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ABSTRACT

Teaching is a foundational professional role addressed within the curriculum of counselor education doctoral programs, yet little is known about the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. This interpretative phenomenological analysis explored the teaching preparation experiences of a purposeful sample of eight current or recently graduated counselor education doctoral students enrolled in Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) through semi-structured interviews. Four superordinate themes, Experiential Integration, Contextual Development, Interactive Reflection, and Emergent Teaching Values, were identified to illustrate how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. These themes provide in-depth, nuanced, and narrative accounts of the multifaceted, experiential, relational, and contextual developmental teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. The findings of this study revealed several important implications for counselor education doctoral students, counselor educations, counselor education doctoral programs, and CACREP to enhance the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. This study overall extends our knowledge of counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation experiences, adding to a growing body of literature on doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education.
Teaching is a foundational professional role addressed within the curriculum of counselor education doctoral programs, yet little is known about the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. This qualitative study explored the teaching preparation experiences of eight current or recently graduated counselor education doctoral students enrolled in accredited counselor education Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) programs. This study used in-depth interviews with counselor education doctoral students to understand how they make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. The analysis of the transcripts of the in-depth interviews revealed four themes that describe experiences, contexts, reflections, and values related to counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation experiences. These themes provide detailed accounts of the many facets of counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation experiences. These findings revealed implications for students, educators, degree programs, and accreditation organizations within counselor education that can enhance the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. This study overall extends our knowledge of counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation experiences. Advancing our understanding of the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students can improve the quality of the teaching, learning, and development facilitated through counselor training programs.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Doctoral training in counselor education is a multifaceted process that prepares emerging counselor educators for the professional domains of counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2015). Among these professional domains, there is increasing scholarly attention focused on teaching (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Despite recent developments within the body of knowledge on teaching in counselor education, researchers have continued to call for more scholarship on the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Baltrinic et al., 2018; Waalkes et al., 2018). Although these researchers have investigated specific preparation modalities (i.e., coteaching; Baltrinic et al., 2016), teaching mentorship styles of counselor educators (Baltrinic et al., 2018), and prior doctoral teaching preparation experiences of early career counselor educators (Waalkes et al., 2018), no study examines the holistic teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students. As a result, the purpose of this study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences.

Context for the Study

Doctoral Teaching Preparation

The preparation of graduate students to advance the tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service within American colleges and universities has received considerable scholarly attention in the field of higher education (Austin, 2002; Berelson, 1960; Jepsen, Varhegyi, & Edwards, 2012; Sutherland, 2017; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). However, many doctoral graduates who obtain academic positions feel unprepared for the diverse roles and
expectations of the professoriate (Austin, 2002; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Meacham, 2002). In a study that excluded counselor education doctoral students, investigators recently examined the influence of formal preparatory courses on the preparedness of doctoral students from applied health and physical science degree programs for academic positions in institutions of higher education (Alkathiri & Olson, 2019). Although formal preparatory courses have been found to provide an overview of the general landscape of higher education for doctoral students interested in seeking academic positions (Alkathiri & Olson, 2019), there is evidence demonstrating a need for specialized training and experiences focused on teaching preparation within doctoral education (Jepsen et al., 2012; Robinson & Hope, 2013). An exploratory study that examines the teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students is needed to understand the teaching preparedness of counselor education doctoral students better within a discipline-specific inquiry.

A variety of possible experiences, such as coursework, academic advising, faculty mentorship, and graduate assistantships inform the process of doctoral student teaching preparation (Golde, 1998; Lovitts, 2001; Weidman et al., 2001). Within the broader landscape of graduate education, the graduate teaching assistantship is a common teaching preparation experience (Tulane & Beckert, 2011). Based on an apprenticeship model of training, graduate teaching assistants engage in teaching responsibilities as instructors of record or assistants to instructors of record (Tulane & Beckert, 2011). Through faculty mentorship, teaching assistantships, and other contextual experiences, graduate students aiming for academic positions at institutions of higher education have opportunities to engage in teaching preparation experiences (Colbeck, 2008; Hall & Burns, 2009). However, the quality of these teaching preparation experiences can contribute to integrated or fragmented professional identities among
doctoral students within their future careers as faculty members (Colbeck, 2008). The extant literature of doctoral education does not capture the variations of these experiences due to contextual factors such as discipline-specific expectations and the types of academic institutions where doctoral training occurs, particularly concerning teaching preparation.

**CACREP Doctoral Teaching Standards**


The CACREP standards corresponding to the professional role of teaching within counselor education are relevant to the context of this current study. Specifically, the CACREP teaching standards require the curriculum of counselor education doctoral programs to address (a) roles and responsibilities related to educating counselors; (b) pedagogy and teaching methods relevant to counselor education; (c) models of adult development and learning; (d) instructional and curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation methods relevant to counselor education; (e) effective approaches for online instruction; (f) screening, remediation, and gatekeeping functions
relevant to teaching; (g) assessment of learning; (h) ethical and culturally relevant strategies used in counselor preparation; (i) the role of mentoring in counselor education (CACREP, 2015, p. 39). Accordingly, the CACREP doctoral teaching standards are intended to prepare future counselor educators to promote the knowledge and skill acquisition of counseling students within master's and doctoral degree training contexts.

**Counselor Education Doctoral Teaching Preparation**

Counselor education researchers have investigated several teaching preparation modalities (e.g., coteaching, teaching mentorship, teaching preparation curriculum). First, researchers have investigated coteaching as a modality of counselor education doctoral student teaching preparation (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011; Malott et al., 2014; Orr et al., 2008). Baltrinic et al. (2016) developed a definition of coteaching for counselor education derived from a phenomenological inquiry into the coteaching experiences of counselor education doctoral students. According to Baltrinic et al. (2016):

> Coteaching can be defined as a teacher preparation process that provides counselor education doctoral students with essential learning opportunities through (a) engagement in a trusting relationship with a faculty teaching mentor, (b) advancement through a series of progressively challenging teaching experiences in and out of the classroom, (c) refinement of teaching knowledge and skills under the guidance of a supervising teacher, and (d) development of teaching competencies that will transfer to future professional teaching roles. (p. 40)

In combination with didactic instruction about teaching, coteaching has been found to support counselor education doctoral students as they develop curriculum, manage classroom dynamics, and cultivate a philosophy of teaching (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011).
Second, teaching mentorship is also thought to contribute to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. In addition to discrete coteaching relationships, teaching mentorship is considered to be an integral aspect of the preparation experience of counselor education doctoral students (Borders et al., 2011). In particular, teaching mentorships have been found to strengthen the professional identities of counselor education doctoral students (Limberg et al., 2013) and enhance the confidence of counselor education doctoral students seeking faculty employment (Warnke et al., 1999). Additionally, Batrinic et al. (2018) found that a variety of teaching mentorship styles exist among counselor educators (i.e., supervisor, facilitator, and evaluator). Concerning teaching preparation explicitly, Hall and Hulse (2010) found that teaching mentorships contribute to greater confidence in the teaching ability of counselor education doctoral students. Thus, the literature on teaching mentorship sheds light on the importance of this type of relationship on the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students.

