Summary

As previously stated, results of correlations between survey items were overwhelmingly positive, indicating that participants who had the experiences included in the survey (teaching an entire course, teaching under supervision, and being given the opportunity to ask faculty questions about teaching, to name a few) more often rated themselves as more highly prepared for teaching as a faculty member. These survey items included experiences that were borne out of the literature, including Meacham's (2002) identification of activities such as: preparing a course syllabus, engaging in self-assessment, and completing a teaching portfolio or Silverman's (2003) endorsement of: taking courses in teaching, being a participant in a teaching practicum, being mentored, sharing of resources with faculty, being supervised, having discussions about teaching philosophy, and having discussions about why instructional decisions are made in courses. Both Meacham and Silverman cited the experiences listed above as activities that might be helpful in training doctoral students to teach. Participants indicated that they felt more prepared after being given opportunities to deliver lectures, grade exams, participate in a teaching practicum, teach under supervision and engage in self assessment with regard to teaching, to name a few. One participant supported the notion that these activities are of extreme importance, through a response to item 58. The response stated that: "Many of the experiences you listed in your survey I never had the opportunity to be involved in, or was not allowed/encouraged to be involved in. I think that this is an extremely important area of preparation that does not receive, in my experience, enough attention in doctoral programs." This statement supports the literature in higher education that concedes that doctoral programs are lacking in their preparation of graduates to teach, and provides support for the importance of teaching preparation as a research topic. The fact that all six research hypotheses were supported

54

indicates that participants did find importance in the activities and experiences included in this

survey. Discussion of these results and implications for counselor educators will be presented in

Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

Chapter Five presents a summary and discussion of the findings of this study. The results of this study and respective limitations are addressed. The overall findings of the study will be presented in four sections; (a) descriptive statistics, (b) responses to one open ended survey item, (c) a discussion of the hypotheses in this study, and finally (d) a presentation of post hoc analyses that followed the collection of data. The chapter concludes with a discussion of implications for counselor education and provides recommendations for further research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine counselor education faculty members' perceptions of the effectiveness of teaching preparation received during their training as doctoral students. The study built on the work of Meacham (2002) and others through the administration of a researcher-designed survey entitled Preparation for Teaching Survey (PFTS), which was distributed electronically to faculty members in CACREP accredited counselor education programs. Additionally, this study extended the work of others who have addressed the need for attention to teaching preparation (Boyer, 1990; Lanning, 1990; Magnuson, 2002; Meacham, 2002). In gathering this information, the intention was to gain more insight into what is currently being done to prepare doctoral students to teach, and what can be done to further improve teacher training. Data analyses were conducted in order to examine the relationships between the frequency of participants' involvement in certain preparatory activities and their self ratings of overall preparedness for teaching upon graduation.

Discussion of the Findings

It has been documented that there is a lack of attention to teaching preparation in doctoral programs across disciplines (Austin 2002a; Austin 2002b; DeNeef, 1993; Golde, 2004; Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003). Teaching preparation is an important area to study in higher education, given the increasing demand placed on doctoral graduates to prove competence in the area of teaching (Austin, 2002b; Warnke et al., 1999). The field of counselor education is not exempt from these demands, and is possibly more affected than other disciplines, due to the fact that doctoral programs are expected to prepare graduates to be competent researchers and teachers and practitioners. Although there is much discussion in the literature about the gap between what is being done to prepare graduates for the role of teacher, and the expectations of institutions of higher education when hiring new faculty (Meacham), there has been no known empirical research done to explore what sort of activities might be useful in the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students.

Several articles across disciplines (Austin 2002a; Austin 2002b; Meacham, 2002; and Silverman, 2003) have offered ideas about what sort of activities might be helpful to train doctoral students to teach. Meacham presented a list of activities that might be helpful during doctoral teacher training. These include: being mentored by senior faculty, spending time following faculty through a typical day on campus, participating in high level graduate seminars on teaching and faculty life, preparing a course syllabus and having it critiqued, being supervised in teaching by excellent teachers, engaging in self-assessment and self reflection as a teacher and potential faculty member, and assembling a teaching portfolio that includes a statement of teaching philosophy. Silverman (2003) suggested activities such as taking courses in teaching, being a participant in a teaching practicum, being mentored, sharing of resources with faculty,

supervision, discussions about teaching philosophy, and discussions about why instructional decisions are made in courses as possible options for improving doctoral teacher training. Austin (2002a; 2002b) recommended supervision, feedback about teaching, time for reflection on feedback about teaching, observing others teaching, participation in designing a course, teaching an entire course, gaining knowledge about individual learning differences as possible activities that would be beneficial for doctoral students in learning how to teach. From these ideas, items for the Preparation for Teaching Survey (PFTS) were created. This survey was distributed electronically to faculty members teaching in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs across the United States.

This is the only known study to examine the frequency and effectiveness of activities to prepare counselor education doctoral students for teaching. Participants were asked to respond to survey items about how often they experienced certain preparatory activities and how effective those activities were in preparing them for the role of teacher. In addition, participants were asked to give themselves an overall rating for teaching preparedness upon graduation from their doctoral programs.

