WAALKES, PHILLIP L., Ph.D. Beginning Counselor Educators' Experiences of Doctoral Teaching Preparation and Teaching Mentoring. (2016)
Directed by Dr. James M. Benshoff. 241 pp.

Teaching is often an area of great challenge for counselor educators in their first two years of full-time employment, as many report feeling overwhelmed in adapting to the myriad of responsibilities of a counselor educator (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004). Beginning counselor educators often struggle through an often frustrating, trial and error process of developing their teaching during the first few years of full-time employment (Buller, 2013; Castellano, 2002; Magnuson, 2002). They also find teaching to be a time and energy consuming process (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2009). Yet, beginning counselor educators report that they did not feel adequately trained in teaching by their counselor education programs (Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Counselor educators also report wishing they had more mentoring in the development of their teaching, both in their doctoral programs and as a new faculty member (Hall & Hulse, 2009; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009).

Numerous researchers have argued for more extensive doctoral teaching preparation (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Heppner, 1994; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Lanning, 1990; Tollerud, 1990). Doctoral teaching preparation can help future counselor educators feel better prepared to teach (Hall & Hulse, 2009), increase their self-efficacy in teaching (Baltrinic, et al., 2016; Heppner, 1994; Tollerud, 1990), and increase their autonomy in teaching (Baltrinic, et al., 2016). However, few

studies have examined teaching preparation practices of doctoral counselor education programs and the experiences of their students.

Therefore, investigating beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation and teaching mentorship in this study using Consensual Qualitative Research (CQR) methodology could be an important first step towards improving methods of training and mentoring for the development of teaching. Nine individual interviews were conducted with beginning counselor educators to better understand their experiences of doctoral teaching preparation and teaching mentorship. The CQR data analysis procedure helped the researchers identify eleven domains relating to participants' experiences: (a) pre-doctoral experiences, (b) doctoral experiences, (c) shortcomings in training, (d) components of teaching, (e) feedback, (f) support, (g) emotions, (h) professional identity, (i) systemic factors, (j) reactions to the research, and (k) other. Research findings and implications of these findings for doctoral counselor education programs and teaching mentors are discussed.

BEGINNING COUNSELOR EDUCATORS' EXPERIENCES

OF DOCTORAL TEACHING PREPARATION

AND TEACHING MENTORING

by

Phillip L. Waalkes

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2016

Approved by

_____
Committee Chair

This dissertation written by PHILLIP L. WAALKES has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair _____

Committee Members _____

_____

_____

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale for the Study

The work of faculty in higher education has traditionally been broken down into the three roles of teaching, research, and service (Boyer, 1990). Higher education has traditionally emphasized the teaching role more than the research role (Beckerman, 2010; Boyer, 1990). Although faculty members, including those at research-focused institutions, spend more time on teaching than on research (U.S. Department of Education, 2005), research still maintains a larger impact on an individual's reputation and prestige in higher education (Kreber, 2006). Research and publications are often the primary method of determining productivity of faculty in higher education for the purposes promotion and tenure (Boyer, 1990). Research acumen is also more sought after by administrators since it increases the reputation of the institution (Bok, 2006; Simmons, 2011). Receiving grants is a critical source of funding for many departments and institutions. Since research often drives grant funding, faculty members are often encouraged or required by their department to spend significant time and energy on writing grants. Consequently, research productivity is often favorably valued in higher education. By contrast, some think of teaching as something that does not require specialized skill or training (Boyer, 1990). This perspective likely drives the fact that

most college teachers received little to no training in teaching in their doctoral programs (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006; Jones, 2008; Mighty, 2013; Simmons, 2011).

Consequently, teaching gets less attention than research in many departments and institutions. Even as faculty members spend more of their time on teaching activities than on conducting research (U.S. Department of Education, 2005), they often approach their teaching with a level of complacency in their own skills (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006). College instructors are unlikely to be using up to date methods of teaching, often focusing on traditional lecture-based methods (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006; Jones, 2008). Teaching practices are still overwhelmingly based on traditional lectures with an emphasis on content coverage that is inconsistent with current research on teaching and learning in higher education (Boice, 1991; Jones, 2008; Mighty, 2013). Yet, 90 percent of college professors consider their teaching above average (Bok, 2006). Instructors also rarely have accurate assessments of student learning in their courses, which course evaluations do not typically illuminate (Bok, 2006). When instructors do decide to focus on improving their teaching, they often find that their institution views this as something that is left entirely to the discretion of the individual professor (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006).

This culture that deemphasizes the development of teaching is largely driven by the research-centric culture of many colleges and universities (Bok, 2006). Success in increasing student learning is seldom rewarded for either individual faculty members or for administrators (Bok, 2006). Institutions and departments are often more focused on agendas that do not include supporting instructors in the development of their teaching. In many departments, some teaching responsibilities are delegated to non-full time faculty.

In 2013, in degree-granting institutions, only 50% of professional employees were full-time whereas full- time faculty made up about 78% of professional employees in 1970 (Snyder & Dillow, 2015). This shift has means adjunct faculty and graduate students are teaching more courses (Arum & Roksa, 2011). Although this serves as a cost saving measure for colleges and universities, it also implies that teaching should be handed off to others so that tenure-track faculty can have more time to dedicate to their research. Additionally, new faculty members are offered minimal mentoring in developing their teaching during their first few years (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006; Carson, 2008). Many new faculty members wish they would receive more concrete support from colleagues such as sample syllabi or strategies for how to cope with a disruptive student (Boice, 1991). In one study, less than five percent of new faculty in their first semesters of teaching could identify any sort of social network for discussing teaching (Boice, 1991).

Even though many faculty members state that they find more of a sense of purpose in their teaching than in their research (Arum & Roksa, 2011), doctoral preparation programs typically offer little guidance on developing instructional practices (Beckerman, 2010; Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006; Jones, 2008). Doctoral preparation programs often exist only in research institutions and departments without doctoral programs often have more of a focus on teaching (Arum & Roksa, 2011; Bok, 2006). In one survey, only 50 percent of doctoral students had either an opportunity to take a teaching assistant training course or to attend workshops and seminars about teaching in their discipline (Golde & Dore, 2001).

Consequently, beginning faculty members often do not feel prepared for the challenges of teaching (Arum & Roksa, 2011; Boice, 1991; Jones, 2008; Simmons, 2011; Toews & Yazedjian, 2007). Even though beginning faculty might get some teaching experience in their doctoral programs, many new faculty members do not feel prepared for the challenges of teaching multiple classes and can feel overwhelmed by the diversity of courses they teach (Toews & Yazedjian, 2007). In Simmons' (2011) phenomenological study where he interviewed seven cross-disciplinary, pre-tenured university teachers, all participants reported feeling underprepared to teach in their current role regardless of prior teaching experience.

Accordingly, this lack of preparation causes many beginning faculty members to spend large amounts of time and energy preparing their classes in a way that is often inefficient (Toews & Yazedjian, 2007), stressful, and overwhelming (Carson, 2008; Simmons, 2011). One-hundred percent of beginning female faculty members in Carson's (2008) study cited that they were challenged by not feeling like they had enough time to complete all of the tasks that were required of them. They especially struggled with finding time for research amidst attending to the needs of students and preparing to teach (Carson, 2008). Additionally all seven participants in Simmons's (2011) phenomenological study reported stress and heavy workload in beginning their teaching roles, dedicating significant time to their teaching and often feeling overwhelmed.

In addition to these negative emotions, a lack of doctoral teaching preparation contributes to new faculty members feeling inadequate in their teaching abilities (Carson, 2008; Jones, 2008; Robertson, 1999). Eighty-eight percent of participants in Carson's

(2008) study cited that they did not feel effective in their teaching, that they would like to engage students more and make their classes more satisfying to both themselves and their students. Thoron et al. (2012) discovered that new faculty at one large university felt they were lacking in knowledge of effective teaching fundamentals, active learning strategies, and student engagement. In lieu of attempting teaching practices that are more congruent with recent research about college teaching, beginning college teachers focus largely on content mastery and meeting their own needs for competence and expertise (Boice, 1991; Jones, 2008; Robertson, 1999).

In Robertson's (1999) developmental model of college teaching, many new faculty members view their teaching from the perspective of egocentrism. Professors with this perspective focus on their own content mastery, replicate positive models of teaching that they have seen in their own experiences as students, and do not pay attention to the learner's experiences (Robertson, 1999). They often project their own experiences as learners onto their students wanting to teach their classes in a way that appealed to them as a student (Jones, 2008; Robertson, 1999). With this mentality, new professors often use a rapid-fire lecture approach, focused on presenting lots of facts and content in an organized manner, an approach that often does not meet the needs of their students (Boice, 1991; Jones, 2008). New faculty are also more likely to blame external factors for their teaching frustrations, such as poorly prepared or uninterested students or heavy workloads, and often do not actively seek outside resources to improve their teaching (Boice, 1991).

Additionally, teaching graduate students presents its own unique set of challenges that are often not addressed during doctoral teaching preparation (Cassuto, 2013; Semenza, 2016). Most of the scholarship on teaching in higher education has focused on teaching undergraduates and research and training on teaching at the graduate level is surprisingly limited (Cassuto, 2013; Semenza, 2016). Teaching graduate students is often overlooked because professors often assume that the skills required to teach undergraduates will transfer over to the graduate level or that teaching graduate students is merely a specialization in the profession (Semenza, 2016).

Teaching in Counselor Education

Counselor education, like higher education in general, weighs research more heavily than teaching in making promotion and tenure decisions (Ramzey et al., 2002). However, most counselor educators agree that teaching is an important skill for their field (Davis et al., 2006; Zimpfer et al., 1997). Most faculty members in doctoral counselor education programs believe it is important to prepare students in many different roles even as individual programs vary in terms of their focus (Zimpfer et al., 1997). Additionally, counselor educators must be skilled and accomplished in research, teaching, and service to be successful in achieving promotion and tenure (Davis et al., 2006).

A few researchers have called for the field to examine how counselor educators teach (Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Lanning, 1990; Sexton, 1998) and how they are prepared to teach by their doctoral preparation programs (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015; Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Hunt & Gilmore, 2013; Lanning,

6

1990; Tollerud, 1990). Notably, Lanning's (1990) educator-practitioner model of counselor education sought to shift the focus of doctoral training in counselor education by calling for more focus on teaching in the curriculum of doctoral counseling programs. He argued that this would strengthen the identity of the counseling profession by producing doctoral graduates who know how to teach aspiring counselors the skills and knowledge necessary to be effective practitioners (Lanning, 1990). Whereas doctoral programs previously had focused on training in mostly clinical skills, Lanning (1990) argued that to cement the identity of the profession it was critical to train counselor educators who also could pass along the counseling identity to future counselors. Accordingly, he argued for more systematic preparation of teaching in doctoral programs, including at least one teaching practicum where students would learn about teaching before beginning to teach a class themselves (Lanning, 1990). In contrast to counseling psychology whose doctoral programs were focusing mostly on clinical practice, Lanning (1990) argued that counselor education could stay relevant by emphasizing high quality teaching which would in turn produce more effective counselors.

Beginning counselor educators have reported that they did not feel adequately trained in teaching by their counselor education programs (Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Teaching is often an area of great challenge for counselor educators in their first two years of full-time employment, where many reported feeling overwhelmed and inadequately trained to teach (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004). Beginning counselor educators struggle through an often frustrating, trial and error process of developing their teaching during

the first few years of full-time employment (Buller, 2013; Castellano, 2002; Magnuson, 2002). They also find teaching to be a time and energy consuming process (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2009). Even as counselor educators often spend a significantly more time in teaching activities than they do in scholarship or service activities (Davis et al., 2006), developing teaching is not a focus of some counselor education programs and doctoral preparation programs (Zimpfer et al., 1997). Yet, teaching is perceived by counselor educators as just as important as research for the purposes of receiving promotion and tenure (Davis et al., 2006).

In struggling with learning to teach over their first few years in a faculty position, some beginning counselor educators also wish they had received better teaching preparation during their doctoral programs. Protivnak and Foss (2009) found that many of their participants wanted better teaching preparation in their doctoral courses. Many participants in both Magnuson's (2002) and Hall and Hulse's (2009) studies stated that they wished they better understood the fundamentals of teaching.

Through years of experience, however, counselor educators do seem to grow in their teaching. Participants in Magnuson et al.'s 2009 study, which examined counselor educators who had been faculty members for six years, reported that they had become much more skilled as teachers with higher expectations of their students and more rigorous instruction. When comparing these comments about teaching to the same participants' comments in earlier studies, this increased level of expectations and rigor seems to indicate that counselor educators are learning how to teach throughout their time as teachers and that many are able to arrive at strong foundational teaching by their sixth

year. The reported level of confidence in their teaching is a distinct change from the nervous and frustrated comments these same counselor educators reported regarding their teaching in earlier studies (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2006).

Research on Teaching in Counselor Education

Although it seems that most counselor educators view teaching as important (Zimpfer et al., 1997) and put many hours of work into their own teaching (Davis et al., 2006), teaching is rarely systematically examined (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio Minton et al., 2014). There also is a dearth of literature specifically addressing doctoral teaching preparation for counselor educators (Baltrinic et al., 2016). In a content analysis, Barrio Minton et al. (2014) examined hundreds of articles about teaching and learning in counselor education from 2001 to 2010. Their review revealed that the majority of counselor education research on teaching did not use empirical methods and did not go beyond the content or techniques of counseling to examine the larger context of teaching and learning in the field (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Barrio Minton et al. (2014) defined an empirical study as representing "a systematic inquiry that included formulation of research questions, clear methodology, explicated data analysis, and presentation of results" (p. 171). The authors discovered that only thirty-two percent of articles were empirical by these standards. Of those that were empirical, the majority of them did not use rigorous measures of evaluating the effectiveness of technique, activity, or teaching style (Barrio Minton et al, 2014). For example, many of those empirical studies were satisfaction studies asking students how happy they were with a classroom activity or

technique (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). In fact, only ten percent of articles in the study evaluated student learning outcomes (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Most of the empirical studies assessed learning with student satisfaction or other indirect measures (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Additionally, only fifteen percent of the articles were clearly grounded in learning theory or instructional research (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). They also found a lack of empirical rigor shown in the majority of articles and a trend towards publishing specific content or techniques as opposed to examining teaching and learning practices throughout the profession (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Finally, there also was a lack of research on how counselor educators can best teach doctoral students (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Specifically there was little apparent understanding of how doctoral students develop teaching and how doctoral programs prepare them to teach (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Clearly, it is difficult to understand how counselor educators develop teaching without rigorous empirical research that focuses on the field more broadly.

Although the expansion of requirements regarding doctoral teaching preparation in the 2016 CACREP standards might push the field towards more examination of teaching methods, counselor education programs attempting to fulfill the requirements of these new standards currently have a limited research base. Therefore, to meet these standards, it is critical for counselor educators to better understand how doctoral programs address the development of teaching and how mentorship functions in developing teaching. Orr et al.'s (2008) development of a collaborative teaching teams model to help train doctoral students in counselor education serves as one practical

example of facilitating the improvement of teaching in counselor education. Additionally, many non-empirical resources exist for counselor educators to improve their teaching such as faculty centers for teaching and learning, books on teaching, and the teaching interest network in the Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors. However, there is a dearth of research examining the experiences of beginning counselor educators in developing teaching and, in turn, how best to support this development. Research on teaching in counselor education is still just beginning to systematically examine how best to mentor counselor educators in the development of their teaching.

In contrast, research has been conducted regarding how counselor education programs develop research skills in doctoral students (Borders et al., 2014; Lambie & Vaccaro, 2010) and how they can be mentored as researchers (Borders et al., 2012). Additionally, other helping professions, such as social work (East & Chambers, 2007; Wehbi, 2009) and psychology (Buskist & Smith, 2008; Gurung et al., 2008; Halpern et al., 1998) are having similar conversations about the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Doctoral Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education

Counselor education programs benefit from having systematic teaching preparation programs for doctoral students (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Heppner, 1994; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Tollerud, 1990). The 2016 CACREP standards dictate that doctoral students in CACREP-accredited programs must have knowledge of specific components of college teaching by the time they graduate. The 2016 CACREP standards dictate that doctoral counselor education programs cover "roles and responsibilities related to educating counselors," "pedagogy and teaching

methods relevant to counselor education," "models of adult development and learning," "instructional and curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation methods relevant to counselor education," "effective approaches to online instruction," "screening, remediation, and gatekeeping functions relevant to teaching," "assessment of learning," "ethical and culturally relevant strategies used in counselor preparation," and "the role of mentoring in counselor education" (Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and Supervision, Section VI, B.3). Additionally, doctoral counselor education programs must be able to assess learning in teaching using multiple measure at multiple different time points (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). Hunt and Gilmore recommended that such programs consist of courses on teaching, a co-teaching internship, and opportunities to receive support and critiques of their teaching from their peers.

Historically, many counselor educators have not received extensive doctoral teaching preparation. Most participants in Buller's (2013) grounded theory study on excellence in teaching in counselor education did not feel prepared to teach as new counselor educators. Only two out of ten the participants in this study had taken coursework on teaching during their doctoral program (Buller, 2013). Similarly, Carter et al. (1994) randomly sampled full-time counselor educators holding an associate or full professor rank and found that only twenty-one percent reported having taken a course in their doctoral program devoted to teaching. Only forty-three percent of respondents reported that they were "very well" prepared for teaching by their doctoral program (Carter et al., 1994). However, this may be changing with the implementation of the 2016 CACREP standards as Barrio Minton and Price (2015) found that ninety-six percent of

counselor education doctoral programs require their doctoral students to take coursework in teaching.

Counselor educators often value their doctoral teaching preparation and can experience growth in their confidence and skills resulting from it. Participants in Magnuson et al.'s (2006) study of experiences of third year counselor educators found that counselor educators valued preparation they received in teaching skills including test construction, grading, and planning. In another study examining doctoral instructors in counselor education, respondents reported an improved ability to present content and manage their classrooms after their teaching internships (Heppner & Johnston, 1994). Receiving feedback from peers and co-instructors together with sharing their own ideas were particularly helpful in preparing counselor education doctoral students to teach (Heppner, 1994; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011).Although many felt uncertainty at the beginning of their coteaching experience, the doctoral students interviewed in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study reported that their confidence and autonomy increased over time as they better understood the methods of teaching with the help of their faculty mentors. Similarly, Tollerud (1990) discovered that, except for teaching the first few courses where self-efficacy declined, the more teaching experience participants had during their doctoral program, the higher they reported their teaching self-efficacy in teaching. In another study, the number of times doctoral students taught classes and received feedback on their teaching was highly correlated with their self-rated levels of preparedness in teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Additionally, a one semester teaching internship significantly increased students' knowledge of teaching and their teaching self-efficacy

(Heppner, 1994). Despite doctoral students' reports of the benefits of doctoral teaching preparation, there is a lack of research about experiences of beginning counselor educators in translating the teaching skills they learned in their doctoral programs into their teaching as a faculty member.

Teaching Mentorship in Counselor Education

Mentorship also can help counselor educators in training and counselor educators improve their teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Heppner, 1994; Heppner & Johnston, 1994). For many of the participants in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study, the relationship between doctoral students and faculty members in coteaching was essential for participants to become more comfortable with the demands of teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016). This relationship helped participants to build confidence, acknowledge their mistakes, and refine their teaching approaches (Baltrinic et al., 2016). All of the participants in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study of coteaching in counselor education doctoral programs acknowledged that learning how to teach required guidance from a more experienced teacher. The exemplary teachers in Buller's (2013) study reported that feedback was valuable to them in improving their teaching. Receiving positive feedback on their teaching is one of the primary ways that graduate psychology instructors felt an increase in their self-efficacy beliefs about their teaching (Heppner, 1994). Additionally, mentorship is especially helpful to faculty members who have experienced marginalization in academia (Benishek et al., 2004; Casto et al., 2005).

Counselor educators have also reported wishing they had more mentoring in the development of their teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al.,

2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Hall and Hulse (2009) surveyed counselor educators about what would have helped them be better prepared as teachers and discovered they wanted more mentorship by experienced faculty, participation in a teaching practicum, more courses on college teaching, and more observation and feedback from faculty. Beginning counselor educators also reported that a lack of mentoring can lead to feelings of stress and isolation (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004).

Statement of the Problem

Several researchers have called for a closer examination of teaching in counselor education (Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Brackette, 2014; Pietrzak et al., 2008). Baltrinic, et al. (2016), Pietrazak et al. (2008), Hall and Hulse (2009) noted the importance of examining doctoral teaching preparation to better understand the ways that programs help future counselor educators improve their teaching. Numerous researchers also have argued for more extensive doctoral teaching preparation (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Heppner, 1994; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Lanning, 1990; Tollerud, 1990). Doctoral teaching preparation can help future counselor educators feel better prepared to teach (Hall & Hulse, 2009), increase their self-efficacy in teaching (Baltrinic, et al., 2016; Heppner, 1994; Tollerud, 1990), and increase their autonomy in teaching (Baltrinic, et al., 2016). Despite these observations, few researchers have examined teaching preparation practices of doctoral counselor education programs and looked in depth at how these experiences influence the teaching of beginning counselor educators.

Given the importance of teaching in counselor education (CACREP, 2016; Hall & Hulse, 2008; Lanning, 1990; Malott et al., 2014; Orr et al., 2008; Sexton, 1998; Urofsky & Bobby, 2012), there seems to be a need for a concerted effort to assess the current status of teaching development in counselor educators and more comprehensive support systems surrounding the development of teaching. Understanding the experiences of beginning counselor educators' doctoral teaching preparation experiences and experiences of teaching mentorship could be an important first step in fulfilling this need.

Purpose of the Study

The primary objectives of this study are to (a) understand the kinds of teaching preparation beginning counselor educators experienced during their doctoral program (b) identify doctor teaching preparation experiences and mentoring beginning counselor educators have received that were most beneficial to their development as teachers and (c) identify teaching-related experiences beginning counselor educators wish they had received during their doctoral preparation. Knowledge of beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation programs may contribute to more structured and systematic teaching training and mentoring for counselor educators. Before these changes can occur, however, an investigation of beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation and mentoring in the growth of their teaching is needed.

Research Questions

1. What kinds of teaching preparation did beginning counselor educators experience during their doctoral programs?

2. What doctoral teaching preparation experiences and mentoring have beginning counselor educators received that were most beneficial to their development as teachers?

3. What teaching-related experiences and mentorship do beginning counselor educators wish they had received during their doctoral preparation?

Need for the Study

Counselor educators play a critical role in preparing future counselors as well as future counselor educators. At the master's level, counselor educators often serve as students' first exposure to the field of counseling and the counseling skill set. To help adequately prepare students as future counselors, counselor educators must be able to create courses that result in high degrees of student learning. Therefore, the development of teaching in doctoral programs is central to the successful growth and development of counselors, as confirmed by the 2016 CACREP standards. However, researchers have rarely examined how counselor educators develop teaching. Investigating beginning counselor educators' experiences of growth in their teaching is an important first step towards improving methods of training and support for the development of teaching in future counselor educators.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms are defined.

- *Beginning counselor educators* are counselor educators in their second, third, or fourth years of full-time employment as a core faculty member in a CACREP accredited counseling program.

- *Doctoral teaching preparation* consists of any of a myriad of intentionally designed, teaching-related experiences that counselor educators took part in as part of their doctoral program, including teaching or coteaching a course, taking a class on teaching, completing a teaching practicum, receiving mentorship, guest lecturing, or being observed and provided with feedback of their teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009).

- *Mentoring* is any of a variety of supports that counselor educators and counselor educators in training receive from other faculty members and includes informal and formal mentoring and mentoring focusing on psychosocial and career domains (Borders et al., 2011). Although mentoring has a variety of purposes in counselor education, the present study focuses specifically on teaching-related mentoring.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is presented in five chapters. The first chapter provides an overview of the research on the development of teaching among beginning faculty in higher education, describes the need for the current study to adapt this research to the field of counselor education, and states research questions. The second chapter gives a detailed review of literature related to the topic of teaching in higher education and counselor education and the importance of mentoring and support systems that aid in their development. The third chapter describes the methods that were used to collect data on beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation programs, as well as information about participants and a description of the pilot study.

The fourth chapter presents the results of the current study. In the fifth chapter,

implications, limitations, and steps for future research are discussed.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching in Higher Education

Roles of Faculty Members in Higher Education

Faculty members in academia often are considered to be spending their time in three roles: research, teaching, and service. However, all of these purposes have not been present throughout the history of colleges and universities in the United States. In fact, faculty members in the United States' earliest colleges and universities focused mostly on teaching, often not spending any time on research or service. Although Boyer (1990) argued that each of these three roles should fit together, the three roles are not always viewed as intersecting. Instead each role is often considered its own separate sphere.

Traditionally, research represents making new discoveries through direct or indirect observation or experience deploying any of a variety of different methods. Research productivity can take on many forms, but in professional schools most often results in publications in peer reviewed research journals. Teaching is defined as both time spent actually teaching students and the preparation, planning, student meetings, and grading that is involved in teaching a course. Some view service as basically any other task that takes up faculty members' that is not related to teaching or research. Such activities might include serving on department or university committees, completing paperwork, and sponsoring student clubs. Ideally, however, Boyer (1990) views service

as a way to broaden the work of academics to the larger community, to make the knowledge and skills of academics have a utilitarian purpose capable of helping people and solving problems.

Rarely have all of these three roles been assigned equal merit (Boyer, 1990). At many institutions research productivity is the primary measure used to evaluate a faculty member for tenure and promotion. Additionally, faculty members are often more recognized and rewarded for their research efforts than for their service or teaching efforts (Bok, 2006). Being scholarly is recognized as being engaged in research and publication (Boyer, 1990). Research is often viewed as the most important way that faculty members gain prestige and advancement.

In his seminal book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate,* Boyer (1990) called for a redefinition of the three rigid roles of teaching, research, and service and a move away from the research versus teaching debate. Instead, he called for placing professors' work into 4 overlapping functions: (1) the scholarship of discovery, (2) the scholarship of integration, (3) the scholarship of application, and (4) the scholarship of teaching.

The scholarship of discovery includes the process of discovering new knowledge and the passion associated with the process (Boyer, 1990). This scholarship is important in the way that it contributes to human knowledge but also enhances the intellectual climate of a college or university (Boyer, 1990). This version of scholarship closely resembles the traditional idea of research but with a broader and less rigid focus (Boyer, 1990).

Boyer's (1990) scholarship of integration involves understanding what research findings mean, taking the knowledge gained through the scholarship of discovery and putting it into perspective. The scholarship of integration challenges faculty members to break outside of traditional disciplines which often value individual contributions over collaborative efforts. Boyer instead encouraged different fields to work together and to view knowledge in a practical and an interdisciplinary way which places that knowledge within a larger context (Boyer, 1990). Faculty members in this scholarship help academics and non-academics value the importance of knowledge in an accessible and engaging way (Boyer, 1990).

Boyer's (1990) scholarship of application demands that knowledge be applied to consequential problems with the purpose of being helpful to individuals and institutions. In this view, researchers should not work in isolation where they are following trails of knowledge just for the sake of knowledge, but rather must create knowledge that can be applied in a meaningful way to others outside of the field (Boyer, 1990). Accordingly, social problems define research agendas so that research can best be used to help solve problems (Boyer, 1990).

Service is praised but often given little attention in the academy and is often viewed as disconnected from what is considered serious academic work (Boyer, 1990). Often everything outside of the usual parameters of teaching and research, from sitting on committees to advising student clubs to attending departmental meetings to providing community service, becomes fodder for the service category. In opposition to this rigid view, Boyer (1990) makes a distinction between scholarship and citizenship. For service

to be considered scholarship, service activities must be connected to one's field of knowledge and the work must be serious, rigorous, and demanding as well as requiring accountability in a similar way to what is traditionally associated with research activities (Boyer, 1990).

Traditionally in higher education, teaching has been viewed as less important than research, as a duty that takes time away from the real work of doing research (Boyer, 1990). Some think of it as something almost anyone can do, something that does not require specialized skill or training. In fact, most teachers in higher education have little to no training in teaching (Bok, 2006; Mighty, 2013). In contrast, Boyer (1990) viewed the scholarship of teaching, which others have since expanded to the scholarship of teaching and learning, as just as important as other forms of scholarship. Teaching not only increases the knowledge of students, but excites them about the content and helps them learn how to think like scholars (Boyer, 1990). Effective teaching can have a major impact on students' lives, helping them become lifelong learners, think more creatively and critically, and inspire them to be future professors (Boyer, 1990). Ideally, professors should model learning and thinking in the ways they want for their students (Bain, 2004; Mighty, 2013) and use their teaching as a process that is connected to and enhances their other forms of scholarship (Boyer, 1990).

Current Teaching Practices in Higher Education

Even as college and university systems emphasize research, most individual faculty members do not always focus more on research than teaching. Although research scholarship has more extrinsic rewards than teaching, there are intrinsic satisfactions of

teaching that propel some faculty members to work harder at their teaching duties (Bok, 2006). In fact, faculty members who identify themselves as teachers before researchers outnumber those who identify themselves as researchers first (Boyer, 1990). On average, full-time faculty and instructional staff at four-year institutions spent fifty-seven percent of their time teaching in 2003. Research and scholarship accounted for twenty-two percent of their time and twenty-one percent of their time was spent on other activities (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Faculty members at institutions with masters programs, but no doctoral programs spent an average of sixty-seven percent of their time teaching whereas those at institutions with PhD programs spent fifty-one percent of their time on teaching (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). Faculty at institutions with doctoral programs spend an average of twenty-eight percent of their time on research activities (U.S. Department of Education, 2005).

Although faculty members, including those at research-focused institutions, spend more time on their teaching than on scholarship, research has more substantial impact on an individual's reputation and a department's prestige. Accordingly, research is viewed as more valuable in helping faculty members attain promotion and tenure (Boyer, 1990). College and university administrators often encourage research since it increases the reputation of the university (Bok, 2006). Academic departments are also hiring more non-full time faculty to teach courses than in the past. In 2013, in degree-granting institutions, only fifty percent of professional employees were full-time whereas full time faculty made up about seventy-eight percent of professional employees in 1970 (Snyder & Dillow, 2015). In many schools, more courses are now being taught by adjunct faculty

and graduate students than full time faculty (Arum & Roksa, 2011). This serves as a cost saving measure for colleges and universities but, within the research-focused culture of higher education, also implies that teaching can be handed off to others so that tenure-track faculty can have more time to dedicate to their research.

A wide variety of systems of evidence-based teaching practices exist in higher education literature. In a study conducted in 2008, Groccia and Buskist (2011) showed that the top five most used evidence-based teaching methods by college educators in order were cooperative learning in small groups (used by 59.1% of faculty members), using real-life problems (55.7%), extensive, non-student-centered lecturing (46.4%), group projects (35.8%), and multiple drafts of written work (24.9%). Such approaches are have been shown to increase student learning since there is a close relationship between the ways teachers teach and how students approach learning (Mighty, 2013). In other words, students tend to approach learning from a bucket-filling method when they are working in traditional, lecture-based classrooms and students tend to be more actively engaged and think more critically in a classroom where the instructor demands and models this kind of thinking (Mighty, 2013). Many of these systems have shown that they are able to produce more permanent and deeper student learning that traditional lecture-based methods of teaching where students passively listen (Mighty, 2013). However, college instructors are rarely encouraged to explore new teaching approaches (Bok, 2006).

This lack of support and focus on teaching in higher education might be driven by the culture of many institutions of higher education and the culture of doctoral

preparation programs that prepare faculty members to teach at those institutions. Success

in increasing student learning is seldom rewarded for either individual faculty members

or for administrators (Bok, 2006). Many faculty in research institutions have the

perception that teaching is an art that is either too simple, too individualized or too innate

to be taught to others in formal preparation (Bok, 2006). Consequently, institutions and

departments are often focused more on agendas that do not include helping supporting

instructors in the development of their teaching. Additionally, when faculty do talk about

their teaching, the conversation is often not about improvements in faculty members'

teaching. Colleges and universities often spend more time planning out their curriculum

as opposed to discussing pedagogy or instructional techniques, essentially focusing more

on what to teach and less on how to teach it (Bok, 2006). Although there is a wealth of

research available about evidence-based teaching in higher education (Groccia & Buskist,

2011), few colleges committees examine this research when having discussions about

curricula (Bok, 2006). Additionally, doctoral programs typically spend little time

focusing on fostering the development of their students' teaching. Even though many

faculty members state that they find more of a sense of purpose in their teaching than in

their research, doctoral preparation programs typically often offer little guidance on

developing instructional practices (Arum & Roksa, 2011; Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006). In

one survey, only 50 percent of doctoral students had either an opportunity to take a

teaching assistant's training course or to attend workshops and seminars about teaching in

their discipline (Golde & Dore, 2001). Doctoral preparation programs often exist only in

research-focused institutions and in departments without doctoral programs in which

faculty are often more focused on research than on teaching (Arum & Roksa, 2011; Bok, 2006). Many faculty members, especially those who seek out more teaching-focused institutions, might want more doctoral teaching preparation than their program offers.

Within this culture, faculty members may spend little time exploring research on teaching to improve their teaching. Many approach their teaching with a level of complacency in their own skills (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006). In fact, ninety percent of faculty members consider their teaching above average (Bok, 2006). These faculty are unlikely to be using up to date methods of teaching, often focusing on traditional lecture-based methods (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006). In fact, according to Mighty (2013), teaching practice are still overwhelmingly based on traditional lectures with an emphasis on content coverage that is inconsistent with current research on teaching and learning in higher education. College instructors also rarely have accurate assessments of student learning in their courses, which course evaluations do not typically illuminate (Bok, 2006). College instructors who decide to focus on improving their teaching often find that their institution views this as an endeavor that is left to the discretion of the individual professor (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006).

Many new faculty members report initially feeling overwhelmed and unsupported in their first few years of teaching (Boice, 1991; Magnuson, 2002). Boice (1991) interviewed new faculty members across disciplines throughout their first four years of teaching in higher education about their teaching and the support they have received in improving their teaching. Less than five percent of new faculty Boice (1991) surveyed in their first semesters of teaching could identify any sort of social network for discussing

teaching. They also almost universally did not have regular meetings with colleagues to discuss teaching (Boice, 1991). New faculty also reported rarely receiving collegial support surrounding teaching from more seasoned faculty members (Boice, 1991). Many participants wished they had received more concrete help on teaching such as past syllabi or strategies for how to cope with disruptive students (Boice, 1991).

Carson (2008) conducted focus groups with eighteen new female faculty members during their first year of hire in a university setting to better understand the challenges they faced. One-hundred percent of participants cited that they felt challenged by not feeling like they had enough time to complete all of the tasks that were required of them and especially struggled with finding time for research amidst their attending to the needs of students and preparing to teach. Class preparation and grading took more time than anticipated and often required having to learn or relearn course content and then prepare related instructional materials. Participants reported that time devoted to meeting students' needs well and caring about their students' welfare, including being available to meet with students, often took longer than they expected. Being constantly accessible to students was viewed as a doubled edged sword, where women sometimes felt disappointed in themselves when they devoted either too much or too little time to it. Women often felt high levels of frustration when the time related to teaching took away from time needed for research.

Similarly, Simmons (2011) interviewed seven pre-tenured university teachers across disciplines to understand their personal constructs of teaching in their specific contexts. All participants reported feeling underprepared to teach in their current role

regardless of prior teaching experience which contributed to them feeling increased stress (Simmons, 2011). All participants also reported stress and heavy workload in beginning their teaching roles, dedicating significant time to their teaching and often feeling overwhelmed (Simmons, 2011). All participants experienced their first year as faculty members as a time surrounded with stress and emotion (Simmons, 2011). Participants further along in their academic careers developed a greater sense of belonging, self-esteem, and a more congruent role among their different responsibilities (Simmons, 2011).

This lack of teaching preparation at the doctoral level often leaves new faculty members with inadequate teaching skills (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006). Many new faculty members approach their teaching largely from the basis of their personal experience as a student instead of using research-based methods (Boice, 1991). New faculty members often use a rapid-fire lecture approach, focused on presenting lots of facts and content in an organized manner, an approach that is at odds with current researcher about teaching and learning (Boice, 1991). New faculty are also more likely to blame external factors for their teaching frustrations such as poor students or heavy workloads and often do not actively see outside resources to improve their teaching (Boice, 1991). Appearing knowledgeable to students is one of their primary concerns (Boice, 1991). Consequently, new faculty members may not actively seek to improve their teaching since that would contradict others' perception of them as knowledgeable (Boice, 1991). New faculty members often feel reluctant to seek outside resources to improve their teaching and apprehensive about accurate assessments of their teaching from others (Boice, 1991).