Finally, teaching internships and practicum have traditionally been the primary teaching preparation modality in counselor education doctoral programs. However, counselor education researchers have recently begun to identify a need for doctoral training in teaching methods and instructional theory (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). This need reflects a shift in the 2016 CACREP doctoral teaching standards that place a greater emphasis on doctoral training in instructional theory in comparison to previous iterations of the standards (CACREP, 2001, 2009). Barrio Minton et al. (2014) conducted a content analysis of peer-reviewed articles on teaching within counseling and counselor education between 2001 and 2010 and observed that only 2.17% (n = 5) of the published literature attended to doctoral teaching preparation. In a replication of the Barrio Minton et al. (2014) study that analyzed the teaching literature in counselor education
between 2011 and 2015, Barrio Minton et al. (2018) found 3.3% (n = 4) of articles contained in the study sample examined doctoral preparation experiences. Specifically, these articles emphasized research preparation as opposed to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students (Barrio Minton et al., 2018).

Although there remains a lack of scholarship on the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students, there has been an increase in counselor education doctoral programs offering formal courses on teaching methods and instructional theory (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015). However, recent evidence suggests there is limited intentionality toward teaching preparation and a concurrent desire for teaching methodology coursework within counselor education doctoral programs (Waalkes et al., 2018). In a consensual qualitative study of beginning counselor educators, Waalkes et al. (2018) found that most participants desired more teaching preparation that focused on a wide range of pedagogies, content delivery methods, and teaching strategies. Furthermore, an autoethnographic study of six counselor education doctoral students revealed that formal instructional theory training, teaching experience, and self-reflection enhanced their teaching self-efficacy (Elliot et al., 2019).

**Statement of the Problem**

Counselor education researchers have recently called for more scholarship on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Waalkes et al., 2018). Among the counselor education literature on teaching, there is a relative lack of attention to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Whereas there is a relative lack of attention on counselor education doctoral student teaching preparation, the *2016 CACREP Standards* provide specific guidelines for the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral
students. Furthermore, the 2016 CACREP Standards require doctoral students to receive teaching preparation experiences related to developing an understanding of assessment, instruction, and development of learners within the context of teaching. Therefore, the following section describes student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive development, scholarship of teaching and learning, and andragogy. Student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive development, scholarship of teaching and learning, and andragogy represent some features of the instructional and developmental process of counselor education doctoral student teaching preparation expressed through the 2016 CACREP Standards.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

The origins of the student learning outcome movement in higher education are traced back to the early 1980s when a combination of federal and state government reports called for institutions to demonstrate transparency about student outcomes, experiences, and return on investment (Ewell, 2009). In more recent years, counselor education joined the student learning outcomes movement when CACREP introduced requirements for the documentation of student knowledge and skills in 2009 (Barrio Minton et al., 2016; CACREP, 2009). Barrio Minton et al. (2016) wrote:

> Participating in accountability and quality assurance practices is part of what it means to be a faculty member in higher education today. This participation will require a more sophisticated understanding of best practices for meaningful, authentic assessment of student learning in a manner that exceeds historical examination of syllabi, student satisfaction, or general indicators such as pass rates on standardized or instructor-developed examinations. (p. 6)
Advancing the knowledge and practice of assessing student learning outcomes in counselor education is imperative and offers a measure of accountability and credibility to the stakeholders of counseling training (e.g., clients, insurers, the public, students, accrediting bodies). However, the role of teaching within the process of assessing student learning receives far too little attention (Ewell, 2009).

Researchers have noted a relationship between the introduction of student learning outcomes within the CACREP standards and the emergence of empirically-based literature on current teaching practices and measures of learning outcomes (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Likewise, scholarly attention toward teaching preparation in counselor education (e.g., Baltrinic et al., 2016; Elliot et al., 2019, Waalkes, 2018) is anticipated to become more prominent due to the emphasis on student learning outcomes within the field of counselor education. Furthermore, central to the student learning outcome movement in counselor education is the quality and rigor of teaching literature (Barrio Minton et al., 2016), along with the faculty who enact the developmental process of counselor education.

**Counselor Cognitive Complexity**

The experiences of professional counselors are complex, diverse, and rarely navigable with linear strategies. Counselor education researchers have acknowledged the complexity of counseling practice (Granello, 2010; Welfare & Borders, 2010a) and have advocated for the integration of cognitive-developmental curricula and pedagogies into counselor training programs (Choate & Granello, 2006; Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Granello, 2010; Granello & Underfer-Babalis, 2004; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b). Previous studies within the field of counselor education have investigated the development of cognitive complexity throughout graduate training (Brendel et al., 2002; Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Fong et al., 1997; Granello,
2002), following the practicum experience (Borders, 1989, 1990), and among professionals after graduation (Granello, 2010). Also, the cognitive complexity of counselors-in-training has been studied within the context of the faculty advisor (Choate & Granello, 2006) and supervisory (Granello, 2000) relationships. Altogether, these studies point to the occurrence of cognitive growth during counselor training and endorse conclusions about the relationship between cognitive complexity and counselor effectiveness (Borders, 1989, 1990; Granello, 2010; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b).

Cognitive complexity has been an object of research since the mid-20th century (Bieri, 1955). Initially defined in terms of a binary structure, Bieri (1955) referred to "cognitive complexity-simplicity" as the degree of differentiation among an individual's construct system, or manner of perceiving people (p. 263). Since this initial conceptualization, the term cognitive complexity has been appropriated to describe cognitive growth within a number of different theories of cognitive development that include (a) conceptual systems (Harvey et al., 1961); (b) cognitive systems (Crockett, 1965; Kelly, 1955); (c) epistemological development (Perry, 1970); (d) ego development (Loevinger, 1976). In the field of counselor education, various definitions of cognitive complexity are found that synthesize views from these different theoretical frameworks (e.g., Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Granello, 2010; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b). According to a broad definition provided by Grannello (2010), cognitive complexity is "the ability to absorb, integrate, and make use of multiple perspectives" (p. 92).

Despite the empirical evidence that supports developing the cognitive complexity of counselors-in-training, it remains unclear how counselor educators promote cognitive complexity within the learning environment of graduate counseling training programs. A possible explanation for this discrepancy relates to the diverse cognitive-developmental theoretical
foundation of cognitive complexity represented within counselor education. This discrepancy may also be related to the nascent scholarly understanding of the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Similar to the phenomenological approach employed by Baltrinic (2014) and Baltrinic et al. (2016), this qualitative study of the overall phenomenon of doctoral teaching preparation as experienced by counselor education doctoral students advances understanding on the preparation of doctoral students for engaging and promoting the cognitive-developmental process of counselor education.