Presentation and Discussion of Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 in Chapter Four includes the number of participant responses, means and standard deviations for each item. For each activity mentioned in the survey, there was a question about how often participants had the opportunity to participate in a certain activity. Participants were asked to rate the frequency on a scale of 1 to 7, with one being never and seven being very frequently. There was also a second question for each activity that asked participants who did have the opportunity to participate in that activity to rate its effectiveness in preparing

them for the task of teaching, and participants were asked to respond on a scale of 1 to 7, with one being not at all effective and 7 being very effective.

Ratings of effectiveness ranged from 1.34 (effectiveness of taking courses in college teaching) to 6.02 (effectiveness of teaching an entire course from start to finish). These ratings indicate that students did not find their courses on college teaching to be effective in preparing them to teach, however, they found that teaching an entire course (different from delivering lectures as a teaching assistant) was very effective in preparing them to teach. This finding supports the notion that experiential teaching activities, as reported by participants in this study, are much more effective than classroom lectures about how to teach. Silverman (2003) discussed that taking courses in teaching might prepare doctoral students to teach, but responses to this survey did not support that sort of activity as effective in teaching preparation. There were 68 (36.4%) participants who reported taking one course in college teaching, while 100 (53.5%) of participants reported not having any college teaching courses. However, according to the participants in this study who did complete courses in college teaching, the courses that were taken during their doctoral training were not rated as effective. Austin's (2002a; 2002b) endorsement of teaching an entire course as a preparatory activity was highly supported by participants in this survey.

Mean effectiveness ratings for some of Silverman's (2003) other suggested activities did indicate that they were effective in teaching preparation. For example, being a participant in a teaching practicum was given a mean rating of 5.56, which indicates that this was rated as highly effective. That rating also provides support for more experiential training of teachers. Sharing of resources with faculty had a mean effectiveness rating of 4.06, teaching under supervision had a mean rating of 5.60 (also suggested by Austin, 2002a; 2002b), having discussions with faculty

about teaching philosophy had a mean rating of 4.76, and having discussions with faculty about why instructional decisions are made in courses had a mean rating of 4.81. All of the aforementioned activities provide support for the use of discussions with faculty and other interactive methods of teacher training for doctoral students. Participants in this study endorse training activities that provide room for observation of skills, feedback, and reflection, along with open discussion of the process.

Austin's (2002a; 2002b) suggested activities were also supported, with receiving feedback about teaching being assigned a mean effectiveness rating of 5.00, being given time to reflect on feedback about teaching receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 5.00, observing others teaching receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 4.91, participation in designing a course receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 5.40, and gaining knowledge about individual learning differences receiving a mean effectiveness rating of 4.59. Since Austin is a counselor educator, there seems to be a definite parallel between counselor training and her suggestions about the training of doctoral students to teach. She emphasized training under supervision, receiving feedback, reflecting on the feedback, and sharing of resources with the supervisor. It follows that a more collaborative model of teacher training, closely resembling the training of counselors might be quite effective in training counselor education doctoral students to teach.

Meacham (2002) suggested preparing a course syllabus, engaging in self assessment, and completing a teaching portfolio as ideas for better teacher training, and those activities received mean effectiveness ratings of 5.89, 5.41 and 4.96 respectively. Of particular emphasis is the rating of 5.41 with regard to self assessment of teaching. Being asked to assess one's own performance as a teacher is a different activity than simply receiving a performance rating given by an observer or supervisor, and may be instrumental in the development of one's own teaching

philosophy. Engaging in self assessment requires students to critique their own performance, ultimately forcing them to ponder their own beliefs and ideas about teaching and learning. Self assessment also fits closely with the way in which counselors are trained. In counselor training programs, students are often encouraged to look inward and examine personal thoughts, beliefs, and biases, in addition to assessing their own growth throughout the learning process. Young (2001) discussed the interaction between self-assessment and other essential factors in the training of counselors, stating that supervision and mentoring are essential for self-assessment and reflection.

Participants also gave participation in a teaching practicum a high mean rating of effectiveness (5.56) providing further support for more experiential teacher training. Of the 202 respondents to this survey, a large number, 91 (46.7%) indicated that they did participate in some sort of teaching practicum. It is important to note that the nature of these teaching practica may vary, given that the term teaching practicum may have been defined differently by participants. All of the activities mentioned above that were given high effectiveness ratings are activities that could be included as part of a teaching practicum, and could be tied into a more collaborative learning experience for doctoral students.

Responses to Open Ended Survey Item about Teaching Preparation

This study also contained one open ended question (presented in Table 6 in Chapter 4) that asked participants to provide any additional information about activities or experiences during their doctoral training that would have better prepared them for being a faculty member. There were four themes identified in the responses to this question: mentoring, a teaching practicum, more courses on teaching, and observation/feedback from faculty. Although these are

four distinct themes that emerged from the data, there is substantial overlap between the applications of these concepts, and they are presented as such in the following discussion.

Mentoring

The identified theme of mentoring provides support for Silverman (2003) and others (Cesa & Fraser, 1989; Wilde & Schau, 1991) who have cited mentoring as an essential factor in teacher training. One participant in this study stated "I would have appreciated more opportunities to have a mentored teaching assistantship rather than being used by faculty to free their lecture time." A second participant stated that "Many of my professors were good examples of teaching/mentoring. This was most helpful in preparing me, along with teachers taking an interest in my learning to teach." For this participant, it appears that conversations about teaching were most helpful and demonstrated that faculty were taking an interest in this student's teaching preparation. Another participant underscored the importance of mentoring by stating "My mentoring relationships were the foundation of my counselor education. I am so grateful." Other participants simply called for "better mentoring." Many responses indicated the same desire, to be mentored into the role of teacher by experienced faculty.