Accordingly, Boice discovered throughout his interviews with the same faculty members across their first four years of teaching in higher education that most faculty members do not make any verifiable progress in terms of their comfort with teaching, efficacy with preparing to teach, and student acceptance of their teaching (Boice, 1991).

Robertson (1999) presented a developmental model for how professors view their teaching. In this model, professors start with an egocentric, teacher-centered view of teaching, moving to an aliocentric or learner-centered view, and finally to a systemocentric or teacher/learner-centered view of teaching (Robertson, 1999). From the perspective of egocentrism, professors focus on their own content mastery, replicate positive models of teaching that they have seen in their own experiences as a student and avoid negative models, and pay little attention to the learner's experiences (Robertson, 1999). Teachers with this perspective often project their own experiences as learners onto their students wanting to teach their classes in a way that appealed to them as students (Robertson, 1999). From the perspective of aliocentrism, professors are less focused on content, but now more interested in non-content concerns such as models of teaching and facilitating learning experiences often at the exclusion of their own experiences as facilitators (Robertson, 1999). Such teachers want to understand the pertinent characteristics of their students such as learning styles and personality types and empathize with their experiences (Robertson, 1999). Finally, teachers operating from a systemocentric perspective have a clear recognition of the way that their lived experiences interacts with the lived experiences of their students and intentionally use this dynamic to facilitate student learning. These teachers view themselves as learning

facilitators rather than as master learner and understand their role as a complex and dynamic interaction (Robertson, 1999).

In a survey of faculty with five or fewer years of teaching experience at one large university, Thoron et al. (2012) asked new faculty to rate their knowledge about and relevance of various teaching competencies to determine which competencies had the largest discrepancies between mean ratings of knowledge and relevance. They discovered that new faculty felt they were most lacking in knowledge of some "nuts and bolts" areas of their teaching including effective teaching fundamentals, active learning strategies, and student engagement (Thoron et al., 2012). Participants in the study who had less prior experience as a teaching assistant rated themselves as being even more lacking in knowledge surrounding these areas (Thoron et al., 2012).

Eighty-eight percent of participant in Carson's (2008) study also reported that they did feel effective in their teaching and that they would like to engage students more and make their classes more satisfying to both themselves and their students. Some participants reported feeling frustrated with rude behaviors, negative evaluations and rejection by students. They also struggled with understanding their students' intellectual abilities and tailoring their course design or assignments to help students be successful in their classes. Although this study had a small number of participants, it is still striking how widespread reports of feeling challenged with learning how to teach were among those who did not have a background in k-12 education. Had these participants been prepared to teach in more rigorous or different ways by their doctoral programs, maybe their experiences teaching during their first year might have been less challenging.

Yet, the lack of new faculty members' improvement in their teaching does not seem to result from a lack of time and effort. As evidenced by the amount of time they spend on teaching, professors as a whole care about their teaching (Bok, 2006). However, there is no necessity for them to reexamine their usual forms of instruction and experiment with pedagogy and teaching methods in an effort to increase student learning (Bok, 2006). Bok (2006) argues that professors often settle for the status quo in part because institutions often do not have effective ways of measuring student learning. Educators in higher education are not pushed to focus on student learning and collect data about what students learn in their classrooms. Increasing student learning is not a focus for many institutions because it does not increase the reputation of the institution as much as other factors (Bok, 2006). Administrators at colleges and universities are often more focused on raising the standing of the college by attracting brighter students with higher test scores, upgrading facilities, and recruiting professors with visible reputations for research (Bok, 2006). College administrators often gain more prestige and money for their schools through these more visible public relations endeavors than they do for increasing student learning (Bok, 2006). Consequently, less than one-third of all colleges nationwide conduct comprehensive evaluations of their general education programs (Bok, 2006). Even when these programs do conduct such evaluations, there is little evidence that their results inform any meaningful changes in their instructors' teaching (Bok, 2006).

Teaching at the Graduate Level

A great deal of the scholarship on teaching in higher education has focused on teaching undergraduates. Cassuto (2013) pointed out that scholarship proliferates on how to teach undergraduates, but that research articles on how to teach graduate students are few and far between. Semenza (2016) noted the absence of a pervasive professional discourse on teaching graduate students and a lack of training focused on how to teach graduate students. He argued that teaching graduate students is often overlooked because professors often assume that the skills required to teach undergraduates will transfer over to the graduate level or that teaching graduate students is merely a specialization in the profession (Semenza, 2016). Similarly, Cassuto (2013) wondered if her experience of having no grand pedagogical vision for teaching graduate courses is typical.

Many professors perceive teaching graduate courses as an easy reward compared to teaching undergraduate courses because graduate students are more mature, motivated, and possess higher level thinking skills (Cassuto, 2013; Knoblauch, 2010). Accordingly, some professors may put less time and effort into teaching graduate courses and allow their students to do more of the work (Cassuto, 2013). Cassuto (2013) argued that she has seen graduate professors who do not take responsibility for designing courses around the needs of their students, but instead operate in a seminar fashion where the students bounce from topic to topic with little direction.

Since counseling programs are taught at the graduate level, it is important to understand some of the unique challenges faced by graduate instructors. Since many graduate-level courses can last for three hours or longer, graduate teaching requires

strong time management skills to cover the sometimes staggering amount of material and readings (Semenza, 2016). Longer classes also can require a variety of different teaching methods to maintain student attention and engagement.

Many new teachers view teaching as dependent on having more knowledge than their students and feel anxious or like an imposter when they doubt their own expertise or knowledge (Boice, 1991; Knoblauch, 2010; Semenza, 2016). Since graduate students can be closer in age and knowledge level to their professors, a new teacher's anxiety might be heightened in comparison to teaching undergraduates (Semenza, 2016). Since many new faculty members overload their students with information to compensate for their anxiety of not feeling like enough of an expert (Boice, 1991), content becomes the primary focus in their classes. Cassuto (2013) argued that this dynamic also happens in graduate level teaching. In their desire to remain content-focused and cover enough information, many graduate instructors cram too much information into a brief time in their classes that often leads to less knowledge transfer and retention for their students (Cassuto, 2013). Instead, as Semenza (2016) acknowledged, graduate student learning should be more self-directed than undergraduate work and requires a shift in teaching methods. Cassuto (2013) agrees that it is important for graduate students to not only learn material, but also engage with the material through practice. Some graduate professors assume that their students have mastered basic research skills and do not set aside time to teach these skills (Cassuto, 2013). In reality many graduate students first need to be taught the basic skills of conducting research and the be given the opportunities to practice those skills (Cassuto, 2013). Semenza (2016) argues that graduate courses have an obligation to go beyond

teaching subject content to including professional-development skills such as professional writing. Teaching at the graduate level requires creating assignments that are practical and applicable to the future professional activities of their students (Semenza, 2016).

Teaching in Counselor Education

The 2009 Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards stated that counselor educators are responsible for helping students be prepared to learn evidence-based counseling practices. Although the new 2016 standards have abandoned language of evidence-based practices (CACREP, 2016), the 2009 CACREP standards represented a major shift in CACREP from teacher input-based objectives to student learning outcome objectives (Urofsky & Bobby, 2012). These standards are framed in terms of what students will learn and what they do with their learning experiences (Urofsky & Bobby, 2012). Counselor education programs accredited under the 2009 CACREP standards are responsible for demonstrating student learning and the ways they measure student learning in a variety of different areas (Urofsky & Bobby, 2012). To become accredited or reaccredited, programs must submit comprehensive assessment plans that detail the procedures by which they will assess individual student learning and how they will conduct program evaluation (Urofsky & Bobby, 2012). Measuring specific, demonstrated student learning requires greater accountability in pushing counselor educators to show evidence of how their teaching strategies and skills impact students. In turn, counselor educators can use this information about student learning to improve their teaching.

With this shift in focus to student learning outcomes, the 2009 CACREP standards focused more on how doctoral students in counselor education are prepared for teaching. These standards required that doctoral students have certain teaching skills by the time they graduate. Specifically, doctoral students should be able to "demonstrate course design, delivery, and evaluation methods appropriate to course objectives" (Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and Supervision, Section IV, D.2). The proposed 2016 CACREP standards add a number of specific teaching skills as part of doctoral programs. According to these future standards, doctoral programs must cover "pedagogy and teaching methods," "models of adult learning and development," and "assessment of learning" (Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and Supervision, Section VI, B.3). However, there is still a dearth of literature about how counselor educators develop these teaching skills (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Given the importance of this new focus on student learning outcomes and the expanding requirements of teaching in the 2016 CACREP standards, counseling programs need to understand how counselor educators develop teaching.

Yet, it seems that future counselor educators may not receive adequate teaching training during their doctoral programs (Hall & Hulse, 2009; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Teaching is often as an area of great challenge for counselor educators in their first two years of full-time employment, where they felt overwhelmed and inadequately trained in teaching (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall and Hulse, 2009; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004). Many new counselor educators wish they had more training in teaching (Magnuson et al., 2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). For example, in a follow up

study by Magnuson et al. (2004) in which they interviewed first and second year new assistant professors, participants commented that they were challenged by developing the necessary teaching skills and did not feeling like they were well trained in teaching methods. Although many universities have new faculty orientation programs (Malott et al. 2014), many new faculty members still feel lacking in their teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009; Magnuson et al. 2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009).

Beginning counselor educators typically struggle through an often frustrating, trial and error process of developing their teaching during the first few years of full-time employment (Buller, 2013; Magnuson, 2002). Buller (2013) found that on the job teaching experience was one of the primary ways that exemplary teachers in counselor education learned to teach, and was both beneficial and challenging. These professors relied on their resilience and capacity to learn from their earlier teaching experiences (Buller, 2013). Beginning counselor educators also find teaching to be a time and energy consuming process (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2009). Even though counselor educators spend a significantly greater amount of time in teaching activities than they do in scholarship or service activities (Davis et al., 2006), developing teaching is not a priority in some counselor education doctoral preparation programs (Zimpfer et al., 1997).

This is of particular interest since counselor educators spend a statistically significantly greater amount of time in teaching activities than they do in scholarship or service (Davis et al., 2006). With the myriad responsibilities that first year counselor educators have, it is critical to prepare them in their doctoral programs to immediately

assume teaching roles and responsibilities as beginning faculty members. Although

beginning a research and publication agenda is a vital imperative at many institutions,

research is more of a process that takes time to evolve. Classroom teaching, on the other

hand, begins in the very first semester of a faculty member's academic career and

requires attention every week.

Roles of Counselor Educators

Traditionally, working as a professor in higher education has been broken down

into the three roles of teaching, research, and service (Boyer, 1990). Successful faculty

members must be skilled and accomplished in each of these areas to be successful in

terms of achieving promotion and tenure (Davis et al., 2006). The 2016 CACREP

standards show that the field of counseling has similar, but expanded expectations in

stating that doctoral programs must be able to "prepare graduates to work as counselor

educators, supervisors, researchers, and practitioners in academic and clinical settings"

(Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and Supervision, Section VI, A). Furthermore,

in the 2016 CACREP standards (Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and

Supervision, Section B) identifies counselor educator roles as comprised of counseling,

supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy. Although

all of these roles are important to being a counselor educator, the study at hand will focus

on the teaching role of counselor educators and the development of skills within that role.

Traditionally, in U.S. colleges and universities, research has been arguably the

most emphasized role. This dynamic seems to hold true in counselor education where

scholarship may be weighted more heavily in promotion and tenure decisions (Ramsey et

al., 2002). Within the last twenty-five years, fueled by the ideas of Boyer (1990), many researchers across disciplines have been calling for a reexamination of the definition of scholarship so that the kind of work that qualifies as scholarship is more integrated and flexible.

As Boyer's ideas have been endorsed by the majority of counselor educators (Davis et al., 2006), it seems that counselor educators in general understand their teaching as a critical and often overlooked role. Although it seems that many counselor educators understand the importance of teaching and put many hours of work into their own teaching (Davis et al., 2006), the field as a whole lacks empirical studies on teaching in general and specifically on how teaching is developed in counselor educators (Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Sexton, 1998). Sexton (1998) argued that counselor educators need to use more up to date pedagogy instead of focusing on teaching approaches based mostly on history and tradition as opposed to current research. A variety of existing institutional and systematic structures may present obstacles to having a broader and more rigorous focus on teaching. For example, information about improving counselor educators teaching is shared in formats other than peer reviewed research, such as conference presentations, book chapters, or informal discussions. Given the importance of teaching in counselor education (CACREP, 2016; Hall & Hulse, 2008; Lanning, 1990; Malott et al., 2014; Orr et al., 2008; Sexton, 1998; Urofsky & Bobby, 2012), there seems to be a need for a concerted effort to assess the current status of teaching development in counselor educators and more comprehensive information and support systems surrounding the development teaching.

Within the field of counselor education, Lanning (1990) called for an expansion of the roles of counselor educators through a shift in the curriculum of doctoral counseling programs. With the purpose of reforming counselor education doctoral programs with an emphasis on teaching as a central domain, Lanning (1990) proposed the educator-practitioner model for counselor education doctoral programs. He argued that this would strengthen the identity of the counseling profession by producing doctoral graduates who know how to teach aspiring counselors the skills and knowledge necessary to be effective practitioners (Lanning, 1990). Whereas previously doctoral programs had focused on training in mostly clinical skills, Lanning (1990) argued that to cement the identity of the profession it was critical that counseling train educators who could pass along the counseling identity to future counselors. He divided the responsibilities of counselor educators into four categories: (1) teaching, (2) supervision, (3) systematic inquiry, and (4) advanced practice of counseling and emphasized that a counselor educator must be skilled in each of these domains (Lanning, 1990). Accordingly, he argued for more systematic preparation of teaching in doctoral programs, including at least one teaching practicum where students would learn how to teach before teaching a class themselves (Lanning, 1990). In contrast to counseling psychology whose doctoral programs were focusing mostly on clinical practice, Lanning (1990) argued that counselor education could stay relevant by emphasizing high quality teaching to train more effective counselors.

Teaching is an important part of counselor educators' work and has value in a myriad of ways. Rogers et al. (1998) examined faculty selection criteria in counselor

education programs. They found that teaching experience ranked as the third most important criteria for hiring a candidate, higher than publication activity. Additionally, Newgent and Fender-Scarr (1999) also stated the importance of teaching experience and skill the marketability of counselor educators seeking to be hired into faculty positions. Davis et al. (2006), surveyed CACREP liaisons regarding the importance they placed on service, teaching, and scholarship in promotion and tenure decisions at their institutions. Respondents perceived that there was a relatively equal emphasis on each of the three functions as part of faculty members' responsibilities (Davis et al., 2006). This perception of equal emphasis also held true for liaisons in both doctoral programs and master's-only programs and across liaisons at different ranks (Davis et al., 2006). Even though scholarship is popularly considered most important for achieving tenure, these counselor educators said they perceived that spending more time on preparing for teaching was equally important for tenure (Davis et al. 2006).

Davis et al., (2006) also surveyed counselor educator CACREP liaisons about how much time they spent in with teaching, service, and research related activities. Respondents reported that assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors all spent a significantly greater percentage of time in teaching activities than in scholarship or service activities (Davis et al. 2006). Davis et al. (2006) also acknowledge the time that beginning faculty must take the time necessary to start from scratch in some of their teaching skills such as developing new syllabi and preparing course materials. Although teaching is time consuming, it is possible that beginning counselor educators spend a large amount of time on it because they must develop teaching ability and

knowledge that they do not have when they start their first faculty positions. Maybe more mentoring and training in teaching during their doctoral programs would help allow beginning counselor educators more time to spend on scholarship and service. This extra time and the potential greater self-efficacy in their teaching abilities from feeling better prepared could also help reduce stress in pretenured counselor educators.

Additionally, many of the CACREP liaisons in Davis et al.'s study (2006) strongly endorsed Boyer's (1990) broader view of scholarship as a more flexible model for decision making about promotion and tenure. If the perception is that counselor educators should spend an equal amount of time on teaching, research, and service in accordance with Boyer's (1990) ideas of scholarship, then it is puzzling why there is so little research regarding how to develop and improve teaching to help faculty members achieve tenure and promotion. Research has been conducted regarding how counselor education programs develop research skills in doctoral students (Borders et al., 2014; Lambie & Vaccaro, 2010) and how they can be supported and mentored as researchers (Borders et al., 2012). However, few studies address how counselor educators can develop as teachers. Additionally similar fields are having such conversations about the scholarship of teaching and learning such as social work (East & Chambers, 2007; Wehbi, 2009) and psychology (Buskist & Smith, 2008; Gurung et al., 2008; Halpern et al., 1998).

However, it is important to view Davis et al.'s (2006) study with caution. They only surveyed CACREP liaisons about their perceptions of requirements for promotion and tenure, rather than getting perceptions of assistant and associate faculty members.

Therefore, their findings might not represent the perceptions of assistant and associate faculty members or actual practices. Additionally, since it only looks at perceptions, this study might not present an accurate picture of the actual productivity required of counselor educators to achieve tenure. Along similar lines, Zimpfer et al. (1997) surveyed coordinators of doctoral programs in counselor education to better understand what they most emphasized in their programs among the five roles of clinical practice, supervision, teaching, research, and leadership. Teaching preparation was nearly unanimously considered important as ninety-eighty percent of respondents reported that they had at least some emphasis on preparing students in teaching. More than a third of programs placed a strong emphasis on teaching as they stated that they emphasized teaching as between twenty-one and forty percent of their programs relative to the other four roles. About twelve percent of programs emphasized teaching at a higher rate than forty percent. Overall about thirty-seven percent of doctoral program coordinators considered teaching as a central focus of their program relative to the other roles. Additionally, the average ratings of participants on the importance of doctoral practicum or internship experiences in instruction lagged behind the average importance ratings of practicum or internship experiences in counseling, supervision, and research and scholarship. However, this may be due to the fact that many doctoral programs do not offer an internship or practicum in teaching or offer experiences less structured or formal than a practicum or internship. However, coteaching was rated by faculty as one of the top three most important ways that faculty can mentor doctoral students.

Although Zimpfer et al. (1997) discovered that that teaching is considered important in almost all counselor education doctoral programs, there was also a great deal of variability in how important counselor education programs viewed teaching compared to other roles. Yet, it also seems striking that nearly across the board programs placed some level of importance on clinical practice, supervision, teaching, and research. A well-rounded counselor educator will be skilled in all of these roles even as the research and doctoral preparation might not always reflect this balance of emphasis.

Research on Teaching in Counselor Education

Although few researchers have examined counselor educators' development of teaching, many studies examine the experiences of counseling students and assess their level of preparation. Researchers have examined the curriculum and level of preparation of master's students in areas including school counseling (Akos & Scarborough, 2004) and crisis counseling (Barrio Minton & Pease-Carter, 2010). Researchers have also examined the experiences of doctoral students in counselor education, including counselor educators' experiences of doctoral training in supervision (Nelson et al., 2006) and their first semester (Hughes & Kleist, 2005). However, few have examined teaching and the student level of preparation at the doctoral level (Barrio Minton et al., 2014) and there is a dearth of research exists examining counselor educators' doctoral training in teaching.

Although many recent articles also exist on teaching and learning in counselor education, but those articles are much more likely to discuss teaching from the perspective of students' experiences of the class instead of from the perspective of

44

counselor educators' teaching development. In a content analysis, Barrio Minton et al. (2014) examined hundreds of articles about teaching and learning in counselor education from 2001 to 2010. These articles often addressed a variety of different pedagogical techniques in counselor education including constructivist or social and situation learning theories, critical pedagogics including transformative learning, liberation pedagogy, and feminist pedagogy, motivation and humanistic learning theories including experiential education, and service-learning, active learning, and multimedia-based pedagogies. Yet, there was a dearth of literature in this study that looked at teaching from a broader, field-wide perspective, including almost no articles looking at how counselor educators develop teaching knowledge and skills and how they can best be mentored in such endeavors throughout their careers (Barrio Minton et al., 2014).

Barrio Minton et al. (2014) also revealed a bleak picture about theoretically-grounded and empirically-based teaching research. Barrio Minton et al. (2014) defined an empirical study as representing "a systematic inquiry that included formulation of research questions, clear methodology, explicated data analysis, and presentation of results" (p. 171). The authors discovered that only 32% of the articles they analyzed were empirical. Of those that were empirical, the majority focused on satisfaction studies with only ten percent of articles in the study evaluating student learning outcomes (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Most of the empirical studies showed a strong gravitation towards satisfaction and other indirect measures of student learning (Barrio Minton et al., 2014) even as student learning outcomes have now become a critical part of the CACREP standards (2009). Additionally, only fifteen percent of the articles were clearly grounded

in learning theory or instructional research (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). There was also a lack of empirical rigor shown in the majority of articles in the way they trended towards publishing specific content or techniques as opposed to examining teaching and learning practices throughout the profession (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Finally, there is also a lack of research on how counselor educators can best teach doctoral students (Barrio Minton et al., 2014) and, in turn, little understanding of how doctoral programs prepare students to teach. It is difficult to understand what constitutes growth teaching in counselor education without research that focuses on the field more broadly and that uses more rigorous research methodology.

The expansion of requirements regarding doctoral teaching preparation in the 2016 CACREP standards might push the field towards more examination of teaching, but programs attempting to fulfill the requirements of these new standards currently have a limited research base. Therefore, to meet these standards, it is critical for counselor education to better understand how doctoral programs address the development of teaching and how counseling programs mentor faculty in the development of their teaching. Orr et al.'s (2008) development of the collaborative teaching teams model to help train doctoral students in counselor education serves as a practical start to facilitating the improvement of teaching in counselor education. However, research on teaching in counselor education has not gone beyond proposing programs to help prepare teachers to a more comprehensive understanding of how best to mentor counselor educators in the development of their teaching.

Beginning Counselor Educators

Stressors of Beginning Counselor Educators

While balancing a variety of different roles, attempting to discover an identity in the department, navigating departmental and institutional politics, and attempting to achieve promotion and tenure, the first few years of working as a professor can be filled with stress for many. Working in the context of higher education often comes along with a variety of stressors including role overload, insufficient feedback, inadequate resources, lack of collegial support and unrealistic expectations (Hill, 2004). This strain can lead to lower productivity, decreased interactions with students, and decreased involvement in decision making about university and departmental issues (Hill, 2004). Pretenured faculty also face a variety of unique challenges including wasting time, work overload, burnout, stress-related health problems, lowered work productivity, inability to cope, and interpersonal conflict (Hill, 2004). Olsen and Crawford (1998) surveyed pretenured faculty and discovered that somewhere between twenty-one percent to forty-six percent identified their work as "very stressful." Typically, there also is a lack of resources available to support pretenured faculty members at overcoming these challenges (Hill, 2004).

It seems that many of these stressors also hold true for pretenured counselor educators. Magnuson (2002) surveyed thirty-eight new assistant professors at both midyear and the end of their first year about their experiences of their first year as a counselor educator. She discovered that, at both time points, more than fifty percent of participants reported a seven or higher stress level on a scale of one to ten. A follow up

study of new assistant professors in their first two years showed similar stress levels throughout both years, with stress increasing on average for participants by the second year (Magnuson et al., 2004). Although the change was not statistically significant, second year new assistant professors commented that their work load increased during the second year as they were given more professional demands including participating in more committees and teaching more courses (Magnuson et al., 2004).

The following two sections describe two specific stressors that are especially relevant to the development of teaching in pretenured counselor educators. Although they are far from the only ones experienced by pretenured counselor educators, both time management and adjusting to a new department and a new role represent two stressors that stand out as pertinent to the development of teaching.

Time management. Managing time and prioritizing tasks is one of the primary requirements of a pretenured professor if they are to find success (Olsen, 1993). Pretenured faculty in higher education must also figure out how to balance multiple demands on their time, including demands with varying timelines and purposes (Hill, 2004). For example, research often demands long-term goals while preparing to teach a class requires short-term goals. It can be difficult for new professors to balance these conflicting demands (Hill, 2004; Sorcinelli, 1994). For eighty-three percent of first year college faculty in one study, stress related to busyness during their first year resulted in physical and emotional symptoms including fatigue, insomnia, and anxiety attacks (Turner & Boice, 1987). Beginning faculty members reported similar results about stress resulting from lack of time in another study (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992). Respondents in

this study reported a decline in their ability to balance their time among conflicting demands and nearly half reported a deterioration of their health (Olsen & Sorcinelli, 1992).

First year assistant professors in counselor educators also reported time management to be one of their most significant stressors in Magnuson's (2002) study. This often included balancing family and personal time with the demands of their work and the pressure to make a positive impression on their colleagues and their students (Magnuson, 2002). Specifically, finding time for the variety of different responsibilities and especially finding a balance between teaching and research were major stressors for many participants (Magnuson, 2002). In a follow up study of these counselor educators' third year, Magnuson et al. (2006) discovered that heavy workloads and balancing responsibilities were some of the respondents' most cited dissatisfactions with their work. By the longitudinal cohort of counselor educators' sixth year, many remarked feeling stressed by a continuous stream of work to be done and never enough time to do it combined with balancing the conflicting roles of service, teaching, and scholarship (Magnuson et al., 2009).

Many participants described the long term pressures of publishing their research and achieving promotion and tenure as daunting and at odds with the more immediate tasks of teaching and adjusting to their new department and responsibilities (Magnuson, 2002). These pressures were not expressed or were expressed less intensely when participants talked about their teaching responsibilities. Although counselor educators often spend more time on their teaching than on their research (Davis et al., 2006), it

seems that the pressure to publish research may create more anxiety (Magnuson, 2002).

Davis et al. (2006) speculated that the publish or perish anxiety surrounding research for many counselor educators might result from the fact that it is the most challenging of the three domains in which to find success. Since acceptance of a manuscript for publication is outside of a counselor educators' control and is subject to high standards of research quality, they often experience heightened anxiety about their ability to publish successfully (Magnuson et al., 2009).

Success in teaching is also measured differently from success in research. Success in teaching is most often measured by teaching evaluations and peer observations which typically involve qualitative or scaled components. In contrast, research is typically measured in only all or nothing quantitative ways, based on the number of articles published. Yet, there is still a lack of research surrounding how beginning counselor educators balance these different roles. More research is needed to understand how counselor educators navigate the pressures of teaching and publication and how this process impacts the development of their teaching.

Adjusting to a new department and a new role. The first few years of an academic appointment require socialization regarding the culture of the department and the work environment and the development of a more realistic sense of what the career entails (Olsen, 1993). Additionally, this adjustment can be complicated by feelings of loneliness, isolation, and insufficient mentoring from senior faculty members (Sorcinelli, 1994).

The first year assistant professors in counselor education surveyed in Magnuson's (2002) study often conceptualized their first year similarly, as an adjustment to a new identity where they were transitioning to new roles. Many of these first year assistant professors stated that they felt more anxiety, stress, and loneliness in feeling unsettled and uncertain in their new role even as they realized that it takes a while to make connections in their new role (Magnuson, 2002). Despite the stress, many of the participants also reported exponential learning during this period of adjustment (Magnuson, 2002). This process also involved understanding and adjusting to the culture and politics of their department and the university bureaucracies (Magnuson, 2002).

Navigating departmental and institutional politics can be an especially challenging part of the job for pretenured counselor educators (Magnuson et al., 2009). Third year assistant professors in Magnuson et al.'s (2006) follow up study cited university political climates as their most frequently source of dissatisfaction. By their sixth year as assistant professors, counselor educators in Magnuson et al.'s (2009) final longitudinal study typically had more negative comments than positive comments about relationships in their work. These negative comments included those about unsupportive administration, hierarchical leadership, demoralizing evaluation processes, lack of collaboration, departmental disorganization, frequent conflict, and lack of appreciation for their work (Magnuson et al., 2009).

Similarly, Protivnak and Foss's (2009), who interviewed counselor education doctoral students about their experiences in their doctoral programs, discovered that many participants talked about having to compromise their values to assimilate into their

department culture. These pressures can be more difficult for international and non-white participants who felt like they had to fit in by suppressing parts of their culture (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Much like the competitive nature of achieving tenure and promotion as a counselor educator, this stress was often complicated by a competitive environment that compared students to one another (Protivnak & Foss, 2009).

Many beginning counselor educators claim they would benefit from having more mentoring in the often stressful transition into a new position (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004). Although mentoring of pretenured counselor educators will be discussed in a later chapter, one possible way of easing the adjustment of new counselor educators into their new role would be to better prepare them to teach. Given that many counselor educators have reported not feeling prepared in teaching by their doctoral preparation programs (Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2006; Protivnak & Foss, 2009), their adjustments to new departments could be easier if they felt more confident about their teaching abilities and more knowledgeable about teaching techniques. Counselor educators who feel more confident in their abilities to teach might feel less stress and might have more time where they are able to spend on other tasks instead of researching and reflecting on teaching. Of course, reflection upon teaching is a continuous process throughout a career. Yet, if teaching activities are how counselor educators spend the majority of their time (Davis et al., 2006), it might help counselor educators feel more prepared and confident in their teaching if they spend more time developing it in their doctoral programs.

The Development of Teaching in Counselor Education

Many researchers have called for counselor education to more closely examine teaching and faculty training surrounding teaching (Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Brackette, 2014; Pietrzak et al., 2008). Pietrazak et al. (2008) also discussed the importance of examining doctoral teaching preparation to better understand the ways that programs help future counselor educators improve their knowledge base in pedagogy and develop their teaching. However, there is still a dearth of literature that looks at teaching in counselor education from a perspective that goes beyond individual class activities or discussions of specific pedagogies (Barrio Minton et al., 2014) and focuses instead on broader issues of the development of teaching throughout the field.

Although there is limited research about how counselor educators and aspiring counselor educators develop in teaching, many beginning counselor educators desire more mentoring in the development of their teaching. Counselor educators in their first few years often find teaching to be challenging and time consuming (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2009). The first year assistant professors in Magnuson's (2002) study reported that planning for their classes took a significant amount of their energy and time. These participants mentioned that preparing exams, strengthening syllabi, determining fair grades and giving feedback were challenging tasks (Magnuson, 2002). Many of these participants felt like they were learning teaching by trial and error in their first few years as an assistant professor (Magnuson, 2002). Many beginning counselor educators develop their teaching based upon their own learning style and from their preferred counseling theories (Castellano, 2002), methods which are often

not research based and might not take into account students' needs and learning styles. Although teaching is a challenging endeavor, the challenge experienced by beginning counselor educators in developing their teaching is striking since teaching skills can be taught and improved with practice, reflection, and knowledge (McGowan & Graham, 2009).

Departmental or institutional politics also sometimes played a role in holding back counselor educators from being able to develop their teaching. Some participants in Protivnak and Foss's (2009) study felt that their program demands conformity to the viewpoints of the department instead of encouraging students to think in critical and reflective ways. Often this might be accompanied by doctoral students navigating political landmines or dealing with difficult professors without wanting to risk their reputation in the field by offending this person (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Similarly, one counselor educator in Magnuson et al.'s (2009) study of sixth year counselor educators stated that departmental pedagogical decisions were often made based upon someone's convenience.

For many counselor educators, teaching also represents one of their primary sources of satisfaction with their career. The first year assistant professors surveyed by Magnuson (2002) reported teaching as a primary source of satisfaction with their job in the ways they receive validation from students and satisfaction in witnessing growth and learning take place. Third and sixth year counselor educators in Magnuson et al.'s (2006; 2009) subsequent studies found witnessing students' growth to be a major factor in their sense of satisfaction in their career. This seems to indicate that, for many, effective

teaching might be linked with a sense of satisfaction in their work and that being better teachers could contribute to assistant professors in counselor education being more satisfied with their careers. If assistant professors are able to more quickly find success in their teaching, it might help ease the adjustment into the role as a counselor educator and reduce stress.

Throughout many years of experience teaching, counselor educators believe they develop stronger teaching. Magnuson et al.'s 2009 study, which examined counselor educators after working for six years, found that participants consistently felt that they had become much more skilled as teachers with higher expectations of their students and more rigorous instruction. When comparing these comments about teaching to the same participants' comments in earlier studies, counselor educators seem to be learning teaching throughout their time as counselor educators and often arrive at strong foundation of teaching ability by their sixth year. The level of confidence expressed in their teaching also seems to indicate a distinct change from the nervous and frustrated comments in earlier studies (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2004; Magnuson et al., 2006). This distinction suggests that counselor educators may not begin their first years well trained in teaching, but rather learn the "nuts and bolts" of teaching through trial and error. Possibly with more rigorous teaching training beginning in doctoral programs, counselor educators might be better able to enter into their first year as assistant professors with the skills they need to be more effective teachers right away.

Mentoring in Counselor Education

Receiving mentorship from others can be a critical component to the success of beginning counselor educators. Many researchers within the field of counselor education have recognized mentoring as important (Benishek et al., 2004; Borders et al., 2011; Casto et al., 2005). Mentorship can also be a way that counselor educators can improve their teaching (Heppner, 1994; Heppner & Johnston, 1994). Pretenured counselor educators regularly receive research mentorship (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008), yet they are often unlikely to receive adequate teaching mentorship (Magnuson et al., 2009). It is also critical to beginning counselor educators who have experienced marginalization in academia (Benishek et al., 2004; Casto et al., 2005).

Mentorship can also have professional and emotional benefits for counselor educators. Although many of the first year counselor educators interviewed in Magnuson's (2002) study experienced high levels of stress, some stated that connectedness with others including other faculty members in their department led to more job satisfaction despite the stress. Third year assistant professors in counselor education in Magnuson et al.'s (2009) study stated that strong mentoring, both going back to their doctoral program and in their current department, has been a major contributor to their success and satisfaction in their current position. However, others in the study felt frustrated and isolated with the lack of mentorship that they have received in their career (Magnuson et al., 2009). Many doctoral students in Protivnak and Foss's (2009) study found mentoring to be a helpful experience in their doctoral programs. Participants stated that support and encouragement, inspiration from their mentor's

passion to keep moving forward, and opportunities for collaboration were among the main benefits of their mentorship (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Other students in the study were frustrated by a lack of mentorship or dissatisfaction with their mentorship.

Similarly, Magnuson (2002) found that other faculty members often were central in providing support that alleviated stress, anxiety, and loneliness as beginning counselor educators were starting a new position. Faculty members provided this mentorship by helping the participants get acclimated to the new environment and their new identity, offering validation and kindness, giving small gifts, suggesting practical solutions, and allowing participants to have a voice immediately in departmental meetings (Magnuson, 2002). However, several of the first year assistant professors in Magnuson's (2002) study stated that they wished their current departments provided them with a more structured mentoring program. In Magnuson et al.'s follow up study (2004), they found that numerous new assistant professors were frustrated by the lack of mentoring, opportunities for co-authorship, and sharing of resources from other faculty members. With this in mind, Magnuson et al. (2004) recommended that counselor education departments provide formal and informal mentoring opportunities to beginning counselor educators in their first year and in subsequent years. The participants who had these sort of mentorship experiences were most satisfied with their jobs at the beginning of their third year as a counselor educator.

Mentorship can also help beginning counselor educators improve their teaching. Participants in Buller's (2013) study reported that feedback was valuable to exemplary teachers in counselor education in improving their teaching. Feedback from both other

teachers and from students was valuable since participants were learning to teach through on the job training (Buller, 2013). Participants in Magnuson et al.'s (2006) study of experiences of third year counselor educators found that counselor educators valued preparation in teaching including test construction, grading, and planning. Receiving positive feedback on their teaching is one of the primary ways that graduate psychology instructors perceived an increase in their self-efficacy beliefs surrounding their teaching (Heppner, 1994). Additionally, teaching practicums or internship experiences significantly increase students' knowledge of teaching and their teaching self-efficacy (Heppner, 1994). Receiving feedback from peers and co-instructors and sharing their own ideas were particularly helpful in preparing counselor education doctoral students to teach (Heppner, 1994; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011).