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

Cognitive complexity relates to the scholarship of teaching and learning. While discussing the relationship between counseling students’ cognitive development and teaching in counselor education, Granello and Hazler (1998) wrote, “We suggest that it is time for the profession to take a more formal stance and give more emphasis to the process of teaching, rather than just the content” (p. 102). Furthermore, consider the most recent revision of Bloom's (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* that supplies an additional cognitive-developmental dimension (i.e., factual, conceptual, procedural, and metacognitive) to the widely-applied scheme for learning goals, objectives, and standards (Krathwohl, 2002). While there is a growing body of empirical literature of content-specific teaching techniques within counselor education (Barrio Minton et al., 2018), learning across domains also reflects the process, methods, and social foundations of teaching and learning.

The contexts in which teaching and learning occur within counseling graduate programs minimally involve classroom instruction and supervised practicum and internships. According to Bernard and Goodyear (2019), clinical supervision is the signature pedagogy of counseling. This interpretation is different from that of Brackette (2014), who identified a signature pedagogy
within the specific context of teaching clinical mental health counseling. Moreover, Brackette (2014) wrote, "[T]he signature pedagogy in clinical mental health counseling is an integrative approach that combines an opportunity for students to create knowledge and understanding based on group, experiential, and self-reflective exercises enhanced with technological, social, and service-learning components" (p. 42). Regardless of the contextual and conceptual views of signature pedagogy within counseling, the process of identifying signature pedagogies is central to the scholarship of teaching and learning (Chick et al., 2012; Gurung et al., 2009; Shulman, 2005).

**Andragogy**

As an alternative to pedagogy, which was historically developed based on research about the learning of children, Malcolm Knowles (1973, 1984) introduced the andragogical theory of adult learning. Knowles (1973, 1984) outlined four assumptions describing the distinctiveness of andragogy that include (a) changes in self-concept; (b) the role of experience; (c) readiness to learn; (d) motivation to learn. Also, Knowles (1984) contended that adult learners should participate in the planning and evaluation of problem-based, experiential, and immediate learning that has a meaningful relationship to their professional and personal life. Based on humanistic notions of learning, the child and adult theory of learning explicated by Carl Rogers (1969) influenced the development of Knowles' (1973, 1984) work concerning andragogy. Rogers' (1969) work extended client-centered theory into the context of teaching and learning. Similar to the theoretical background of Knowles' (1973, 1984) andragogical theory of learning, humanism is considered to be the foundation of the counseling profession (Hansen et al., 2014). However, it is unclear how the guiding theories of learning in counselor education and the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students reflect the humanistic foundation
of professional counseling. The implications of a qualitative exploration of the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students may clarify the theoretical foundations of teaching in counselor education. This clarification may provide an understanding of the congruence between the practice of counseling and counselor education. Whereas teaching and learning scholarship in counselor education commonly utilizes the language of pedagogy, graduate counselor training often involves adult learners. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students through the lens of andragogy.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Question**

Although recent studies have broadened our understanding of coteaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016), teaching mentorship styles (Baltrinic et al., 2018), and the doctoral teaching preparation experiences from the standpoint of early career counselor educators (Waalkes et al., 2018), researchers have not studied the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students in much detail (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Given the centrality of teaching to accreditation, learning outcomes, and student development in counselor education, it is essential that we better understand the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Furthermore, improving our understanding of the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students can enhance the quality of the teaching, learning, and development facilitated through counselor training programs. Above all, expanding our understanding of doctoral teaching preparation can add to the quality of counseling services provided to clients.

Among the recent scholarship on doctoral teaching preparation, no single study exists which explores the holistic teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Moreover, a recent autoethnographic study explored the experiences of counselor
education doctoral students who engaged in an instructional theory course (Elliot et al., 2019). However, a more comprehensive study may include various dimensions of counselor education doctoral student teaching preparation (e.g., coteaching, teaching internships, and teaching mentorship). Likewise, a study that explores the holistic teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students can provide an enhanced understanding of how the different aspects of the counselor education doctoral experience contribute to doctoral teaching preparation.

No one study can fully capture the comprehensiveness of counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation experiences. With that said, what is currently absent from the literature on the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students is a study that examines not only the individual parts of doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education but also the whole of a counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation. Although the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students has been studied using a variety of qualitative approaches, no one study has utilized an interpretative or hermeneutic framework to examine counselor education doctoral students' teaching preparation experiences. A study drawing from a hermeneutic tradition supports a holistic exploration of the phenomenon of doctoral teaching preparation.

Methodologically, the present study sought to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences by employing interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA; Smith et al., 2009). There are currently no studies within the counselor education literature that have utilized IPA methodology to investigate the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Some of the primary features of the present study that distinguish it from other counselor education studies on doctoral
teaching preparation include the use of IPA methodology and a holistic approach to the phenomenon of doctoral teaching preparation. Additionally, no study within counselor education has asked the research question of this present study.

The purpose of this study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Rather than investigate a specific technique or relationship that informs doctoral teaching preparation, the present study sought to focus on the overall teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students. In particular, this study aimed to offer an extensive and process-oriented exploration of the meaning counselor education doctoral students ascribe to their teaching preparation experiences. The research question of this study asks: How do counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences?

Definition of Terms

Andragogy

Andragogy refers to learning theory based on practical and empirical evidence about the unique characteristics of adult learners (Knowles, 1973). Five assumptions demonstrate the distinctiveness of andragogical theories of learning that include (a) self-concept; (b) experience; (c) readiness to learn; (d) orientation to learning; (e) motivation to learn (Knowles, 1973, 1984). Additionally, Knowles (1984) suggested four principles of adult learning that comprise of (a) learner involvement in planning and evaluation of instruction; (b) experience as the foundation of learning; (c) learning should relate to the immediate professional, and personal life of adults; (d) adult learning is problem-centered.
Doctoral Teaching Preparation

Teaching preparation refers to experiences that specifically influence counselor education doctoral students’ development for the faculty role of teaching in institutions of higher education. As the central phenomenon of this study, this broad conceptualization of teaching preparation is intended to open space for an inductive exploration of the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular experiences of doctoral students that inform their development as teachers. Within the context of this study, teaching preparation may include formal (e.g., coursework, teaching internships, graduate teaching assistantships) and informal (e.g., teaching mentorships, peer mentorships, self-directed learning). Therefore, this phenomenological study is interested in understanding the meaning counselor education doctoral students ascribe to their teaching preparation. Thus, experiences that influence a counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation may fall outside of this a priori conceptualization.