Based on the responses that asked for mentoring into the role of teacher, it appears that participants would have preferred a much more hands on process of teacher training where they could use their respective faculty members as role models for integration into the role of teacher. This information supports the ideas of Anderson and Shannon (1988) who wrote that the purpose of a mentor is to integrate a new person into a professional role that is already held by the mentor, and Tentoni (1992) who further defined mentoring as a helping relationship, during which the experienced mentor assists the student through direct interaction. There is evidence in the field of counselor education to show that mentoring of counseling students is already in

62

place. This is apparent in the fact that mentoring has been discussed in the literature as an integral component in the clinical supervision of counseling students (Tentoni, 1992). If indeed counselor education programs are already practicing mentoring during the training of counseling students, it would not be difficult to channel that same concept into the training of doctoral counselor education students to teach.

Participation in a Teaching Practicum

The second theme, participation in a teaching practicum, arising from responses to the open ended question, was a call for a teaching practicum/internship and supervision of teaching. One participant stated that "A teaching practicum would have definitely been beneficial to me. Given the fact that what I primarily do is teach, it's odd that so little time is devoted to teaching that art while in a counselor education program." A second participant requested "a required teaching practicum under supervision that dealt with all of the elements of teaching, from course design through assessment." Another participant supported the need for a teaching practicum and respective lack of emphasis on teaching in counselor education programs by stating that "A teaching practicum would have been helpful. Counselor education programs in general still seem to be more focused on counseling and supervision skills rather than teaching". Similarly, another participant stated that "Many of the experiences you have listed in your survey [were experiences] that I never had the opportunity to be involved in or was not allowed/encouraged to be involved in. I think this is an extremely important area of preparation that does not receive, in my experience, enough attention in doctoral programs." Other comments supporting a desire for more structured teaching preparation abound; providing evidence that not only is there a need for more attention to teaching preparation, but also a desire for further instruction by the doctoral students enrolled in counselor education programs. These comments provide support for

Lanning's (1990) endorsement of an educator practitioner model in counselor education doctoral programs, as he pointed out that doctoral programs in counselor education should be concerned with preparing graduates who were not only skilled counselors, but also skilled teachers.

More Courses on College Teaching

Along with the desire for a teaching practicum, participants identified a need for more comprehensive courses on teaching. One participant said "[I] need a class or several seminars on teaching including teaching methods, syllabus development, grading and classroom/student management", while another participant reported "I felt that having classes about pedagogy and teaching would have been so helpful and needed." A third response stated that "I knew a lot about counseling, but learned little regarding how to teach in a university setting. [I] could have used instruction on how to develop lecture approaches to teaching." There was a definite desire for more coursework about teaching with many participants endorsing a need for additional teaching classes.

Observation and Feedback from Faculty

The fourth identified theme from responses to the open ended question was a need for observation and feedback from faculty. One participant stated:

I would have liked to have more observation and feedback from my faculty members. They seemed to be overly confident in my abilities, sight unseen. I wonder if it was just too much hassle for them to observe me or what the issue was. I could have used feedback and assistance on setting up a syllabus, grading, etc., that I had to struggle with learning on my own. (which made my first job harder.) They [faculty members] prepared me well for leadership, research, and publication at the expense of developing my actual teaching.

Support for the importance of observation and feedback can be found in the response of one participant who reported having an exceptional teaching experience "Their [faculty members'] commitment to providing me with opportunities, feedback, and role modeling were the key elements to my success as a "teacher" of counselor education." This finding suggests that some participants may find observation of teaching and feedback to be essential parts of the mentoring that they desire, which provides support for the literature that states that the mentoring of doctoral students to teach is an effective training method (Cesa & Fraser, 1989; Wilde & Schau, 1991; Silverman, 2003).

Discussion of Hypotheses

There were six research hypotheses at the outset of this study. All six hypotheses were tested through the use of Pearson product moment correlations between items. In addition, there were 15 additional post hoc analyses computed on the data. The first hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught from start to finish as a doctoral student is positively related to the level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The positive correlation found (r (114)= .300, p <.001) indicates that as the frequency of courses that participants taught as doctoral students increased, their ratings of overall preparedness for teaching increased. Often, when doctoral students are given the opportunity to teach, they serve as teaching assistants, delivering the occasional lecture. It is clear that more teaching experience allowed participants to feel more prepared overall for teaching, but it seems that the experience of teaching an entire course, rather than single presentations is key. If students are given the opportunity to teach an entire course from start to finish, there would be a need to address issues such as beginning the course, developing the learning climate, and ending the course; all different experiences than simply preparing and delivering a lecture. Here, the importance of continuity is evident. In the field of

65

counselor education, counseling students are expected to have some degree of continuity in counseling relationships, as opposed to having single sessions with multiple clients. The rationale here is that the students will build confidence and competence while moving through the developmental process of becoming a counselor. The same could be true in the training of doctoral students to teach counselor education; thus, the importance of teaching entire courses is supported. Of course, delivering lectures could be a beneficial first step in the developmental process of learning how to teach, but the training could involve additional steps with increasing responsibility.