Given these benefits of teaching mentorship, Magnuson et al. (2004) recommended that new assistant professors need to be provided with assistance related to their teaching. Heppner (1994) recommended that mentors of teachers in training should focus on building students' self-efficacy in teaching to enhance their skill development. A practicum experience where students are able to have a safe place to express their feelings and thoughts about teaching can go a long way in helping teachers feel supported and confident in their teaching (Heppner, 1994).

Borders et al. (2011) discussed good practices within a counselor education program when it comes to mentoring promotion/tenure seeking faculty in teaching. One critical part of effective mentorship is giving feedback on performance (Borders et al., 2011) Accordingly, Borders et al. (2011) recommended pretenure counselor educators

receive at least one peer review of a class session each year where they get specific feedback on their teaching. Additionally, beginning faculty member should receive mentoring when it comes to developing their teaching including being connected with teaching-related campus programs and resources, observing other faculty members teaching, and attending conference presentations on teaching. These suggested practices demonstrate that beginning counselor educators need mentoring and feedback in developing their teaching to become well rounded and tenure counselor educators.

Heppner and Johnston (1994) recommended peer consultation as a useful way of obtaining student feedback in a class to help beginning counselor educators improve their teaching. In this process, faculty members pair up with a peer consultant who goes into their partner's classroom by themselves to facilitate student feedback on the course and instructor. The peer consultant leads students in conducting an activity and discussion their experiences of the course. The peer consultant then writes up a report about the student feedback and presents it to the faculty member while helping him or her process how best to use the feedback to improve their teaching. All participants in the study found this feedback as helpful and often commented that this process was able to produce feedback from students that they would not usually receive from students by themselves. Feedback became more specific, detailed, and focused when bringing in the peer consultant. In turn, the peer consultation process resulted in useful pedagogical improvements, including enhancing the sense of community in the classroom by drawing more attention to the process the class was engaged in together (Heppner & Johnston, 1994).

Heppner (1994) interviewed five doctoral graduate instructors in a psychology program to assess the teaching mentorship they were receiving during their programs. Graduate student instructors in the study had taught an average of five college courses previously but still indicated at the beginning of their teaching practicum that they had limited knowledge of a number of topics important to teaching. Teaching experience alone it seems does not always lead to improved teaching, but through the experience of receiving feedback through even one semester long teaching practicum showed significant improvements in a number of their previously underdeveloped teaching abilities. Students also reported that mentoring from faculty and peers were helpful aspects of their teaching internships. Most respondents also thought that weekly supervision surrounding their teaching and teaching courses were helpful. Students responded that with a teaching internship they felt well prepared to teach including feeling skilled in presenting content and using classroom management strategies. The teaching practicum also represented a safe place for doctoral students to take risks in their teaching by implement new teaching methods and pedagogies and, in turn, experience growth in their teaching.

Doctoral Teaching Preparation Programs in Counselor Education

In facing learning teaching in the first few years as a counselor educator through trial and error, many beginning counselor educators have remarked that they wished they were better prepared for teaching by their doctoral teaching preparation programs (Hall & Hulse, 2009; Magnuson et al., 2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Participants in Magnuson et al.'s (2006) study of experiences of third year counselor educators found that counselor

60

educators valued doctoral preparation they received in teaching including test construction, grading, and planning.

Barrio Minton and Price (2015) conducted a three phase study to analyze teacher preparation in counselor education doctoral programs. Phase one of their study included an initial review of public documents including program websites, catalogues, and handbooks (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). Phase two of the study included a survey of CAREP liaisons and phase three was a content analysis of syllabi of teaching courses (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). The authors sought information from in these second two phases from the CACREP liaisons of all CACREP-accredited doctoral programs with a forty-three percent participation rate (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). They reviewed seventeen syllabi since many programs were not willing to share their syllabi (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015).

Ninety-six percent of counselor education doctoral programs require coursework in teaching (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). Only twenty-seven percent of the syllabi included overt attention to adult development, remediation and gatekeeping, and assessment of learning (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). The topics of pedagogy and methods (ninety-one percent), instructional and curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation (eighty-two percent) and ethical and cultural considerations (eighty-two percent) were widely covered in an overt way (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). The topics mostly likely to be focused on overtly according to these syllabi are those that revolve around course design and delivery and less on the developmental needs of students and helping struggling students. Although it cannot be assumed how these courses are taught

based solely on their syllabi, it seems possible that creating a learning environment based upon students' developmental needs is not a focus of these courses.

Since there was very limited research about coteaching in counselor education, Baltrinic et al. (2016) argued that coteaching should be more closely examined in the field of counselor education because doctoral students need training opportunities to develop knowledge and skills about best teaching practices for their future professional work. To examine participants' coteaching experiences, Baltrinic et al. (2016) conducted two rounds of interviews with ten counselor education doctoral students who had cotaught at least one course while in their programs.

After using phenomenological methodology to code the interview data, Baltrinic et al. (2016) discovered findings related to ways that coteaching was relational, operational, and developmental for participants. The relationship between doctoral students and faculty members in coteaching was essential for participants to become more comfortable with the demands of teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Participants trusted their mentors and valued the ways their mentors maintained open lines of communication that invited their lived experiences into the classroom and helped them feel less alone and more at ease in the process of teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016). This open communication was also characterized by constructive feedback between participants and faculty members that helped participants acknowledge mistakes and refine their teaching approaches (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Participants reported that it was helpful in enhancing their confidence when faculty mentors allowed them to make

immediate contributions in the classroom by sharing their recent counseling experiences (Baltrinic et al., 2016).

Many participants in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study reported uncertainty about what to do at the beginning of their coteaching. However, participants' confidence and autonomy increased over time as they better understood the methods of teaching with the help of their faculty mentors (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Faculty mentors helped facilitate this process by initially holding regular class planning discussions that included preparing course materials and discussing strategies for the delivery of course content (Baltrinic et al., 2016). For all participants, the frequency and duration of these planning meetings decreased as the coteaching progressed (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Participants viewed this as an indication of their faculty members' increased trust in their teaching abilities (Baltrinic et al., 2016).

Faculty mentors also supported participants in coteaching by allowing them to start the experience out by observing and then gradually increase their teaching responsibilities and level of involvement in the course (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Participants in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study also reported that their coinstructors supervised them in a conversational manner about their teaching mistakes, challenges, and struggles. These more informal conversations often involved guided reflection about their teaching performance and helped participants feel more at ease (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Finally, supervision conversations early on in the semester included discussion of role delineation and role expectations that helped participants navigate the increasing demands of the coteaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Participants favored coteaching experiences where

mentors defined coteaching roles and expectations (Baltrinic et al., 2016). In a similar way, it seems like it could be important to help doctoral counselor education students understand the expectations and their role within their doctoral teaching preparation programs as a whole. Understanding the helpful and unhelpful experiences of beginning counselor educators in their doctoral teaching preparation could be a first step in the process of helping doctoral counselor education programs better understand how to do this.

Baltrinic et al. (2016) also discovered that coteaching experiences contributed to the development of participants' teaching in a way that is similar to supervision in counseling. Faculty coteachers often adjusted their level of support depending on the nature and complexity of the teaching task (Baltrinic et al., 2016). During difficult moments in the class, the mentor would often jump in and take more of a directive approach followed by a debriefing conversation of what to do next time. Additionally, many of the participants in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study began incorporating their own ideas about teaching in their experiences that integrated their faculty member's ideas and their own teaching style. Ultimately, all of the participants acknowledged that learning how to teach required guidance from a more experienced teacher (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Since coteaching has proved to be so helpful to the point of being required for these participants (Baltrinic et al., 2016), it seems critical to better understand how mentorship in teaching preparation for future counselor educators works on a broader scale as well.

Unfortunately, however, many beginning counselor educators do not feel adequately prepared for teaching by their doctoral programs (Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse,

2009; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Protivnak and Foss (2009) also found that many of the participants in their study wanted better teaching preparation in their doctoral courses. One such participant wanted to be provided more information about how to train students in specific counseling skills instead of learner-based discussion and recycling of information (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Many participants in both Magnusons's (2002) and Hall and Hulse's (2009) studies stated that they wished they better understood the nuts and bolts of teaching. One participant observed that the specific skills involved in teaching including syllabus construction, classroom management, grading, and course issues are not openly discussed in many counselor education programs (Magnuson, 2002). Another participant in Magnuson et al.'s (2006) study on third year counselor educators felt that they were never prepared by their doctoral program to be able to deal with difficult student situations. A lack of adequate doctoral teaching preparation and discussion of teaching can make it more difficult for counselor educators to improve their knowledge of teaching methodologies and hone their teaching. It might also contribute to a sense of isolation as beginning counselor educators must struggle with these issues by themselves.

Buller (2013) conducted a phenomenological study interviewing ten counselor educators who had been recognized as excellent teachers about their experiences in their doctoral teaching preparation. Participants were chosen based upon either winning a teaching award or based upon the recommendation of the dean of their department. Similarly to participants in Hunt and Gilmore's study, most participants did not feel prepared to teach when they started teaching as counselor educators. Five out of ten

participants had taught an entire course in their doctoral program. They found this valuable in contributing to their development as exemplary teachers. Doctoral co-teaching was also a meaningful experience that produced learning for four of the ten participants who cotaught, even as those experiences were varied and sometimes informal. Two out of ten participants had taken coursework on teaching. They felt their coursework was meaningful and helped them grow as teachers. Buller (2013) puts out a call for counselor educators to receive better teaching training in their doctoral programs. Buller believed that counselor education doctoral programs needed to "include opportunities for doctoral students to teach, feedback on teaching, mentorship, observation of teaching, and college teaching courses" (p. 125).

Doctoral coursework on teaching alone is often inadequate to help beginning counselor educators be well prepared in their teaching (Tollerud, 1990), since, even when counselor educators have knowledge of teaching methodology, they are not always able to execute them properly in their classes (Malott et al., 2014). Accordingly, for doctoral counseling students to feel well prepared as teachers, it seems critical that their doctoral teaching preparation combines learning about teaching with teaching experiences and feedback on how to improve their teaching (Tollerud, 1990).

Few doctoral programs provide students with teaching coursework or teaching internships (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). Hunt and Gilmore (2011) surveyed counselor educators who were coordinators for the teaching preparation experiences for CACREP-accredited doctoral programs to find out how and how well doctoral students were being prepared for teaching. In the second

phase of their study, they surveyed doctoral counselor education students who had recently completed a teaching internship in one of the programs that responded. Although a number of the programs did not respond or did not require any kind of teaching experience of doctoral students, nine of the sixteen programs required students to complete a formal teaching internship. These internships most often consisted of co-teaching a master's level counseling course with a counselor education faculty member. Eight of the sixteen programs required students take a didactic course on teaching. Even as a little over half of the schools surveyed had more structured doctoral teaching experiences in place, the proportion may be even less among the overall population of counselor education doctoral programs since Hunt and Gilmore only surveyed students in programs where they could identify clear teaching experience coordinators. It is also possible that programs with a strong teaching emphasis were more likely to respond to this study than those with less of a teaching emphasis.

By and large, the doctoral students surveyed felt their internship or practicum experiences in teaching helped increase their abilities and self-efficacy surrounding teaching, Therefore, Hunt and Gilmore (2011) recommended that counselor education programs would benefit from having a systematic doctoral teaching preparation program (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). They also stated that this process ideally would include courses on teaching, a co-teaching internship, and opportunities to receive mentoring and critiques of their teaching from faculty and their peers.

Carter et al. (1994) randomly sampled full-time counselor educators holding an associate or full professor rank and surveyed them about their satisfaction with their

teaching as well as their doctoral teaching preparation. They found that twenty-one percent of respondents reported taking a course in their doctoral program devoted to teaching. Thirty-two percent stated that teaching had been covered throughout various courses in their doctoral training. Similarly, nineteen percent of respondents reported completing a practicum in teaching during their doctoral program and seventeen percent reported some kind of teaching experience during a doctoral internship. Only forty-three percent of respondents reported that they were "very well" prepared for teaching by their doctoral program. Based on these findings, Carter et al. recommended that doctoral programs pay more attention to how they prepare their doctoral students to teaching and that they design more intentional teaching courses and experiences.

More comprehensive doctoral teaching preparation can have a strong impact on beginning counselor educators teaching preparedness (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Hall and Hulse (2009) sought to understand how well Lanning's (1990) model has been implemented by examining counselor educators' perceptions of doctoral level teaching preparation. They surveyed counselor educators about how well their teaching preparation readied them for teaching as a counselor educators (Hall & Hulse, 2009). They asked respondents to identify the frequency with which they had engaged in a variety of different experiences during their teaching preparation and examined the correlations of those frequencies with respondents' self-reported overall preparedness to teach (Hall & Hulse, 2009). The more frequently that counselor educators taught or cotaught classes was strongly correlated with how well prepared they rated themselves as teachers (Hall & Hulse, 2009). The frequency that they received feedback on their

teaching was also strongly correlated with their ratings of their preparedness (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Overall, the strongest correlations of teaching preparedness ratings and the forty-six teaching preparation experiences examined were in items related to feedback, conversation, and reflection surrounding their teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Based on these findings, Hall and Hulse suggested that aspiring counselor educators might benefit from a more structured support system surrounding their teaching that resembles supervision in counseling.

Hall and Hulse (2009) also asked open-ended questions about how participants could have been better prepared by their doctoral programs to teach as counselor educators. Respondents reported that more mentorship by experienced faculty, participation in a teaching practicum, more courses on college teaching, and more observation and feedback from faculty would have helped facilitate their growth (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Many respondents who experienced teaching preparation wanted more structure in these experiences especially involving more formal and specific feedback about their teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Respondents also wanted more courses on college teaching that would focused on going in-depth about specific skills involved in teaching such as grading, creating assignments, syllabus development, teaching methods, and engaging learners (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Although these responses do not address how realistic implementing such doctoral teaching preparation techniques would be for counselor education programs, it shows there is a high demand for more structure in doctoral teaching experiences, more in depth discussion of teaching methodology, and more feedback on their teaching.

More comprehensive doctoral teaching preparation can also have a strong impact on teaching (Buller, 2013; Heppner, 1994). Heppner (1994) discovered that graduate psychology instructors had little knowledge about numerous areas of teaching at the beginning of a teaching practicum. However, by the end of the teaching practicum students reported experiencing significant growth in twenty-one of the twenty-two learning objectives in the syllabus that accompanied their practicum. The areas where students showed the greatest growth were often those which they had little to no background knowledge at the beginning of their teaching practicum. When asked about what changes student instructors were making as a result of their practicum, the five doctoral graduate instructors interviewed by Heppner (1994) stated that sixty percent of the changes were in the structure and content of their classes. Accordingly, if doctoral students are able to take part in a teaching practicum experience, they might be able to have much more of a foundation of teaching by the time they become assistant professors.

More comprehensive doctoral teaching preparation can also have a strong impact on beginning counselor educators' self-efficacy (Tollerud, 1990). Tollerud (1990) administered the Self-Efficacy Toward Teaching Inventory (SETI) to advanced doctoral students and recent graduates of CACREP-accredited institutions to describe the relationship between level of self-efficacy towards teaching and various other factors including number of pedagogy courses taken as a graduate student and number of courses taught as a graduate student. She found that participants with experience teaching three to five courses had higher levels of self-efficacy for teaching. In other words, except for

teaching the first few courses, the more teaching experience a participant had during their doctoral program, their higher their teaching self-efficacy. Tollerud also found that teaching coursework on its own did not result in higher levels of teaching self-efficacy unless it was combined with teaching experiences.

Conclusion

Several researchers have called for a closer examination of teaching (Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Brackette, 2014; Pietrzak et al., 2008). Numerous researchers have also argued for more extensive doctoral teaching preparation (Buller, 2013; Carter et al., 1994; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Heppner, 1994; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Lanning, 1990; Tollerud, 1990). Despite observations that beginning counselor educators benefit from doctoral teaching preparation (Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Heppner, 1994; Tollerud, 1990) and that they often did not feel adequately trained in teaching by their counselor education programs (Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse, 2009; Protivnak & Foss, 2009), few studies have examined teaching preparation practices of doctoral counselor education programs and experiences of their students. In general, there is a dearth of research related to counselor educators' experiences in their doctoral teaching preparation and in their teaching development. Given the importance of preparing future counselors and the breadth of knowledge and skills required for counselor educators by the 2016 CACREP standards, there is a need to understand (a) the kinds of teaching preparation beginning counselor educators experienced during their doctoral program (b) doctoral teaching preparation experiences and mentoring beginning counselor educators have received that were most beneficial to their development as teachers and (c) teaching-

related experiences beginning counselor educators wish they had received as part of their doctoral programs. A qualitative exploration of beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation and teaching-related mentoring will hopefully provide a starting point for research in this area.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this research study was to explore beginning counselor educators'
experiences of doctoral teaching preparation and teaching-related mentoring and the
growth they achieved in their teaching because of these experiences. The primary
objectives were to identify: (a) the kinds of teaching preparation beginning counselor
educators experienced during their doctoral program; (b) doctoral teaching preparation
experiences and mentoring that beginning counselor educators have received that were
most beneficial to their development as teachers; and, (c) teaching-related experiences
beginning counselor educators wish they had received as part of their doctoral programs.
Consensual qualitative research (CQR) provides a structure for examining beginning
counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation and teaching-
related mentoring.

Research Questions

1. What kinds of teaching preparation did beginning counselor educators experience
   as part of their doctoral programs?

2. What doctoral teaching preparation experiences and mentoring have beginning
   counselor educators received that were most beneficial to their development as
   teachers?

3. What teaching-related experiences and mentorship do beginning counselor educators wish they had received as part of their doctoral programs?

Research Design

Consensual Qualitative Research

CQR is a widely-used methodology (Hill, 2012) that brings quantitative rigor to qualitative methodology and is a good fit for the current study for a variety of reasons. Since beginning counselor educators' experiences of doctoral teaching preparation and teaching-related mentoring have not yet been researched, CQR's exploratory nature makes it a strong fit for the current study (Crook-Lyon et al., 2012). In addition, as opposed to quantitative and some other qualitative methodologies which sacrifice depth for greater generalizability, CQR allows for a more thorough description of complicated phenomena such as participants' inner experiences (Crook-Lyon et al., 2012). This methodology allows for reporting of minority opinions which can become lost in the large participant pools of quantitative methodologies (Crook-Lyon et al., 2012). In the CQR data analysis process, the researcher collects and reports qualitative frequency data about the experiences of participants. From this data the researcher the researcher developed recommendations that may prove useful to counselor education doctoral programs in improving their teaching preparation by creating a clearer picture of the most common shortcomings in doctoral teaching preparation experienced by beginning counselor educators. This frequency data also could serve as a starting point to inform future quantitative research on this topic. Finally, the capability of CQR methodology to achieve a thorough description of a phenomena could allow for future research in

developing theories or models related to development or supporting of teaching

competencies in counselor education (Crook-Lyon et al., 2012).

Procedures

Participants

As recommended by Hill and Williams (2012), a random sample of beginning

counselor educators was recruited for this study. A random sample was used so the

participant pool would be more likely to be representative of the population of beginning

counselor educators than one that is unique in a way that would shape the study (Hill &

Williams, 2012). The sample consisted of participants who have had teaching

experiences as both a doctoral student in counselor education and a counselor educator

and were able to go into extensive detail about these experiences (Hill & Williams,

2012). As recommended by Ladany et al. (2012), the sample achieved in this process

should be homogeneous to help assure the transferability of the study. Therefore, a

number of constrains were placed on those eligible to participate. Firstly, participants

were required to currently work as a core-faculty member in a CACREP-accredited

counseling program and to have graduated from a CACREP-accredited doctoral program.

Given that the 2016 CACREP standards emphasized the importance of preparing doctoral

students in teaching (Doctoral Standards Counselor Education and Supervision, Section

VI, B.3), it is important to examine how CACREP-accredited doctoral programs are

preparing their students to teach. Consequently, this study aimed to understand how well

counselor education programs are preparing their students to teach according to CACREP

standards. Additionally, according to the 2016 CACREP standards, CACREP-accredited

programs can now hire only "core counselor education faculty who have earned doctoral

degrees in counselor education, preferably from a CACREP-accredited program" (The

Learning Environment, Section I, W). Therefore this study included only faculty

members who graduated from CACREP-accredited doctoral programs where these

standards dictate the importance of teaching. In addition, since the 2016 CACREP

standards recommend that new core faculty hires have graduated from CACREP-

accredited doctoral programs, participants in this study were required to be currently

working as core faculty members and were ineligible to participate if they were currently

working only in non-tenure-track or clinical positions.

To be eligible to participate, individuals also were required to be in their second,

third, or fourth year of working as a counselor educator and to have graduated from a

counselor education doctoral program within one year of starting their first core faculty

position as a counselor educator. Hill and Williams (2016) emphasized the importance of

the recency and salience of the experience for participants and second, third, or fourth

year counselor educators should be better able to provide detailed accounts of the topic

under investigation as opposed to counselor educators who are more removed from their

doctoral experience. Even though participants might be several years removed from their

experiences as doctoral students, their experiences of doctoral teaching preparation are

likely to represent very salient events that "are remembered longer and with more clarity"

(Hill & Williams, 2012).

First year counselor educators were excluded from this study because counselor

educators with less than a year of experience as a faculty member might not have had as

much time to reflect on their teaching. Counselor educators often struggle with learning

to teach during their first year (Magnuson, 2002) and might not have a strong awareness

of their abilities as a teacher until subsequent years. In addition, these beginning

counselor educators might not have as much perspective on how their doctoral teaching

preparation experiences have impacted their teaching as counselor educators. For

purposes of determining years of experience that a participant had working as a counselor

educator, years working in post-doctoral non-core faculty positions, including as adjunct

or clinical professor, were counted. This assured that participants had more recent

recollections of the teaching preparation they experienced in their doctoral program since

they would not be as far removed from those experiences. Similarly, the sample in this

study excluded those who had not yet graduated from their doctoral programs since those

faculty members are likely to have had different experiences in teaching than new faculty

members in full-time positions.

As recommended by Hill and Williams (2012), the sample in this study was

clearly defined since too much variability often contributes to inconsistent results.

Accordingly, Hill and Williams (2012) emphasized that the sample be defined carefully,

keeping in mind to whom the results might apply. This study attempted to clearly and

narrowly define a sample that would best offer transferable findings to counselor

education doctoral programs (Hill & Williams, 2012). In addition to the criteria described

above, participants were required to have taught mostly face to face courses since starting

as a counselor educator. Online teaching, in many ways, requires additional skills

beyond those of face to face teaching, and those who teach predominantly online or

77

hybrid courses might have a different perspective on how their doctoral program prepared them to teach as opposed to those who teach mostly face to face courses. The sample was restricted to faculty members working in the United States who received some kind of teaching preparation during their doctoral programs. Faculty members who received minimal or no teaching preparation during their doctoral programs would not be able to offer in depth reflections on experiences they did not have and might not be able to speak as well to how this lack of teaching preparation impacted their teaching as a counselor educator. Since doctoral counselor education programs must prepare students to work as counselor educators in a variety of contexts, the sample included participants currently working in both masters-only and masters and doctoral programs.

To collect a random sample as recommended by Hill and Williams (2012), the primary researcher created a list of all CACREP-accredited counseling programs in the United States based on information from the CACREP website. Next, a random sample of twenty-five out of the 320 accredited counselor education programs was created. For each of these twenty-five programs, the researcher examined the program's website to develop a list of names and contact information for all faculty who appeared to fit criteria for participation in this study. As often as possible, potential participants were screened based on looking at their curriculum vitae and other information available to determine eligibility. Where it was impossible to fully determine who was eligible to participate, all faculty members listed as assistant professors were sent invitations to participate. Programs which did not list faculty members or which did not have clear information on their website about faculty were omitted from the samples.

Each participant was contacted individually by email and asked if they would be willing to participate in the study. In this initial email (see Appendix A) and in the attached recruitment info sheet (see Appendix B), information was provided to participants about the study's purpose and methodology. Additionally, the initial email stated specific criteria for eligibility so that participants would be able to determine their eligibility to participate before agreeing to be interviewed. After approximately one week, all participants who had not responded to the initial email were sent a follow up email (see Appendix C) as a final reminder. For each beginning counselor educator who agreed to participate, researcher and participant scheduled a time for the interview. Prior to the interview, the researcher emailed each participant interview questions (see Appendix D), informed consent (see Appendix E), and a demographic data form (see Appendix F). Participants were asked to complete and email back the demographic data form and review the informed consent and interview questions prior to their interviews. In emails before the interview and in verbally at the beginning of the interview, participants were made aware that by starting the interview, they were agreeing to the terms listed in the informed consent. All participants who completed the interview received a twenty-five dollar Amazon gift card as an incentive for their participation.

Since the first random sample of twenty-five schools did not yield an adequate number of participants to attain some consistency in results (Hill & Williams, 2012), a second random sample of twenty-five different institutions was created using the same procedures as with the initial sample. After this second sample, a third and final sample was created to find a few more participants. A random sample of fifteen different

institutions was created for this third attempt using the same procedures as for the previous two samples. Across the three samples, eighty-six counselor educators were sent recruitment emails, yielding a total of twelve counselor educators who were interviewed for the study (approximately a fourteen percent response rate).

Hill and Williams (2012) recommended the use of a large enough sample to obtain some consistency of results. Although Hill and Williams (2012) generally recommend a sample size of twelve to fifteen, the current study had a total of nine eligible participants. After conducting interviews with twelve participants, three were removed from the study due to unanticipated sampling eligibility issues. These issues included two participants who were working in their first year as a counselor educator and one participant who had worked for many years as a clinical assistant professor before starting her first year as a tenure-track assistant professor. Even though the final sample was not as robust as recommended (Hill & Williams, 2012), the interviews in this study did achieve some consistency in results across participants. Because consistency resulted in saturation of the data, where no new domains and categories emerged in the data coding (Williams & Hill, 2012), it was determined the sample size of nine was sufficient.

The nine participants included five males and four females. Seven participants identified their race/ethnicity as Caucasian/white. One participant identified as Asian American/Pacific Islander and one identified as African American/black. Ages of participants ranged from thirty to forty-six with a mean age of thirty-eight. None of the participants were international faculty members.

Participants' years of experiences working as a tenure-track counselor educator ranged from two to four years. All but two participants worked in a tenure-track counselor educator exclusively at one institution. The other two participants had worked at one other institution. Participants had between one semester to four years working at the current institution. Five participants worked in a program with only a master's program and the other four worked in programs with both masters and doctoral programs. The number of credit hours that participants had taught at their current institution ranged from eight to eighty-seven with a mean of forty-six credit hours taught. Three participants had taught doctoral level courses at their current institution.

Interviews

Individual interviews were used to gather data (Hill, 2012) about beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation. Open ended questions were used to access beginning counselor educators' inner cognitive and emotional experiences that can be difficult to understand through observation alone (Hill, 2012). These questions allowed the interviewer to access explicit and implicit skills and emotions that beginning counselor educators experience with their teaching. Gathering data through qualitative individual interviews is "based on the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit" (Brott, 1997, p. 85).

Individual audio interviews were scheduled at participants' convenience. As recommended by Burkard et al. (2012), interview questions (see Appendix D) were emailed to participants at least one week before the interview along with an informed

consent from (see Appendix E), and demographic data form (see Appendix F). The demographic data form asked participants to report descriptive information including sex, age, ethnicity, and information about the participant's doctoral program and current work environment. Participants were asked to return their completed demographics data forms through email before the scheduled time of their interview. Demographic data forms were printed out and kept in a locked file cabinet in the primary researcher's home office away from the recordings. Computer files of the demographic data forms were deleted after they were printed. Participants also were asked to review the informed consent form and interview questions before the start of the study. As stated in the informed consent, by choosing to begin the interview, participants were agreeing to the terms of the informed consent. At the beginning of each interview, participants were asked if they had any questions or concerns about the demographic data form or the informed consent form.

For the interviews, participants were contacted at a phone number of their choosing using a Google Voice number created for this study. The researcher conducted all interviews through his computer and audio recorded them for transcription purposes using Audacity, a sound editing program ("Audacity: Free Audio Editor and Recorder," 2016). Participants were aware that the interviews would be audio recorded from the informed consent document. The interviews involved a semi-structured questioning approach recommended by Burkard et al. (2012) using a mix of ten pre-scripted open-ended questions and unscripted probes. This structure allowed for consistency across interviews while also gathering in-depth information unique to each participant's experience (Burkard et al., 2012). Interviews lasted for forty-five to sixty minutes,

depending upon the natural flow of the interview. Participants were free to stop the interview at any point without consequences.

Shortly after the conclusion of each interview, the research wrote down notes about the content of the interview and his experience of it as recommended by Burkard et al. (2012). After each interview, participants were identified by a sequential number based upon the chronological order of the interviews. This number was recorded on the upper left corner of the demographic data form. Filenames for electronic interview files also were identified by these case numbers. Participants' names were linked to their ID numbers only in a master list that was stored in a locked drawer in the primary researcher's campus office, separate from the recordings and the demographic data forms. Each individual interview was treated as one case for the purpose of analysis with CQR methodology. The demographic data forms and the researcher's notes were placed in a locked file cabinet in the researcher's home office and electronic copies were permanently deleted after printing. Audio interviews were stored in a password protected folder on the primary researcher's personal laptop and permanently deleted at the conclusion of the transcription process. Only the primary researcher had access to the protected storage locations.

Nine of the twelve interviews were transcribed in the researcher's home office within two weeks of the interview date. An assistant, who was a masters-level counseling student, was hired to transcribe the final three interviews. Before beginning the transcriptions, the assistant signed a confidentiality agreement (see Appendix G) stating that she would maintain confidentiality during the transcription process. The transcription

assistant did not have access to the identifying information about the participants. While

transcribing, the researcher and the assistant listened to the interviews on headphones to

offset the unlikely possibility that information could be heard by others. After

transcribing, audio recordings of their interviews were permanently deleted. Copies of

transcribed interviews were emailed to participants within two weeks of the interview as

indicated on the demographic data forms so that they could offer any additions,

corrections, or clarifications to the transcript (Burkard et al., 2012). After all of the

interviews had been transcribed, copies were emailed to members of the research team to

read.

Interview Questions

As recommended by Burkard et al. (2012), the interviews in this study were

conducted using a semi-structured questioning approach which uses a mix of pre-

scripted, open-ended questions and unscripted probes. This structure allowed for

consistency across interviews combined with the flexibility to collect unique and in-depth

information about each participant's experience (Burkard et al., 2012). Since Burkard et

al. (2012) recommended a total of eight to ten pre-scripted questions, ten questions were

created based on the study's research questions. The researcher also brainstormed

possible topics for unscripted probing questions.

After creating the pre-scripted interview questions, Burkard et al. (2012)

recommended consultation with "researchers knowledgeable about the topic to ensure

that interviews are capturing the relevant data" (p. 87). Therefore, the primary researcher

consulted with members of his doctoral dissertation committee, the study's external

auditor, and a doctoral counseling student with teaching experience and research interests in teaching in counselor education for feedback on the questions. Finally, the researcher incorporated suggestions from his dissertation committee members after his dissertation proposal to refine the interview questions after receiving feedback in his dissertation proposal. Interview questions can be found in Appendix B.

Coding Data

The Research Team

The research team was composed of the author and primary researcher, a 34-year old white male who is a third-year doctoral student in counselor education. He has five years of college teaching experience within the field of counseling. Additionally, he has been immersed in counselor education teaching literature for about 2 years and has previously been a researcher in a study using CQR methodology. The rest of the research team consisted of two white female doctoral students in counselor education, one who is in her first year and one who is in her second year. Both have college teaching experience, familiarity with CQR methodology, and an interest in the topic. The external auditor was a second year doctoral student in counselor education and a white female. She also has college teaching experience and knowledge of CQR methodology.

Recording Biases and Expectations

One of the fundamental assumptions of CQR methodology is that researchers' values cannot be removed from the research process and should be discussed explicitly (Stahl et al., 2012). However, Stahl et al. (2012) also suggested that researchers using CQR methodology should bracket their biases to reduce the degree to which they

influence the results of the research. Addressing biases and expectations in CQR methodology through open, explicit discussion can help the research be more rigorous, allow the research team to look at the data from diverse perspectives, and help researchers understand their context as it relates to the research topic (Sim et al., 2012). Before beginning the coding of the data in this study or reading any of the interviews, each researcher team member individually wrote an informal free narrative about their biases and expectations of the research topic and participants. For all three team members, biases included statements of their experiences as both a teacher and a student in counselor education classes and their assumptions about how interviewees might answer questions in this study based upon those experiences. Each researcher also noted subjects or experiences that might interfere with their ability to respond objectively to the data. For example, the primary researcher noted that he had often felt anxious in the process of teaching his first few college classes, but slowly grew in his teaching through a trial and error process. He acknowledged that he might be more drawn to noticing ways that participants had similar experiences of coping with challenging emotions and learning improving their teaching through trial and error.

At the beginning of the first research team meeting, members shared their statements of biases and expectations and the team discussed ways that members could help one another remain aware of how those biases and expectations might impact their work in the data coding process. To help team members hold one another accountable throughout the process, each team member's written bracketing exercise was then compiled and distributed to all team members. Additionally, team members were

encouraged to challenge one another when it seemed like a bias was interfering with someone's ability to view the data objectively.

Coding Process

Throughout the coding process, the research team members met on a near weekly basis over a four month period. These meetings ranged from about an hour to three hours in length. As suggested by Thompson et al. (2012), research team members typically worked on the task at hand independently before each meeting and then came together to discuss their work and reach consensus on the final product often combing different viewpoints together or debating the merits of differing approaches.

After discussing their biases and expectations in the initial coding meeting, research team members discussed the domains they noticed emerging from the first four interview transcripts with the purpose of reaching consensus on a tentative domain list. Before the meeting, each team member had worked independently to create a list of domains that emerged for them from the first four cases. Before the second research meeting, team members read over each the final five transcripts and tested those cases to see if they fit with the tentative domain list while looking for domains to add or remove. Then, team members reconvened to reach consensus on a modified domain list based on incorporating the final five cases. In this meeting, the team also developed a list of eleven domains, more precise wording for each domain and an order for the domains so that similar domains were near each other. After consensus was reached on this domain list, it was sent to the external auditor for her feedback.

After receiving feedback on the domain list from the external auditor, the research team met to decide how to change the domains based upon the feedback. The domains largely remained unchanged except for a few wording and order changes since the external auditor was largely in agreement with the domain list. Next, each member of the research team individually coded every section of text in the first interview under at least one of the domains. Then the research team came together again and reached consensus about the coding of the domains in this first case. This process was repeated until the research team had coded all of the raw data for all nine cases into the domains. Although the research team remained open to the possibility of new domains emerging or the existing domains being restructured, the original domain list remained intact throughout this process.

Before beginning the process of creating core ideas for each coded chunk of text, the primary researcher created a table of domains, raw text, case number, and line numbers to allow for more efficient sorting of the domains for the cross analysis process in the future (Thompson et al., 2012). In accordance with the suggestion of Thompson et al. (2012) and in contrast with the process for creating and coding domains, the research team did not develop core ideas independently. To better understand the process and to reach a level of consistency in the work, the research team worked on developing the core ideas for the first case together through the consensus process (Thompson et al., 2012). However, for subsequent cases, the primary researcher independently created core ideas and then each other team member independently reviewed his work. Finally, the research team came together to discuss what changes should be made to the core ideas in each

case. After consensus had been reach on all of the core ideas, the chart including the coded domains and core ideas was sent to the external auditor for feedback.

After receiving feedback from the external auditor, the team reviewed feedback on domain coding and core ideas, integrating a number of changes to the wording and content of specific core ideas and a few more global changes to the ways topics were coded. Afterwards, the research team cross analyzed each domain for common themes across cases. As recommended by Ladany et al. (2012), the research team chose to begin the cross analysis process with the support domain because was a relatively small and easy domain. Independently, the research team developed a category structure for this domain, including categories and subcategories, with the goal of creating a structure that "captures most if not all of the data within the domain" (Ladany et al., 2012, p. 118). Then the research team came together again to reach consensus about the category structure of the first domain to achieve a level of consistency in their work in the cross analysis process (Ladany et al., 2012). Next, the research team worked together to break down each core idea into separate units and then place each separate unit into the category structure (Ladany et al., 2012). For subsequent domains, each member of the research team individually created a category structure and then the team came together to reach consensus about that structure.