Learning

The field of educational psychology informs the conceptualization of learning used in this study. According to Ormrod (2016), learning is "a long-term change in mental representations or associations as a result of experience" (p. 4). This definition describes the temporal, developmental, and experiential qualities of learning.

Pedagogy

Nelson and Neufeldt (1998) defined pedagogy as "the art and science of teaching" (p. 71). Throughout this study, the term pedagogy refers to the theories, methods, and practices of teaching. The historical and etymological development of the meaning of pedagogy within the scholarly discourse on teaching and education serves as the basis of this conceptualization. Although the term pedagogy has historical origins in the teaching of children, this study endorses
pedagogy as a concept that includes a wide range of teaching practice, methods, and theories applicable to all learners.

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

Throughout this study, scholarship of teaching and learning refers to the systematic study of teaching and learning in higher education that results in findings that can be shared, reviewed, and built upon within the appropriate scholarly community (McKinney, 2007). Additionally, the understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning in this study is oriented toward reflective teaching practice to improve teaching and student learning (Prosser, 2008).

**Teaching**

While a variety of definitions of teaching exist within the literature related to education, this study draws from the definition suggested by Rogers (1969) who saw teaching as the "facilitation of learning" (p. 119). This definition fits within the purpose of the current study that is interested in the how, or process, of teaching preparation. Also, this conceptualization is consistent with the constructivist and developmental approach to teaching within counselor education described by McAuliffe (2001).

**Overview of the Method**

The methodological approach taken in this qualitative study is IPA (Smith et al., 2009). IPA is grounded in the philosophical and theoretical traditions of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and idiography (Smith et al., 2009). IPA is an appropriate methodology for this study that focuses on counselor education doctoral students' meaning and sense-making regarding their teaching preparation experiences. In-depth semi-structured interviews with a purposive and homogenous sample of eight counselor education doctoral students enrolled in Doctor of Philosophy (Ph. D.) or Doctoral of Education (Ed.D.) degree programs at institutions that are
accredited according to the 2016 CACREP Standards were conducted to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Interviews were transcribed verbatim and coded according to the individual case and group-level analytical strategy of IPA that includes a) multiple readings of the transcripts; b) initial noting; c) developing emergent themes; d) pursuing connections among emergent themes; e) shifting to subsequent cases; f) observing patterns across cases (Smith et al., 2009). Superordinate themes were established based on emergent themes and patterns observed across all cases.

Document Organization

The overall structure of the study takes the form of five chapters, including this introductory chapter that has discussed the context for the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, definition of terms, and the overview of the method. Chapter Two presents a review of relevant conceptual and empirical literature related to the phenomenon of counselor education doctoral student teaching preparation. Chapter Three provides details regarding the methodological features of the study, including the research design, semi-structured interview guide, data analysis plan, researcher positionality, and procedures to establish rigor, credibility, and trustworthiness. Chapter Four presents the findings of the study, focusing on the subordinate and emergent themes that help to answer the primary and secondary research questions. Chapter Five provides a discussion that is grounded in the findings, and that focuses on implications, limitations, future research, and the conclusion of the study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to explore the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Furthermore, the present study sought to examine the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education through an interpretive and exploratory methodological standpoint in which the participants in this study determined the attributes that are meaningful to their teaching preparation experiences. Chapter Two sets out to provide a review of the scholarly literature relevant to the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Referring to the relationship between a literature review and IPA methodology, Smith et al. (2009) explained:

In IPA, primary research questions, and the subsequent interview questions which may devolve from them, are not usually theory-driven. But a literature review should help you to identify a gap which your research question can then address, and it should also help you to learn something about your participants. (p. 42)

Chapter Two develops the context and statement of the problem for this study with this methodological perspective in mind.

The Context for the Study section situates the present study within the broader landscape of doctoral education while moving toward a more discipline-specific discussion about the CACREP doctoral teaching standards and the scholarly literature on teaching preparation in counselor education. Moreover, the Statement of the Problem section offers background into some of the topics that inform the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. These topics include student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive complexity, scholarship of teaching and learning, and andragogy. Chapter Two concludes with a summary that explains
how this present study that explored the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students helps to fill a gap in the literature on doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education.

**Context for the Study**

The following section focuses on the context of this study that explores the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Overall, this section provides a literature review that focuses on the broader landscape of teaching preparation in graduate education, CACREP doctoral teaching standards, and counselor education doctoral teaching preparation. The immediate discussion of this literature review related to the context of the current study focuses on the more general landscape of graduate education related to doctoral teaching preparation.

**Doctoral Teaching Preparation**

Doctoral education in the United States has an extended history, with the first research doctorate (Ph.D.) awarded in 1861 at Yale University (National Science Board, 1969). Within the field of higher education, considerable scholarly attention has been given to the preparation of doctoral students for professorial roles in colleges and universities within the United States (Austin, 2002; Berelson, 1960; Jepsen et al., 2012; Sutherland, 2017; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). The historical-critical analysis of graduate education came into prominence around the mid-twentieth century through the works of Storr (1953), Berelson (1960), Eells (1963), and Walters (1965). Berelson (1960) examined the history of graduate education within the United States and found multiple instances of doctoral teaching preparation as a noteworthy issue among university and college administrators. In reflecting on several questions concerning doctoral preparation experiences generated by the Association for American Universities during the 1920s and 1930s,
Berelson (1960) stated, “Should there be more direct training for teaching?” (p. 28). This question contained in Berelson’s (1960) review demonstrates the depth of the historical context of the role of teaching preparation within the experience of doctoral education.

Although doctoral teaching preparation has been considered within the history of graduate education in the United States, the need for training and experience in this area has persisted. In a four-year longitudinal qualitative study of graduate students who aspired to the professoriate for example, Austin (2002) found that graduate students desired diverse and developmentally-oriented teaching opportunities. Referring to recommendations for doctoral teaching preparation provided by participants, Austin (2002) reported, “Several participants praised the value of diverse teaching experiences and urged systematic attention to providing graduate students with opportunities to take on increasingly complex and more autonomous teaching responsibilities” (p. 112). Several of the 79 participants in the Austin (2002) study described the value of diverse teaching preparation experiences, but many doctoral graduates who go on to obtain academic positions feel unprepared for the role of teaching (Austin, 2002; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Meacham, 2002).