The second hypothesis stated that the number of courses taught under the supervision of a full time faculty member is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The positive correlation found here (r (140)= .297, p <.001) indicated that there is a significant relationship; as frequency of teaching under supervision increased, so did participants' ratings of their overall preparedness. This hypothesis was also supported (as previously mentioned) by the identification of the themes in response to the open ended question in this study. Teaching under supervision implies that there is some guidance and assessment provided by the supervising faculty member, rather than the student being "given" a course to teach without any support from faculty. In a parallel way, supervision is provided to counseling students during practicum and internship not only to ensure client safety, but also to support new practitioners (Ladany et al., 1999). It follows that the same sort of support and assessment would be helpful for new teachers. In addition, as a profession, counseling is concerned with the quality of service being provided to clients; thus, counselor educators should be concerned with the training of those who will teach students to become effective practitioners.

Research hypothesis three stated that receiving feedback about teaching more frequently during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. This hypothesis was supported through findings which indicated a highly significant correlation (r (182)= .547, p <.001). As frequency of receiving feedback increased, participants rated themselves as more prepared to teach. Much like research hypothesis two, this hypothesis was supported by responses to the open ended survey item addressing a desire for receiving feedback. Again, there is a parallel here to the training of counselors. An integral part of the supervision process is the observation of students (through use of audio or video tapes) and the provision of feedback about their performance. Feedback has been given great attention in the counselor education literature (Young, 2001), particularly attention to the use of corrective feedback and its' utility in counselor training (Hulse-Killacky, 1996). A similar process for the training of teachers would be useful, and fairly easy to employ. Doctoral students could tape the classes being taught and then turn the tapes in to faculty supervisors, later receiving feedback about the teaching skills employed in classrooms. Alternatively, doctoral students could serve as lead instructors of courses under the supervision of faculty supervisors, who would be responsible for attending classes taught by the doctoral student lead instructor and providing feedback about the student's teaching.

Research hypothesis four stated that the frequency of being given opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching is positively related to the level of overall preparedness for teaching. When this hypothesis was tested through the use of a Pearson product moment correlation, a highly significant result was found (r (180)= .550, p <.001). Those participants reporting more opportunities to reflect on feedback about teaching rated themselves as more overall prepared for the task of teaching. Again, in the training of counselors, there is often a focus on being aware of

what is happening in the counseling session and reflecting on the experience of counseling after the session's conclusion. The opportunity to reflect on feedback can be seen as even more important than receiving the feedback, given that feedback is useless without some reflection about it's meaning by the receiver. Young (2001) supported the importance of reflection encouraging students to "stop and reflect" on what is being learned. There are ways in which counselor educators can provide more structured opportunities for doctoral students to reflect on feedback about their teaching. For example, there could be a requirement for students to answer questions about teaching experiences based on feedback received, in the form of a short reflection paper. Alternatively, reflections could be presented in the form of a short presentation to a group of other students who are teaching; which would encourage the desired discussion that has been endorsed by participants in this study.

Research hypothesis five stated that the frequency of attending seminars on college teaching during doctoral training is positively related to level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Analyses of responses indicated a positive correlation (r (183) = .259, p <.001), indicating that as frequency of attending college teaching seminars increased, so did levels of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Silverman (2003) and Meacham (2002) cited college teaching seminars as activities that might be helpful in the preparation of doctoral students to teach. In addition, responses to the open ended item in this survey yielded the identification of the desire for more courses/seminars in college teaching as a common theme, providing support for hypothesis five. Again, participants seem to be indicating a need for more structured training for teaching. A mechanism for the use of counselor education seminars could be developed that closely follows the training of counselors. Students of counseling are not lectured on theories and techniques with minimal practice, they are given opportunities to put

theory into practice in practicum and internship. The link between theory and practice could be applied to doctoral students by using seminars as the first phase of teacher training, and having an experiential second phase that would allow the students to test out techniques that have been learned. Counselor educators could even develop seminars that contain information pertinent to the counseling profession. For example, the presentation of issues such as professional identity, supervision in counseling or multiculturalism could be topics for teaching seminars. There would be two outcomes with this approach; learning to teach and learning about important issues in the field.

Research hypothesis six stated that the frequency of having discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy is positively related to the level of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. When a Pearson product moment correlation was computed to test this hypothesis, a highly significant result was found (r (183)= .478, p <.001). As frequency of discussions with faculty about teaching philosophy increased, so did perceived overall preparedness for teaching. The occurrence of these discussions with faculty seems to be related to the notion of reflection on feedback about teaching and mentoring. When students are given the opportunity to reflect on feedback and engage in self assessment, they can begin to develop a teaching philosophy.

Post Hoc Analyses

A further examination of the data in this study indicated a need for additional analyses. These post hoc analyses build on previous discussions and add additional information to strengthen teaching preparation. The first of the 15 post hoc analyses that were computed on these data was a Pearson product moment correlation to examine the relationship between number of times participating in course design and perceived overall preparedness for teaching. This analysis produced a positive correlation (r (126)= .264, p =.003) indicating a significant

relationship. As frequency of participating in course design increased, participant's perceptions of their overall preparedness for teaching increased. Being able to participate in the design of a course enables doctoral students to decide not only what content to include in the course, but also to examine different ways of presenting the material, addressing different learning styles, and considering issues such as time management.