In the next step of the process, the primary researcher broke down core ideas for each domain into separate units and placed those units within the category structure. The other research team members reviewed his work individually and then the team met together to reach consensus about the final product. As the creation of the category

89

structure for each domain was completed, the category structure was sent to the external auditor for feedback. At subsequent meetings, the external auditor's feedback was discussed and parts of the category structure for a number of the domains was shifted based upon this feedback. This process of creating category structures and submitting them to the external auditor continued for each domain. At the conclusion of this process, the primary researcher assigned each category a frequency rating of general, typical, or variant based upon the number of cases where it appears (Ladany et al., 2012).

Trustworthiness

Williams and Hill (2012) explained that, as a qualitative methodology, CQR is more focused on achieving trustworthiness than validity and transferability as opposed to generalizability. Trustworthiness, or "the researchers' claim to have used appropriate, adequate, and replicable methods and to have correctly reported the findings" (Williams & Hill, 2012, p. 175), was maintained in this study by maintaining the integrity of the data through providing details about methods, looking for saturation, and considering generalizability. Efforts were made to provide detailed explanations of the methodology used in this study to allow the study's procedures to be replicated (Williams & Hill, 2012). In addition, saturation, or the point where no new data emerge in the study, was reached in the data collection process (Williams & Hill, 2012). Domains and categories in the data coding process were stable by the time the last few cases were analyzed and reviewed in the external audit. Additionally, the categories and domains are well linked to the research questions and have provided findings that answer those questions.

Transferability in this study was established by the fact there were a number of categories in cross analysis that demonstrated a general frequency (Williams & Hill, 2012). This fact also is further evidence that saturation was reached in data collection (Williams & Hill, 2012). Finally, the bracketing exercise the research team completed before reading any of the interviews and the efforts made by the research team to challenge one another on these biases and expectations helped ensure researcher reflexivity so that the researchers' biases and interpretative lenses would not interfere with participants' intended meaning (Williams & Hill, 2012). Additionally, the research team and external auditor made efforts to stay close to the actual words of the participants in the raw data throughout the data coding process and often returned to those words to resolve disagreements (Williams & Hill, 2012). The study, however, did not use triangulation methods to enhance the integrity of the data, as recommended by Williams and Hill (2012), because the only source of data collected was interviews where participants self-reported about their teaching.

Pilot Study

Burkard et al. (2012) recommended that interview questions be tested in a pilot study with participants who meet the inclusion criteria of the study but are not included as part of the final sample. The primary researcher conducted a pilot interview with one participant to receive feedback on the interview questions and whether the questions are yielding data about the area of interest of the study (Burkard et al., 2012). The researcher sought feedback from the participant regarding clarity of the interview questions, and

whether interview questions logically flowed together to adequately capture all parts of the research questions (Burkard et al., 2012).

Research Questions

1. How did beginning counselor educators experience teaching preparation during their doctoral programs?

2. What doctoral teaching preparation experiences and mentoring have beginning counselor educators received that led to growth in their teaching skills?

3. What teaching-related experiences and mentorship do beginning counselor educators wish they had received during their doctoral preparation?

Participant

The pilot study participant was a 28-year old Caucasian/White male working in his first year as a counselor educator. He had just graduated with a Ph.D. from a CACREP-accredited doctoral program in counselor education that previous spring and is a tenure-track counselor educator at an institution with CACREP-accredited masters and doctoral programs. The participant was in the process of teaching six credit hours at his current institution, and previously had taught nine credit hours and cotaught six credit hours as a doctoral student.

Interview Questions

Initial interview questions were drafted by consulting with members of the primary researchers' doctoral dissertation committee, the study's external auditor, and a doctoral counseling student with teaching experience and research interests in teaching in counselor education. Interview questions can be found in Appendix H.

Procedure

After receiving IRB approval for the pilot study, the primary researcher contacted the potential participant by email using the recruitment script (Appendix I). The participant was asked to formally consent to be interviewed as a participant and to reflect on the interview process for the pilot study. The participant was told that the length of the interview would be between 45 and 60 minutes.

After agreeing to participate, the participant and the researcher scheduled a time for the interview and the participant was asked to read over the informed consent (Appendix J) and interview questions (Appendix H) and complete the demographic data sheet (Appendix K) before the time of the interview. The interview took place in an audio format over the internet and was recorded with the researcher's personal laptop using Audacity, a sound editing program ("Audacity: Free Audio Editor and Recorder," 2016). Video chat was not used during the call and no video was recorded. As stated in the informed consent, when the participant chose to begin the interview, he was agreeing to terms of the informed consent. To begin the interview, the participant was asked if he had any questions about the informed consent form or the study.

The researcher asked the pilot study participant eleven scripted open-ended questions (Appendix H), followed up with unscripted probing questions to clarify or expand upon the interviewee's responses. After answering interview questions, the participant was asked to reflect on the interview process and his reactions to interview questions. Finally, this participant offered verbal feedback on further revision of the interview questions and his experience answering them. At the conclusion of the

interview, the interviewee was informed that he would receive the typed transcript; after the interviewee reviewed the transcript for accuracy, the audio recording of the interview was deleted. The semi-structured interview lasted fifty-two minutes, for a total assessment time of one hour and four minutes including the feedback afterwards. After the interview, the interviewee was given a twenty-five dollar dollar Amazon gift card, as explained in the informed consent, and informed that he would receive a typed interview transcript within two weeks.

Results

Based on the results of the pilot study, the primary researcher speculated that support, feedback, and bringing counseling skills into the classroom might be potential domains in the larger study. After the interview, the participant commented that questions were clear and that none of them caught him off guard since they all flowed together logically. The questions seemed to be well worded in ways that allowed him to bring the questions back to his own experience and knowledge without placing too much structure on his answers. The participant mentioned that question five was difficult for him to answer, but that he felt that it was a fair and well worded question. He stated that this question was difficult to answer because he had not received as much doctoral preparation in the area of pedagogy and specific teaching methods, so he did not have much to say beyond that.

Similarly, the participant stated that it was valuable having Young and Shaw's (1999) seven dimensions that differentiate effective teaching from ineffective teaching (Appendix L) emailed to him before the interview. He stated that these items helped

frame his thinking without dictating how he should answer interview questions. At about fifty-two minutes, the length of the eleven-question interview was in range of the desired forty-five to sixty minute timeframe.

Discussion and Modifications for Full Study

The researcher took into account the participant's feedback on the interview questions and the interview process as well as his own reactions to interview to modify the questions and the study (Burkard et al., 2012). Based on results of the pilot study, the following modifications were made to the proposed research study. Since the interview's length fell within the desired length of forty-five to sixty minutes, the pacing of the interview and the number of questions felt like they matched the desired goals of the CQR methodology. Subsequently, however, the primary researcher reduced the number of interview questions down from eleven to ten in order to get more precision in answering the research questions as suggested by Burkard et al. (2012). Additionally, since the interview had been a bit on the shorter end of the spectrum, more specific unscripted probes were brainstormed by the primary researcher to help assure that participants would go into more depth about their experiences.

At times, the interview often took on a theoretical focus where the participant talked about his ideal doctoral teaching preparation program instead of talking about his experiences. Although this information partially helped answer the research question about what mentoring the participant wishes he had received during his doctoral training program, it also strayed from the scope of the current study at times. Therefore, for the main study the interviewer asked more intentional and more focused probing questions

that would help participants elaborate on the core questions while maintaining a focus within the framework of the research questions.

Additionally, the participant often responded to questions by relating them back to his experience as a supervisor and as a counselor. When he did talk about issues specific to teaching, he often referred to them in more vague terms compared to the way he talked about his counseling and supervision. This might result from the fact that, like this participant, many counselor educators have received little training on pedagogy, issues, and vocabulary surrounding teaching in higher education (Hall & Hulse, 2009). This participant did talk about his teaching in a deep and meaningful way, but this lack of specificity seems to be illuminating about the topic of the study. However, although adding more specific structure and teaching vocabulary to interview questions could have encouraged participants to be more specific in their answers, too much specificity might have prevented participants from freely exploring their experiences on their own terms. Therefore, in subsequent interviews, the interviewer used probing questions to help participants specifically name their skills using this vocabulary and asked a variety of open-ended probing questions that required participants to be more specific about their experiences including what they learned from and how they felt about their doctoral teaching preparation.

Even though the pilot study participant had found Young and Shaw's items to be helpful in answering the interview questions, they were ultimately removed from the final study as its focus moved away from teaching skills towards a more holistic understanding of participants' experiences of teaching.

Limitations

      The pilot study had a number of limitations. One limitation in this study was the potential bias of the interviewer who was also the primary researcher of this study. The researcher was a student in the same doctoral counselor education program for two years and had developed a friendship with the participant over that time. Therefore, the interviewee and researcher had some knowledge and preconceived notions of one another and their experiences teaching. This dynamic might have also produced a more relaxed and friendly atmosphere during the interview that might have impacted the way the participant answered the questions. A further limitation was the convenience sampling. Since the participant graduated from the same institution as the interviewer, the interviewee may have exhibited some social desirability in responses and may have wanted to be more supportive than constructive with his feedback on the interview questions. Additionally, the convenience sample means that it is difficult to know how likely this participant's experiences of the interview and of his doctoral teaching preparation have transferability to the larger population of beginning counselor educators.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A review of nine individual cases produced eleven domains, each with two to seven categories (see Appendix M for a list of all domains and categories). These domains and categories addressed the following research questions:

1. What kinds of teaching preparation did beginning counselor educators experience as part of their doctoral programs?

2. What doctoral teaching preparation experiences and mentoring have beginning counselor educators received that were most beneficial to their development as teachers?

3. What teaching-related experiences and mentorship do beginning counselor educators wish they had received as part of their doctoral programs?

Domains and Categories

Eleven domains surfaced as a result of nine individual interviews with beginning counselor educators. These twelve domains describe beginning counselor educators' experiences of doctoral teaching preparation and teaching mentorship: 1) pre-doctoral experience, 2) doctoral experience, 3) shortcomings in training, 4) components of teaching, 5) feedback, 6) support, 7) emotions, 8) professional identity, 9) systemic factors, 10) reactions to the research, and 11) other. Each of these domains will be discussed below. In addition, categories identified within each domain will be discussed.

Pre-doctoral Experience

Within the first domain, beginning counselor educators identified their experiences that occurred before entering their doctoral program which shaped their teaching. Participants identified five kinds of experiences or lack of experiences that had influenced their teaching: (a) counseling experience, (b) teaching experience, (c) presentation experience, (d) other professional experience, and (e) no teaching experience. Some participants also pointed out how their pre-doctoral experiences had impacted their teaching.

Counseling experience. Two participants mentioned the length of time they had worked as a counselor before beginning their doctoral counselor education program as contributing positively to their teaching. Both of these participants had worked for over ten years as a counselor before starting their doctoral counselor education programs. Another participant mentioned his seventeen to eighteen years working as a counselor.

Having many years of counseling experience influenced participants' teaching in different ways. For one beginning counselor educator it opened door for him to have more teaching opportunities in his doctoral program:

> I don't know if it's unique to [doctoral institution], but this is something else that opened the door for my teaching and that was that I was an independently licensed counselor when I came into my program because I had worked for almost 15 years as a counselor.

Teaching experience. Five out of nine participants reported that they had some kind of pre-doctoral teaching experience including teaching English in a foreign country, working as a teaching assistant in an internship class, teaching at a community college,

and teaching as an adjunct professor. For some participants, pre-doctoral teaching led them to get a doctoral degree: "My first experience was actually teaching in the human services department at a community college for about a year. And that's what led me to go back and get my PhD."

Two participants discussed multiple years of pre-doctoral teaching experience in a pastoral ministry role or in graduate religion courses: "Previously, my teaching experiences have been in religion. And so I taught probably 5-6 years in graduate level religion courses as an adjunct professor as I was doing other work and as I was a practitioner."

Presentation experience. Four beginning counselor educators talked about their pre-doctoral presentation experience. One participant mentioned shying away from being in front of audiences until the final few years of his work as a counselor:

> I was always kind of reluctant to get up in front of audiences, as I worked as a counselor, so I didn't have opportunities to do presentations, I typically shied away from it, then maybe, you know the last two or three years before I went back for my doctorate degree, I started to have more confidence around that.

Other participants commented on the extent of their experience doing presentations as a clinician in a college counseling center and as a one-day seminar to medical professionals. Another did presentations while working in a children's hospital: "So I would do presentations and mini-workshops for psychiatry and residents and things like that."

Other professional experience. Two participants talked about professional experiences other than teaching, counseling, or presentations that had influenced their future teaching. One participant talked about working in pastoral ministry:

> Before I went into work on my PhD, I was in pastoral ministry roles for a number of years and was quite used to teaching although in a different environment, regular sort of leading congregations to different types of teaching models and lots of different age groups over the course of those few years with adolescent groups to adult groups and so forth. So I was very much used to being in front of groups and teaching.

Another participant talked about doing consultations and trainings:

> I had spent five years traveling for our center both in [state] and out of [state], training people on these different treatment programs, assessment devices. And so by the time I had .. literally that was the majority of my job was consultations and trainings.

No teaching experience. Two participants specifically mentioned having no previous teaching experience prior to starting their doctoral programs: "So before my doc program, I had no teaching experience. I came straight from my master's program and I came straight from my undergrad."

Impact of pre-doctoral experience on teaching. Four beginning counselor educators talked about how their pre-doctoral experiences impacted their teaching. All of them talked about a specific way that one of their experiences had helped them be better prepared to teach. One beginning counselor educator discussed how his previous coursework had prepared him:

My dissertation was grounded in student learning theory, adult student learning theory I should say and my college degree is actually in college student development and so that's my specialty in my masters. So I kinda already had this good understanding of college students and development and learning. So I thought it was ... my background lended it really well to my doctoral training.

Participants also talked about how their pre-doctoral experiences helped them feel more comfortable as a teacher. Two participants reported that their previous experiences helped them feel more comfortable being up in front of people:

So I guess I felt I wasn't afraid to be in front of people. I didn't always know what to do and I was willing to get help, but I didn't have any of those nerves related to oh my god, I'm standing up in front of people, I don't know what to do.

Participants also discussed teaching skills that their pre-doctoral experiences had helped provide them. One participant talked about how working in the ministry meant he already knew how to engage people and that he had to learn to support what he said with research and best practices compared to his previous role. Another talked about how being challenged as a consultant helped him not feel pressure to be a content expert as a teacher. Yet another participant talked about how teaching graduate level religion courses provided him with foundational skills: "The earlier experiences really gave me a foundation in which to look at them - the relationships between students and faculty, and course preparation."

Doctoral Experience

In talking about their doctoral experiences, participants talked about a variety of different topics in general, often descriptive terms. Although a great deal of information about participants' doctoral experience was contained in many other domains, this

domain was reserved for general descriptions of their experiences that did not fit into other domains. Beginning counselor educators talked about their doctoral experiences within the following categories: (a) teaching experience, (b) courses on teaching, (c) relative value of experiences, (d) program design, (e) impact of experiences, and (f) other.

Teaching experience. All nine participants mentioned having some kind of teaching experience where they were actually in front of a class during their doctoral program. Participants talked about their teaching experience based on the nature of their teacher role: (a) instructor of record, (b) co-teacher, (c) teaching assistant, (d) teaching practicum/internship, (e) guest lectures/presentations, (f) seeking out teaching experiences, and (g) policies that created barriers to teaching.

Instructor of record. Four talked in their interviews about experiences in their doctoral programs where they taught as an instructor of record or, in other words, the sole instructor of an entire course. Three participants talked about teaching one or two courses as the instructor of record. One of these participants mentioned that his experience teaching as the instructor of record was atypical and that he "was one of the few who had that opportunity there."

The other participant was able to teach courses as the instructor of record on a regular basis throughout most of their program. He was able to teach as an instructor of record almost every semester during his doctoral program for the following reasons:

> Any doc student who came into the program with a lot of supervision experience and independent licensure were asked at some point to be instructors of record for practicum classes which I did pretty quickly after I started the program. So I was

already kind of teaching more in that supervisor slash teaching role, but the knocking on the doors and the coteaching stuff was the stuff that led to solo teaching and content courses.

Co-teacher. All nine participants co-taught at some point during their doctoral programs, either with one of their professors or offsite during a practicum or internship. Most participants co-taught multiple times during their programs and many found their experiences to be valuable learning experiences. One participant talked about how valuable co-teaching had been for her:

> I would say they were positive and I think it really, especially because they were both in clinical courses, helped me see how to ... people who I see as very similar ran group supervision in very different ... which is really great thing in their very different ways. And I did get experiences doing reflecting teams in internship class because it was a rather large class. And so I'm very grateful for that.

Participants did not always go into detail about what their role was as a co-instructor and the kinds of tasks they were responsible for in co-teaching. However, one participant mentioned that she was responsible for more as a co-teacher than she had been previously as a teaching assistant:

> [I] was responsible for doing lectures, having, owning an entire class that was mine. And by class I mean class day. And then also a lot more responsibility with grading and whatnot.

Teaching assistant. Two participants mentioned serving as teaching assistants in addition to serving as co-instructors. One participant talked about how her experience as a teaching assistant was early in her program and was fairly minimal because her professors did not want to overload her:

I served as a TA, not necessarily co-teaching at that point, but with the family counseling class. I did a couple lectures and helped with grading assignments and that was really just ... It was great because I volunteered and the instructor recognized that and didn't overload me too much with the responsibility, but I still felt I was contributing and learning also at the same time.

The other participant discussed serving as a teaching assistant during his first year as a doctoral student:

Starting in my first semester, the first semester, first year doc students helped, well we're basically teaching assistants for the counseling skills course and so we were there practicing with the students on their basic skills and then in the second semester we actually taught their, as a group we taught their practicum class.

Teaching practicum/internship. Two participants completed offsite teaching practica or internships as part of their doctoral program. One participant took the choice offered by his program to do a teaching practicum because he already had a lot of clinical experience. In his internship, he "taught a 3-3 my third year while I was finishing up," basically as if he were an adjunct professor.

The other participant was required to do three one-hundred hour practica in her doctoral program: a teaching practicum, a supervision practicum, and a clinical practicum. She described her one semester offsite teaching practicum as a co-teaching experience:

I co-taught at a different university with an instructor as part of the practicum, and I just, I went in and observed, for a while and then I did a- we did a unit together, you know where she took part, I took part, and then I taught one on my own. And so it was kind of over one semester.

Guest lectures/presentations. One participant talked about her guest lecturing and presentation experiences during her doctoral program. She "went in a few times to one of the school counseling courses and did a lecture for them about substance abuse and how that is relevant for working in the schools." She also talked about doing conference presentations regularly during her doctoral program and that they "really influenced me as an educator."

Seeking out teaching experiences. Four participants mentioned how they had to seek out teaching opportunities during their doctoral program. One participant talked about having to seek out opportunities through doing a cognate in education:

> I ensured that I had the experience I wanted to have, which is why I did the additional cognate classes. And teaching and embrace mentoring and the thought process and I advocated for mentoring and all of those things.

Another participant talked about how seeking out co-teaching opportunities led to solo teaching opportunities for him:

> So I was already kind of teaching more in that supervisor slash teaching role, but the knocking on the doors and the co-teaching stuff was the stuff that led to solo teaching and content courses.

Policies that created barriers to teaching. Two beginning counselor educators were not allowed to teach as instructors of record at their institutions because of departmental or institutional policies. One participant explained her institution's rationale for this policy:

106

My university really valued good, competent teaching. So they often didn't allow doctoral students to be the sole instructor of classes and that was because they really valued the educational process, not only for doc students, but also for the masters students. They didn't want to just hand off a class to a doctoral student. They wanted to make sure that person would be mentored throughout the entire process. I really think that there was a high value placed on the educational process for all different levels of students.

Courses on teaching. Eight participants mentioned taking at least one course in their doctoral program that was either dedicated to teaching or include a component where students learned about teaching. Participants talked about their courses on teaching in terms of the following categories: (a) design of courses, (b) assignments, (c) significance of courses.

Design of course. Five of the participants said that they took a course that was dedicated entirely to teaching and the other participant said his course "was geared at helping you think through what it would be like to be a counselor educator." Two participants' courses took place over the summer.

One participant described his class on instructional design:

Our professor really tried to structure the course, as far as a formal course that is, tried to really develop it in that constructivist model of alright, let us think together here, let's gather our thoughts and let's all share bits and pieces so you can all take away what's valuable and meaningful for you.

Assignments. Six participants discussed specific assignments they completed as part of their doctoral teaching courses. Five of these participants mentioned that they did some kind of practical teaching experience. For one of those beginning counselor educators, that experience was guest lecturing:

> We went into masters classes and taught for the first time, just one day. I think it was like 45 minutes that we needed to do a presentation.

Another participant had a similar experience of going into master's counseling classes and then receiving peer feedback:

> We had to do like chunks of lecture. So each of the students in the class had to go and teach a segment of a graduate class and we had to observe our peers while they were doing that. So and then we gave formal feedback and then we had for the fishbowl feedback for each of the experiences.

Three participants taught a part of their teaching class and received feedback on their teaching. One such participant described his experience as taking turns "doing a lesson and getting feedback from our peers very intentionally about pedagogy."

One participant said that her educational psychology class did not have a practical component, but instead required "two projects, I think we wrote a couple papers, did maybe a group project, read lots of articles, reported on those."

Three participants talked about having to do readings of for their class.

Significance of courses. Four beginning counselor educators spoke to the significance of their courses on teaching, including the impact it had on them as a teacher. All four participants mentioned their experience in their doctoral teaching class in a positive light. One participant discussed her doctoral teaching class in terms of a metaphor:

> That class was like the mortar. The bricks were there having gone through a CACREP masters program. The bricks existed, but then the mortar really was that class to be able to highlight why it was done like it was done.

Another participant mentioned that his experience in the doctoral teaching course strengthened the rest of his doctoral teaching experiences:

> Without the course and that specific set aside time to really focus on pedagogy and teaching and developing a course, I think the other experiences would have been a little more anemic and not felt quite as robust. So I would say that specific course where we looked at teaching specifically and had a chance to develop an intentional lesson and then get feedback on it, develop the syllabus for a course, and scope and sequence of the semester, talked a lot about evaluation in the classroom. All those sorts of things I think felt probably for me more of the most formative parts of my preparation.

Relative value of experiences. Six participants mentioned which of their doctoral teaching preparation experiences was most valuable or impactful to them. Some participants mentioned multiple experiences that were there most valuable experiences. Three participants mentioned that their experiences teaching as an instructor of record, either at their doctoral institution or as an adjunct, were their most valuable teaching preparation experience. Three participants said that their co-teaching experience was their most valuable doctoral teaching preparation experience. Two participants said that their doctoral teaching course was their most valuable experience.

Program design. Six participants talked about the ways their program was structured or designed that impacted their doctoral experiences. They discussed the design of their programs in the following categories: (a) program focus and (b) program structure.

Program focus. Five participants talked about the focus of their doctoral program. Two participants mentioned that their programs placed an emphasis on preparing doctoral

students to be a counselor educator. One such participant described it as developing skills necessary to be a well-rounded counselor educator:

> The message that I was hearing from my program was certainly we place a value on developing strong counselor educators and being a counselor educator involves doing teaching, scholarship, and services. The message I heard at least was always you better do the things now that'll make you skilled or attractive in those areas.

Two participants talked about how developing a research agenda was most valued by their programs. One such participant commented that developing teaching was "a close second." The other participant talked about how the emphasis on research preparation overshadowed teaching preparation at his doctoral institution:

> It was fantastic because I was at a CACREP research one institution. And so the ability to gain knowledge about research and how to do great research it was great. Very little really focused on being a teacher.

One other participant appreciated that teaching "was really emphasized and I felt really well prepared to be an educator as a result."

Program structure. Four beginning counselor educators discussed the way their programs were structured. One participant mentioned that his program required three-hundred hours of teaching:

> Our program faculty tried to find ways to get us to teach. So we were certainly allowed to co-teach with our faculty on any course if we wanted to and of course, as a CACREP program, CACREP even instituted some policies that of your 600 hour internship at least 300 has to be within teaching. We certainly were all required to do a teaching internship as well.

110

Similarly, another participant described the doctoral internship requirements in her program:

> We had to do a clinical internship and we also had to do a teaching internship, which was 300 hours where we ... it was divided amongst different roles that counselor educators could take in terms of teaching classes but also doing professional, scholarly work to count for some of your hours for that.

Finally, another participant talked about how his program built in a teaching component throughout its classes:

> We had this cohort model and we pretty much took all of our classes together. In each of the classes, the cohort would kinda divvy out responsibility for the content of the course each semester … and so we had opportunity after opportunity to work on how we take counselor education content and present it to the group ... at times it felt stale and felt repetitive, like, "Ok, I'm gonna start this up again and I'm gonna teach part, you're gonna teach part." And that sort of thing. In hindsight, I realized how valuable it was and how much real teaching experience we got in that model … that constant exposure to being asked to come into the classroom prepared to deliver content, semester after semester after semester to doctoral level peers was really valuable.

Impact of experiences. Six participants discussed how their doctoral experiences impacted them. One participant described that the impact of his program in general provided him with "an advanced level of knowledge about counseling as a whole." Another participant felt that it was rich learning for her in her doctoral teaching preparation experiences to have an "experience of being on the other side of things … and just how intense it can be." Another beginning counselor educator felt overwhelmed at first, but worked out a lot of the bugs in his teaching while balancing his dissertation and teaching on his own:

111

It was pretty hard. [laughs] I mean I loved it and it was invigorating, but it was really incredibly hard to do it, to do a dissertation and to maintain all that. I worked out a lot of the bugs with my teaching and my students were very patient. It was a little overwhelming at first.

Other. Three beginning counselor educators talked about their doctoral experiences outside of the other categories in this domain. One talked about the ways she worked with her doctoral advisor on "doing all these IRBs and grant writing and doing research and publishing and teaching." Another participant said he would "have to go back and really look to see if there was an actual course in teaching internship." The final participant told a story about teaching a course as an instructor of record.

Shortcomings in Training

In discussing the shortcomings in training, beginning counselor educators discussed gaps in their doctoral teaching preparation or teaching preparation experiences they wish they had had in their doctoral program. Participants talked about these shortcomings in training within the following categories: (a) shortcomings in program design, (b) lack of preparation in components of teaching, (c) lack of support, (d) desire for more feedback, (e) impact of shortcomings in training, and (f) other.

Shortcomings in program design. Eight participants mentioned shortcomings in the design of their doctoral teaching preparation. They talked about these shortcomings in the following categories: (a) lack of emphasis on teaching, (b) lack of teaching experience, (c) inadequate teaching coursework, and (d) lack of preparation for the work of a counselor educator.

112

Lack of emphasis on teaching. Five participants felt that their doctoral programs did not place enough of an emphasis on preparing them as teachers. One participant described his program as lacking a focus on the nuts and bolts of good teaching and instead focusing more on professional identity development:

> In all the education and in all the focus in counselor education even in our program, it still comes back to a lot more professional identity, counselor identity and probably a little bit less on nuts and bolts. How do you actually stand up and keep people's attention? What's good body posture? How do you use your eye contact to facilitate a crowd? Some of those things that just make for good public speaking so to speak.

Another participant described a similar lack of intentionality behind teaching about the skills on teaching:

> Because I'm a counselor, I know how to connect and evaluate, and think flexibly and on the fly, some of the mistakes I made I was able to correct pretty easily, and you know, my teaching's good, I've always had really good evaluations, and I love that part of it, but that's maybe a little bit more intuitive, not what I've been trained to do. You know, or mentored to do, so.

Four participants talked how their program was focused on other roles of being a counselor educator to the exclusion of teaching. Two participants mentioned that their programs were more focused on advanced clinical skills as opposed to teaching. One such participant discussed how this focus was not a good fit for her needs:

> My professors at the university were more, I think, concerned about how to supervise a clinical experience, and how to do clinical work, and for me I came in as an experienced clinician, with years and years of clinical work, and I didn't need that. I mean I was already way beyond licensure, but at the institution, a lot of the students were younger and didn't have a clinical license yet, so I think they were, the message more was, you need to be licensed, and focus on that clinical

work. And I just already had that, and I was kind of surprised that others didn't to tell you the truth, so, yeah, so I guess that was kind of the focus, probably just getting people to be licensed, and supervise new counselors, rather than teaching.

Another participant talked about how his program was more focused on developing him as a researcher than on helping him learn how to teach. He stated that "as far as being significant for me personally, it was really the research part," and not so much the teaching part. Another participant commented about how developing teaching was compartmentalized to a few experiences in her program and was not integrated throughout the program. She also lamented the lack of opportunities to practice teaching skills after she had learned about them:

> It was a course at the beginning and then there wasn't like continued applications … it wasn't well integrated. I didn't get to practice those skills. And after I learned them, I didn't get to practice.

Lack of teaching experience. Four beginning counselor educators discussed the lack of teaching experience they got in their doctoral programs. One participant compared the teaching requirements of his doctoral program to those of his current program:

> It wasn't as structured as what we do with our doc students here, where they've got to have a minimum of 16 hours up in front of the class. But still it was helpful.

Another participant wishes she was able to have gotten experience teaching as a full instructor:

114

One of the things that really would have been incredibly helpful is just to be the full instructor for a course … just having the opportunity really plan fully and execute a course on your own is much different than being a co-instructor … to have that kind of cushion, to be able to have launched on my own under the care and supervision of those that kind of saw me, that could have been helpful before I spread my wings and flew all the way to a whole different state and whole different environment, that would have been helpful.

Two participants wished they had had more opportunities to coteach at their doctoral institution, since the "teaching experience I had was offsite, so it wasn't a part of the program … I co-taught at a different university with an instructor as part of the practicum."

Inadequate teaching coursework. Five beginning counselor educators felt that their doctoral teaching coursework was inadequate. One participant talked about how his program had no class dedicated to teaching, but instead took a professional identity course that was "basically, what's it like to work in academia, what's the importance of research and of grants and we talked a little bit about teaching. Maybe one class period." Similarly, another participant wished that her one credit summer teaching course had been longer and contained more detail before she started teaching on her own:

So something that would have been more transitional as far as theories on pedagogy and that kind of thing, a little more in depth on that before we actually started teaching. I feel like after that all of my preparation experiences were very much jumping in the fire.

One participant had trouble remembering much about his doctoral teaching coursework and felt it was not impactful:

> There are no classes, or very few classes are actually focused on teacher
> education, then I can't say that it was that impactful or meaningful in that sense.

Finally, one participant wished that her doctoral teaching course had a stronger text and had focused more on pedagogy in general.

  Lack of preparation for the work of a counselor educator. Six participants talked about how their doctoral teaching preparation experiences did not prepare them well for the actual work they have been doing as a counselor educator. Multiple participants were concerned about how they spent so much time teaching as a counselor educator in a way that was disproportional to the amount of time their programs spent training them to teach:

> You can teach at an institution of higher education and not really be a teacher, not
> be trained as a teacher, and I don't really understand that. You know, if you're a
> history teacher, you just are really good at history, and you have a PhD in history,
> but not so much teaching it. So, definitely more of that I think would be helpful at
> that level.

Another participant was frustrated at not getting experience in how to juggle the different roles involved in being a counselor educator:

> We think it's a lot when we're in a doctoral program and we get really great
> training in kind of juggling but then it almost like we're being asked to be the
> masters of the circus and all different roles within that and it's a lot. So to have the
> more solid firm experience of own a course really would help with that mastering
> before I would have launched on to my own.

Similarly, another participant did not feel that his doctoral program prepared him to do a number of teaching tasks that he does frequently as a counselor educator:

It goes back to some of the basic mechanics of teaching. Had I been involved a bit more maybe constructing the syllabus and everything that goes into that and how it's got to tie in with the CACREP requirements as well as state licensure requirements. I didn't give any of that any thought in my doc program, but I've certainly had to do it here.

One participant summed up this dynamic as doctoral programs presenting a utopian perspective of counselor education that does not necessarily resemble the real world:

When I was there maybe it felt very very nicely packaged and a nice oiled machine and it wasn't necessarily the real world. When I was in the office at 3am every day and the person in the office next to me is in there, because I'm blasting my music at 3am and jumping off the walls, having a dance party by myself to try to stay awake and get some work done. And then she comes pounding on the door, saying "Can you keep it down? Someone's trying to work in here." And I'm like, "You're in here too." [laughs] "Oh, my gosh. It's 3 am." But that kinda stuff didn't, wasn't taught to me or told to me or expected. That was off the radar.

Lack of preparation in components of teaching. Eight participants mentioned their doctoral programs not adequately preparing them in specific components of teaching. They mentioned not feeling prepared in the following component categories: (a) philosophy and theory, (b) pedagogy/teaching strategies, (c) understanding developmental levels of students, (d) course design, (e) assessment, and (f) setting classroom expectations.

Philosophy and theory. Three participants reported feeling like their doctoral programs did not integrate enough about teaching theory or teaching philosophy. One participant wished that his doctoral program had addressed how to create a teaching philosophy statement:

117

When I was in the job search, there were several universities that asked you about, in your job application, about your teaching philosophy and we didn't address that directly in my doc program.

That participant wished his doctoral program would have given him more of a background in teaching theory because he does not have time to focus on that now before he has tenure:

My thoughts are after I get tenure, take a breather, really look harder at my classes, how I can make them better. But right now I don't have the bandwidth to do much more than I'm doing as far as . . . I tweak the classes, make them better, but as far as going back and looking at best practices in teaching and teaching theories and philosophies, it's going to be a while before I can bite that one off.

Another participant talked about how her doctoral teaching course required her to write a teaching philosophy statement which she and her classmates struggled with since they had never taught before:

One other thing we did is our teaching philosophy, which I know we all really struggled with because we hadn't taught and we didn't know what it was and so it would've been interested to see that kind of as a thread throughout the program, kind of continuing to grow and evolve our teaching philosophy.

Pedagogy/teaching strategies. Eight beginning counselor educators felt like they did not get enough exposure to pedagogy or teaching strategies in their doctoral programs. One participant stated that "teaching pedagogy was not there at all" in the courses of her doctoral program. Similarly, many of the beginning counselor educators felt there was far too little focus on pedagogy at any point during their doctoral program.

118

For example, one participant was hard pressed to remember anything he learned about

teaching methods in his doctoral program:

> Not a lot about working with students, not a lot about understanding student needs, not a lot about understanding teaching methods and so forth, different teaching styles. You know - some of that, but not enough that I remember, nothing that I couldn't say it, you know that springs to my mind.

Along those lines, another participant talked about not getting the opportunity to

try out different teaching styles in her doctoral teaching course:

> I try to do a lot of flipped classroom techniques with things. That just ... if you wanted to try out that teaching style, in that class you wouldn't have had the opportunity necessarily. I don't think thirty minutes would have been enough to do something like that.

Still another participant talked about not getting instruction on how to create lesson plans:

> I have still to this day never had instruction on how to write a lesson plan or do we even need to have lesson plans. I absolutely find that we do, at least for me I need to have a plan of what I am going to do for the day. But for students that get an undergraduate degree in education or a masters degree in education, they take classes in how to write lesson plans.

One participant summed up this dynamic in his program as not going beyond the basics

of teaching including lecturing and disseminating content:

> The thing that the programs prepare you to do, I think, our program is how to be a basically to be a lecturer. And to create a syllabus, find a textbook, put PowerPoints together and to go in and sorta disseminate content. And that's really, when you come out of that, that's the basic scaffolding for the beginnings of teachers.

Understanding the developmental level of students. Four participants talked about how their doctoral program did not help them understand developmental levels of students. One participant wanted to understand how to meet students' development at various levels:

> I think where I would have really liked to have had more feedback was on the level of rigor and expectation where you think about pedagogy, what's developmentally appropriate to expect at the undergraduate level versus the masters level and now the doc level.

Another participant told a story about how he wished he would have had more information about student learning to justify his teaching decisions:

> I ran up against a very smart doc student that I who had been a teacher who at the end of the semester wanted to straighten me out that I should have very clear expectations and rubrics and this and that. But I was really clear that at the doc level that was not what I was looking for. He had an idea of what he wanted from K-12, but at this level is very different. I give certain parameters, but I don't want to dictate exactly what the end product needs to be because that's not gonna help them in creating their own manuscripts and research and so I didn't give a lot of structure to it, but I thought at this level that's the way it needed to be. Still getting challenges like that, and I was pretty confident in my approach, but still getting challenges like that, I guess, [pause] I wished I'd had more formal instruction on how to back up what I knew to be the most effective way to go about it.