*Locus of Responsibility*

If some doctoral students feel unprepared for the faculty role of teaching, who is responsible for the teaching preparation of doctoral students? Meacham (2002) considered both doctoral training programs and academic departments hiring doctoral graduates as the contexts responsible for teaching preparation within colleges and universities. A variety of factors contribute to institutional and individual perspectives on where the responsibility for the teaching preparation of doctoral students lies. Some of these factors include the potential for drawing time and effort away from research and a perceived threat to research, institutional, and faculty
ranking systems posed by teaching (Meacham, 2002). Providing a personal critique of the vacillating responsibility of doctoral teaching preparation, Meacham (2002) wrote:

However, I believe that the core concern is that most faculty in doctoral research programs don’t know how to instill a passion and commitment for teaching in their doctoral students, or how to mentor novice teachers to be student-centered and to acquire a repertoire of teaching skills beyond lecturing, or how to prepare their graduates to be change agents for their students, their institutions, and their communities. (p. 25)

The debate about the site of responsibility for teaching preparation in academia can result in incongruent outcomes for the career development of doctoral students (Bieber & Worley, 2006; Meacham; 2002).

In a qualitative study that included 34 doctoral students, Bieber and Worley (2006) described a division between the schemas held by faculty and doctoral students about the role of teaching and teaching preparation. Bieber and Worley (2006) recommended that currently held schemas on teaching be disclosed within the contexts of faculty and doctoral student relationships. This recommendation called for open communication between faculty and doctoral students regarding the priority of teaching within the current role of the faculty members and the future career goals of doctoral students (Bieber & Worley, 2006). The discrepancies evidenced by where the responsibility for doctoral teaching preparation lies and the prioritization of the role of teaching have led to the development of national efforts to mitigate some of the gaps in faculty and doctoral teaching preparation.

**Preparing Future Faculty**

One national program designed to prepare graduate students to enter and succeed in academic careers is Preparing Future Faculty (PFF). PFF was launched in 1993 by the
Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Council of Graduate Schools, the National Science Foundation, and the Pew Charitable Trust (Gaff et al., 2003). These faculty preparation programs give graduate students opportunities to complete supervised teaching activities, exposes students to the tripartite mission and faculty responsibilities, and facilitates interaction with multiple faculty mentors who provide feedback to the students (Gaff et al., 2003). PFF and other similar programs at universities typically offer formal coursework and workshops as primary training modalities. Within these faculty preparation programs, teaching preparation is only one dimension of the curricular experience of doctoral students enrolled in these programs.

A recent ethnographic case study by Alkathiri and Olson (2019) investigated doctoral preparation for academic faculty positions through a formal preparatory course, a common feature of future faculty preparation programs. Although this study did not include counselor education doctoral students, the findings from this study provide helpful insight into doctoral student preparation. Overall, Alkathiri and Olson (2019) found that a formal course on preparing students for the professoriate was influential in preparing doctoral students from a variety of academic disciplines. Commenting on the implications of their study, Alkathiri and Olson (2019) stated, “Formal preparatory courses within doctoral programs might become the best way to prepare students for the professoriate” (p. 62). However, participants in this study perceived a lack of formal and informal preparatory opportunities within their doctoral degree programs (Alkathiri & Olson, 2019). The findings from the Alkathiri and Olson (2019) study highlights a need for formal and informal preparatory opportunities that are specific to each of area of the tripartite mission. Despite teaching preparation being only one dimension of faculty preparation programs, an assortment of diverse teaching experiences contributes to the teaching preparation
experiences of doctoral students (Austin, 2002). In addition to formal preparatory courses that focus on the general roles of the professoriate, there is evidence that specialized training and experiences focused on teaching supports the faculty preparedness of doctoral students (Jepsen et al., 2012; Robinson & Hope, 2013).

**Summary of Doctoral Teaching Preparation**

Within higher education literature, considerable scholarly attention has been directed toward the preparation of doctoral students for faculty roles in colleges and universities (Austin, 2002; Berelson, 1960; Jepsen et al., 2012; Sutherland, 2017; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). Although the overall preparation of doctoral students has been considered within the higher education literature, many doctoral students report feeling unprepared for the role of teaching within colleges and universities (Austin, 2002; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Meacham, 2002). PFF and other faculty preparation programs at colleges and universities across the United States primarily offer formal coursework and workshops to doctoral students preparing to become faculty members (Alkathiri & Olson, 2019). Teaching is only one dimension of these doctoral preparation experiences. In addition to generic preparation experiences for doctoral students seeking faculty positions, specific training and experiences related to teaching are a necessary feature of doctoral preparation (Jepsen et al., 2012; Robinson & Hope, 2013).

**Doctoral Teaching Preparation Modalities**

The broader landscape of doctoral preparation contains various experiences that may contribute to the specific teaching preparation of doctoral students. Some of the more common of these experiences include formal teaching coursework, faculty mentorship, and graduate assistantships (Golde, 1998; Lovitts, 2001; Weidman et al., 2001). While many students have an opportunity to teach at some point during their doctoral journey, their programs may not provide
structured experiences that prepare them to contend with issues such as “assessment, different types of student learning, the pedagogy of the discipline, curricular innovations, the impact of technology on education, or the variety of teaching styles that may be helpful with students from different racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds” (Gaff et al., 2003, p. 3). Whereas these teaching preparation experiences exist within doctoral education, not all doctoral students participate equally or experience quality in their coursework, faculty mentorship, or graduate teaching assistantship opportunities (Golde, 1998; Lovitts, 2001). Also, the quantity and quality of the teaching preparation experiences of doctoral students can contribute to attrition (Golde, 1998; Lovitts, 2001). Additional scholarly attention toward the nature of doctoral teaching preparation can enhance the current experiences and future preparedness of doctoral students.

**Graduate Teaching Assistantships**

Since the late 1800s, graduate teaching assistantships have been offered to doctoral students at colleges and universities in the United States (Allen & Rueter, 1990). Traditionally, the graduate teaching assistantship has been a commonplace teaching preparation experience within the broader landscape of higher education (Tulane & Beckert, 2011). As a form of on-the-job-training for teaching, doctoral students who serve as graduate teaching assistants engage in course delivery responsibilities as instructors of record or assistants to instructors of record within an apprenticeship training model (Tulane & Beckert, 2011). In general, graduate teaching assistants engage in a variety of activities that include curriculum development, course maintenance, teaching responsibilities, and mentoring (Tulane & Beckert, 2011). Additionally, doctoral students serving as teaching assistants provide much of the undergraduate instruction at large research universities in the United States (Austin, 2002). Although these roles provide doctoral students with teaching experience, and in many cases funding, graduate teaching
assistantships often serve to meet the needs of academic departments to cover courses and not the intentional development of future faculty (Austin, 2002). Moreover, the teaching assistantship continues to be a form of teaching preparation for doctoral students within the broader landscape of higher education.