A second Pearson product moment correlation was computed to examine the relationship between number of times participants designed course syllabi and their perceived overall preparedness for teaching. A positive relationship was found (r (115)= .188, p <.05) indicating that participants who designed more course syllabi rated themselves as more highly prepared overall for teaching; however the utility of this finding is limited due to the fact that this is a relatively weak correlation. This finding, however limited, makes sense, as the design of course syllabi could be part of participation in preparing a course, which was also positively correlated with perceived overall preparedness for teaching.

A significant relationship (r (182)= .492, p<.001) was also found between how often faculty shared teaching resources with participants and participant ratings of perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Again, a significant part of counselor training is the sharing of resources between supervisors and their supervisees (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Being able to ask faculty members questions about teaching was found to be positively correlated with perceived overall preparedness for teaching (r (181) = .622, p <.001).

Similarly, a positive relationship (r (183) = .512, p<.001) was found between frequency of discussing with faculty why instructional classroom decisions are made and perceived overall preparedness for teaching. One participant responded to the open ended question in this survey by stating that " I had a lot of hands on experience, and felt pretty good about what I was doing

(and got good feedback from students), but didn't have any real sense of why I was doing what I was doing. I did, and continue to feel a bit lost at times when planning my courses." This response indicates that there is an element of confusion about why instructional decisions are being made in courses. Discussions of instructional decisions, along with the sharing of resources between faculty and students could be an integral portion of a supervisory teaching relationship as part of a structured teaching practicum, which again, could be modeled after the current way that programs are currently training students to be counselors.

Other important discussions that could be a part of the supervisory relationship include discussions about individual learning differences. When frequency of having discussions with faculty about learning differences was correlated with overall perceived preparedness for teaching, a positive relationship was found (r (183) = .418, p <.001). Participants who had discussions with faculty about individual learning differences more often rated themselves are more highly prepared overall for the task of teaching. Having an understanding of individual learning differences certainly would inform the ways in which multiple teaching techniques are used (i.e. including different presentations of concepts, visual, experiential, and auditory to name a few). This finding also has implications for working with students who have disabilities because of the focus on addressing the needs of individual students for learning.

Yet another significant relationship (r (183) = .464, p <.001) was found when correlating the frequency of discussions about grading with overall perceived preparedness for teaching. One participant reported having questions about grading and stated "We had little on grading and I would have very much have appreciated a class on this." Other items about grading yielded similar results. A significant relationship was found (r (185) = .409, p <.001) between frequency of grading exams and perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Participants with more

experience grading exams as doctoral students rated themselves as more highly prepared overall for teaching. In addition, frequency of grading or providing feedback on written assignments was highly correlated with overall perceived preparedness for teaching (r (181) = .481, p <.001). Participants seemed to believe that more experience in grading exams and written assignments better prepared them for teaching, and in addition, believed that discussions about grading were (or would have been in the case of some participants) very helpful in preparing them to teach.

In addition to the importance of being able to ask faculty questions about teaching and have discussions with them about important issues such as individual learning differences and grading, participants found that how often they engaged in conversations with other students about teaching was important in their preparation. A significant relationship (r (181) = .561, p <.001) was found between frequency of conversations with other students about teaching and perceived overall preparedness for teaching. Group supervision is often used in the training of students for counseling, and in these sessions an open exchange of ideas is generally encouraged. It follows that group supervision, where students could share ideas with other students about teaching might be helpful in the training of doctoral students.

Limitations of the Study

The participant sample represents the first potential limitation of this study. Because participants are not required to complete the survey, those that chose to complete it may not be representative of the entire population of counselor education faculty. In addition, because the survey was delivered electronically, access was limited to those that have both internet and e-mail access. A third limitation of the study lies in the percentage of completed surveys; one thousand and sixty two e-mails were sent, and two hundred and sixty two participants completed the survey (a response rate of 24.6%). Finally, items on the instrument may not accurately

reflect factors that contribute to effective teaching preparation, and the counselor educators who were willing to participate in this study may not provide an accurate representation of all counselor educators. Those who chose to participate in the study were providing information based on their own perceptions of their training to teach. It is unclear whether participants' perceptions of their own teaching preparedness are an accurate representation of their actual preparation for teaching. In addition, this study was an exploratory study, given that it is the first of its kind, attempting to identify factors that were perceived as effective in the preparation of doctoral students to teach. Due to the novelty of the instrument, further instrument development and refinement could improve its utility. The concepts of mentoring and teaching practica and their inclusion in teacher training could be further explored as well.

Implications for Counselor Education

Overall, the importance of activities such as teaching entire courses, receiving supervision while teaching, receiving feedback about teaching, reflecting on that feedback, and having discussions with faculty and other students about teaching issues were highlighted in the responses to this survey. Findings suggested a need to create structured approaches for teacher training. A teaching practicum that involves the concepts mentioned above could be beneficial in training doctoral students to teach; and this teaching practicum could be very similar to the regimented way in which counselor education programs train students to be counselors. This practicum would include components such as supervision, observation of teaching, feedback from faculty about teaching and opportunities for students to reflect on that feedback and engage in self assessment with regard to development of teaching skills. The supervision of doctoral students is of particular importance during teacher training, and this need could be addressed in a variety of ways. Doctoral seminars on supervision could be expanded to include a component of

teacher training, based on Bernard and Goodyear's (1998) notions about the teaching component

of supervision. Doctoral students could then be provided with feedback from faculty

supervisors, based on observations of teaching (through live supervision, viewing of audio or

video tapes for example). A next step would be to have structured approaches to reflection on

this feedback, and having doctoral students engage in self assessment of progress by way of

reflection papers, for example. As stated previously in this manuscript, a model for teacher

training with these components would closely follow the way that counselors are being trained.