Course design. Two participants wished that their doctoral programs had prepared them better to design courses. One of these participants said, she wished her program had covered more of "the nuts and bolts of how you construct a syllabus, how you set like expectations in your classroom."

120

Assessment. Two participants thought their programs did not adequately prepare them to assessment student learning, create tests, and grade student work. One participant never got much of an opportunity to do grading in his doctoral program:

> I didn't help out with the grading very much and so it didn't give me an opportunity to really talk to the professors about how do you decided how many points to take off and how did you construct this test?

Setting classroom expectations. Two participants wished their doctoral programs had better prepared them to set classroom expectations. One participant could not remember ever talking about how to set expectations for professional etiquette in the classroom during his doctoral program:

> I don't remember anybody telling me how important it was to make sure that I used the syllabus to outweigh not just learning outcomes but expectations for behavior, professional etiquette in the classroom. Everything that I want to be able to enforce as professional and graduate level etiquette, how to use the syllabus to communicate that and use it for accountability purposes. Again part of the intentional part of pedagogy that I think doesn't always come across in the organic training processes.

Lack of support. Seven participants reported feeling a lack of support for teaching. Although the rest of the of this domain included shortcomings in participants' doctoral program, this category included comments about a lack of support across various contexts. Beginning counselor educators talked about this lack of support in the following different settings: (a) doctoral program, (b) current institution, and (c) other.

Doctoral program. Four participants reported a lack of support in teaching in their doctoral program. Although some participants talked about doctoral programs in

general not focusing enough on relationships, most talked specifically about wanting

more of a formalized mentoring program or more care and supervision. One such

participant did not feel like she had a strong mentor in her doctoral program: "there really

wasn't anybody in my doctoral program mentor-wise that I can think of in the teaching

area."

Another participant summarized the issues as one where hectic schedules force

building relationships to the backburner:

> Your schedule's so hectic when you're doing your PhD that you're just trying to get through and get done. I mean anybody that's done a PhD knows that there's more the notion in regards to the amount of work. So a lot of times building those types of relationships is put on the backburner, and it's just knocking the courses off and trying to complete the dissertation.

Current institution. Two participants did not feel supported in teaching in some

way at their current institution. One participant felt misunderstood by a white male

colleague in some of the teaching issues he faced as a male of color:

> If I talk to another colleague who's a white male, a middle-aged white male and say, "What? That's never been an issue for me. What are you talking about? Just do it. Do that in class. What are you talking about?" And I'll be like, "Well, it's a little bit different. I can't really do those things. I can't really say those kinda things."

Another participant talked about not knowing when to ask questions to his colleagues

when they are busy:

> Part of it is just professional respect. You can ask any questions that you have and it's weird to know how to navigate that in a new university system. You're busy and you're colleagues are busy and it seems like the expectation is there.

Other. Two participants did not feel supported in teaching in a context outside of their doctoral program and their current institution. One such participant commented that she did not get much support or mentorship while teaching at a community college before she started her doctoral program. Another participant mentioned not getting much support while working as an adjunct professor during her doctoral program: "When I became an adjunct professor, there was nobody, it was like, oh here, you're going to teach this class, and so, I got a syllabus and that's about it."

Desire for more feedback. Four participants wished they had received more feedback on their teaching during their doctoral program. All four beginning counselor educators wished they had received more observations of their teaching. One participant framed this in a similar way to how counseling supervision is conducted:

> I want to think about even in the same way we do supervision having to provide recorded teaching samples from classes even if you're teaching independently and get feedback on that. Having a mentor that particularly focuses on that part of your preparation in your program. I think about things even here. I've toyed with the idea of having sort of a teacher education, counselor education sort of even where doc students had the opportunity to present a lesson to all of us professors in the same room and get feedback from all of us sort of in a panel style.

Another beginning counselor educator talked about getting only one formal evaluation on his teaching during his doctoral program:

> The last thing that I'll add is that I was at [doctoral institution] for three years and of those three years I was there, I taught for 2 and a half and only one time did I get a formal evaluation of my teaching from a faculty member. And so if someone's gonna be teaching or coteaching, once again it goes back to that getting feedback in formal and informal ways around ... like mentoring. I think about mentoring formally and informally. There needs to be some specific formal written feedback and verbal feedback to support the written feedback more than

one time in a person's program when their learning how to become a teacher within the counselor educator role … So, I didn't know how I was doing. I didn't get any kind of feedback from them.

Finally, one participant talked about some of the specific topics she would have appreciated having feedback on:

I think where I would have really liked to have had more feedback was on the level of rigor and expectation where you think about pedagogy, what's developmentally appropriate to expect at the undergraduate level versus the masters level and now the doc level.

Impact of shortcomings in training. Three participants wished they had received more feedback on their teaching during their doctoral programs. One participant said that "in the moment I thought that things were okay. However, I didn't ... I don't think I felt fully prepared had I not had the mentoring I did when I went in to become an adjunct." Another participant talked about still struggling with his teaching philosophy because it was not talked about much in his doctoral program. Finally one participant talked about having to seek out support from faculty at her current institution to cover gaps in her teaching preparation:

I went to a lot of the faculty here early on to understand, you know like, accreditation standards, or development of a syllabus, and had to reach out quite a bit, maybe to know- to get some of the basics, and to learn the ropes a little bit more.

Other. Three beginning counselor educators talked about other shortcomings in their training as teachers that were outside of the rest of the category structure. One brainstormed that counselor education programs could seek out cross-discipline

124

collaboration with those in the education field to better prepare doctoral students to teach. Another talked about how it is difficult for a doctoral program to completely prepare a beginning counselor educator how to teach:

> [My doctoral program] tried to kind of help you understand the profession and the job, but more, informally, like this is kind of the way it's going to be, and all the politics, and you know, they try to tell you that without really getting into it, because they're in the middle of it, and you're a student in the middle of it, [laugh] so [laugh]. You really don't know until you actually get into the field.

Finally, another participant talked about the potential for programs to take advantage of doctoral teachers in a way that does not always benefit their development:

> There's always an opportunistic aspect of having students kind of take teaching roles in that it can lighten the load if the students are competent and can be instructors of record and that kind of thing, but it can also isolate the students at the same time who feel like they have to be responsible and do a good job and they don't want to screw up and look like their messing up in front of the faculty members. And so the potential ... to me the social justice issue is to avoid any potential for being exploited especially for people who have experience.

Components of Teaching

Beginning counselor educators in this study frequently discussed specific components of teaching in a variety of different contexts. These included discussions of how participants learned about components of teaching in their doctoral programs or how they used these components now as assistant professors or how they would like to grow in these components. Participants talked about components of teaching in the following categories: (a) course construction, (b) evaluation, (c) presentation of content, (d) interactions with students, (e) technology, and (f) reflection.

Course construction. Eight participants mentioned the need to learn how to construct and design a course. They talked about course construction in terms of: (a) designing a course, and (b) accrediting standards.

Designing a course. Eight beginning counselor educators talked about designing a college course. Seven of these participants talked about how their doctoral teaching coursework had taught them how to design a course and write a syllabus. One such participant appreciated getting to think through her rationale for making decisions in creating a course:

> So just getting to kind of hear their rationale behind why they created the assignment and the syllabi the way they did and the expectations they had for students. It was probably informal conversations about that were I think just good for me in thinking about my future development.

Another participant talked about the way his doctoral teaching course helped them learn about course design:

> We had to design a course and not only that but we had to pitch it to the class and the class had to push back like they were a snarky curriculum committee.

Finally, outside of the doctoral teaching coursework context, another participant told a story of having to recreate a course on his own and having difficulty using the previous instructor's materials:

> I started out with a fairly large class the first time I taught the diagnosis class and I was trying to, I found out which class I was teaching maybe a week before the class started and we had just moved to the DSM-V, so there were no textbooks available. So I pretty much, much of the class I had to create myself. I did try using PowerPoints from the previous instructor and that just, it didn't work for me

at all. I put those away and just had to start from scratch and think about what I thought was the most important, most salient things that I wanted my students to get. And once I did that it made a big difference.

Accrediting standards. Four beginning counselor educators talked about using CACREP accreditation standards in the design of their courses. Three participants were taught how to do this by their doctoral programs. One such participant talked about how helpful this has been to her as a counselor educator:

> For some of the assignments in that class we did have to include standards and talk about how we would address them and how we would evaluate them. So I think in the moment I actually didn't realize how valuable that would be. But now as I want help through our program prepare for our report that we submitted in January, it was incredibly helpful in comparison to those who had not done that before.

Another participant said that she learned how to meet these standards through her coteaching experience in her doctoral practicum.

Evaluation. Five participants talked about evaluation in college classes including creating and grading tests and when to make difficult decisions about student grades. Four of these participants talked about student evaluation being addressed in their doctoral teaching preparation. One such participant described her doctoral teaching course as "where I really learned the importance of evaluation, but not just evaluation, how to do it and some of those processes."

Another participant talked about seeking mentoring in evaluation as a beginning counselor educator to learn more of the nuances of it:

When I put an expectation out there that wasn't clear and it's obvious because nobody met it and how to look at the way I communicated that and take some responsibility for the process. How to use testing fairly and being considerate of all sorts of cultural considerations and all of those are the questions that for me weren't addressed in preparation but have emerged in actual practice and that I've needed some continual mentoring with or have appreciated the continual mentoring with.

Finally, another participant talked about how he still struggles with grading and test construction:

What I struggle more with is, you know, constructing good test questions and grading. I know it sounds simple, but grading is a real pain for me and I don't have confidence in the way that I do it and nobody's really taught me how to do it.

Presentation of content. Eight participants talked about different methods and considerations of presenting content to students. They talked about presentation of content within the following categories: (a) varied teaching modalities, (b) student engagement/active learning, (c) philosophy/theory, (d) structuring class time, and (e) lesson planning.

Varied teaching modalities. Three beginning counselor educators talked about using varied teaching modalities. One participant talked about how she learned a variety of different teaching modalities by watching her professors in her doctoral program. Another participant talked about how her doctoral program encouraged her to take more challenges in using different teaching modalities, although in conversations outside of the required components of his doctoral teaching preparation:

The stuff that came later was taking more chances by using different kinds of teaching strategies, like using groups or flipping classes or integrating seminar

type things where students take some responsibility, team-based learning approaches, stuff from k-12. That stuff came later and that was ... that's why I said that talking with [professor] was really helpful for me because when I wanted to try something out, I talked it through with him and then we'd talk about how to implement it and then I'd try it out.

Another participant talked about how his doctoral program helped him learn to increase student engagement by using varied teaching modalities:

So I think one of the things that became really important and it helped me develop was how to use lots of varied teaching modalities in the same course period to promote creativity and engagement and active learning because a three hour course, to just lecture for three hours is mind numbing for everybody. Even two hours is tough. And so the set-up of this programs, in my experience in my program, really helped me embrace and see examples of and gain skills that helped me use lots of different learning modalities in the same course to keep things active and engaging.

Student engagement/active learning. Three beginning counselor educators talked about ways to keeps students engaged and actively learning. Two participants talked about specific active learning activities they had borrowed from their doctoral faculty. One took a specific reflecting team technique from her doctoral co-teacher that she continues to use to this day. Another participant talked about a group learning activity called the advanced planner which requires students to use "cooperative learning, application, some knowledge of content like what were the facts of it, and then diagramming." Another participant talked about the way his doctoral program helped him learned a different skill set to bring to the classroom beyond lecturing:

For me I had the lecture part down pat. I knew how to do that. My preparation helped me learn a whole different skill of bringing others sort of processes into the classroom.

129

Philosophy/theory. Seven participants talked about integrating philosophy and theory into teaching. A total of six participants said that their doctoral programs covered incorporating philosophy and learning theory, but four participants said that their programs put a strong emphasis on theory. Additionally, three participants stated that their doctoral programs required them to create a teaching philosophy statement. One participant talked about how her doctoral program used theory to help her learn how to be more intentional about creating learning goals:

> But you know that learning objectives and goals, they're not just kinda random for what you think you should do. You need to create those according to Bloom's Taxonomy and even understanding what is Bloom's Taxonomy and what that means, that was really heavy in the theories class.

Another participant wished that he was better able to incorporate more theory into his teaching now.

Structuring class time. Three beginning counselor educators talked about how to structure class time. All three participants talked about how they learned how to better structure class time from their doctoral programs. One participant talked about observing instructors in her doctoral program to see how they structured class time:

> I really paid attention to what the instructors were doing when I was in class, like when I was helping co-teach to see how were they setting up class in terms of structure. Were they doing lecture first? Were they doing video first? When do they do the group discussion?

Another participant talked about how valuable it was for her to see how her coinstructor structured class time in a weekend class to prepare her for the weekend classes she is now teaching as a counselor educator:

> I was very lucky with that course that I wasn't teaching that class alone. So I could see how did this instructor set it up and break it up with activities and whatnot throughout the day. So that was really helpful and great experience.

Lesson planning. Three participants talked about lesson planning. Two participants talked generally about how their doctoral programs taught them how to plan lessons. Two other participants talked about how their doctoral programs helped them plan out how to break down content into chunks for their students. One of these participants stated that he wanted students to come away from his classes with a few points:

> If you got people in the room for 2 or 3 hours and you feel like you need to have 125 slides on your PowerPoint and you've got to go through each one in excruciating detail in order to tell yourself you did a good job, that's probably not the right way to do it. You gotta chunk things and most people are only gonna come away with, besides things that they emotionally connect with, a few points. And you need to really think about what you're trying to express and think about the learning process.

Interactions with students. Eight beginning counselor educators talked about components of teaching that involved interactions with students. They talked about these components within the following categories: (a) scaffolding, (b) dealing with student issues, and (c) adapting to students.

131

Scaffolding. Six beginning counselor educators discussed how to scaffold learning for their students. Three participants mentioned that their doctoral programs helped them think through learning theories such as Bloom's Taxonomy in order to help them learn how to scaffold material for students. One such participant talked about how her program helped her make this connection:

> How to structure a course and how to maximize learning, so we did some stuff on learning styles, you know like some students learn better through the kinesthetic channels, some do better through an auditory, some do better through you know, reading, cognitive, and so that helped me understand having lots of different modalities in the classroom is critical, and then how to kind of build - it, really that scaffolding, so what do they already know and then hooking the new stuff to what they already know, right, and then building upon that, and then - we also did some stuff with developing like learning objectives, so Bloom's taxonomy.

Two other participants talked about how they balanced rigor and support for their students, deciding what parts of a course they should be responsible for as instructors and what parts their students should be responsible for. One participant talked about this in terms of asking himself questions about his lessons: "What percentage do I want to take responsibility for? What percentage can the students take responsibility for? And then what do I need to evaluate between the two?"

A final participant talked about how she is currently thinking about Bloom's Taxonomy to encourage higher levels of learning with a flipped classroom approach:

> I think a lot of bloom's taxonomy and I think a lot of it was like the memorization of how we were being taught to on that level. And just knowing that the brain is capable of so much more. So it was maybe informed in that way of thinking like how could I shift this to still covering the same information but in a different format. Or maybe people are getting to higher levels of learning.

Dealing with student issues. Five participants talked about dealing with often

challenging student issues that arise in teaching. Two participants talked about how their

doctoral teaching course had discussions about how to deal with student behaviors.

However, another participant talked about he has had to seek mentoring in "how to

handle when students do complain and even complain about your teaching, how to

facilitate hard conversations in the classroom" since he thinks these unique situations are

difficult to address in doctoral teaching preparation. Another participant talked about how

"self-development and self-reflection" have helped her learn how to deal with student

issues and unique situations.

Another participant appreciated the transparency of one of her doctoral co-

teachers in modeling her thought processes in dealing with a difficult student:

> There was this student who I think probably rubbed every single person the wrong
> way including her and I just remember that was a moment I really saw her as
> human as we were able to process the frustrations and how she worked through
> that … being able to hear how she in supervision addressed those things with the
> student ... I really appreciated her being honest and transparent about what she
> was struggling with and talking through how she worked through it.

Adapting to students. Four participants talked about how to pay attention to the

reactions of students and adapt their teaching accordingly. One participant talked about

learning how to do this in his doctoral program. Another participant mentioned how this

is something very important to how he teaches now. For example, he uses student

performance and responses from previous classes to adapt his teaching the next semester:

> Things that the students didn't understand that I should have highlighted early on
> or really driven home or sent to them in writing or made sure we practiced early

on when I'm a few weeks into the class and something surprises me, I take note of it and really try to address it early on the next time I teach that class.

Two other participants talked about how they did not want to engage in power struggle with their students. One participant talked about how his pre-doctoral experiences as a consultant helped him know how not to get into power struggles with students over course content:

I had an advantage in that way cause I never really got into a power struggle with students about content. I can't think of a single time. I can think of several times where they might ask me a question and I'd be like, "I gotta check that out." And I would send them an email or I'd bring it back to the class or whatever. But it was never about me speaking to the students about this is how you do this.

Technology. One participant talked about how to use technology as a college teacher. He mentioned that learning to use the Blackboard course management system was new to him as a beginning counselor educator.

Reflection. Four beginning counselor educators talked about the way they reflect upon their own teaching to help themselves grow in teaching. Two participants talked about how their doctoral programs encouraged them to reflect on their teaching. One of these participants talked about how she was provided with structure to reflect on doctoral teaching opportunities with faculty and peers and that these opportunities encouraged her "in terms of self-exploration, self-understanding, it really pushed me to challenge … my anxiety to be a good educator."

Another participant talked about how she used skills in reflection that she had developed as a counselor to reflect on the teaching of her doctoral professors. A final

participant talked about how seeking mentoring and reflection had helped him think

through the mistakes he made in teaching.

Feedback

Within the feedback domain, beginning counselor educators discussed ways that

they had received feedback on their teaching in their doctoral program and in their

current work environment. Participants received feedback from various kinds of sources

and mentioned feedback in a few other capacities, resulting in the follow categories: (a)

feedback source, and (b) other.

Feedback source. Seven participants discussed the people who had provided

them with feedback on their teaching. Beginning counselor educators received feedback

from (a) students, (b) doctoral faculty, (c) colleagues, and (d) doctoral peers.

Students. Four participants talked about how they received either formal or

informal feedback from students in their classes. Three participants mentioned that they

ask for specific feedback from their students outside of the regular end of course teacher

evaluations using a variety of different approaches. These participants talked about the

importance of seeking out student feedback before the end of a course so that they could

adapt their teaching to better fit the needs of students and improve their end of semester

student evaluations of teaching. One participant talked about the approach she used to

solicit feedback from students around the midterm point in her courses:

> At midterm time I always do just informal on a piece of paper or note card like
> the stop, start, continue. What should I stop doing? What should I start doing?
> What should I continue doing? And I found that to be very beneficial in the end of
> the semester evaluations. There's not always a lot of stop doing things, a lot of
> continue, but more than anything I really try and look at if their like start, so

something in that. I found that when I implement, even if it's something like super small, like, "Oh, if you could provide more videos that we could watch out of class." So as simple as me doing a google search for something that might enhance their learning. They really seem, when they do their qualitative feedback at the end on the IDEA surveys, they really give positive feedback for that of the teacher really listened to what might help.

Two participants talked about how building strong relationships with students allows for richer feedback. One participant talked specifically about how his role as a teacher while he was a doctoral student allowed him to be more collaborative about seeking feedback because the students perceived him differently and he felt safe from the pressure of trying to get tenured. His students helped him understand what was and was not working in his teaching:

> If I didn't have that internship. I woulda had a lot more trouble my first year to be honest. To have the safety of being the doc student role while I was doing that was really really helpful because my students were more collaborative than helpful. They didn't see me as the faculty member, they saw me as the teacher who was a doc student and a student like them. And that really ... we were able to sit down and talk frankly about this is what's working and what's not working.

Two beginning counselor educators discussed the ways that student feedback was helpful to them. For one participant, it helped her achieve better student evaluations because her students commented that they felt listened to. She also commented that it was hard to know what she needed to change about her teaching until she heard feedback from students. Finally, seeking this feedback also benefited her students:

> It's that permission, kinda like when we work with clients unless we give them that permission, they don't think they have that right as a student to say anything. So I found it to be beneficial even in relationships. They feel like they have some control over what happens in the classroom.

136

Doctoral faculty. Five beginning counselor educators talked about receiving

feedback from their doctoral faculty. Two participants talked about receiving feedback on

their teaching through observations or other formal evaluations. One participant

mentioned valuing the specific technical feedback she received in this process:

> She came in and did the formal evaluation every semester and that was submitted
> up to the university, so it was a thing they have in place for that part, but she
> didn't have to do all the additional supervision. And, so that again, I found very
> very helpful because I was getting feedback, I was getting a lot of other ideas
> when she would come in to say, "Hey," again it wasn't so much of, "Don't do
> that." I wasn't having any problems. It was more of like, "Here's some other ideas.
> Here's some activities I use when I'm doing case study."

Three participants reported that their teaching feedback often took place in more informal

conversations with doctoral faculty. Some of these took place within a co-teaching

relationship. One participant appreciated how he was able to come to his mentor and get

specific, technical suggestions about the feedback he had received from students. Another

beginning counselor educator talked about an important conversation where his mentor

had challenged him for choosing a textbook that was too expensive:

> "If I create a class I would use this book." And my professor was like, "Yeah
> that's a good book. That's also a pretty expensive book, huh?" And I would be
> like, "Oh yeah. That's a consideration to think." Maybe it's a nice book to us but
> with students to purchase a $300 book, one book for one class, then if a book is
> $300 it's not unrealistic to think a student might pay 700, 800, 900 bucks in one
> semester just for books in one semester.

Two beginning counselor educators also mentioned how much they valued the

frequent feedback they received from their doctoral faculty or the way their doctoral

program emphasized feedback. One stated that he received ample feedback on his

teaching in his doctoral program. The other appreciated the way constant feedback

combined with a variety of teaching experiences in his doctoral program challenged him:

> The constant feedback and opportunities to teach with my doc level peers, but then running the classroom with these undergraduates on regular basis. It really provided the best of both worlds. And was kinda good and rich challenges.

Lastly, three beginning counselor educators discussed the ways that feedback

from doctoral faculty had helped them grow as teachers. One participant felt like the

feedback he received helped him better understand the choices his co-teacher was making

and helped him think through how to be more intentional about his choices as a teacher.

Another participant appreciated receiving feedback about ideas and actives that she was

doing and felt more confident in her teaching:

> Having that feedback from someone who literally came in and watched my whole class and did again the next semester in both the classes I taught, I should say. It really helped build my confidence.

The third participant appreciated having a better understanding of his strengths

and areas for growth as a teacher in his conversations:

> We would just sit down and either over a - over coffee or lunch or his office visit, and we'd just talk about here are some things you did well, here are some things you want to work on, here are some ways that you can improve, it was just very collegial, and the receiving the feedback.

Colleagues. Two participants spoke about receiving feedback from their

colleagues. One beginning counselor educator appreciated receiving feedback from a

more senior faculty member at his current institution:

Out of 30 questions there were about 5 of them that over half the class missed and so I knew they were bad questions. And I didn't know if it . . . or well I say that, I didn't know that, I wasn't sure if I should have taught it differently. But talking to the senior faculty and he said just get rid of those. Go back to your students, ask them what troubled them about those questions, see if you can adjust it and if not throw it out.

The other participant appreciated the way that her department head at the institution where she was teaching as an adjunct during her doctoral program did regular observations and evaluations of her teaching:

When I taught adjunct at a different university during my doctoral program, that was actually something that was required once a semester. There was someone who within the department came in and evaluated my teaching and as a doctoral student that was incredibly helpful.

Similarly, that same participant found it helpful to have members of the center for teaching and learning at her current institution observe her class and offer feedback about her flipped classroom approach:

Another resource through that same office is they offer, you can have it each semester, and a person will come in two times, but you sign up for a time of observation. And so prior to the time of them coming in, you have to submit to them your course materials for the day, what your objectives are. So they have that coming in knowing what you're planning to do. They stay and do an observation for your class period. You meet and get feedback afterwards. And then they come in towards the end of the semester and you submit the same things to them again of what their expectations are. They give you the two evaluations within the semester, but also see if you're able to implement some of the teaching strategies that they've given you in that first time.

Doctoral peers. Two beginning counselor educators mentioned that they received feedback from other doctoral students in their program. For one participant, this was an

139

intentionally structured part of her program within a group supervision class including

doctoral students presenting their work from both clinical and teaching internships. The

doctoral students in this class used the same rubrics to evaluate one another that their

university used in the promotion and tenure process with its faculty. This participant like

receiving positive feedback on her teaching from her peers, but did not always find it

constructive:

> When we did those observations we used that same form that the faculty members
> would use when they're going up for promotion which was really helpful for us
> just to see what are the types of things that we're going to be expected to do in this
> role. So, my feedback was always really positive, which was ... getting good
> feedback, it feels good, but it's not always the most helpful because you don't
> know how to improve.

Other. Five participants discussed feedback in other ways outside of referencing

the source of the feedback. In this category, beginning counselor educators discussed (a)

providing feedback, (b) importance of feedback, and (c) designing teaching evaluations.

Providing feedback. Four participants talked about how they provide feedback to

their students. Two participants talked about how their doctoral programs had helped

them learn ways to provide feedback to students. One participant appreciated the

modeling she received by getting to watch her coteacher navigate interpersonal

differences with students. In fact, she has adopted a number of the phrases her co-teacher

used in providing hard feedback:

> And just learning these little phrases that I've taken with me, you know when
> feedback's hard to give, by saying something as simple as, "I'm not preparing you
> professionally unless I'm able to provide this feedback for you." And I found that

140

to be one of the most invaluable statements [laughs]. As I give students feedback they just seem to hear things really well that way.

Two participants talked about ways that they give doctoral students at their current institution feedback on their teaching. One participant stated that since he wanted more feedback on his teaching in his doctoral program, "today I try to be very intentional about giving students lots of feedback in both supportive things that they are doing very well and supporting their strengths and also areas of growth and things that they could improve on." Another participant talked about the way that many of his students do not watch the flow of the class or engage their students enough. So he provides them with feedback and helps them problem solve these issues in conversations and through scaffolding:

> So I give them feedback on that and typically I have them teach a class where they can't use PowerPoints at all and it's usually scary for them to do that, but then they prepare in different ways and for at least a couple of them it was by far the best class that they taught.

Importance of feedback. Three beginning counselor educators discussed ways that feedback is important for teaching and that it should be emphasized in doctoral counselor education programs. One participant talked about how feedback was necessary to take teaching to a deeper, more aware level beyond just copying example syllabi:

> Everybody can grab a syllabus, not everybody, but I think with the ACES clearing house you can see your share of syllabi. We could go back to our programs, our masters or whatever and we could pull up some syllabi, we can look at that. We can go on a publishers website and pull up and bunch of books and read desk copies and try to figure out a good book, but I think all of that is, not to say futile, but it's, or irrelevant, but I think a lot of it is, it's in a totally different context

without bringing you some feedback on, from what you're doing and what you're thinking from professors and … colleagues now here.

Designing teaching evaluations. One participant talked about how he was currently working at an institution that allowed him to design his own teaching evaluations that would be used for his promotion and tenure decisions. He talked about how he was trying to include multiple sources of data in his evaluation:

> So I wanted external perspectives, my own perspective, and the perspective of the students. And so, I'm actually in the process of working on questions, quantitative and qualitative questions for the student evaluations of my teaching. Last Thursday, I had a peer evaluation of my teaching. And I have been trying to generate some guided reflection questions for myself to ask from year to year about how I'm growing. I try to keep things framed up within the scholarship of teaching model, that Boyer model.

Support

Beginning counselor educators discussed support in numerous ways during their interviews. Participants talked about support in teaching in a variety of different ways: (a) sources of support, (b) structure of relationships, (c) methods of support, (d) emotional/social impact of support, and (e) other.

Sources of support. All nine participants mentioned receiving support about their teaching from somewhere. Most often this support came from doctoral faculty or colleagues. In other cases, it came from doctoral classmates, other mentors, or as part of the culture or institutional polices of their environment. Accordingly, this category consists of the following subcategories: (a) doctoral faculty, (b) colleagues, (c) doctoral classmates, (d) institutional/cultural, and (e) other mentors.

Doctoral faculty. Seven participants mentioned being supported by their doctoral faculty. Beginning counselor educators valued the mentorship they received from their doctoral faculty through co-teaching and in informal conversations. Two participants valued being able to receive support from mentors who were experts in teaching. One such participant valued having a mentor with extensive experience teaching and doing research:

> I had a great supervisor, and professor who I worked - who I chose to work with that professor intentionally because they had been teaching for 40 + years. So I knew that they were a wealth of knowledge, they had been doing it, they had been a practitioner, they had been teaching for 40 years, they were great researcher, which was what I was aiming to be, all three of those things.

Many participants commented on how valuable these relationships were to them and how they felt the mentorship they received was strong. One participant talked about how her faculty members had a huge impact on her:

> I remember a couple faculty members that taught me in my masters program that also taught me in my doctoral program just had made a huge impact on me in my masters program and so I'd always seen them as mentors. But most of that came out of the doc program.

Colleagues. Six participants mentioned receiving support from their colleagues either at their current institution, at previous institutions they had worked at other than their doctoral programs, or from their time working as counselors. Four participants talked about seeking out support for their teaching from faculty members at their current institution, often finding it helpful and supportive. Some talked about individual relationships with specific faculty members, but others talked about an overall collegial

and supportive environment created by the faculty. One such participant found the

supportive environment created by his colleagues to be particularly beneficial:

> It's a great relationship among the faculty in regards to supporting each other to get things done, and to support the growth of you and your faculty. So that is phenomenal. I could not have gone to a better situation that was more supportive of new faculty.

Another participant talked in a similar fashion about appreciating the support she

received while teaching as an adjunct in her doctoral program:

> I had a really wonderful experience with that because prior to coming in as I was creating my syllabi, again she knew the program. She knew the students. And so she was able to give feedback about what other texts and what other assignments the program does. So I just felt like I had this incredible opportunity with a mentor. And I kind of took everything that I could from that experience and really utilized her.

One other participant valued the advice he had received from a mentor about doing

presentations while working as a counselor:

> I remember when I did my first workshop with him were worked together on one, did one for the mental health board. There was a shitload of people there and we had prepped and talked about that and he was telling me, "Trust the process but here's some advice for you." I remember that very clearly.

Doctoral classmates. Two beginning counselor educators talked about receiving

support from their doctoral classmates. Both valued being able to process teaching

experiences with peers through "a lot of process discussions, a lot of just being able to

share the experience with peers and learn from the decisions they were making."

Similarly, the other participant appreciated getting to discuss "mutual observations of

faculty member's teaching styles, about things we really loved and things we didn't agree with." That participant also talked about his peers serving as a sound board for one another to vent frustrations and celebrate accomplishments:

> We had that peer sounding board and you could support each other when you were overwhelmed. You could celebrate accomplishments. So I think that peer support all the way through made a huge difference because I didn't have to put my best foot forward all the time. If you had drop an F-bomb or had to be angry or shed a tear, you didn't feel as much in the spot like as with faculty members.

Institutional/cultural. Six participants talked about supportive parts of the culture or institutional policies of their doctoral or current institution. Three participants talked about how their institutions provided them with lots of opportunities. One such participant talked about how her current institution offered lots of professional development on various teaching-related topics. Another participant appreciated the opportunities afforded by her doctoral program:

> We were given a lot of opportunities to get experience and exposure and then to come back and discuss and reflect on that with faculty and our peers and that's something I really appreciated.

Three participants talked about the overall supportive environment at either their doctoral or current institution. One participant talked about being treated as a peer by her colleagues at the institution where she taught as an adjunct during her doctoral program:

> I just really felt like I was in the loop. I did not feel like I was treated as an adjunct. It was a satellite campus, but we were all in one big office too, with cubicles. And so I just felt like the other folks and faculty really treated me as a peer. It was the first time I remember feeling not like a student.

One participant felt supported in teaching by her current institution's center for teaching and learning:

> So we have a weekly email that comes out and they give, I think generally, 3 to 5 articles strictly to college teaching. And so things ... just good reminders of best practices or things to think about in your teaching. Different ways to structure your classroom.

Other mentors. Four participants mentioned other mentors who had influenced their teaching. One participant mentioned her father as an important mentor since he was also an educator. Another participant mentioned having a continual mentoring relationship with one of the professors from his master's counseling program. Two participants mentioned getting support from mentors at the institution where they did their doctoral teaching internships. One especially appreciated the way that person provided "lots of resources" and "lots of coaching."

Structure of relationships. Seven participants mentioned details about the way that their mentoring relationships were structured. They talked about the following categories related to the structure of their relationships: (a) frequency and length of meetings, (b) ongoing relationships, (c) mentoring beyond teaching, (d) informal nature, and (e) seeking out support.

Frequency and length of meetings. Two beginning counselor educators talked about feeling support by having frequent or lengthy meetings with their mentors. One mentioned that he met weekly with his doctoral advisor as a doctoral student. The other participant mentioned meeting for an hour "on a regular basis because I wanted the feedback from my professor and my professor wanted to give me that type of feedback."

Ongoing relationships. Four participants mentioned appreciating the ongoing nature of their mentoring relationships, frequently commenting that the relationship had extended beyond its initial parameters. All four of these participants mentioned that these mentoring relationships occurred with doctoral faculty members and that those relationships still continue on to this day even though they have graduated from that institution. One participant valued the way "that professor and I are still coffee mates and so I go to them for mentoring now. And so they're always there to support me so that's an ongoing relationship."

Mentoring beyond teaching. Two beginning counselor educators talked about their mentoring relationships having a broader focus and system of support as opposed to focusing primarily on teaching. As one participant put it, his mentors were more focused on helping him develop as a person than on developing his teaching:

> "Hey, I'm here to help you whatever way it can be." There's that trickle-down effect and if it impacts you in your teaching, awesome. If it impacts you with something you're doing for your research, awesome. But at the very least, if it just helps you be more comfortable as a person, hey, that's the goal. And that's just hope, let's just make good people.

Informal nature. Two participants talked about the informal nature of their mentoring relationships. Both of these participants mentioned that their mentoring relationships came about organically as opposed to within a structured mentoring program. One participant described this dynamic as he and his mentor "naturally gravitating towards each other."

Seeking out support. Four participants talked about the fact that they had to seek out mentoring and support instead of having it offered to them. One participant believed that it was "common for new faculty members to have to seek out mentoring," and many of the other participants agreed that this was a common dynamic as both a doctoral student and as a beginning counselor educator. One viewed this dynamic in a positive light for the growth of doctoral students:

> The student has to decide what they want to be and how they want to be and they're expected at that level to actually be the motivators of their own journey and their own educational desires.

In contrast, another participant wished her mentoring in her doctoral program had been more formalized, but could see benefits of having to seek out support:

> There's a part of me that starts to say if that had been a little more structured, but then the other part of me says, it's good for students to have to take that initiative and to seek out opportunities that they want. So, I think the main thing would be just a little bit more maybe formalized education and preparation.

One participant believed that she would have reached out for more support in her experience working as an adjunct in her doctoral program:

> I think people just thought you don't need, you know [laugh], you've been around a long time, you don't need us to hold your hand, so and a little bit of like I really don't know if I want to bother anybody either, so, part of that was probably on me, not reaching out more.

Methods of support. Eight beginning counselor educators discussed specific actions their mentors took to support them. They talked about the following areas in

which they were supported: (a) information/resource sharing, (b) feedback, (c) encouraging identity development, (d) discussion of challenges and problem solving, (e) encouraging reflection on teaching, and (f) personalized support.

Information/resource sharing. Four participants talked about ways their mentors had shared information or resources with them. Some of these resources included course materials, actives, and structure of classes. For example, one participant discussed the way that her and her colleagues share creative classroom activities:

> I'd say I have an ability to come up with creative activities to use in class and so faculty come to me a lot to say, "Hey, I want to do this. What do you think about that?" or "I need an idea to do this in class." And I go to them also if I have an idea, I'll run it by them and say, "Do you think that it would be a good idea to teach this topic?"