**Faculty Mentorship**

Support for faculty mentorship within the context of doctoral teaching preparation is present in the literature of higher education (Austin, 2002; Austin, 2003; Jepsen et al., 2012; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). In a four-year longitudinal qualitative study that explored the experiences of doctoral students preparing to become faculty members, Austin (2002) found a lack of mentoring from faculty focused on teaching. Although some students in this study reported having faculty mentors, most did not (Austin, 2002). Also, few students reported having opportunities to explore assumptions about teaching and career development (Austin, 2002). Based on positive outcomes related to students who did have faculty mentorship related to their teaching development, Austin (2002) recommended giving more attention to regular mentoring, advising, and feedback. Furthermore, the mentorship provided by faculty related to teaching preparation has been found to enhance curriculum design and teaching technology competence (Austin, 2003), along with increase self-confidence and comfort with teaching as future faculty members (Utecht & Tullous, 2009). Overall, faculty mentorship supports the teaching preparation of doctoral students.

**Formal Teaching Coursework**

Formal graduate courses that focus on teaching methodology and instructional theory also contribute to the teaching preparation of doctoral students (Miller et al., 2010; Robinson et al., 2013; Robinson et al., 2015; Robinson et al., 2019). In contrast to faculty preparation
programs that are often short, voluntary, and offer generic overviews of various faculty roles, formal teaching courses provide dedicated time and attention to the teaching development and preparation of doctoral students (O’Loughlin et al., 2017). These formal teaching preparation courses are commonly delivered across entire institutions with multidisciplinary enrollment or within academic programs or departments providing a discipline-specific context for teaching preparation (O’Loughlin et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2019). The prevalence of formal teaching courses has expanded throughout the past 25 years, and this growth is attributed to institutional and departmental acknowledgment of the identified gaps in doctoral teaching preparation (O’Loughlin et al., 2017). Although scholars have demonstrated the utility of formal teaching preparation courses in graduate doctoral education (Miller et al., 2010; O’Loughlin et al., 2017; Robinson et al., 2013; Robinson et al., 2015; Robinson et al., 2019), there is evidence that specialized teaching preparation through formal teaching courses within graduate programs is needed (Jepsen et al., 2012; Robinson & Hope, 2013), and recommendations for their expansion persists (Robinson et al., 2019).

**Summary of Doctoral Teaching Preparation Modalities**

Graduate teaching assistantships, faculty mentorship, and formal teaching coursework provide doctoral students with opportunities to obtain teaching preparation experiences across higher education (Colbeck, 2008; Hall & Burns, 2009). An essential aspect of these teaching preparation experiences is their developmental and systematic quality (Austin, 2002; Colbeck, 2008). Developmentally-organized teaching preparation experiences have the potential to promote integrated professional identities among doctoral students (Colbeck, 2008). Alternatively, teaching preparation experiences that lack intentionality and developmental organization may lead to fragmented professional identity development among doctoral students.
as they transition into careers as faculty members (Colbeck, 2008). Also, the higher education literature on doctoral teaching preparation does not take into account discipline-specific expectations. Therefore, the following section of this review focuses on the discipline-specific doctoral teaching preparation literature from within the counselor education field. This discipline-specific review of literature begins with a discussion of the CACREP doctoral teaching standards.

**CACREP Doctoral Teaching Standards**

**Accreditation and Recognition**

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and the United States Department of Education (USDE) oversee the process of accreditation throughout higher education in the United States. According to the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), accreditation is the process of external review within higher education to examine colleges, universities, and programs for quality assurance and improvement (Eaton, 2015). Emerging from concerns to protect the health, safety, and interests of the public, accreditation in the United States is more than 100 years old (Eaton, 2015). Furthermore, accreditation is carried out by private, nonprofit organizations designed to assure and improve the quality of colleges, universities, and academic programs (Eaton, 2015). Recognized by CHEA and USDE, CACREP is the programmatic accrediting organization for the counseling profession. The process of recognition is considered to be the accreditation of accrediting organizations (Eaton, 2015; Urofsky, 2013).

CACREP accredits master’s and doctoral degree programs in counseling offered by colleges and universities primarily in the United States, but also throughout the world (CACREP, 2019). The current program specialty areas accredited by CACREP include (a) addiction; (b)
career; (c) clinical mental health; (d) clinical rehabilitation; (e) college; (f) community; (g) gerontological, (h) marriage, couple, and family; (i) mental health; (j) rehabilitation; (k) school; (l) student affairs; (m) student affairs and college; (n) doctoral-level counselor education and supervision (CACREP, 2019). Representing the most recent iteration of the CACREP accreditation standards, the *2016 CACREP Standards* outline the current expectations for counselor education doctoral students (CACREP, 2015). Additionally, the CACREP standards are scheduled to be updated in 2022 with the release of the *2023 CACREP Standards*.

**Historical Development of Doctoral Standards**

The current CACREP doctoral standards originate from the 1978 ACES *Guidelines for Doctoral Preparation in Counselor Education* (Adkison-Bradley, 2013). The ACES doctoral guidelines shaped successive iterations of the CACREP doctoral preparation guidelines published in 1988, 2001, 2009, and 2016 (Adkison-Bradley, 2013; Stripling, 1978; Sweeney, 1992). At the end of the calendar year 2018, there were a total of 871 entry and doctoral-level programs accredited by CACREP (CACREP, 2019). From 2017 to 2018, doctoral student enrollment in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs rose from 2,561 to 2,917 (CACREP, 2019). In the summer of 2019, there were 82 CACREP-accredited counselor education and supervision doctoral programs. Among this total number, 29 counselor education and supervision doctoral programs are accredited according to the *2016 CACREP Standards*.

Generally, the 2016 CACREP standards present programmatic expectations for counselor education and supervision doctoral programs related to the learning environment and professional counselor development. The *2016 CACREP Standards* include six sections:

1. Learning environment: Institutional, academic department, and faculty and staff expectations.
2. Professional counseling identity: Foundational standards and counseling curriculum for the eight required core content areas (i.e., professional counseling orientation and ethical practice, social and cultural diversity, human growth and development, career development, counseling and helping relationships, group counseling and group work, assessment and testing, research and program evaluation).

3. Professional practice: Entry-level practice, practicum, internship, supervisor qualifications, and practicum and internship course loads.

4. Program evaluation: Program-level evaluation, student assessment, and evaluation of faculty and supervisors.

5. Specialty areas: Standards related to specific specialty areas (i.e., career, clinical mental health, clinical rehabilitation, college counseling and student affairs, marriage, couple and family, school counseling, and rehabilitation counseling).

6. Doctoral program standards: Requirements for the learning environment, professional identity, and practicum and internship requirements.

Based on the doctoral program standards, counselor education doctoral programs are specifically required to address the core professional areas of counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy (CACREP, 2015).