For this reason, counselor education is in a prime position to be responsive to the needs of

doctoral students highlighted in the responses to the PFTS.

Implications for Further Research

This was an exploratory study that examined activities and experiences in counselor

education doctoral programs that prepare graduates to teach in higher education. The results of

this study are intended to extend counselor educators' understanding of the state of teaching

preparation in doctoral programs. Based on the preliminary findings of this study, future

research can focus on several areas.

Instrument Development

Further development of the Preparation for Teaching Scale is needed and this could be

accomplished through a second administration aimed at increasing the clarity of information

presented and possibly refining the survey through an exploratory factor analysis.

Additional Qualitative Research

In the qualitative responses to this survey, two themes emerged that warranted further

clarity: mentoring and teaching practica. For example, a qualitative study could be helpful to

explore what a mentoring relationship for teaching in counselor education would look like.

Many participants in this study cited a mentoring relationship as crucial for development of teaching skills, and others who had not experienced a mentoring relationship stated that it would have been helpful. However, mentoring may be defined in a variety of ways, so further investigation into the meaning of mentoring and its relationship to teaching preparation is warranted. Further exploration of the need for a teaching practicum would also provide insight into better training of doctoral students. In the previous section, implications for counselor education, a model for teaching practica was presented, however, additional qualitative inquiry into what teaching pracitca should include would be helpful to further refine the quality of the experience. For example, what activities would a teaching practicum consist of? If supervision and observation of teaching were included, how would these activities be structured?

Research Correlating Measures of Good Teaching to Experiences During Doctoral Study

Correlating measures of good teaching to experiences aimed at training doctoral students to teach would provide additional empirical support for the effectiveness of those experiences. Measures of good teaching could include using teaching evaluations, using students' scores on comprehensive exams, or by having department chairs nominate the best teachers in their departments to participate in future research.

Cross-Disciplinary Research

Examination of teaching preparation at the doctoral level could also be useful across disciplines. Research could be conducted to compare several disciplines that have a masters' degree as the terminal degree for practice (i.e. social work, counselor education, business administration, public administration) evaluating their respective approaches to teacher training at the doctoral level. The assumption here is that many people obtaining a doctorate in

disciplines that only require a master's degree for practice are doing so to prepare themselves to take faculty positions, which will require a significant amount of teaching.

Comparing Responses to the PFTS Across Academic Rank

Yet another topic for further research would involve comparing responses to the PFTS across ranks in academia (assistant professors, associate professors and professors) to examine whether level of experience has an affect on perceptions of doctoral level teaching preparation.

Examining the Impact of Prior Teaching Experience in Secondary Education

Finally, further investigation into whether having teaching experience in secondary education prior to pursuing a doctoral degree has an effect on doctoral teacher training could be useful; thus probing the issue of whether learning to teach adults is somehow different than learning to teach children and adolescents.

Conclusion

There is increasing attention to teaching in higher education, with additional demands being placed on faculty to prove competency in the area of teaching (Austin, 2002b). In addition, it is apparent that teaching as a skill is valued by the field of counselor education. At this point, the issue for counselor educators is to be clear about where teaching preparation will fall in counselor education programs and to make decisions about where to place program resources. These data provide initial ideas about how to train doctoral students to teach which are in line with Hosie's (1990) and Lanning's (1990) arguments for an educator practitioner model of doctoral training. In fact, the discussion of results not only provides support for Lanning's idea of an educator practitioner model, but begins to suggest ways in which it could be implemented. An educator practitioner model that prepares doctoral students to be competent practitioners as well as competent educators could be achieved through the use of structured

76

approaches to teaching preparation. These structured approaches could include a teaching

practicum that follows the current method by which counselors are trained. There is a definite

need for attention to teacher training in doctoral programs, and the students of these programs are

indicating a strong desire for better preparation. The results of this study and respective

discussion of findings provide a starting point for addressing an area in counselor education that

is in great need of attention. It is obvious that teaching is still in competition with research; this

is true across disciplines in higher education. One question remains: does teaching have to be in

competition with research, or can counselor education doctoral training programs address both?

REFERENCES

Anderson, E.M., & Shannon, A.L. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 38-42.

Austin, A. E. (2002a). Creating a bridge to the future: Preparing new faculty to face changing expectations in a shifting context. *The Review of Higher Education,* 26, 119-144.

Austin, A. E. (2002b). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94-122.

Benassi, V. A., & Fernald, P. S. (1993). Preparing tomorrow's psychologists for careers in academe. *Teaching of Psychology,* 20(3), 149-155.

Bernard, J.M., & Goodyear, R.G. (1998). *Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision* (2nd ed.). Nedham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carter, R.B., Bowman, R.L., Kher, N., Bowman, V.E., Jones, R.L., & Tollerud, T.R. (1994). Counselor educators' perceptions of satisfying and dissatisfying teaching experiences. *Education,* 114, 439-450.

Cesa, I.L., & Fraser, S.C. (1989). A method for encouraging the development of good mentor-protégé relationships. *Teaching of Psychology,* 16, 125-128.

DeNeef, A. L. (1993). Right here right now. *Liberal Education,* 79(2), 20-26.