One participant found it very useful when her mentor shared information about the context of her new work environment. She appreciated they ways her mentors taught her about university politics and programs and nuances about what the program expects from the courses. Additionally, her mentor was helpful in sharing her knowledge about the program and its students:

> She knew the program. She knew the students. And so she was able to give feedback about what other texts and what other assignments the program does. So I just felt like I had this incredible opportunity with a mentor. And I kind of took everything that I could from that experience and really utilized her.

Feedback. Three participants talked about how their mentors had provided them with feedback on their teaching in a supportive way. One participant mentioned appreciating how her mentor provided her with feedback about the texts and assignments

currently used in her program. Another participant sought feedback about ideas for class activities from her mentors.

Encouraging identity development. Five participants talked about how their mentors had helped encourage the development of their identities as teachers and counselor educators. Two participants appreciated the ways their mentors modeled being strong counselor educators. One participant had a mentor who provided her with a philosophy of support that she has since adopted in working with doctoral teaching assistants. Mentors helped another participant think about how she wanted to show up as an educator:

> They gave me a model in my mind of what I knew a good educator could be and how I wanted to show up. And my journey has been very much about both trying to emulate that model and also figuring out ... taking those models and using them but then figuring out who I am independent from them.

Similarly, another participant talked about how conversations with her mentor helped give her permission to make her courses her own:

> More than anything I think that it's helped give me permission, like, "Hey, make this you own." Which is something I heard a lot, like, "Here's what they did, but if you have other ideas." And I know that doesn't happen everywhere, but [pause] new ideas were very welcomes in the classroom both from students and faculty when I came here.

Additionally, two participants talked about learning how to be a well-rounded counselor educator from their mentors. For example, one participant was given advice about having experience in all parts of being a counselor educator:

I never really thought that I would identify more with the teacher role. So I was told basically, to be competitive for jobs, you need to have some teaching experience. If you wanna get a faculty job as a counselor educator, you need to have some teaching under your belt. Research alone is not gonna be enough usually because you're gonna have to teach alone in these programs.

Discussion of challenges and problem solving. Six beginning counselor educators talked about ways their mentors helped them discuss challenges with their teaching and brainstormed solutions. Three participants talked generally about their mentors helping them problem solve or deal with student issues. Others brought up specific scenarios that their mentors had helped them work through. One such participant sought guidance from other faculty about a recent plagiarism case in one of her classes:

I just had a plagiarism case happen in one of my classes and being able to say, "Hey, can you take a look at this." … "Do you think this is plagiarism or is this not? What do you think this is?"

Two participants talked the importance of having a mentor to help them think of ways to keep students engaged:

And it's good to have colleagues that you can talk through and it brings up good points of brainstorm ways to make class more intriguing, especially when we're teaching these night courses, five to eight, five to nine. It's good to have that on your mind to keep that fresh as far as keeping yourself and the students engaged.

Another participant appreciated the way that he was able to speak freely with his mentor in his problem solving discussions:

I would say that my conversations with my advisor and my chair were the most helpful as ways to process and speak freely. He and I developed a relationship where we could speak freely with one another.

Encouraging reflection on teaching. Four participants pointed out that their mentors or the culture of their programs encouraged them to reflect on their teaching. One participant talked about how her doctoral teaching mentors had a philosophy of support that encouraged her to reflect on teaching. Another participant talked about how it was important for him to be transparent about his teaching struggles with his students and then reflect on his mistakes:

> They were patient and I would just commit to just saying, "Nope I didn't get that right." And so I tried some things out that I felt were appropriate because I would talk those through with people, but I made a lot of mistakes and I recovered from them and I owned them and I looked to students to help guide things.

Personalized support. One participant talked about how she appreciated the personalized support she received from her doctoral mentors. She talked about being encouraged to ask for what she needed from her doctoral mentors:

> I remember saying to one of my faculty supervisors, "I'm really intimidated when you're in the room. Is it okay if I do it by myself tonight and you not be there?" And he was like, "Sure. Absolutely. You just needed to tell me that." I was like, "Okay." And then before we started the semester we had the agreement on what I would be responsible for and to be able to say half way through the semester, "Hey, I think I need more experience grading papers. Is it okay if I grade this next set of papers?" And he was like, "Yeah. No problem."

Emotional/social impact of support. Seven beginning counselor educators discussed the emotional or social impact that support from their mentors had on them. They talked about this impact in the following ways: (a) normalization/validation, (b) increases comfort/confidence, (c) catharsis, (d) increased motivation/agency, and (e) other.

Normalization/validation. Three participants reported feeling normalized or validated by their mentors. One participant said that a statement by his mentor helped ease his imposter syndrome:

> From a validation perspective it was also kinda nice to be in that course and to have our department chair teaching it and to say, "You're here because we believe you make a good counselor educator" and it was kinda validating, I guess, for me and kinda helped ease some of my concerns about imposter syndrome.

Another participant told a story about how feedback from a mentor had helped him differentiate between parts of his teaching that in his control and parts that were out of his control:

> There was one class I taught in my, the only class I had where my evaluations were mediocre. And I worried and I fretted over that and I really, I was wondering if this was the right job for me for a full six months and then I mentioned it to one of the senior faculty here, to two of them and they said "ahhh, gosh yeah I had low evaluations when I taught that class too." And that made all the difference in the world to me because where I was feeling terrible about myself and once you've been through a doc program and we tend to be pretty competitive and hard on ourselves and noticing where we're lacking rather than giving ourselves credit, at least that's the way I've been. And so that was really normalizing and helpful for me and I learned from that class about a lot of things I would do different but just knowing that those people who are very accomplished, they've been at this for twenty plus years, also had a similar experience was really validating.

Increased comfort/confidence. Five participant reported that they felt a sense of increased comfort or confidence from the support of their mentors. Three participants said they felt more comfortable taking a variety of risks in their teaching based on the support of their mentor. One beginning counselor educator agreed to teach in an area that was not his area of expertise because of the comfort and confidence he felt based upon

his relationships with his co-teachers. Other participants felt less nervous about messing up or about trying new teaching approaches with the support of their mentors. One such participant talked about how her anxiety about appearing incompetent was reduced by her mentoring relationship:

> I just really valued her opinions and so I didn't have any anxiety about messing up or asking a dumb question because she just had made it very clear that she was there only to support and make this a really great experience for me in that time.

Another participant talked about the way that her mentor's confidence in her abilities helped her feel more confident about herself:

> The mentor I was working with actually trusting me with the class [laughs]. I remember there was a death of someone close to her and she had to be away and she asked me if I was comfortable taking the class and she would have been okay if I hadn't been and I remember thinking, "She's comfortable with this? Well if she's comfortable, I believe I can do that because she believes I can."

Catharsis. Two participants stated that they felt a sense of catharsis getting to express their feelings about and reactions to teaching with their mentors. One participant valued being able to vent to his mentors without judgment. The other participant felt that he could be more open in expressing emotions with doctoral peers than he could with his doctoral faculty.

Increased motivation/agency. Four participants described a sense of increased motivation or agency based upon their relationships with their mentors. One participant stated that a positive relationship with a mentor provided him with more opportunities in his doctoral program. Another beginning counselor education said the mentorship from

other faculty at his current institution was helpful in creating a new substance abuse

program there.

Another participant's drive was enhanced by the praise of his doctoral coteacher:

> Hearing from someone again in her position … to have someone be, "We are so excited to have you in the field." Hearing that from a respected professional is like ... I think it just really enhances your drive, like I was like, I need to finish my dissertation and I need to do this.

Other. Four participants discussed support in other ways. Two participants talked

about how doctoral programs could better support their students. One believed that

counselor education programs should be more intentional about what they include in their

programs to better support students. Another participant would like to see more doctoral

programs in counselor education have a course on "this is how you go through the hiring

process for academia."

That same participant discussed how the faculty members at his current institution

had made his track to tenure a lot easier:

> You know those unknown things that you need to know in order to get promoted and get tenured in an institution. And let me tell you what, that is essential for anybody that's going forward in academia to understand.

Another participant talked about how he based his decisions of what courses to coteach

on the faculty he felt comfortable working with as opposed to the content areas he knew

the most about:

> I ended up teaching courses with faculty who I felt--who happened to all be faculty of color actually--I ended up teaching a lot with them, almost exclusively

with them I should say. But we taught ... my focus or emphasis, I guess in the experience I got out of it, was how can I be the best educator I can be. Not necessarily how can I be best multicultural counseling educator or the best assessment educator, but how can I just be the best counselor educator. So I worked with people who I trust or who I trusted, who I felt would give me honest and valuable feedback and who would also allow me to be as vulnerable as I am or as I could be and then say, "Man, I feel like a freakin' idiot up there" or something like that. Or, "I don't know what … I'm doing,"

Emotions

Beginning counselor educators talked about the emotions they felt in regards to their teaching and their doctoral teaching preparation. They discussed the following emotional categories in their interviews: (a) comfort and confidence, (b) excitement and enjoyment, (c) appreciation, (d) anxiety, (e) stress and being overwhelmed, (f) loneliness, and (g) change influenced by emotions.

Comfort and confidence. Three participants talked about feeling comfortable or confident in teaching and many of them talked about what helped increased these feelings for them. One participant talked about how his doctoral teaching preparation helped him feel more confident in front of a class:

It helped me just with comfort in being up in front of a group of students and building confidence that I had something worthwhile to offer. Where I got my doc degree was a very highly competitive, small, research intensive school and so the masters students there were brilliant, but my experiences there helped me see I had something to offer and it gave me confidence and I began to be more relaxed in front of a group of people teaching.

Another participant talked about factors that helped ease her anxiety about teaching when she taught her first semester courses at her current institution:

Those classes were very small and I was teaching something that I had cotaught before but I still felt in many ways uncertain about it … But I had two really good experiences that first semester. I think I was given the opportunity to teach in more of a seminar style that really made me more comfortable. So I think that set the tone for a lot of things and after that I just felt more confident.

A final participant talked about how teaching as an adjunct during her doctoral program helped her feel more confident:

That was an invaluable experience for me in gaining confidence. And I remember that was also a time that I felt like, "Oh, this is gonna be like a great career." Like I really enjoyed getting to do the teaching, but also it was a really healthy atmosphere that was teaching adjunct.

Excitement and enjoyment. Three beginning counselor educators talked about feeling excitement and enjoyment when they are teaching. One talked about how she had been looking forward to learning how to teach better in her doctoral teaching course:

I remember my experience with that was very fond. I remember that very positively. It felt exciting to me to actually get to talk about best ways to teach and best practices and like what that would look like. Teaching was the thing I was most excited about when I came back to PhD. It was the reason I came back.

Another participant talked about how feeling overwhelmed in teaching in addition to his other responsibilities at first faded and it became invigorating and enjoyable.

Appreciation. Three participants expressed appreciation towards their doctoral teaching courses or programs in general. One participant appreciated the "person centered approach" of her doctoral teaching course. Another participant felt "very fortunate" that she had a strong instructor in her doctoral teaching course with lots of background in

157

student development. Another beginning counselor educator appreciated what he got out of his doctoral program:

> It was one of those counseling things that you take out what you put in kinda thing. And I feel fortunate that I was able to put in a lot and take out a lot.

Anxiety. One participant talked a great deal about overcoming her anxiety surrounding teaching during her doctoral teaching experiences. She talked about how teaching her first two undergraduate classes as an instructor of record were struggles for her:

> [Those first two undergraduate classes were what I] struggled the most with, especially with my anxiety and how I showed up. I remember that first undergraduate class just trying to get my wits about me with just trying to plan a curriculum and organizing everything and having to learn the lesson during that semester that it wasn't my job to be liked and accepted. It was my job to help them learn.

Stress and being overwhelmed. Four participants talked about feeling stressed or overwhelmed by their teaching. Two participants mentioned feeling overwhelmed during their first few years as a counselor educator. One such participant felt "frustrated" and "under pressure" by teaching a DSM-V class that he largely created on his own. The other participant felt overwhelmed by all of his responsibilities in his first year as a counselor educator:

It was really hard on me. It was like a personal thing almost, like I'm a person of failure if I can't do this or I thought, "I was trained to do this. I came from a doc program that prepared us for this and they told us how to become great amazing teachers and researchers, but yet why am I still struggling? ... it was a real existential moment.

Another participant talked about how she found teaching "a little overwhelming because I created one syllabi for the course" while teaching as an adjunct during her doctoral program.

Loneliness. One participant was surprised at how she felt disconnected from other faculty members in her department at her current institution:

> I'm surprised at how much it is, you're kind of on your own, and you're very autonomous, and independent in a lot of ways, and I didn't realize how lonely it would really actually be, because you're in your office a lot, and you're with students, but you don't really interact with faculty outside of the department meetings.

Change influenced by emotions. One participant commented that her anxiety was part of what inspired her to want to improve her teaching. She told a story of her first experience co-teaching a class in her doctoral program where she was displeased with some of her student evaluations:

> In that first graduate class, in the theories class, oh man, at the end of the semester, the class did an evaluation of us separately, the main instructor and me and I looked through my evaluations and they were largely very strong, there were a lot of positive things said. Many people were saying I had come off as cold or detached and not warm or approachable, which I remember being struck by because that did not reflect what I thought of myself and I really had to dig into that and I felt upset by it, I felt more alarmed than anything that my anxiety was getting in the way of me coming across as myself in the classroom and I met with my mentor and we talked about that and what that meant. And so I think that class really marked my okay I can take a leap not just from ... I don't need to be liked, I have a job here, but not too I can own this and be myself in this and I don't need to fit in to some ideal or model of what a teacher should look like. How can I actually show up as me? And that might look different from other people.

159

Although this participant says she still struggles with anxiety in her teaching, she has now has learned some strategies to calm herself down such as "how to begin a class when I'm feeling anxious to calm myself down, how to get the students more involved because I feel much more comfortable when it's a conversational environment than a didactic environment."

Professional Identity

Beginning counselor educators identified a variety of factors that influenced their professional identity and the professional identity of counselor educators in general. Participants discussed three categories regarding professional identity: (a) teacher identity, (b) professional development, and (c) other.

Teacher identity. Eight participants identified factors influencing their identity as an educator. They discussed their teacher identities in terms of system factors or institutional culture relating to their current institution in the following categories: (a) teaching focus; (b) developing teaching style; (c) personal relationship with teaching; (d) balancing being student-centered and being an expert; (e) translating counseling skills to teaching; (f) growth in teaching; and (g) content areas.

Teaching focus. Two participants talked about how teaching was a primary focus of their careers as counselor educators. One of these participants talked about how his first teaching experience in his doctoral program shifted his focus towards teaching:

> So my second semester of my first year, I approached [first name of professor at doctoral institution] and we cotaught multicultural counseling, which he calls it turning a person to the dark side, using the Star Wars analogy or whatever. But once I taught with him and we worked together, I was like I love this. And so I

160

sorta had my little existential crisis slash epiphany. And I said, "Yeah, I'm gonna do the teaching thing. I really dig it."

The other participant talked about how he was intentional about earning his PhD so he could be "a better instructor, a better teacher, and creating better relationships."

Developing teaching style. Two participants discussed how their doctoral programs helped them develop their teaching styles. One such participant talked about how coteaching with two instructors with different styles helped her start to think about her own teaching style:

> Just seeing those different teaching styles would also just good to see and I think it just brought about thought of where would I fall in that? Like what would my teaching ... because again I hadn't even started to develop a teaching style. It was just helpful on thinking about those pieces.

Personal relationship with teaching. Three participants talked about their own personal relationships with teaching, whether it was through personal connections to the field, their personal philosophies, or bringing their previous backgrounds into the classroom. One participant mentioned that she came "from a long line of teachers and so it's something that's been a very central value in my family." The same participant talked about how her doctoral teaching course helped her realize that learning is personal for her:

> That's a statement I still have in my teaching philosophy: that learning is personal. I believe that and the invitation for that to be okay and even celebrate in that teaching seminar, that really made a difference for me.

Two other participants talked about ways they fused their previous professional experiences with their teaching. One of those participants realized that teaching was a way for him to use those previous experiences to provide something meaningful to future counselors:

> And I thought, "Oh my god. The perfect way to blend your experiences and provide instruction or provide ... I don't know, something meaningful to these folks who are gonna graduate and take on counseling jobs. And it was like this is the perfect storm of ways to have impact on people and also it was neat for me to recall those experiences and weight them against the content that I was trying to cover.

Balancing being student-centered and being an expert. Two counselor educators talked about how they balanced being student-centered with being a content expert. One participant talked about how bringing in more active learning activities into his teaching required a "little bit of [pause] letting go of depending on my own ability to control the environment and the response of the crowd." Another participant talked about how he struggled with this in a supervision context:

> I personally had more challenges in my practicum classes than I did in my content classes as far as that expertise thing goes. Cause there the practicum students, I mean, if they missed something or there is ... especially early on, their doing things wrong or their interrupting clients or their not reflecting appropriately or their not doing a suicide assessment. They are doing it wrong and they need to be corrected and shown how to do it more right and so there's where the expertise power struggle really came into play and ego came into play a lot. Cause if they don't do it right, there not gonna pass the class. So that was my solution was to bring MI and use the work samples and the interpersonal process recall.

Translating counseling skills to teaching. Three participants talked about ways

that they started translating their counseling skills into their teaching. One participant

talked about how specific counseling skills translated into his teaching:

> I found that counseling actually helped me quite a bit … really watching and
> seeing how they were receiving or not receiving what I had to say. It really helped
> me to read a classroom and I think it also really taught me how to break down
> concepts and present them at the appropriate level where my clients could take in
> the information and so give them a little information and then check in to see how
> they'd received it.

Another participant spoke to how his counseling skills help he read a room and adapt his

teaching approach:

> I go into the classroom very much like counseling sessions, just assessing that the
> environment, the culture of the people in the room, the culture of the room itself,
> how do I join with this particular group in this semester or even this night because
> even one week to the next it can be a little bit different. But I tend to go into those
> classes in the same way I do counseling sessions now. I'm really open to a little
> bit of the organicity of the process and [pause] realizing that because I have a
> plan, doesn't necessarily mean that it's gonna be the best plan. I need to read the
> culture of the room when I get in there and be responsive to that.

Growth in teaching. Two participants talked about growth in their teaching as it

related to their professional development. One of these participants talked about how he

used his dissertation as a process to also transform his teaching:

> So how can I make this a reflective process, a learning process and a research
> process. It was really deeper than just conducting a study for my dissertation. It
> was a self-growth exercise that lead to a research study. Because I came in with
> an attitude, "ah whatever, I just came in so I could be a PI on grants and conduct
> research and stuff like that." It was a transformational process for me.

Content areas. Two beginning counselor educators talked about how they were drawn to certain content areas. One mentioned how teaching courses in her doctoral program helped her develop an identity in certain content areas. Another talked about how his doctoral program helped him become more "comfortable and confident and natural … in integrating multicultural and diverse dialogues into my courses and my assignments."

Professional development. Seven participants discussed how they have developed professionally as counselor educators throughout various experiences. They talked about this professional development in terms of: (a) development facilitated by doctoral programs, (b) professional advancement, (c) transition to assistant professor, and (d) conference presentations.

Development facilitated by doctoral programs. Three beginning counselor educators mentioned how their doctoral programs helped them develop professionally in a general way. One talked about how his doctoral program encouraged him to take part in conferences:

> So I think it really helped me with my professional identity. Encouraged to go to professional development activities, encouraged to be part of ACES, encouraged to be part of SACES, encouraged to present at those types of conferences to network with people in those divisions.

Another participant talked about how she moved from feeling like a student to feeling like an educator in her doctoral program:

It was through that experience I really moved from feeling like a student to feeling like an educator. And a lot of that had to do with the mentorship I got during those coteaching experiences.

Professional advancement. Four beginning counselor educators talked about professional advancement in counseling and counselor education. All four of these participants stated that experiences in their doctoral program helped them either get a job as a counselor educator or helped make them more marketable when applying for jobs. One participant mentioned that getting the chance to teach as the instructor of record many times in his doctoral program allowed him "to be competitive and to be able move into those roles." Another participant stated that how she had "navigated difficult situations in the classroom" as an adjunct professor while in her doctoral program helped her in interviewing for counselor education positions. A third participant commented on the value of having gained experience co-teaching courses that many other counselor educators do not enjoy teaching:

> They were saying, "That's amazing. That's great. When you get here, we're giving you career class. Nobody teaches career class here. Nobody likes career. People hate career. You come here, we're gonna give you career." And sure enough they gave me career.

Interestingly, at the conclusion of his interview, one participant was left thinking about how to help doctoral students:

> How I can help better prepare doctoral students who are in their last year understand the process of transitioning from being a doctoral student to being a counselor educator in a university? From working with the students- to getting a job and the job hiring process, to surviving their first year and a half to two years within the university environment. Because those are crucial.

Transition to assistant professor. Two participants talked about their transition to being an assistant professor from a professional identity standpoint. One participant talked about juggling the different roles of being a counselor educator:

> Especially because when you become a counselor educator you are not just becoming a teacher, you're becoming an advisor, you're becoming a mentor, you're becoming a supervisor. So you have to figure out how to wear all of these different hats when you don't even know what the style of the hat looks like yet.

The other participant talked about how her experience working as an adjunct professor was essential to having a smoother transition to being an assistant professor:

> There's so much other stuff when you become an assistant professor and figuring out tenure track stuff, that if you have kind of a good teaching style, certainly we're always gonna continue to build on that, but I think really helped me feel comfortable in this role. The research and all of the other things, figuring out department and university standards. I think that's the hard part of your first year as an assistant professor, so if you can come in with that experience, it just made my transition into the assistant professor position so much smoother.

Conference presentations. Two beginning counselor educators talked about the number of conference presentations they had done in their careers which had helped them develop as teachers. One mentioned that she had done "a lot of presentations" and the other mentioned that he had done between "thirty and forty."

Other. Four participants talked about systemic factors in ways that were outside of the rest of the category structure. Many participants talked about other topics that did not fit into subcategories in the other category, which are discussed below in this section. However, participants also talked about the following categories: (a) impact of being a person of color, and (b) developing student identities.

166

One participant mentioned how he thought that counselor educators are not

always good presenters and communicators and how this impacts doctoral students:

> Counselors aren't always good presenters and communicators. Just because we are
> good therapists or good supervisors and have the content, I think there aren't
> always the best presenters and communicators. And that's true in any discipline.
> So I think that in any program there's gonna be some that are really good in the
> classroom and have a lot to offer but if you just don't allow that to organically
> come out in your program and hope that students get it in their co-teaching and
> teaching experiences, some will and some won't. The ones who will typically are
> the ones who align with those who take teaching very seriously and are best at it.
> They'll get the kind of mentoring from those faculty members.

Impact of being a person of color. One participant talked about being a male of

color has impacted him professionally. He mentioned that he resonated with a study he

read recently about how males of color had the highest perceived stress level among

faculty groups:

> I read a study on higher ed faculty in general faculty and they're saying how their
> ranking the perceived level of stresses among faculty … and they came up that
> male faculty of color had the lowest [laughs] ... And it was interest when I read
> that … when I read that and I thought to myself, "Really? Interesting." And I'm
> reading that as a doc student and as a new faculty member. And as I'm here I
> certainly feel it at times.

Developing student identities. One beginning counselor educator talked about his

philosophy on how to develop students' counselor identities in his program and how it

impacts his teaching:

> I see some students that at the admissions point, I thought, "Ah, I'm not sure about
> this one. I'm not sure that they could make." And they've turned out to be some of
> the best. And some others that I thought would be really really good, who haven't.
> And so in the way we do counselor ed. preparation, even talking through some of

those things, what is that transformation that happens around our professional identity and as a professor, how do you facilitate that across the span of the program, across the whole training program. And really seeing pedagogy not just confined to a course in the classroom, but the transformational potential it has as related to their development of a professional counselor identity.

Systemic Factors

Beginning counselor educators identified a variety of systemic factors that influenced their teaching. Some of these factors included the departmental or institutional culture of their current institution, and the challenges they faced there as a beginning counselor educator. Systemic factors relating to a participant's doctoral program or to another context before beginning their doctoral program were not coded in this domain; instead they were coded in the doctoral experience and pre-doctoral experience domains respectively. Participants discussed four categories of systemic factors: (a) current institution, (b) challenges as a beginning counselor educator, (c) cultural shifts in higher education, and (d) other.

Current institution. All participants identified system factors taking place at their current institution. They discussed system factors relating to their current institution in the following categories: (a) emphasis on teaching, (b) balanced focus, (c) research focus, (d) importance of teaching for promotion and tenure, and (e) teaching assignments.

Emphasis on teaching. Six participants talked about how their current institution emphasized teaching. Five participants stated that their current institution was focused on teaching or that it was extremely important or highly valued. Although three participants mentioned that their institution focused more on teaching than on research, the other two

participants did not compare how their institution valued teaching in comparison to

research. According to one participant, teaching was extremely important:

> In my current institution, teaching is extremely important for promotion and tenure. I work at a teaching institution, so the majority of the focus when they review our portfolios is looking at course evaluations, also mentoring that you have done, but primarily looking at your teaching and how students respond to that. So, I would say it's extremely high valued.

One participant said that teaching has come a little more into focus in the last few years:

> We are a research institution that historically has probably leaned more on the research emphasis, but in the last few years has become a little more focused on teaching by necessity. And therefore the emphasis of teaching in promotion and tenure has increased as well. So we're still expect to research and publish and be very active as scholars but the increasing demand that we do really good in the classroom is also present.

Balanced focus. Three participants talked about how their current institution

valued both teaching and research in high regard. One participant described this balance

in terms of both being equally valued:

> In the program where I am right now, the emphasis is on teaching and research primarily and I feel like the way it's treated here is the two go hand in hand. I will say that's the way it was written in my job description and it's been forth to me that tenure is going to be based on teaching evaluations and research productivity primarily.

Research focus. Two participants mentioned that their institution was primarily a

research institution, placing more emphasis on research than on teaching. One participant

stated plainly, "my current institution is actually a research institution."

Importance of teaching for promotion and tenure. Eight beginning counselor educators talked about the importance of teaching for promotion and tenure at their current institution. Five participants stated that teaching or teaching evaluations were an important or central component for decision making about promotion and tenure. One participant described the way that teaching was a central component to promotion and tenure:

> I feel like it's a central component. They look especially at our teaching evaluations. Each year we have to do a year-end report where our evaluations are included there and we can comment on anything related to that.

Two participants talked about the specific requirements of faculty member's teaching evaluations in order for them to be promoted or tenure. One participant stated that faculty members needed "to be in the top third percent of scores" on their teaching evaluations. Another participant talked about the composite score required on teaching evaluations:

> You have to have a very high kind of composite on your teaching evaluations to be able to be promoted, or for tenure and so the importance there is huge. You have to have a 4.3 average on a 5 point scale in order to reach tenure on your teaching evals, so, very important.

Finally, one participant mentioned that his current institution's tenure system provided faculty with the flexibility to choose whether they wanted to focus more on teaching or on research.

Teaching assignments. Five participants mentioned the teaching loads at their current institution. These ranged from teaching two to three classes every semester. Some

participants talked about the kind of classes they taught such as weekend classes, only face to face classes, or only master's level classes. One participant reported teaching a "diversity of courses" so far at her current institution.

Challenges as a beginning counselor educator. Eight beginning counselor educators identified challenges faced by beginning counselor educators, many of which they had faced themselves. These challenges included: (a) time management; (b) solitary nature of teaching; (c) transition to a new context; (d) need for an emphasis on teaching in doctoral programs; (e) shortcomings of teaching evaluations; and, (f) new class preps.

Time management challenges. Four participants talked about time management challenges of beginning counselor educators. One participant felt supported in teaching, but also found it challenging to feel torn between the teaching, service, and research as a beginning counselor educator. Two participants also talked about how teaching holds beginning counselor educators accountable on a regular basis, but research does not:

> The thing that's easy to fall into as a junior faculty is that for your teaching there are lots of things to hold you accountable. There's emails from students. There's homework to be graded, tests to be created and you've got to show up ready for class every week. So that automatically holds you accountable, but what often happens with the writing and the research is nobody asks and checks in with you on that until your year-end review and it's a set up. And I've spent a lot of time working on my classes as I think I needed to, but it was easy to let the writing slide because there weren't those other things there to hold me accountable for it.

Finally, one participants talked about how changes in his institution were putting more pressures on faculty:

> It's more about enrollment and student retention and some of the changing demographics on campus, the changing funding streams from our governmental

structures has just changed the way that we've had to look at, for lack of a better word, it's changed the way we look at doing business as an institution. And having to make sure that we are providing students with the kind of experience in the classroom that they're satisfied with and think highly of and become ambassadors for the university has become pretty important.

Solitary nature of teaching. Two beginning counselor educators talked about the capability for loneliness or isolation that can be felt in teaching. One talked about not know how much of a struggle in teaching is normal:

People just let you go to go do it and it's hard to know how much struggle is normal. And why didn't I know how to do this any better? All those questions come in.

Another participant talked about not feeling connected to her colleagues when she worked as an adjunct professor:

Well, you know it was a little bit shocking in a way, especially that when I became an adjunct professor and I thought, they're just entrusting me to teach this class, and nobody's really overseeing what I'm doing, and I think they're expectation was I'm learning that in the program.

Transition to a new context. Two beginning counselor educators talked about difficulties in transitioning to a new context when taking on a first job as a counselor educator. One talked specifically about transitioning from teaching classes face to face to having to learn how to teach mostly online courses at his new institution. Another mentioned that there is a lot to figure out being at a new institution, such as "where the bathrooms are and what all the acronyms are at this university."

Need for an emphasis on teaching in doctoral programs. Four beginning

counselor educators discussed the need for an emphasis on teaching in doctoral programs

to help better prepare them to be counselor educators. One participant reported that many

new faculty across disciplines at his current institution feel like they have not "been

taught how to teach and you're just sort of dropped in and expected to do it." Similarly,

another participant spoke of the importance of intentionality in preparing teachers:

> It's important enough for us to take a whole semester to focus just on that with a
> course. And not just hope that you get it organically as you move through some of
> these other curricular experiences.

Another participant spoke of a culture of punching the clock that distracted from learning

to be an effective teacher:

> Let's get them through these courses that are required by CACREP and all of that,
> let them punch the clock, and get out, take the class, do their dissertation, do their
> research.

One participant summarized this issue as one of critical importance to beginning

counselor educators' livelihood:

> If new faculty members are dealing with [issues in their teaching], I mean, they
> get written up, they get disciplined, they get their PDRs or their PDPs. Their
> tenure and promotion goals are influenced by this kinda stuff. And so it's really
> like the right thing to do, but it's also like people depend on this stuff because
> their living year to year until they get tenured.

Shortcomings of teaching evaluations. Three participants talked about

limitations of using student evaluations of teaching as a way of assessing teaching at the

college level. Each had a slightly different perspective as to how they saw teaching

evaluations as limited. One participant felt that "we have large classes, so there are

always gonna be students who for whatever reason have certain kind of feelings. So that

data can be skewed." Another participant thought that an over-focus on teaching

evaluations hold college instructors back from challenging students, since a "professor's

scared they're going to lose their job because well students will rate me really really bad

because my courses are harder." A final participant drew attention to how students

evaluating him more harshly as a Black male impacted his teaching:

> Sometimes I feel like maybe I might have to be a little bit more lenient or not to
> say I water down things but sometimes I do have to be a bit more compromising I
> think in some of the things that I value.

New class preps. Two beginning counselor educators said that the number of new

courses preparations they have had in their career has been a challenge for them. One of

them said that she has taught nine new classes and has yet to have a semester without a

new course prep. The other participant stated that it has been challenging for him to have

sixty-seven percent of his classes at his current institution being new courses for him.

Cultural shifts in higher education. Three participants talked about broader

cultural shifts in higher education that impact their teaching and their institutions. Each of

them talked about how a business model was permeating higher education in ways that

impacted their teaching. One participant talked about how she balances keeping students

happy as consumers and helping them learn:

174

[Students] pay for their education at this level, and they come in and they don't feel like they're learning anything, I think that's really a disservice, I think we get- it's a weird place to be in, you know I'm in charge of this classroom, but you're paying me to learn something, and if I'm dissatisfied [laugh], you know, what rights do I have, and where is the teacher, are we just trained to do whatever we can to make people happy consumers, but are they learning anything, yeah it's just a really weird balance.

Another participant talked about how changes at his institution have put more of a focus on teaching and advising at a historically research-focused institution:

It's more about enrollment and student retention and some of the changing demographics on campus, the changing funding streams from our governmental structures has just changed the way that we've had to look at, for lack of a better word, it's changed the way we look at doing business as an institution. And having to make sure that we are providing students with the kind of experience in the classroom that they're satisfied with and think highly of and become ambassadors for the university has become pretty important.

One participant talked about how students are now viewed as consumers more than they were in the past and that means they often feel more entitled to get good grades:

Students are the consumers, and so students are ultimately almost like the customer who are right all the time. I think some of the shifts in education have created an environment where students have more power and authority in a classroom than some professors do. Which is very different from what it was 15-20 years ago.

Additionally, that participant talked about what is lost when professors cram too much into their courses:

What happens in a lot of cases now is that we're trying to press so many things in too quickly that people do not gain an appreciation for the education - for the thing they learn. And so we're just kind of moving through the process and I think that that's a - to me- I think that's hurtful because I think a lot of times we come

175

out with knowledge that we don't really appreciate the experience and then that hampers our ability to apply the knowledge.

Other. Five participants talked about systemic factors in ways that were outside of the rest of the category structure. Many participants talked about other topics that did not fit into subcategories in the other category, which are discussed below. However, participants also talked about the following categories: (a) previous institutions, (b) online teaching, and (c) gatekeeping.

One participant talked about how doctoral students at his current institution are prepared for teaching and that "they've really not been exposed to teaching philosophies and best practices." Another participant talked about the way she sought feedback from students while teaching as adjunct professor during her doctoral program and that she thought back about the teaching of her doctoral professors.

Previous institutions. Two participants talked about systemic factors relating to previous institutions they had worked at before their most recent job. One talked about how he had worked for one year at a teaching-focused university where research requirements were "very very very minimal to the point where I believe I was close to meeting all my requirements for tenure and promotion within the first year that I was there." He mentioned that he was expecting that by transitioning to a teaching institution that he would have more of a focus on teaching, but "it hasn't quite worked out that way in the sense of you can't just, I can't just ignore my teaching."

The other participant talked about how he had previously worked at a research focused institution and that moving to an institution with a union where "they don't

interfere with faculty rights around curriculum" was a major factor in moving to his new position.

Online teaching. One participant, who was teaching mostly online and hybrid classes, talked about systemic issues related to online teaching. He talked about the reasons more counseling courses are shifting to online formats:

> Most of the colleges I'm aware of now are in the process of trying to receive CACREP accreditation for online courses. Because cutbacks and funding for universities, and these are things that people need to know as well, what impacts the university system, and the funding and the knowledge and the government, and state and the federal government that's not doing what they used to. So the university's just saying ok well we can't build more classrooms, we may not be able to build any more buildings, but in a marketing strategy, every university's marketing strategy is to attract online students. Which means the counseling programs have to go online.

Gatekeeping. One participant talked about how gatekeeping was an important factor in shaping her teaching:

> I'm teaching, and I am turning out counselors who are going to impact many lives, and all, can either be for good or for harm, and I want every chance for it to be for good, so that gatekeeping function that we have, how do you remediate a student who's not doing well, how do you ensure that they're competent and healthy enough to be out there interacting with people who are vulnerable, you know that whole level of teaching in our profession is so different because we not only have to have knowledge, can you pass this test, but do you have the dispositional skills and are you well enough to really be in a position of a lot of influence [laugh] over very serious issues. So and, that have very serious outcomes.

Reactions to the Research

As recommended by Thompson et al. (2012), the second to last domain is where participants talked about their reactions to taking part in the study and their thoughts

about the study in general. Most of the core ideas coded into this domain came from the final question in the interview protocol: "What are you left thinking about at the end of this interview?" Participants made statements demonstrating three different kinds of reactions to the study: (a) importance of the topic, (b) appreciation of the study, and (c) excitement for findings.