**Doctoral Teaching Standards**

The CACREP standards concerned with the professional role of teaching within counselor education are most relevant to this present study on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. The CACREP standards specific to teaching require the curriculum of counselor education doctoral programs to address (a) roles and responsibilities related to educating counselors; (b) pedagogy and teaching methods relevant
to counselor education; (c) models of adult development and learning; (d) instructional and curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation methods relevant to counselor education; (e) effective approaches for online instruction; (f) screening, remediation, and gatekeeping functions relevant to teaching; (g) assessment of learning; (h) ethical and culturally relevant strategies used in counselor preparation; (i) the role of mentoring in counselor education (CACREP, 2015, p. 39). Thus, the CACREP doctoral teaching standards are intended to prepare emerging counselor educators to facilitate the learning of master’s and doctoral counseling students.

The 2016 CACREP Standards expand the doctoral training requirements related to teaching preparation. For example, the 2016 doctoral teaching standards place additional significance on doctoral training in instructional theory and the assessment of student learning outcomes in comparison to previous iterations of the standards. This trend toward requiring more specialized teaching preparation criteria within the 2009 and 2016 standards has been noted by Barrio Minton et al. (2016) and Barrio Minton et al. (2018). It is anticipated that the 2023 CACREP Standards will further expand the teaching preparation standards required of counselor education and supervision doctoral programs.

**Summary of CACREP Doctoral Teaching Standards**

CACREP is the programmatic accrediting organization for the counseling profession. The 2016 CACREP Standards is the most recent publication of counseling program accreditation expectations for counselor education doctoral students (CACREP, 2015). For initial accreditation and reaccreditation, counselor education doctoral programs are required to address the areas of counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy with doctoral students (CACREP, 2015). Specifically, the accreditation standards related to teaching in counselor education address (a) teaching roles and responsibilities; (b) pedagogy; (c) models
of learning and development; (d) instructional design, delivery, and evaluation methods; (e) online instruction; (f) remediation and gatekeeping; (g) learning assessment; (h) ethics and multicultural teaching strategies; (i) mentoring (CACREP, 2015). Additionally, the 2016 CACREP Standards expanded the teaching preparation requirements for counselor education doctoral programs.

Counselor Education Doctoral Teaching Preparation Modalities

The historical development of the CACREP accreditation standards demonstrates incremental growth of the foundational role of teaching in counselor education. Thus, teaching is a foundational counselor educator role (CACREP, 2015; Hall & Hulse, 2010). Specifically, the expanded teaching preparation expectations within the curriculum of counselor education and supervision doctoral programs signals the importance of teaching in counselor education. Contributing to the foundation of teaching in counselor education, researchers have examined several teaching preparation modalities present within counselor education doctoral curriculum. Some of these approaches to teaching preparation include coteaching, teaching mentorship, and teaching internships. A discussion of studies related to coteaching, teaching mentorship, and formal teaching coursework follows.

Coteaching

Researchers have studied coteaching, a common feature of counselor education doctoral curriculum, as a modality of doctoral student teaching preparation in counselor education (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011; Malott et al., 2014; Orr et al., 2008). Coteaching emerged from pre-service primary and secondary teacher training as a method to develop future teachers (Guise et al., 2017). Based on the coteaching scholarship of Badiali and Titus (2010) and Bacharach et al. (2010), Guise et al. (2017) defined coteaching as, “Both the
pre-service and cooperating teacher are engaged in student learning at all times through daily co-planning, co-instructing, and co-assessing” (p. 370).

Within counselor education doctoral programs, coteaching often occurs through the collaborative facilitation of instruction among faculty and doctoral students within the context of doctoral internship or practicum (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011). Some of the reported benefits of coteaching for counselor education doctoral students include enhanced preparation for the counselor educator role of teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2010; Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008) and increased marketability in securing faculty positions in counselor education (Warnke, et al., 1999). Also, coteaching has been found to help counselor education doctoral students develop curriculum, manage classroom dynamics, and cultivate a philosophy of teaching (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011). Orr et al. (2008) outlined the collaborative teaching teams model as an approach to coteaching that helped counselor education doctoral students gain experience and increase their teaching competence.

Baltrinic et al. (2016) derived a definition of coteaching in counselor education from a phenomenological study of the coteaching experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Features of the Baltrinic et al. (2016) definition of coteaching include (a) a trusting relationship with a supervising faculty member; (b) scaffolding of teaching experiences within and outside the classroom; (c) supervising faculty guidance and supervision; (d) development of transferrable teaching competencies. Based on similar research performed through a dissertation study (Baltrinic, 2014), Baltrinic et al. (2016) conducted in-depth interviews with 10 counselor education doctoral students enrolled in three different programs from large universities in the Midwest. The themes of relationships, operational, and development are identified through the
findings of the Baltrinic et al. (2016) study. In this small-scale analysis, the authors claimed to have provided a structural description of coteaching.

Although Baltrinic et al. (2016) offered an invaluable contribution to the literature on the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students, it is essential to examine the methodology used by these researchers to avoid informal fallacies of generalization. These authors utilized a phenomenological qualitative design which has a stated goal of describing the essence of a phenomenon (Van Manen, 2016). Within a study of 10 counselor education doctoral students from three programs within the Midwest, the essence and structure of meaning of the phenomenon of coteaching is limited to these delimitations. Whereas the Baltrinic et al. (2016) study acknowledged the sample size limitations concerning the transferability of their findings, providing a structural description and a definition of coteaching for counselor education programs has the potential to imply positivistic generalizability.

**Teaching Mentorship**

Teaching mentorship also adds to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Supplementing coteaching and teaching coursework, mentorship related to teaching is considered an essential feature of the preparation experience of counselor education doctoral students (Borders et al., 2011). Using cross-sectional focus groups to explore the preparation experiences contributing to professional identity development with three cohorts of counselor education doctoral students (N=18), Limberg et al. (2013) found that relationships with faculty mentors contributed to their identity as counselor educators. Although the Limberg et al. (2013) study was not explicitly designed to investigate the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students, teaching and mentoring emerged as domains in their study. Mentorship that includes advising specific to teaching has also been found to raise the
confidence of counselor education doctoral students seeking faculty positions (Warnke et al., 1999). Directly related to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students, Hall and Hulse (2010) found that teaching mentorships provided counselor education doctoral students with greater confidence in their teaching ability.

Overall, faculty mentorship contributes to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. What is unclear from the literature on mentoring relationships in counselor education is the degree to which teaching emerges in these mentor-mentee relationships. It may be that mentorships within counselor education doctoral programs are inclusive of all the professional core areas of the counselor education doctoral curriculum (i.e., counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy). Baltrinic et al. (2018) described the uncertainty present within the teaching mentorship literature in counselor education. In a study that utilized Q methodology, Baltrinic et al. (2018) identified the teaching mentoring styles of supervisor, facilitator, and evaluator among counselor educators who provided teaching mentorship. More research on teaching mentorship is needed to develop a greater understanding and best practices for this teaching preparation modality.