Golde, C. M. (2004). The responsibility of doctoral programs for the career preparation of future faculty. *Peer Review,* 26-29.

Hosie, T. W. (1990). Recommendations for improvement in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 29(3), 130-133.

Hulse-Killacky, D. (1996). Using the classroom as a group to integrate knowledge, skills, and supervised practice. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 21, 163-168.

Ladany, N., Ellis, M.V., & Friedlander, M.L. (1999). The supervisory working alliance, trainee self-efficacy and satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77, 447-455.

Lanning, W. (1990). An educator/practitioner model for counselor education doctoral programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 30(2), 163-170.

Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 41(4), 306-320.

Meacham, J. (2002). Our doctoral programs are failing our undergraduate students. *Liberal Education,* 88(3), 22-28.

Olsen, D. (1993). Work satisfaction and stress in the first and third year of academic appointment. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 64(4), 453-471.

Silverman, S. (2003). The role of teaching in the preparation of future faculty. *Quest, 55,* 72-81.

Tentoni, S.C. (August, 1992). Mentoring psychology trainees: History, definition, and rationale. Symposium presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Warnke, M. A., Bethany, R.L. & Hedstrom, S.M. (1999). Advising doctoral students seeking counselor education faculty positions. *Counselor Education and Supervision,* 38(3), 177-191.

Wilde, J.B., & Schau, C.G. (1991). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentees'

perceptions. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 59, 165-179.

Young, M.E. (2001). *Learning the art of helping: Building blocks and techniques.* Upper Saddle

River, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

PERSONAL INFORMATION

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following personal information:

1. Sex: **2. Ethnicity:**
_____Male   _____African American
_____Female   _____Asian American
                                          _____Caucasian/European American
                                          _____Hispanic
                                          _____Native American
                                          _____Other_____

3. Tenure Status:
Please check all that apply
___ Tenured
___ Pre-Tenure
___Non-Tenure Track

4. Type of Program in Which You are Currently Employed:
___ Master's Only
___ Master's and Doctoral

5. Type of Institution in Which You are Currently Employed:
___ Private
___ Public

6. Academic Rank:
___ Full Professor
___ Associate Professor
___ Assistant Professor
___ Instructor
___ Lecturer

7. Number of Years as a Faculty Member: _____

8. Was Your Doctoral Training Program CACREP accredited?
___ Yes
___ No

9. Please List All Degrees That You Currently Hold:
_____

Appendix B

PREPARATION FOR TEACHING SURVEY

PREPARATION FOR TEACHING SURVEY

Please read the items below and respond based on the training that you received as a doctoral student:

FREQUENCY
      Never   **Very Frequently**
                      1   2   3   4   5   6   7

EFFECTIVENESS
      Not at All Effective   **Very Effective**
                      1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. How many times did you participate in designing a course? _____

11. If you participated in designing a course, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:
                                1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

12. How many times did you teach an entire course from beginning to end? _____

13. If you taught a course from beginning to end, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:
                                1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

14. How many times did you design a course syllabus? _____

15. If you designed a course syllabus, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:
                                1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

16. How many times did you teach a course under the supervision of a full time faculty member? _____

17. If you taught a course under the supervision of a full time faculty member, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:
                    1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

18. How often did you have discussions with faculty about your teaching philosophy?
                              1   2   3   4   5   6   7

19. If you discussed your teaching philosophy with faculty, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

                                            1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

20. How often did faculty share teaching resources (e.g. lecture materials) with you?

                                        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

21. If faculty shared teaching resources with you, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching: 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

22. How often did you have discussions with faculty about why instructional classroom decisions are made?   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

23. If you had discussions with faculty about why instructional classroom decisions are made, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

                                          1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

24. Did you participate in a teaching practicum? Yes_____ No _____

25. If you participated in a teaching practicum, please rate it's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

                                          1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

26. How many courses in college teaching did you take? _____

27. If you took courses in college teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

                                          1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

28. How often did you receive feedback from a faculty member about your teaching skills?

                              1   2   3   4   5   6   7

29. If you received feedback from a faculty member about your teaching skills, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

                                          1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

30. How often were you provided with opportunities to reflect on feedback about your teaching?

                                    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

31. If you were given the opportunity to reflect on feedback about your teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

                                        1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

32. How often did you observe someone teaching (not including classes that you were enrolled in?)   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

33. If you observed someone teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA</div>

34. How often did you have discussions with faculty about individual learning differences?

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

35. If you had discussions with faculty about individual learning differences, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA</div>

36. How often did you have conversations with faculty about their approaches to grading?

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

37. If you had conversations with faculty about their approaches to grading; please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA</div>

38. How often did you engage in self assessment with regard to your teaching?

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

39. If you engaged in self assessment with regard to your teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA</div>

40. Were you encouraged to develop a teaching portfolio? Yes____ No ____

41. Were you provided assistance in developing the portfolio by a faculty member? Yes___ No___ N/A____

42. If you were given the opportunity to develop a teaching portfolio, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA</div>

43. How often did you deliver a lecture in the classroom?

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7</div>

44. If you delivered a lecture in the classroom, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 NA

45. How often did you grade exams?   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46. If you graded exams, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA</div>