Importance of topic. Three participants spoke to how they felt the current study was important. One stated that he thought the study felt unique and he was glad the topic was being looked at. Another spoke about how teaching is central to the work of a counselor educator, but that there is not a lot of conversations about how to develop teaching skills. Yet another participant spoke about why it was important to examine doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education programs:

> Your first couple of years, you're gonna be prepping classes, which means there's a whole bunch of assumed things that you know how to do and if you don't know how to do them, man, that job's gonna suck for you. And so I think we really need to help people get ready for these realities, because they are there.

Appreciation of the study. Three beginning counselor educators showed appreciation for the fact that the primary researcher was conducting the study. One stated that he was glad that other people were thinking about teaching and appreciated talking to someone else who cared about it like he did:

> The first thing that I thought is that I'm glad other people are thinking about this. I'm glad that I ... I mean, I haven't talked about some of these things. So it was cool to talk about them to someone who's also interested this line of research.

Another participant was thankful that his experience might resonate with somebody else: "If my story can resonate with somebody, that's awesome. Hey, that's what we do as qualitative researchers too, right?"

Excitement for findings. Three participants were excited to find out what the findings of the study might contain. One participant speculated on the impact of the study on the field. Another participant wanted to know more about doctoral teaching preparation practices in the field: "I would actually be interested at some point in time when you finish your research, I'm definitely going to be looking to read your study, because I want to see what others are saying about their programs as well."

Other. As recommended by Thompson et al. (2012), the final domain is an other domain for data that is potentially relevant but that does not fit in any of the other domains. This domain contains two categories: (a) advice for doctoral students, and (b) providing feedback to their doctoral program.

Advice for doctoral students. Two beginning counselor educators gave advice to doctoral students during their interviews. One mentioned her experiences further her career by seeking out opportunities and suggested that doctoral students seek out opportunities as well:

> If I were teaching at a doc level program, which I'm not, so if co-teaching wasn't built in the program, I would just highly be suggesting that students seek out those opportunities whenever possible.

Similarly, another participant suggested that doctoral students do an additional cognate in teaching like he had done:

[Doing a cognate in teaching] helps you obtain a familiarity with students and the teaching environment, it helps you to gain confidence in your teaching, it helps you to connect, and I would say this if you're going to do it in a cognate area, do one somewhere else, besides your own institution. Because then you gain additional exposure to different environments, and then you- it also increases your network and marketability.

This participant also suggested that doctoral students get experience teaching an online course and learn how to network to help them in the job search process.

Providing feedback to their doctoral program. One participant talked about how she had recently been asked by her doctoral program to provide them with feedback on her experiences as a doctoral student. She felt grateful for the opportunity to do this:

It was a good feeling being able to give feedback without defensiveness because it's not like I know, I'm one person's experience. It was nice knowing that they kind of were wondering how they could improve.

She also talked about how it was important for doctoral students to provide feedback to their programs like this:

But I think also just the importance of giving feedback back to your program. All this was hindsight for me. I don't think I knew what I was missing while I was in there. It was just these great opportunities that just kinda popped up when I went through.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to use qualitative methodology to better understand beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation and teaching-related mentorship they have received. Although research on pedagogy and specific classroom interventions in counselor education exists, there is a dearth of research about the development of teaching in counselor educators and current practices of preparing counselor educators as teachers. Therefore, this study could serve as an important first step for learning more about how beginning counselor educators were prepared to teach by their doctoral programs and what gaps exist in doctoral teaching preparation programs. In this chapter, findings based upon each of the three research questions, implications for counselor education doctoral programs and counselor educators, the limitations of the study, and directions for future research will be discussed.

Summary of Findings

For the current study, nine individual interviews were conducted to collect data about beginning counselor educators' experiences of their doctoral teaching preparation. Eleven domains surfaced as a result of these interviews, each with two to seven categories. Three frequency labels were used for these categories based upon the number of participants who talked about that category: (a) general, (b) typical, and (c) variant. If a

category applied to all participants, or all but one, the category was labeled general.

Categories were labeled typical if they apply to more than half of participants, but less

than the general category. Categories that consist of data for at least two participants, but

less than half of the participants were considered variant. A list of all domains and

categories and their frequency labels can be found in Appendix M.

Findings by Research Question

Three research questions were addressed through nine individual interviews with

beginning counselor educators. Results of the study based on the context of each of these

research questions are discussed below.

RQ1: What kinds of teaching preparation did beginning counselor educators

experience during their doctoral programs? The following data about the kinds of

doctoral teaching preparation experiences was collected from participants in their

demographic data forms. In some cases, the numbers do not match up with the number of

participants who reflected on these experiences in their interviews because some

participants did not talk about these experiences during their interviews. Six of the nine

participants taught at least one course as the instructor of record during their doctoral

program, although some taught these courses while working as an adjunct professor at an

institution outside of their doctoral program. Two participants mentioned that, based on

departmental or institutional policies, they were not allowed to teach courses as the

instructor of record at their doctoral institutions. All nine participants cotaught at least

one course in their doctoral program. Seven out of nine participants took a course that

primarily focused on teaching. All but one of these seven participants took only one

teaching course and one participant completed two courses. All participants received

feedback from peers or faculty on their teaching. Finally, all nine participants also

designed a syllabus in their doctoral program. The number of participants who

experienced other doctoral teaching preparation experiences appears in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Frequencies of Participants Doctoral Teaching Preparation Experiences

Doctoral teaching preparation experience	Number of participants	Average number of courses
Teaching an entire course by yourself	5	2.00
Coteaching a course	9	2.89
Taking a course that primarily focused on teaching	7	0.89
Receiving peer or faculty feedback on teaching	9	N/A
Observing teaching	8	N/A
Attending seminars/presentations on teaching	4	N/A
Participating in designing a course	5	N/A
Designing a course's syllabus	9	N/A

In addition to the experiences reflected on the demographic data form, two

participants mentioned during their interviews that they served as teaching assistants in

what seems to have been coteaching experience with pared-down responsibilities. Two

participants also talked about completing offsite teaching practica or internships. One of

these participants completed a one-hundred hour practicum by coteaching a course at a

different university for a semester. The other participant's teaching internship was more

extensive. She took a job in the final year of her doctoral program teaching a 3-3 course

load as an adjunct at a different university. This experience also served as her teaching

internship. Four participants remarked that they had to seek out teaching experiences

during their doctoral program since coteaching or teaching as an instructor of record was

not a built in requirement in their doctoral programs. Because of the way they sought out teaching experiences, some of these participants mentioned that the teaching preparation in their doctoral programs varied from student to student.

Eight out of nine participants talked in their interviews about taking a course in their doctoral program that was focused on teaching or included a teaching component. Seven participants reported having taken an entire course dedicated to teaching preparation. The other participant took a course on professional development as a counselor educator that included information on teaching. Five participants mentioned that their teaching course required some kind of practical teaching experience, either guest lecturing in a master's level counseling class or teaching a lesson during their class time. All five of these participants stated that they received feedback from peers and their instructor based on their teaching after these experiences.

The findings about beginning counselor educators in this qualitative study were similar to those of Barrio Minton and Price (2015) where the majority of CACREP-accredited doctoral programs surveyed were found to require coursework in teaching (93%) and fieldwork in teaching (86%). These findings seem to represent a shift in recent years towards more required doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education programs compared to Hall and Hulse's (2009) study on perceptions of doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education. In that study, more than half (53.5%) of counselor educators in CACREP accredited programs reported that they had not taken a course in college teaching during their doctoral program (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Just less than half (46.7%) of these participants stated that they completed a teaching practicum during their

doctoral program, although Hall and Hulse did not clearly define teaching practicum. Hall and Hulse's study is now seven years old and they surveyed all counselor educators in CACREP accredited programs including those who were more removed from their doctoral experiences. Therefore, it seems likely that their study does not accurately reflect current practices in doctoral teaching preparation.

In contrast, Barrio Minton and Price and the current study have looked at teaching preparation practices of doctoral programs and beginning counselor educators respectively. Therefore, these two studies collectively provide a clearer picture of current teaching preparation practices compared to those more historical practices presented in Hall and Hulse's study. It seems evident from discrepancies in doctoral teaching preparation that required teaching courses and required teaching fieldwork are much more common in doctoral programs now than they have been in the past. The increased emphasis on teaching in the 2016 CACREP standards may have inspired counselor education programs to include more required doctoral teaching preparation experiences. Then again, the field as a whole seems to be shifting towards emphasizing the importance of preparing doctoral students as teachers.

RQ2: What doctoral teaching preparation experiences and mentoring have beginning counselor educators received that were most beneficial to their development as teachers? Participants' responses varied on identifying their most valuable teaching preparation experiences in their interviews. However, only two out of six participant named their doctoral teaching course as their most valuable experience. Participants were more likely to name one of their teaching experiences, either

coteaching or teaching as an instructor of record as their most valuable experience. Although further investigation into the value of experience teaching in a counselor education doctoral program is warranted, these results suggest that getting actual teaching experience could be one of the most impactful ways for beginning counselor educators to develop as teachers. Participants who valued their doctoral teaching experiences often spoke of growing in their teaching based on support and feedback. Seven of them felt supported in teaching in some way by their doctoral faculty and five of them reported receiving valuable feedback on their teaching from doctoral faculty. Similarly, Baltrinic et al. (2016) suggested that it is critical for faculty mentors to provide doctoral students with specific feedback and concrete suggestions about their teaching through a continuous, open communication process.

The following general or typical categories in the components of teaching domain might provide a sense of the parts of teaching where beginning counselor educators feel more prepared and confident. Eight participants talked about designing a course and seven of those participants talked about how their doctoral programs helped teach them how to design courses. Seven participants talked about integrating philosophy and theory into their courses, including six participants who talked about how their doctoral programs incorporated philosophy and theory into their programs. Six participants talked about scaffolding, but only three of these participants talked about how their doctoral programs helped them learn how to scaffold. Given the small sample size and open-ended nature of the interviews in this study, one cannot assume these numbers are representative of beginning counselor educators as a whole. However, these results do suggest that

providing doctoral students in counselor education with theoretical and course design foundations regarding teaching is widespread. Yet, although many participants in this study found discussions involving these topics valuable (n=4), it is not possible to draw conclusions that this information is presented in an impactful way across programs.

Seven out of nine participants reported feeling supported by members of their doctoral faculty in teaching. Additionally, two beginning counselor educators felt supported by their peers during their doctoral program. The most common way (n=6) that beginning counselor educators reported having been supported by their doctoral faculty was through discussions of challenges and problem solving. Most participants (n=6) also felt that the support they had received had a positive emotional impact on them. These relationships with doctoral mentors seem to be one of the most impactful ways that beginning counselor educators develop their teaching and self-efficacy.

RQ3: What teaching-related experiences and mentorship do beginning counselor educators wish they had received during their doctoral preparation? All participants mentioned at least one way their doctoral teaching preparation could have better prepared them to teach as a beginning counselor educator. All but one participant reported that they wished their program had more thoroughly addressed pedagogy, teaching strategies, or curriculum delivery. More than half of participants also wished their programs had a stronger emphasis on teaching, had better teaching coursework, and had prepared them better for the actual teaching responsibilities they have now as a counselor educator. More than a quarter, but less than half, of participants wanted more opportunities for teaching experiences, more support surrounding teaching from their

187

doctoral faculty, more feedback on their teaching, more discussions about the developmental level of students, and more discussion of teaching philosophy and theory.

Implications

In this section, implications related to counselor education doctoral programs and counselor education faculty members will be discussed.

Lack of Intentionality in Program Design

Between participants who mentioned that they sought out teaching experiences in their doctoral program (n=4) and participants who mentioned that they sought out support in their teaching (n=4), a total of six participants mentioned how they had to seek out teaching preparation in their doctoral program. Seeking out experiences or feedback was also a theme. Some beginning counselor educators sought out feedback from students beyond student evaluations in lieu of feedback from other sources. Others asked for feedback or observations of their teaching from doctoral faculty. Although many of these participants' doctoral programs had intentionally designed teaching courses or thoughtful mentoring practices, the process of developing teaching skills often was left to "organicity," to use the word of one participant. That is, doctoral students in these programs had to ask faculty members for support and teaching opportunities as opposed to having those built into their programs. Baltrinic et al. (2016) cautioned doctoral programs from using "a sink or swim approach" to teaching preparation. Although the "sink or swim" approach was not pervasive in this study, it was reported by some participants. However, the "seeking out" approach was much more common. Although the "seeking out" approach can offer more support to doctoral students than a "sink or

swim" model, the experiences of participants in this study suggest that it still seems to be characterized by some of the same limitations. Nearly all participants in this study felt there were shortcomings in their doctoral teaching preparation, often expressing a lack of emphasis placed on preparing them as teachers in their programs. The lack of intentionality in the "seeking out" model may limit the ability of some doctoral students to grow in their teaching by leaving them to figure out their developmental needs as teachers on their own.

Five participants felt that there was a lack of emphasis on teaching in their doctoral programs. Many expressed that this lack of emphasis resulted from a lack of intentional design and support surrounding teaching in their programs. The "seeking out" model of teaching preparation has the potential to send a message to students that teaching is not important enough to have more intentionally designed experiences. Additionally, the "seeking out" model sends a message that strong teaching preparation is optional. Within a demanding doctoral program, it seems likely that not all students would take advantage of optional opportunities. Although the 2016 CACREP standards were not in place during the time participants in this study attended their doctoral programs, the increased emphasis on preparing doctoral students to teach in comparison to the 2009 standards highlights the need for programs to be more intentional in designing and justifying their teaching preparation programs. The "seeking out" model does not always offer the consistency of doctoral teaching preparation experiences across students that is required by these new standards.

The "seeking out" experiences model has the potential to lead to unfair situations where some students unintentionally receive better doctoral teaching preparation than others. For example, in this study two participants attended the same doctoral institution at the same time. One male participant reported being offered many opportunities to teach and coteach in his program because he sought out those opportunities early on in his studies. Those early opportunities, combined with the fact that he was already a licensed counselor, lead to numerous instructor of record opportunities. That participant also talked about frequently soliciting feedback and support from his mentors in informal conversations. Overall, this participant had a very favorable view of his doctoral teaching preparation and felt fortunate for the opportunities he received. The other participant from the same institution sought out experiences in her program, but ended up with less teaching experience than the other participant. In many ways, she felt frustrated with the lack of teaching preparation at her institution. From their interviews alone, it is hard to understand completely why the first participant received more teaching opportunities than the second one. However, it does seems clear that these two student experiences were quite different. In some ways, this "seeking out" model encourages doctoral students' development by encouraging them to advocate for themselves to personalize their program around their needs and career goals. However, this model does not result in a consistent and intentional level of doctoral teaching preparation.

As mentioned by one participant, asking doctoral students to seek out teaching preparation can be valuable in helping them learn to be an advocate for themselves. Without scaffolding, however, it may be difficult for many doctoral students to realize

190

what they don't know about teaching and what questions they need to ask to improve their teaching.

Doctoral students teaching their first few classes might struggle with being aware of their areas for growth in teaching and learning specific strategies for improving their teaching. Additionally, as expressed by some participants, the first few times teaching a college course can be an anxiety-provoking or stressful experience that might cloud doctoral students' self-awareness of their teaching abilities. Intentional support from doctoral faculty could both help ease some of the stress and anxiety of starting to teach and help students pinpoint areas for growth and ways to address them. As opposed to asking doctoral students to have insight into their own developmental needs as a teacher, it seems that teaching preparation could be strengthened if professors had a stronger understanding of students' developmental needs as teachers and designed teaching preparation programs intentionally around those needs.

Six participants reported that they felt their doctoral programs did not prepare them well in parts of teaching that they now do frequently as counselor educators, such as non-lecture based teaching techniques and strategies and developing relationships with students across a semester. For example, multiple participants reported doing some kind of guest lecturing or teaching part of a class in their doctoral teaching course. Those participants often expressed how these experiences were limited in their usefulness since the assignments often required a lecture-based approach and allowed participants to lecture on topics in their areas of expertise. Many of these participants did not feel challenged them by these experiences and did not feel like they helped them understand

191

the nuances of college teaching. Of course, no program could ever fully prepare doctoral students for teaching as a counselor educator. However, a higher level of intentionality in teaching preparation that more closely approximates teaching as a counselor educator may help beginning counselor educators as teachers.

Pedagogy and Delivery Methods

Seven out of nine participants in this study wished their doctoral program had focused more on preparing them in pedagogy, teaching strategies, and content delivery methods. Teaching preparation programs in this study often seemed to focus on teaching doctoral students how to lecture and disseminate content. Almost no participants reported that their programs covered a wide range of content delivery methods or pedagogies. This lack of preparation in pedagogy and curriculum delivery methods might be the result of the culture of traditional, lecture-based teaching methods remaining pervasive in higher education (Boice, 1991; Bok, 2006; Jones, 2008). Yet, the 2016 CACREP standards (Section 6, 3.B & 3.D) require that doctoral students have foundational knowledge in pedagogy and curriculum delivery. In contrast, most participants talked about receiving preparation in designing a course (n=8) and in incorporating theories and philosophy into their teaching (n=7).

The pervasiveness of this lack of preparation in pedagogy and curriculum design seemed to show that this might be a gap in the teaching abilities of beginning counselor educators. Many participants also reported that they wished they would have had more of an opportunity to practice teaching methods and receive feedback (n=4). Additionally, four participants appreciated the opportunities they had to reflect on their teaching. More

attention to the teaching developmental levels of doctoral students and the process of developing teaching skills could help alleviate some of these gaps. Baltrinic et al. (2016) recommended that doctoral programs evaluate their students' teaching skills with an awareness that they are in a state of development. Similarly, Hall and Hulse (2009) discovered that counselor educators felt better prepared as teachers the more frequently they received feedback and the more frequently they had opportunities to reflect on feedback. They recommended that doctoral programs adopt an approach to feedback on teaching similar to supervision in counseling (Hall & Hulse, 2009). Similarly, Baltrinic et al. (2016) recommended that coteaching experiences be accompanied by regular supervision sessions with transparent and open communication between faculty and student. Providing a structure for regular feedback with attention to the developmental and emotional needs of students as teachers and opportunities for students to reflect on that feedback seems like it could help students learn to step outside of the default lecture-based approaches to teaching and encourage a wider variety of teaching methodologies.

Importance of Mentoring

Being mentored in teaching was a powerful experience for participants both in working through challenging emotions surrounding teaching and in developing their teaching abilities. As evidenced by many (n=6) participants who talked about the positive emotional impact of the teaching support they received, the right kinds of support to beginning teachers can be powerful in helping reduce some of the negative emotions associated with learning to teach at the college level. For example, five participants reported feeling an increase in their comfort or confidence based on their teaching

mentoring. Participants also reported feeling validated or normalized (n=3), having an opportunity for catharsis (n=2), and feeling an increased sense of agency (n=4). Mentoring in doctoral teaching preparation can help students work through emotional issues surrounding teaching that might be difficult for them to address on their own.

In addition, two participants noted that teaching can feel like an isolating experience in some contexts. Doctoral students might feel more isolated when they do not feel that teaching is emphasized in their doctoral programs and they do not have regular opportunities for support. As reported by some participants in this study, many doctoral students feel a lack of confidence or comfort or a sense of imposter syndrome in teaching their first few courses. Regular support to discuss teaching experiences could help alleviate some of these feelings of isolation or imposter syndrome.

Many participants expressed how helpful it was for them to have someone with more experience and expertise in teaching help them work through their challenges as beginning college teachers. Six participants appreciated discussions of challenges and problem solving they had with mentors. Additionally, participants appreciated information and resource sharing (n=4), receiving feedback (n=3), encouragement of their identity development as a teacher (n=5), and encouragement to take time to reflect on their teaching (n=4).

Accordingly, doctoral programs could help doctoral students develop as teachers by being intentional about creating teaching mentoring relationships. These relationships might include regular meetings with a teaching mentor who provides feedback and opportunities for reflection built into the structure of their doctoral program.

Additionally, since four participants in this study expressed appreciation for having mentoring relationships that were ongoing relationships even beyond their doctoral programs, students could benefit from having teaching mentoring relationships that extend beyond a one semester experience. Whether these experiences are through one mentor or multiple mentors, providing ongoing support, feedback, and scaffolding for doctoral students could help them feel a more consistent level of support.

Directions for Future Research

Since participants in this study were from a subsection of the overall span of the career of a counselor educator, future studies on the development of teaching in counselor education might focus on different time points during this span. For example, comparing the teaching development of beginning counselor educators to doctoral students who are teaching a class for the first time might produce results that help inform doctoral teaching preparation practices. Many of the struggles and needs of these two groups could overlap, but understanding how the needs of beginning teachers compared to teachers with more experience could illuminate how teaching skills develop over time in counselor educators. Such a study might also make clearer how doctoral students respond emotionally to teaching a class for the first time, and what first time teachers most need in terms of support. This might help inform doctoral programs about how they can scaffold the development of teaching over the course of their programs in ways that could help them create developmentally appropriate programs to address the changing needs of first time teachers compared to students further along in the program. A case study could be one such way of closely examining specific skills and needs of beginning teachers and

195

the kinds of preparation that help them develop those skills. Ultimately, studies examining the development of teaching could help inform the development of teaching competencies for doctoral programs.

Additionally, future studies on teaching preparation might include triangulation of data to better understand the developmental teaching needs of beginning counselor educators. Especially without strong doctoral teaching preparation, beginning counselor educators have areas of their teaching that are not within their awareness and will not be evident in only interview data. Perspectives on participants' teaching from a variety of different viewpoints including from students and outside observers, might produce a more well-rounded view of how counselor educators develop as teachers. Experienced counselor educators serving as observers could be able to notice some behavioral elements of a counselor educator's teaching or students' reactions to teachers that are outside of participants' zones of awareness.

Additionally, another study might investigate how different doctoral teaching preparation experiences such as taking a course on teaching, coteaching, and teaching as an instructor of record prepare students differently. Different participants in this study found all of these types of experiences helpful in developing their teaching and understanding more clearly the way each of these experiences impacts students could be helpful for doctoral programs in thinking intentionally and systemically about their teaching programs. Similarly, understanding more specifically the types and frequency of feedback and support received by doctoral students and beginning counselor educators could illuminate students' process of teaching development. It could be helpful to know

196

how feedback on teaching is delivered, how often and from whom doctoral students receive feedback on their teaching, and how students process feedback. Many participants in this study mentioned receiving feedback in a one-time fashion, such as while doing guest lecturing in their doctoral program, but did not have follow up conversations about the feedback. A study examining differences between an ongoing conversation of teaching feedback compared to this one-time approach might help advocate for more of a counselor education department's resources being spent on mentorship to provide consistent feedback on teaching.

More than half of participants in this study had previous college teaching experience before entering their doctoral program. It seems likely that doctoral students without any previous college teaching experience might have different needs than more experienced college teachers. Accordingly, future studies investigating the impact of having previous teaching experience on the needs for doctoral training in teaching also could be enlightening. As participants in Baltrinic et al.'s (2016) study suggested, teaching in a K-12 setting is qualitatively different from teaching in higher education and requires a new or refined set of teaching skills. Moreover, teaching in a counselor education context requires a different skill set than other contexts. Gaining a better understanding of how those with and without teaching experience think and feel about their first doctoral experiences with teaching might help doctoral programs better understand how to meet the needs of both of these groups of students.

Finally, based on the number of participants that talked about how their doctoral teaching preparation was influenced by the culture and focus of their department,

investigating the impact of institutional factors that influence doctoral teaching preparation could present a clearer picture of how to structure a program more intentionally. For example, programs with a cohort model might have different requirements and methods of preparing their students to teach than those with a non-cohort model. Additionally, in some programs most doctoral students aspire to become counselor educators, but, in other programs, less than half of students might have this aspiration. Likewise, faculty may be more likely to identify as teachers or spend more time on their teaching at some institutions more than others. Seeing how these demographics impact the doctoral teaching preparation and development of teaching could help doctoral programs better understand how to intentionally design doctoral teaching preparation programs in a variety of contexts.

Limitations

This study has several limitations that must be considered when reviewing its findings. Consultation with experienced researchers, current literature, and faculty advisors has taken place to ensure that these limitations do not denigrate the trustworthiness of the study. Limitations that were considered include the limited sample, potential researcher bias, and self-report as the only source of data.

Limited Sample

Although the proposed study used a random sampling of assistant professors in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs, the study's sample consisted of nine participants and, therefore, has limited generalizability to the overall population of beginning counselor educators. Qualitative research is focused on understanding the

depth of participants' experiences and transferring those findings to the larger population rather than attempting to generalize its findings. So seeking to understand in more depth how beginning counselor educators have experienced their doctoral teaching preparation was the primary goal of this study. Consequently, although results of the study have provided a deeper understanding of these experiences, they do not represent the population of beginning counselor educators as a whole. Therefore, doctoral counselor education programs should exercise caution in using the results of this study to make changes to their doctoral teaching preparation programs. Counselor educators should view these findings with consideration of how they might look different in the unique context of their programs. Doctoral teaching preparation experiences in CACREP-accredited programs vary widely and this study might only explore a small subset of the diversity of such experiences. Additionally, since this study has fewer than the twelve to fifteen participants recommended by Williams and Hill (2012), the frequency data collected with CQR methodology might not accurately represent the frequency of these issues among all beginning counselor educators even as saturation has been achieved.

The sample in this study was also limited by the fact that participants were predominantly white (n=7) and that more than half of participants (n=5) had pre-doctoral teaching experience. Since the sample was predominantly white it is important to be cautious in assuming that the results of this study transfer to non-white counselor educators. Additionally, pre-doctoral teaching experience could dramatically change the teaching preparation needs and experiences of doctoral students. It is difficult to know what percentage of the population of beginning counselor educators have pre-doctoral

teaching experience, but the rate in this sample might not be similar to the rate within the population. Therefore, the transferability of the findings in this study might be limited. Furthermore, since both those with and without pre-doctoral teaching experience are represented in near equal measures in this study, the sample is not homogeneous in this way which might limit the trustworthiness of the findings.

The Research Team

Since a key component of CQR methodology is trustworthiness (Williams & Hill, 2012), this study included numerous checks to maintain objectivity, including use of the research team and an external auditor, together with the practice of bracketing assumptions and biases. However, another limitation of this study was the bias of the primary researcher, who also served as sole interviewer in this study. The primary researcher believed in the importance of developing teaching in doctoral counselor education students and in mentoring counselor educators to improve their teaching. Although he attempted to approach all interviews with an awareness of these biases, he might have expressed more enthusiasm towards elements of the interviewee's statements that confirmed his beliefs. Additionally, since this study was serving as his doctoral dissertation, the primary researcher took the lead on the research through the interview, data coding, and writing process. Although the research team closely followed the recommendations of Hill (2012) in completing the CQR coding process and all members of the research team were highly involved in the process, the primary researcher invested more time and energy in the process than the other researchers, including examining the interviews with greater detail during the coding process. Therefore, his viewpoints might

be disproportionately represented in the findings compared to the viewpoints of the rest of the research team.

The composition of the research team might also serve as a limitation, since those who choose to collaborate with the primary research in this study were likely to have similar beliefs about the importance of teaching in counselor education. Furthermore, the research team consisted of only doctoral counselor education students from one institution. Therefore, each of the team members may have had (or would have) similar experiences in their doctoral teaching preparation at that institution, and had not yet experienced working as a beginning counselor educator. Having similar doctoral teaching preparation experiences might have limited the research team's ability to view the interviews from different viewpoints. Additionally, the research team may have had a limited ability to understand the teaching preparation needs of beginning counselor educators without this first-hand experience. Finally, all of the research team members and the external auditor were white. This positionality may have limited the research team's ability to view the interviews from a variety of perspectives.

Self-Report of Data

This study asked participants to self-reflect on their teaching development which might not reveal the full picture of how beginning counselor educators develop as teachers since important information about participants' development may have been outside of their awareness. The focus of the present study was on an in depth understanding of the inner experiences of counselor educators in developing their teaching and therefore used interviews as the only data source. However, interviews

alone may be influenced by the interviewees wanting to be viewed in a favorable light or by their lack of awareness of all of the factors influencing their teaching. It may have been difficult for participants to be objective about their teaching ability and training needs since they are still in the developmental process of learning to teach. Further research that triangulates the self-report data of this study would help increase the integrity of the results of this study (Williams and Hill, 2012). Other data sources including student work, classroom observations, reflective journals, and student focus groups used in subsequent studies could help to provide a broader view of how beginning counselor educators develop their teaching.

REFERENCES

Akos, P. & Scarborough, J. L. (2004). An examination of the clinical preparation of school counselors. *Counselor Education and Supervision , 44*(December), 96-107.

Andrews, J., Garriso, D. R., & Magnusson, K. (1996). The teaching and learning transaction in higher education: A study of excellent professors and their students. *Teaching in Higher Education , 1*(1), 81-103.

Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Audacity: Free Audio Editor and Recorder. Web. 10 March 2016.

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baltrinic, E., Jencius, M., McGlothlin, J. (2016). Coteaching in counselor education: Preparing doctoral students for future teaching. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 55,* 31-45.

Barrio Minton, C. A., Morris, C. A. W., & Yaites, L. D. (2014). Pedagogy in counselor education : A 10-year content analysis of journals. *Couselor Education & Supervision*, *53*(September), 162–178.

Barrio Minton, C. A., & Pease-Carter, C. (2010). The status of crisis preparation in counselor education: A national study and content analysis. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, & Research, 38,* 5-17.

Barrio Minton, C. A., & Price, E. (2015, October). *Teaching the teacher: A preliminary analysis of teaching preparation in counselor education doctoral programs.* Presentation at 2015 Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, Philadelphia, PA.

Benishek, L. A., Bieschke, K. J., Park, J., & Slattery, S. M. (2004). A multicultural feminist model of mentoring. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32,* 428-442.

Beckerman, N. L. (2010). Teaching the teachers. *Academe 96,* 28-29.

Boice, R. (1991). New faculty as teachers. *The Journal of Higher Education, 62*(2), 150-173.

Bok, D. C. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Borders, L. D., Wester, K. L., Granello, D. H., Chang, C. Y., Hays, D. G., Pepperell, J., & Spurgeon, S. L. (2012). Association for counselor education and supervision guidelines for research mentorship: Development and implementation. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 51*(September), 162-175.

Borders, L. D., Young, J. S., Wester, K. L., Murray, C. E., Villalba, J. A., Lewis, T. F., & Mobley, A. K. (2011). Mentoring promotion/tenure-seeking faculty: Principles of good practice within a counselor education program. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 50*(March), 171-188.

Borders, L. D., Wester, K. L., Fickling, M. J., & Adamson, N. A. (2014). Research training in doctoral programs accredited by the council for accreditation of counseling and related education programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 53*(June), 145-160.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brackette, C. M. (2014). The scholarship of teaching and learning in clinical mental helath counseling. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 139*(Fall), 37-48.

Briggs, C. A., & Pehrsson, D. (2008). Research mentorship in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 48*(December), 101-113.

Brott, P. E. (1997). The development of school counselor identity. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 57*(12-A), 50-59.

Buller, A. (2013). *Exploring the experiences of counselor educators recognized for their excellence in teaching.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

Buskist W., & Smith, R. A. (2008). The scholarhip of teaching and learning in psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 35,* 247-248.

Burkard, A. W., Knox, S., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Data collection. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 83-102). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Carlson, J. A. (2008). If I had only known: Challenges experienced by women new to the professoriate. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 28,* 1-16.

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(3), 439-444.

Cassuto, L. (2013). Student-centered graduate teaching. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 60*, 29.

Casto, C., Caldwell, C., & Salazar, C. F. (2005). Creating mentoring relationships between female faculty and students in counselor education: Guidelines for potential mentees and mentors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 83*(Summer), 331-336.

Castellano, G. D. V. (2002). *Perspectives on the teaching of core counseling courses: A grounded theory inquiry..* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of New Orleans, New Orleans, LA.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2009). *CACREP accreditation standards and procedures manual*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2016). *CACREP accreditation standards and procedures manual*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Crook-Lyon, R. E., Goates-Jones, M. K., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Getting started. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 35-46). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Davis, T. E., Levitt, D. H., Mcglothlin, J. M., & Hill, N. R. (2006). Perceived

 expectations related to promotion and tenure: A national survey of CACREP

 program liaisons. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *46*(December), 146–156.

East, J. & Chambers, R. (2007). Courage to teachin for social work educators. *Social

 Work Education, 26*(8), 810-826.

Feldman, K. A. (1976). The superior college teacher from the students' view. *Research in

 Higher Education, 5,* 243-288.

Feldman, K. A. (1988). Effective college teaching from the students' and faculty's view:

 Matched or mismatched priorities? *Research in Higher Education, 28*(4), 291-329.

Fischer, C. T. (2009). Bracketing in qualitative research: Conceptual and practical

 matters. *Psychotherapy Research, 19,* 583-590.

Frisby B. N. & Martin, M. M. (2007). Instructor-student and student-student rapport in

 the classroom. *Communication Education, 59*(2), 146-164.

Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *Findings of the survey of doctoral education and

 career preparation: A report to the preparing future faculty program.* Unpublished

 manuscript, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Groccia, J. E. & Buskist, W. (2011). Need for evidence-based teaching. *New Directions

 for Teaching and Learning, 128*(Winter), 5-11.

Gurung, R. A. R., Ansburg, P. I., Alexander, P. A., Lawrence, N. K., & Johnson, D. E.

 (2008). The state of the scholarship of teaching and learning in psychology.

 Teaching of Psychology, 35, 249-261.

Hall, S., & Hulse, D. (2010). Perceptions of doctoral level teaching preparation in counselor education. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 1*(2), 2-16.

Halpern, D. F., Sothergill, D. W., Allen, M., Baker, S., Baum, C., Best, D., Ferrari, J., Geisinger, K. F., Gilden, E. R., Hester, M., Keith-Spiegel, P., Kierniesky, N. C., McGovern, T. V., McKeachie, W. J., Prokasy, W. F., Szuchman, L. T., Vasta, R., & Weaver, K. A. (1998). Scholarship in psychology: A paradigm for the twenty-first century. *American Psychologist, 53*(12), 1292-1297.

Hativa, N., Barak, R., Simhi, E. (2001). Exemplary university teachers: Knowledge and beliefs regarding effective teaching dimensions and strategies. *The Journal of Higher Education, 72*(6), 699-729.

Heppner, M. (1994). An empirical investigation of the effects of a teaching practicum on prospective faculty. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*(5), 500-507.

Heppner, P. P. & Johnston, J. A. (1994). Peer consultation: Faculty and students working together to improve teaching. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72,* 492-499.

Hill, C. E. (2012). Introduction to consensual qualitative research. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 3-20). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hill, C. E., Knox, S., Thompson, B. J., Williams, E. N., & Hess, S. A. (2005). Consensual qualitative research: An update. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 196-205.

Hill, C. E., Williams, E. N. (2012). The sample. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 71-81). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hill, C. E., Thompson, B. J., & Williams, E. N. (1997). A guide to conducting consensual qualitative research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25,* 517-572.

Hill, N. R. (2004). The challenges experienced by pretenured faculty members in counselor education: A wellness perspective. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44,* 135-146.

Houser, M. & Frymier, A. (2009). The role of student characteristics and teaching behaviors in students' learner empowerment. *Communication Education, 58*(1), 35-53.

Hughes, F. & Kleist, D. (2005). First-semester experiences of counselor education doctoral students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(2), 97-108.

Hunt, G., & Gilmore, B. (2013). Learning to teach: Teaching internships in counselor education and supervision. *The Professional Counselor, 1*(2), 143-152.

Johnston, S. (1996). What can we learn about teaching from our best university teachers? *Teaching in Higher Education, 1*(2), 213-225.

Jones, A. (2008). Preparing new faculty members for their teaching role. *New Directions for Higher Education, 143,* 93-100.

Knoblauch, A. (2010, March 4). Teaching graduate students [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/profhacker/teaching-graduate-students/23018

Kreber, C. (2000). How university teaching award winners conceptualise academic work: Some further thoughts on the meaning of scholarship. *Teaching in Higher Education, 5*(1), 61-78.

Kreber, C. (2002). Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 27*(1), 5-23.

Kreber, C. (2006). Setting the context: The climate of university teaching and learning. *New Directions for Higher Education, 133,* 5-11.