47. How often did you grade or provide feedback on written assignments?

                                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

48. If you graded or provided feedback on written assignments, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

49. How often did you prepare course assignments?

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

50. If you prepared course assignments, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

51. How often did you attend seminars on college teaching?

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

52. If you attended seminars on college teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching: 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

53. How often did you engage in conversations with other students about teaching?

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

54. If you engaged in conversations with other students about teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

55. How often were you able to ask faculty members questions about teaching?

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

56. If you asked faculty members questions about teaching, please rate the event's effectiveness in preparing you for teaching:

    1   2   3   4   5   6   7 NA

57. Upon completion of your doctoral degree, please rate your overall preparedness for the task of teaching:

    Not at All Prepared   Very Prepared

                      1   2   3   4   5   6   7

58. Please provide any additional information about activities or experiences during your doctoral training that would have better prepared you for teaching as a faculty member:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Appendix C

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Appendix C

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Below are the means and standard deviations for the expert panel's responses to each survey item.

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	N/A	N/A
2	N/A	N/A
3	N/A	N/A
4	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A
9	N/A	N/A
10	2.28	1.57
11	5.28	1.90
12	2.25	1.29
13	6.75	.43
14	2.25	1.29
15	5.75	.829
16	2.57	1.76
17	6.43	1.04
18	4.25	1.19
19	5.00	2.17
20	4.38	1.99
21	5.43	1.04
22	3.25	1.63
23	4.83	1.86
24	N/A	N/A
25	4.00	0
26	N/A	N/A
27	4.00	2.00
28	4.38	1.65
29	5.43	1.39
30	3.63	2.05
31	4.33	1.59
32	3.38	1.86
33	4.50	1.87
34	4.00	2.00

35	5.33	1.69
36	3.38	1.57
37	4.43	1.49
38	4.13	2.57
39	6.20	0.74
40	N/A	N/A
41	N/A	N/A
42	5.33	1.69
43	4.88	1.45
44	6.00	1.32
45	3.25	1.92
46	5.17	1.77
47	4.63	1.72
48	5.38	1.72
49	3.38	2.05
50	5.00	2.00
51	2.13	1.26
52	5.50	2.06
53	5.25	1.63
54	4.75	1.63
55	5.50	1.58
56	5.75	1.63
57	N/A	N/A

Appendix D

ELECTRONIC MESSAGE TO PARTICIPANTS

Appendix D

Electronic Message to Participants

Dear Counselor Educator,

I am writing to request your assistance with my dissertation study entitled *Counselor Educator's Perceptions of Their Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation.* I have developed an instrument entitled "Preparation for Teaching Survey or PFTS" that asks faculty members questions about training received at the doctoral level related to teaching. I plan to use data collected from the survey to define ways in which teacher training at the doctoral level might be enhanced.

All responses will be completely anonymous, there will be no means by which you could be identified once your answers have been transmitted. The approximate completion time for the instrument is 20-25 minutes.

If you are willing to assist me with this important part of my study, please click the following link:

[insert link]

Your participation in this study will be extremely helpful and important in defining ways to better prepare doctoral graduates in counselor education for teaching. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw your participation at any time without consequence. The risks for participation in this study are minimal. If you would like any information about the study, or have questions about anything related to the study and it's completion, you may contact myself, the principal investigator, Stephanie Hall, at shbailey@uno.edu or my faculty advisor, Diana Hulse-Killacky at dhulseki@uno.edu . You may also reach us by telephone at 504-280-6662. Thank you in advance for your participation!!

Stephanie Hall, M.A., Doctoral Candidate (ABD)
University of New Orleans
348 Bicentennial Education Building
University of New Orleans, Lakefront Campus
2000 Lakeshore Drive
New Orleans, LA 70148

Appendix E

HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL LETTER

University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research University of New Orleans

Campus Correspondence

Dr. Diana Hulse-Killacky
Stephanie Hall
348 ED

10/23/06

IRB#: 07oct07

RE: Counselor educators' perceptions of their doctoral level teaching preparation

The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures are compliant with the University of New Orleans and federal guidelines.

Please remember that approval is only valid for one year from the approval date. Any changes to the procedures or protocols must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event.

Best of luck with your project!
Sincerely,

Laura Scaramella, Ph.D.
Chair, University Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

Stephanie Hall was born on July 7, 1977 in Frankfort, Kentucky. She earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology in 1999 from the University of Kentucky and a Master of Arts degree in Counseling and Guidance from Louisiana Tech University in 2004. She is registered with the state of Louisiana as a Counselor Intern and expects to obtain licensure during 2007.

Stephanie has counseling experiences in a variety of settings, including counseling students within a public high school, a college counseling center, and community agencies such as Trinity Counseling and Training Center and St Stephen Counseling Center, where she served as clinical director. These activities have provided Stephanie with invaluable clinical experiences and have contributed to her growth and identity as a professional counselor and counselor educator. In addition, Stephanie had the opportunity to participate in a teaching collaborative during doctoral study, which afforded her the opportunity to gain experience in teaching three graduate level courses as a doctoral student. As a result of these teaching experiences, Stephanie became interested in studying the topic of teaching preparation at the doctoral level.

Stephanie currently serves as treasurer of the Alpha Eta Chapter of Chi Sigma Iota, an academic honor society for the counseling profession. She is a member of the American Counseling Association, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, the Louisiana Counseling Association, and the Louisiana Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. She has presented on various counseling-related topics at professional conferences in the state of Louisiana and nationally.