Ladany N., Thompson, B. J., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Cross-analysis. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 117-134). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lambie, G. W. & Vaccaro, N. (2011). Doctoral counselor education students' levels of research self-efficacy perceptions of the research training environment and interest in research. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 50*(4), 243-258.

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

Lo, C. C. (2010). How student satisfaction factors affect perceived learning. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 10*(1), 47-54.

Lowman, J. (1996). Characteristics of exemplary teachers. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning, 65*(Spring), 33-40.

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

Magnuson, S., Shaw, H., Tubin, B., & Norem, K. (2004). Assistant professors of
counselor education: First and second year experiences. *Journal of Professional
Counseling, Practice, Theory, & Research, 32*(1), 3-18.

Magnuson, S, Black, L. L., & Lahman, M. K. E. (2006). The 2000 cohort of new
assistant professors of counselor education: Year 3. *Counselor Education and
Supervision, 45*(March), 162-179.

Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Lonneman-Doroff, T. (2009). The 2000 chohort of new
assistant professors of counselor education: Reflecting at the culmination of six
years. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 49*(September), 54-72.

Malott, K. M., Hall, K. H., Sheely-Moore, A., Krell, M. M., & Cardaciotto, L. (2014).
Evidence-based teaching in higher education: Application to counselor education.
Counselor Education and Supervision, 53(December), 294-305.

Marsh, H. W., & Roche, L. A. (1997). Making students' evaluations of teaching
effectiveness effective: The critical issues of validity, bias, and utility. *American
Psychologist, 52*(11), 1187-1197.

McGowan, W. R., & Graham, C. R. (2009). Factors contributing to improved teaching
performance. *Innovative Higher Education, 34,* 161-171.

Mighty, J. (2013). The future of university teaching: Bleak or promising? *International
Journal -for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 7*(2), 1-6.

Morrow, S. L. (2007). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: Conceptual
foundations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35*(2), 209-235.

Mottet, T. P., Frymier, A. B., & Beebe, S. A. (2006). Foundations of instructional communication. In Mottet, T. P., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (Eds.), *Instructional communication: Rhetoriacl and relational perspectives* (pp. 3-27). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nelson, K. W., Oliver, M., & Capps, F. (2006). Becoming a supervisor: Doctoral student perceptions of the training experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 46*(1), 17-31.

Newgent, R. A., & Fender-Scarr, L. K. (1999). Beyond curriculum: The development of a counselor educator. (Report No. ED-444-095). Akron, OH: The University of Akron. Retrived from ERIC database.

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

Olsen, D. & Crawford, L. A. (1998). A five-year study of junior faculty expectations about their work. *The Review of Higher Education, 22,* 39-54.

Olsen, D. & Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). The pretenure years: A longitudinal perspective. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *Developing new and juinor faculty* (pp. 15-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Orr, J. J., Hall, S. F., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2008). A model for collaborative teaching teams in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 47,* 146-163.

Pietrzak, D., Duncan, K., & Korcuska, J. S. (2008). Counseling students' decision making regarding teaching effectiveness: A conjoint analysis. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48,* 114-132.

Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 126-136.

Protivnak, J., & Foss, L. L. (2009). An exploration of themes that influence the counselor education doctoral student experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48*(4), 239-256.

Ramsey, M., Cavallaro, M., & Zila, L. (2002). Scholarly productivity redefined in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42,* 40-57.

Robertson, D. (1999). Professors' perspectives on their teaching: A new construct and developmental model. *Innovative Higher Education, 23,* 271-294.

Rogers, J. R., Gill-Wigal, J. A., Harrigan, M., & Abbey-Hines, J. (1998). Academic hiring policies and projections: A survey of CACREP- and APA-accredited counseling programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37*(3), 166-178.

Schlosser, L. Z., Dewey, J. J. H., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Auditing. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 135-144). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Semenza, G. (2016). The unacknowledged craft of teaching graduate students. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 62*, 8.

Sexton, T. L. (1998). Reconstructing counselor education: Issues of our pedagogical foundation. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38*(December), 66-69.

Sidelinger, R. (2010). College student involvement: An examination of student

    characteristics and perceived instructor communication behaviors in the classroom.

    Communication Studies, 61(1), 87-103.

Sim, W., Huang, T. C., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Biases and expectations. In C. E. Hill (Ed.),

    Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social

    science phenomena (pp. 59-69). Washington, DC: American Psychological

    Association.

Simmons, N. (2011). Caught with their constructs down? Teaching development in the

    pre-tenure years. *International Journal for Academic Development, 16,* 229-241.

Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2015). *Digest of Education Statistics 2013* (NCES 2015-

    011). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U. S.

    Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Sorcinelli, M. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of*

    Counseling & Development, 72(5), 474-479.

Stahl, J. V., Taylor, N. E., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Philosophical and historical background

    of consensual qualitative research. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative*

    research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena (pp. 21-

    32). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Thompson, B. J., Vivino, B. L., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Coding the data: Domains and core

    ideas. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for*

    investigating social science phenomena (pp. 103-116). Washington, DC: American

    Psychological Association.

Toews, M. L., & Yazedjian, A. (2007). The three-ring circus of academia: How to become the ringmaster. *Innovative Higher Education, 32,* 113-122.

Tollerud, T. (1990). *The perceived self-efficacy of teaching skills of advanced doctoral students and graduates from counselor education programs.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.

Thoron, A. C., Myers, B. E., Harder, A., Stedman, N., & Roberts, T. G. (2012). An analysis of teaching competencies of junior faculty with different levels of graduate teaching assistant experiences. *Journal of Natural Resources & Life Sciences Education, 41,* 1-6.

Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: Concerns and needs of new faculty. *To Improve the Academy, 6,* 41-55.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). Washington, DC: Author.

Urofsky, R. I., & Bobby, C. L. (2012). The evolution of a student learning outcomes focus in the CACREP standards in relation to accountability in higher education. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 3*(2), 63-72.

Vivino, B. L., Thompson, B. J., & Hill, C. E. (2012). The research team. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 47-58). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Webb, N. G., & Barrett, L. O. (2014). Student views of instructor-student rapport in the college classroom. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 14*(2), 15-28.

Wehbi, S. (2009). Reclaiming our agency in academia: Engaging in the scholarship of teaching in social work. *Social Work Education, 28*(5), 502-511.

Williams, E. N., & Hill, C. E. (2012). Establishing trustworthiness in consensual qualitative research studies. In C. E. Hill (Ed.), *Consensual qualitative research: A practical resource for investigating social science phenomena* (pp. 175-186). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Worley, D, Titsworth, S., Worley, D. W., & Cornett-DeVito, M. (2007). Instructional communication competence: Lessons learned from award-winning teachers. *Communication Studies, 58*(2), 207-222.

Yeh, C. J., & Inman, A. G. (2007). Qualitative data analysis and interpretation in couneling psychology: Strategies for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist, 35,* 369-403.

Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers. *The journal of higher education, 70*(6), 670-686.

Zimpfer, D., Cox, J. A., West, J. D., Bubenzer, D. L., & Brooks, D. K. (1997). An examination of counselor preparation doctoral program goals. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*(4), 318-331.

APPENDIX A

INITIAL RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Hello Dr. (insert counselor educator's last name),

Have you ever wondered about how doctoral counselor education programs prepare future counselor educators to teach? My name is Phillip Waalkes and I am a doctoral student at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I am contacting you to request your participation in my dissertation research project. I would like to invite you to participate in a study I am conducting as part of my dissertation research. In this study, I aim to learn more about beginning counselor educators' experiences of teaching preparation and mentorship during their doctoral program and teaching-related experiences and mentorship they wish they had received during their doctoral programs.

In this study, I will ask questions about your experiences in your doctoral teaching preparation and mentoring through a recorded phone interview. If you choose to participate in this study, you will receive a **$25 Amazon gift card**. For more information about how to participate, please read the attached information sheet.

I thank you for you considering participating in this research opportunity.

Sincerely,

Phillip Waalkes, MAEd, NCC
Doctoral Candidate
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

James M. Benshoff, PhD
Professor & Dissertation Chair
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

APPENDIX B

RECRUITMENT INFO SHEET

You are eligible to participate if you are in your **second, third, or fourth year working as a counselor educators and have graduated from a CACREP-accredited doctoral program in counselor education**. It is also required that you are working in a non-clinical, tenure-track faculty position and that you experienced some form of doctoral teaching preparation. You were randomly chosen from among other assistant professors working in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in the United States to be invited to participate in this research study.   You will receive one follow up email to remind you of this opportunity approximately one week after the initial recruitment email.

The total estimated time of the interview is 45-60 minutes. Within two weeks of the completion of the interview, I will contact you and provide you with a written transcript of your responses for your perusal and approval.

Because your voice potentially will be identifiable by anyone who hears the recording, your confidentiality for things you say on the recording cannot be guaranteed. I will limit access to the recording by keeping it in a password protected folder on my computer. I will be the only one who knows the password to access this folder. In addition, I will destroy the digital audio file of the interview after the transcription process. Demographic data forms will be printed out and kept in a locked file cabinet in my work office away from the recordings. Computer files of the demographic data forms will be deleted after they are printed.

Please note that your participation in this research project is voluntary. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro's Institutional Review Board makes sure that studies with people follow federal rules; they have approved this study (IRB # 15-0504). If you have any concerns about your rights, how you are being treated, concerns or complaints about this project or benefits or risks associated with being in this study please contact the Office of Research Integrity at UNCG toll-free at (855)-251-2351**. If you have any questions, want more information, or would like to be a part of this investigation, please contact me, Phillip Waalkes, by email at plwaalke@uncg.edu and/or by phone at (919) 609-7510.**

APPENDIX C

FOLLOWUP RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Hello Dr. (insert counselor educator's last name),

Last week, I sent you an email inviting you to participate in my dissertation study on how beginning counselor educators experience their doctoral teaching preparation. I am writing you today as one last friendly reminder of this opportunity to be interviewed for my study and receive a **$25 Amazon gift card** for your participation. The information about participating sent in last week's email is attached.

Thank you again for considering this opportunity.

Sincerely,
Phil

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Thank you for your interest in my study on beginning counselor educators' experiences of doctoral teaching preparation. I believe that this is an important topic for the field of counselor education and I am thankful that you are willing to contribute to this cause. For the purposes of this interview, your doctoral teaching preparation refers to any of a myriad of intentionally designed, teaching-related experiences that you experienced as part of your doctoral program, including teaching or coteaching a course, taking a class on teaching, completing a teaching practicum, receiving mentorship, or being observed and provided feedback of your teaching.

Please be assured that your responses will be kept confidential as described in the informed consent. By starting this interview, you are agreeing to the terms in the informed consent document emailed to you previously. Do you have any questions before we begin?

1) What are your thoughts about the value placed on teaching in the counseling program where you are currently employed? How important does teaching seem to be for promotion and tenure?
2) What are your thoughts about the value placed on teaching in your doctoral counselor education program?
3) Tell me about your past and present teaching experiences in a counselor education context and in other contexts.
4) Reflect back on your doctoral teaching preparation experiences. What did they consist of and how did you experience them?
5) Which of your doctoral teaching preparation experiences were most valuable to you in your development as a teacher?
6) What areas of your teaching did your doctoral teaching preparation program help you develop? How did your doctoral teaching preparation help you grow in these areas?
7) What past and present mentoring outside of your doctoral teaching preparation have you received that has facilitated growth in your teaching? How did this mentoring help you grow?
8) What, if any, teaching preparation experiences and mentoring do you wish you would have received during your doctoral program? How would these

experiences during your doctoral program have helped you as a beginning counselor educator?

9) What else would you like to add about your doctoral teaching preparation or the teaching mentorship you have received?

10) What are you left thinking about as we near the conclusion of this interview?

APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO

CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN PARTICIPANT: LONG FORM

Project Title: Beginning Counselor Educators' Experiences of Doctoral Teaching Preparation and Mentoring in Growing Their Teaching

Principal Investigator and Faculty Advisor (if applicable): <u>Phillip Waalkes, MAEd, NCC, NCLSC,</u> Faculty Advisor: Dr. James Benshoff, PhD, LPC, NCC

Participant's Name:

_____ _____

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in the study is voluntary. You may choose not to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. There may not be any direct benefit to you for being in the research study. There also may be risks to being in research studies. If you choose not to be in the study or leave the study before it is done, it will not affect your relationship with the researcher or the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Details about this study are discussed in this consent form. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.

You will be given a copy of this consent form. If you have any questions about this study at any time, you should ask the researchers named in this consent form. Their contact information is below.

What is the study about?
This is a research project. Your participation is voluntary. This study seeks to examine beginning counselor educators' experiences of teaching preparation during their doctoral program, examine teaching preparation experiences and mentoring that beginning counselor educators have received that have most benefited their teaching development, and identify doctoral teaching preparation experiences that beginning counselor educators wish they had received.

222

Why are you asking me?
You have been selected based upon your status as a second, third, or fourth year counselor educators who has graduated from a doctoral program in counselor education. It is also required that you are non-clinical, tenure-track faculty and that you experienced some form of doctoral teaching preparation. You were randomly chosen from among other assistant professors working in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in the United States to be invited to participate in this research study.

What will you ask me to do if I agree to be in the study?
You will be asked to spend approximately 45-60 minutes participating in an individual interview discussing your experience in doctoral teaching preparation and your experience in the growth of your teaching. By beginning to take part in the interview you are giving consent to the conditions on this form.

Within one to two weeks following the interview, the student investigator will contact you and provide you with a written transcript of your responses for your review. A few months later, you will be asked to review and provide feedback on the proposed findings for the study. Should you have any questions after the interview, the student investigator can be reached at plwaalke@uncg.edu or (919) 609-7510.

Is there any audio/video recording?
Interviews will be audio recorded. Video images will not be shared or recorded. Because your voice will be potentially identifiable by anyone who hears the tape, your confidentiality for things you say on the tape cannot be guaranteed although the researcher will take steps to limit access to the tape as described below.

What are the risks to me?
Because interviews will be audio recorded, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed but every measure will be taken to protect information shared by participants. Specific measures that will be in place to protect confidentiality are explained below.

If you have any questions, want more information, or have suggestions, please contact Phillip Waalkes (plwaalke@uncg.edu) or my faculty advisor Dr. James Benshoff (benshoff@uncg.edu).

If you have any concerns about your rights, how you are being treated, concerns or complaints about this project or benefits or risks associated with being in this study please contact the Office of Research Integrity at UNCG toll-free at (855)-251-2351.

Are there any benefits to society as a result of me taking part in this research?
Your participation may contribute to our larger effort to enhance teaching quality and doctoral teaching preparation in our field and reflects similar current efforts in other related fields.

Are there any benefits to *me* for taking part in this research study?
There are no direct benefits to participants in this study. You may find that answering the questions about doctoral teaching preparation and growth in your teaching skills allow you to reflect on your past and current teaching experiences, which may be useful to you.

Will I get paid for being in the study? Will it cost me anything?
A $25 Amazon gift card will be provided to you after completion of the interview. If you choose to withdraw from this study before your interview is complete, you will not be eligible to receive the gift card. There are no costs to you for participating in this study.

How will you keep my information confidential?
In order to protect your information, you will be referred to as a number. The demographic form and researcher's notes will be kept in a locked file drawer in the student researcher's home office. A master list linking your name to your ID number will be kept in a locked drawer in the student researcher's on-campus office, separate from your recording and your demographic data form. The audio recording will be stored in a password protected folder on the researcher's laptop and then securely deleted within 30 days of the interview. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

What if I want to leave the study?
You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw at any time, without penalty. If you do withdraw, it will not affect you in any way. If you choose to withdraw, you may request that any of your data which has been collected be destroyed unless it is in a de-identifiable state. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time. This could be because you have had an unexpected reaction, or have failed to follow instructions, or because the entire study has been stopped.

What about new information/changes in the study?
If significant new information relating to the study becomes available which may relate to your willingness to continue to participate, this information will be provided to you.

Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By participating in the interview, you are agreeing that you read, or it has been read to you, and you fully understand the contents of this document and are openly willing consent to take part in this study. All of your questions concerning this study have been answered. By participating in the interview, you are agreeing that you are 18 years of age or older and are agreeing to participate in this study described to you by Phillip Waalkes.

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHICS DATA FORM

1. Please indicate your sex:
    ☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Other

2. What is your age? Click here to enter text.

3. Which of the following best describes your race/ethnicity?
    ☐ Asian American / Pacific Islander
    ☐ American Indian
    ☐ African American / Black
    ☐ Caucasian / White
    ☐ Hispanic / Latino/a
    ☐ Multiracial
    ☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

4. Are you an international faculty member? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Doctoral Training
5. Which of the following describes your doctoral degree?
    ☐ PhD ☐ EdD ☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text.

6. Name of your doctoral degree (e.g., Counselor Education, Counselor Education and Supervision, Counseling and Counselor Education):

    Click here to enter text.

7. Name of the university from which you received your doctoral degree:
    Click here to enter text.

8. Was your doctoral program CACREP-accredited at the time you were enrolled?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No

9. What courses did you teach by yourself during your doctoral program?
Click here to enter text.

10. What courses did you coteach during your doctoral program?
Click here to enter text.

11. Please check all of the doctoral teaching preparation experiences that took part in you during your doctoral program. For each experience you check, please indicate how many instances you took part in this experience throughout your doctoral program.

☐ Teaching an entire course by yourself, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Coteaching a course, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Taking a course that primarily focused on teaching, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Receiving peer or faculty feedback on your teaching, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Observing teaching, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Attending seminars/presentations on teaching, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Participating in Designing a Course, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Designing a Course syllabus, Frequency: Click here to enter text.

☐ Other (please specify): Click here to enter text., Frequency: Click here to enter text.

Employment as an Assistant Professor

12. How long have you worked at your current college or university?
Click here to enter text.

13. How many total years of experience do you have working as a counselor educator?
Click here to enter text.

14. What is your official title in your current position?
Click here to enter text.

15. Is your position tenure-track, clinical, visiting, or other (please specify)?
Click here to enter text.

16. What is your primary specialization? – school counseling, mental health counseling, college counseling, rehabilitation counseling, couple/marriage and family counseling, other (please specify)
Click here to enter text.

17. Is your current program CACREP-accredited? ☐ Yes   ☐ No

18. Are you currently employed in a ☐ master's only or a ☐ master's/doctoral program?

19. Including summer semesters, please list the number of credits you have taught or are in the process of teaching at your current position in each category below. For the purposes of this study, supervision does not count as a course taught.

Total Credits: Click here to enter text.
Undergraduate: Click here to enter text.
Masters: Click here to enter text.
Doctoral: Click here to enter text.
Face to face: Click here to enter text.
Synchronous online: Click here to enter text.
Asynchronous online: Click here to enter text.
Hybrid: Click here to enter text.

APPENDIX G

TRANSCRIPTIONIST CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

I, _____ transcriptionist, agree to maintain full confidentiality in regards to any and all audiotapes and documentations received from Phillip Waalkes related to his research study on the researcher study Beginning Counselor Educators' Experiences of Doctoral Teaching Preparation and Mentoring in Growing Their Teaching.

Furthermore, I agree:
1. To hold in strictest confidence the identification of any individual that may be inadvertently revealed during the transcription of audio-taped interviews, or in any associated documents.

2. To not make copies of any audiotapes or computerized titles of the transcribed interviews texts, unless specifically requested to do so by the researcher, Phillip Waalkes.

3. To store all study-related audiotapes and materials in a safe, secure location as long as they are in my possession.

4. To return all audiotapes and study-related materials to Phillip Waalkes in a complete and timely manner.

5. To delete all electronic files containing study-related documents from my computer hard drive and any back-up devices.

I am aware that I can be held legally responsible for any breach of this confidentiality agreement, and for any harm incurred by individuals if I disclose identifiable information contained in the audiotapes and/or files to which I will have access.

Transcriber's name (printed)

_____

Transcriber's signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX H

PILOT STUDY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Thank you for your interest in my study on beginning counselor educators' experiences of doctoral teaching preparation and growth in teaching skills. I believe that this is an important topic for the field of counselor education and I am thankful that you are willing to contribute to this cause. For the purposes of this interview, please focus your experiences primarily in terms of teaching skills, or observable, teaching-related behaviors and attitudes. To serve as a frame of reference in describing such skills, I emailed you Young and Shaw's (1999) seven items that differentiate effective teaching from ineffective teaching. Again, these include: value of the course, motivating students, course organization, effective communication, comfortable learning atmosphere, concern for student learning, and genuine respect for students. These categories provide a general framework for thinking about teaching skills, but feel free to talk about whatever teaching-related behaviors and attitudes are most pertinent for you in answering these questions. Growth in your teaching skills refers to changes that result in a shift in teaching behavior as opposed to only changes within the instructor that do not have a direct impact on their work with students. Your doctoral teaching preparation refers to any of a myriad of intentionally designed, teaching-related experiences that you took part in as part of your doctoral program, including teaching or coteaching a course, taking a class on teaching, completing a teaching practicum, receiving mentorship, guest lecturing, or being observed and provided with feedback of their teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2009).

Please be assured that your responses will be kept confidential as described in the informed consent.

1) Before we begin discussing teaching, please tell me about the culture of your current work environment and your experience of being a faculty member there.
2) Tell me about the culture of your doctoral program and your experience of being a student in that program.
3) Tell me about your past and present teaching experiences in a counselor education context and in other contexts.
4) Reflect back on your doctoral teaching preparation experiences. What did they consist of and how did you experience them?
5) What kinds of content, such as pedagogies, teaching methodologies, and classroom management strategies, did you learn about during your doctoral teaching preparation?
6) What teaching skills did your doctoral teaching preparation program help you develop? How did your doctoral teaching preparation help you grow in these skills?

7) What supports other than your doctoral teaching preparation have you received that have facilitated grow in your teaching skills? How did these supports help you experience this growth?
8) What teaching skills do you wish you would have grown more in during your doctoral program? How would more focus on these skills during your doctoral program have helped you as a beginning counselor educator?
9) What, if any, teaching preparation experiences do you wish you would have had during your doctoral program? How did the lack of these experiences influence the development of your teaching skills?
10) What else would you like to add about your doctoral teaching preparation or your experiences of growth in your teaching skills?
11) Why did you choose to participate in this interview?

APPENDIX I

RECRUITMENT EMAIL FOR PILOT STUDY

Hello [Participant's First Name],

Have you been wondering recently about how you can grow in your teaching skills and help your students learn more? My name is Phillip Waalkes and I am a doctoral student at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I am contacting you to request your participation in my dissertation research project. I would like to invite you to participate in a study I am conducting as part of my dissertation research at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. This study is focused on learning more about beginning counselor educators' experiences of teaching preparation during their doctoral program and experiences of growth in their teaching skills. You are eligible to participate because of your status as a first or second year counselor educator who has graduated from a doctoral program in counselor education within the past 24 months or who is All But Dissertation (ABD) status. This interview will serve as the pilot study and as an actual case within the larger study, so your participation would include offering feedback about the interview questions after the interview has been completed. If you choose to participate in this study, you will receive a **$25 Amazon gift card**.

In this study, I will ask questions about your experiences in your doctoral teaching preparation and in growing in your teaching skills through a phone interview. The total estimated time of the interview is 45-60 minutes. Within two weeks of the completion of the interview, I will contact you and provide you with a written transcript of your responses for your perusal and approval.

Because your voice potentially will be identifiable by anyone who hears the recording, your confidentiality for things you say on the recording cannot be guaranteed. I will limit access to the recording by keeping it in a password protected folder on my computer. I will be the only one who knows the password to access this folder. In addition, I will destroy the digital audio file of the interview after the transcription process. Demographic data forms will be printed out and kept in a locked file cabinet in my work office away from the recordings. Computer files of the demographic data forms will be deleted after they are printed.

Please note that your participation in this research project is voluntary. The University of North Carolina at Greensboro's Institutional Review Board makes sure that studies with people follow federal rules; they have approved this study. If you have any concerns about your rights, how you are being treated, concerns or complaints about this project or benefits or risks associated with being in this study please contact the Office of Research Integrity at UNCG toll-free at (855)-251-

2351**. If you have any questions, want more information, or would like to be a part of this investigation, please contact me, Phillip Waalkes, by email at plwaalke@unge.edu and/or by phone at (919) 609-7510.**

I thank you for you considering participating in this research opportunity.

Sincerely,
Phillip Waalkes, MAEd, NCC

APPENDIX J

PILOT STUDY INFORMED CONSENT

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO
CONSENT TO ACT AS A HUMAN PARTICIPANT: LONG FORM

Project Title: Beginning Counselor Educators Experiences of Doctoral Teaching
Preparation and Growth in Their Teaching Skills

Principal Investigator and Faculty Advisor (if applicable): <u>Phillip Waalkes, MAEd,
NCC, NCLSC,</u> Faculty Advisor: Dr. James Benshoff, PhD, LPC, NCC

Participant's Name:

_____

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in the study is
voluntary. You may choose not to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the
study, for any reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help
people in the future. There may not be any direct benefit to you for being in the research
study. There also may be risks to being in research studies. If you choose not to be in the
study or leave the study before it is done, it will not affect your relationship with the
researcher or the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Details about this study are discussed in this consent form. It is important that you
understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this
research study.

You will be given a copy of this consent form. If you have any questions about this study
at any time, you should ask the researchers named in this consent form. Their contact
information is below.

What is the study about?
This is a research project. Your participation is voluntary. This study seeks to examine
beginning counselor educators' experiences of teaching preparation during their doctoral
program, examine beginning counselor educators' experiences of growth in their teaching
skills, identify ways beginning counselor educators would like to grow in their teaching
skills looking forward, and identify what beginning counselor educators need in order to
experience their desired growth in their teaching skills.

Why are you asking me?
You have been selected based upon your status as a first or second year counselor educators who has graduated from a doctoral program in counselor education within the past 24 months or who is All But Dissertation (ABD). You were randomly chosen from among other assistant professors working in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in the United States to be invited to participate in this research study.

What will you ask me to do if I agree to be in the study?
You will be asked to spend approximately 45-60 minutes participating in an individual interview discussing your experience in doctoral teaching preparation and your experience in the growth of your teaching skills. By beginning to take part in the interview you are giving consent to the conditions on this form.

Within one to two weeks following the interview, the student investigator will contact you and provide you with a written transcript of your responses for your review. A few months later, you will be asked to review and provide feedback on the proposed findings for the study. Should you have any questions after the interview, the student investigator can be reached at plwaalke@unge.edu or (919) 609-7510.

Is there any audio/video recording?
Interviews will be audio recorded. Video images will not be shared or recorded. Because your voice will be potentially identifiable by anyone who hears the tape, your confidentiality for things you say on the tape cannot be guaranteed although the researcher will take steps to limit access to the tape as described below.

What are the risks to me?
Because interviews will be audio recorded, confidentiality cannot be guaranteed but every measure will be taken to protect information shared by participants. Specific measures that will be in place to protect confidentiality are explained below.

If you have any questions, want more information, or have suggestions, please contact Phillip Waalkes (plwaalke@uncg.edu) or my faculty advisor Dr. James Benshoff (benshoff@uncg.edu).
If you have any concerns about your rights, how you are being treated, concerns or complaints about this project or benefits or risks associated with being in this study please contact the Office of Research Integrity at UNCG toll-free at (855)-251-2351.

Are there any benefits to society as a result of me taking part in this research?
Your participation may contribute to our larger effort to enhance teaching quality and doctoral teaching preparation in our field and reflects similar current efforts in other related fields.

Are there any benefits to *me* for taking part in this research study?
There are no direct benefits to participants in this study. You may find that answering the questions about doctoral teaching preparation and growth in your teaching skills allow you to reflect on your past and current teaching experiences, which may be useful to you.

Will I get paid for being in the study? Will it cost me anything?
A $25 Amazon gift card will be provided to you after completion of the interview. If you choose to withdraw from this study before your interview is complete, you will not be eligible to receive the gift card. There are no costs to you for participating in this study.

How will you keep my information confidential?
In order to protect your information, you will be referred to as a number. The demographic form and researcher's notes will be kept in a locked file drawer in the student researcher's home office. A master list linking your name to your ID number will be kept in a locked drawer in the student researcher's on-campus office, separate from your recording and your demographic data form. The audio recording will be stored in a password protected folder on the researcher's laptop and then securely deleted within 30 days of the interview. All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law.

What if I want to leave the study?
You have the right to refuse to participate or to withdraw at any time, without penalty. If you do withdraw, it will not affect you in any way. If you choose to withdraw, you may request that any of your data which has been collected be destroyed unless it is in a de-identifiable state. The investigators also have the right to stop your participation at any time. This could be because you have had an unexpected reaction, or have failed to follow instructions, or because the entire study has been stopped.

What about new information/changes in the study?
If significant new information relating to the study becomes available which may relate to your willingness to continue to participate, this information will be provided to you.

Voluntary Consent by Participant:
By participating in the interview, you are agreeing that you read, or it has been read to you, and you fully understand the contents of this document and are openly willing consent to take part in this study. All of your questions concerning this study have been answered. By participating in the interview, you are agreeing that you are 18 years of age or older and are agreeing to participate in this study described to you by Phillip Waalkes.

APPENDIX K

PILOT STUDY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM

1. Please indicate your sex:
____ Male
____Female

2. What is your age? _____

3. Which of the following best describes your ethnicity?
____ Asian American / Pacific Islander
____ American Indian
____ African American / Black
____ Caucasian / White
____ Hispanic / Latino/a
____ Multiracial
____ Other (please specify) _____

4. Are you an International faculty member?   YES   NO

Doctoral Research Training

5. Which of the following is your doctoral degree status?
____ PhD
____ EdD
____ ABD (All but Dissertation)
____ Other (Please specify:_____)

6. Name of your doctoral degree (e.g., Counselor Education, Counselor Education and Supervision, Counseling and Counselor Education):
_____
_____

7. Name of the university from which you received your doctoral degree:
_____
_____

8. Was your doctoral program CACREP-accredited at the time you were enrolled?
YES   NO

9. How many credit hours in teaching did you complete during your doctoral program?
_____

10. How many semesters did you teach by yourself during your doctoral program?
_____

11. How many courses did you coteach during your doctoral program? What courses?
_____
_____

Employment as an Assistant Professor

12. How long have you worked at your current college or university?_____

13. What is your official title in your current position?
_____
_____

14. Is your position tenure-track, clinical, visiting, or other (please specify)?
_____
_____

15. What is your primary specialization? – school counseling, mental health counseling, college counseling, rehabilitation counseling, couple/marriage and family counseling, other (please specify)
_____
_____

16. Is your current program CACREP-accredited? YES   NO

17. Are you currently employed in a _____ master's only or a _____ master's/doctoral program?

18. How many total course credit hours have you taught or are in the process of teaching at your current position?
_____

APPENDIX L

YOUNG AND SHAW ITEMS

Young and Shaw's (1999) items that differentiate effective teaching from ineffective teaching

1. value of the course
2. motivating students
3. course organization
4. effective communication
5. comfortable learning atmosphere
6. concern for student learning
7. genuine respect for students

From

Young, S., & Shaw, D. G. (1999). Profiles of effective college and university teachers.

The journal of higher education, 70(6), 670-686.

APPENDIX M

DOMAINS AND CATEGORIES

Table 2. Frequencies of Domains and Categories

Domain title	Core ideas	Cases & Frequency
Pre-doctoral experience	**Teaching experience**	**5 - Typical**
	Impact of pre-doctoral experience on teaching	**4 - Variant**
	Presentation experience	**4 - Variant**
	Other professional experience	**2- Variant**
	No teaching experience	**2 - Variant**
	Counseling experience	**2 - Variant**
Doctoral experience	**Teaching experience**	**9 - General**
	Co-teacher	9 - General
	Instructor of record	4 - Variant
	Seeking out teaching experiences	4 - Variant
	Teaching assistant	2 - Variant
	Teaching practicum/internship	2 - Variant
	Policies that created barriers to teaching	2 - Variant
	Courses on teaching	**8 - General**
	Design of courses	6 - Typical
	Assignments	6 - Typical
	Significance of courses	4 - Variant
	Relative Value of experiences	**6 - Typical**
	Program design	**6 - Typical**
	Program focus	5 - Typical
	Program structure	4 - Variant
	Impact of experiences	**6 - Typical**
Shortcomings in training	**Shortcomings in program design**	**8 - General**
	Lack of preparation for the work of a counselor educator	6 - Typical
	Lack of emphasis on teaching	5 - Typical
	Inadequate teaching coursework	5 - Typical
	Lack of teaching experience	4 - Variant
	Lack of preparation in components of teaching	**7 - Typical**
	Pedagogy/teaching strategies	7 - Typical

239

	Understanding the developmental levels of students	4 - Variant
	Philosophy and theory	3 - Variant
	Course design	2 - Variant
	Assessment	2 - Variant
	Setting classroom expectations	2 - Variant
	Lack of support	**7 - Typical**
	Doctoral program	4 - Variant
	Current institution	2 - Variant
	Desire for more feedback	**4 - Variant**
	Impact of shortcomings in training	**3 - Variant**
Components of teaching	**Course construction**	**8 - General**
	Designing a course	8 - General
	Accrediting standards	4 - Variant
	Presentation of content	**8 - General**
	Philosophy/theory	7 - Typical
	Varied teaching modalities	3 - Variant
	Student engagement/active learning	3 - Variant
	Structuring class time	3 - Variant
	Lesson planning	3 - Variant
	Interactions with students	**8 - General**
	Scaffolding	6 - Typical
	Dealing with student issues	5 - Typical
	Adapting to students	4 - Variant
	Evaluation	**5 - Typical**
	Reflection	**4 - Variant**
Feedback	**Feedback source**	**7 - Typical**
	Doctoral faculty	5 - Typical
	Students	4 - Variant
	Colleagues	2 - Variant
	Doctoral peers	2 - Variant
Support	**Sources of support**	**9 - General**
	Doctoral faculty	7 - Typical
	Colleagues	6 - Typical
	Institutional/cultural	6 - Typical
	Other mentors	4 - Variant
	Doctoral classmates	2 - Variant
	Methods of support	**8 - General**
	Discussion of challenges & problem solving	6 - Typical
	Encouraging identity development	5 - Typical
	Information/resource sharing	4 - Variant
	Encouraging reflection on teaching	4 - Variant
	Feedback	3 - Variant

	Structure of relationships	**7 - Typical**
	Seeking out support	4 - Variant
	Ongoing relationships	4 - Variant
	Mentoring beyond teaching	2 - Variant
	Informal nature	2 - Variant
	Emotional/social impact of support	**7 - Typical**
	Increased comfort/confidence	5 - Typical
	Normalization/validation	3 - Variant
	Catharsis	2 - Variant
	Increased motivation/agency	4 - Variant
Emotions	**Comfort & confidence**	**3 - Variant**
	Stress & being overwhelmed	**4 - Variant**
	Excitement & enjoyment	**3 - Variant**
	Appreciation	**3 - Variant**
Professional identity	**Teacher identity**	**8 - General**
	Personal relationship with teaching	3 - Variant
	Translating counseling skills to teaching	3 - Variant
	Growth in teaching	2 - Variant
	Content areas	2 - Variant
	Developing teaching style	2 - Variant
	Balancing being student-centered and being an expert	2 - Variant
	Teaching focus	2 - Variant
	Professional development	**7 - Typical**
	Development facilitated by doctoral programs	3 - Variant
	Professional advancement	4 - Variant
	Transition to assistant professor	2 - Variant
	Conference presentations	2 - Variant
Systemic factors	**Current institution**	**9 - General**
	Importance of teaching for promotion and tenure	8 - General
	Emphasis on teaching	6 - Typical
	Teaching assignments	5 - Typical
	Balanced focus	3 - Variant
	Research focus	2 - Variant
	Challenges as a beginning counselor educator	**8 - General**
	Time management challenges	4 - Variant
	Solitary nature of teaching	2 - Variant
	Transition to a new context	2 - Variant

	Need for an emphasis on teaching in doctoral programs	4 - Variant
	Shortcomings of teaching evaluations	3 - Variant
	New class preps	2 - Variant
	Cultural shifts in higher education	**3 - Variant**
Reactions to the research	**Importance of topic**	**3 - Variant**
	Appreciation of the study	**3 - Variant**
	Excitement for findings	**3 - Variant**