**Formal Teaching Coursework**

Didactic courses in teaching also contribute to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students (Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011). The doctoral teaching standards of the 2016 CACREP Standards also call for more robust training in instructional theory, pedagogy, and assessment of student learning. Thus, leading to appeals for more doctoral training and scholarship on teaching methods and instructional theory (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Although there is a higher number of formal teaching courses offered by counselor education doctoral programs (Barrio Minton & Price, 2015), more recent evidence suggests that students still desire
more teaching methodology coursework (Waalkes et al., 2018). In their consensual qualitative study that explored the doctoral teaching preparation experiences of beginning counselor educators, Waalkes et al. (2018) found that formal teaching coursework was primarily limited to a single course within participants’ program of study. Also, no participants in the Waalkes et al. (2018) study reported receiving instruction on a wide range of instructional delivery methods and pedagogies.

In a recent autoethnographic study, Elliot et al. (2019) explored the experiences of six counselor education doctoral students enrolled in an instructional theory course at a single CACREP-accredited program. The findings from this study suggest that formal teaching coursework and experiential learning (i.e., coteaching and internships) have the potential to contribute to higher teaching self-efficacy among counselor education doctoral students (Elliot et al., 2019). The authors also described the significance of intra- and interpersonal processing, which appeared to be contained in intentional mentoring and advising relationships (Elliot et al., 2019). Overall, the Elliot et al. (2019) study demonstrated the importance of formal coursework focused on instructional theory and pedagogy toward the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.

**Summary of Counselor Education Doctoral Teaching Preparation Modalities**

The modalities of coteaching, teaching mentorship, and formal teaching coursework contribute to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Although the preceding discussion presented these modalities as discrete features of teaching preparation in counselor education, the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students represent a composition of coteaching, mentoring, and coursework. The work of Elliot et al. (2019) illustrated the interrelatedness between various modalities of teaching preparation
available to counselor education doctoral students. Furthermore, there is a need for more research that explores the discrete modalities and overall experiences of teaching preparation among counselor education doctoral students (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Additional scholarship on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education students can further refine the practices of teaching preparation and strengthen the foundational role of teaching within counselor education.

**Statement of the Problem**

The 2016 CACREP Standards provide specific guidelines for the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Generally, the 2016 CACREP Standards require doctoral students to receive teaching preparation related to the assessment, instruction, and development of learners within the context of teaching. Student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive development, scholarship of teaching and learning, and andragogy are types of the process of counselor education doctoral student teaching preparation expressed through the 2016 CACREP Standards. Therefore, the following section offers a review of the counselor education literature on student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive development, scholarship of teaching and learning, and andragogy.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

*History of Student Learning Outcomes*

The student learning outcomes movement emerged in the landscape of higher education in the United States around the early to mid-1980s (Ewell, 2002, 2009; Kuh & Ikenberry, 2018). Further catalyzing the development of the student learning outcomes movement, a report from The Secretary of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education criticized higher education for a lack of transparency concerning student learning outcomes (U.S. Department of
Although the student learning outcomes movement existed before the Commission on the Future of Higher Education report, the findings described in this report demanded that institutions demonstrate student learning outcomes and the return on investment of higher education (Ewell, 2009).

The expansion of student learning outcomes is credited with the rise of accreditation organizations (Ewell, 2009). Regional institutional accreditation and discipline-specific program accreditation currently represent the primary motivators to engage in the assessment of student learning outcomes (Barrio Minton et al., 2016). Commenting on the relationship between student learning outcomes, accreditation, and teaching, Ewell (2009) stated:

In recent years, the role of institutional accreditation in promoting assessment has become far more complicated. On the surface—and overwhelmingly sincerely, I believe—both the rhetoric and the evolving practice of institutional accreditation is even more dedicated now than in the past to helping institutions enhance teaching and learning. (p. 12)

Assessing student learning outcomes has the potential to help programs and faculty meet accreditation standards, but also improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching.

**Student Learning Outcomes in Counselor Education**

Counselor education prioritized student learning outcomes through the 2009 CACREP Standards which required counselor education programs to document student knowledge and skills acquisition (Barrio Minton et al., 2016; CACREP, 2009). However, the assessment of student learning outcomes in counselor education is not limited to academic progress. In a review of the assessment of student learning outcomes within a CACREP-accredited program at an urban state university, Haberstroh et al. (2014) reported, “Thus, a comprehensive assessment
of counselor education programs includes systematic evaluation of students’ academic, clinical, and interpersonal progress as guideposts for program improvement” (p. 28). Assessing student learning outcomes in counselor education requires not only measuring traditional academic progress, but also the experiential learning aspects of counselor education curricula.

The 2016 CACREP Standards include expectations for the assessment of student learning outcomes. The specific standards related to the assessment of student learning outcomes require that:

- Counselor education program faculty systematically assesses each student’s progress throughout the program by examining student learning in relation to a combination of knowledge and skills. The assessment process includes the following: (1) identification of 19 key performance indicators of student learning in each of the eight core areas and in each student’s respective specialty area(s) (for doctoral programs, each of the five doctoral core areas), (2) measurement of student learning conducted via multiple measures and over multiple points in time, and (3) review or analysis of data. (4.F.; CACREP, 2015, p. 18)

- Counselor education program faculty systematically assesses each student’s professional dispositions throughout the program. The assessment process includes the following: (1) identification of key professional dispositions, (2) measurement of student professional dispositions over multiple points in time, and (3) review or analysis of data. (4.G.; CACREP, 2015, p. 19)

- Counselor education program faculty has a systematic process in place for the use of individual student assessment data in relation to retention, remediation, and dismissal. (4.H.; CACREP, 2015, p. 19)
To address expectations of the 2016 CACREP Standards regarding the assessment of students learning outcomes, Barrio Minton et al. (2016) offered a cyclical evaluation process that includes (a) identifying objectives; (b) mapping curricula and processes; (c) selecting assessments; (d) developing measures; (e) collecting and managing data; (f) analyzing data; (g) reporting data; (h) using data. Therefore, assessing student learning outcomes is one dimension of broader expectations for counselor education program evaluation.

**Teaching Preparation and Student Learning Outcomes**

Advancing our understanding and application of student learning outcomes assessment in counselor education programs is crucial, extending a degree of accountability and credibility to the stakeholders of counselor preparation (e.g., clients, insurers, the public, students, accrediting bodies; Barrio Minton & Gibson, 2012; Barrio Minton et al., 2016). Still, the role of teaching in student learning outcomes assessment attracts considerably limited attention (Ewell, 2009). Additionally, teaching facilitates the outcomes of student learning. Ewell (2009) reported:

> Far too many institutions have established learning outcomes in response to accreditation requirements and to drive assessments without ensuring that these goals are continuously mapped to, and reinforced by, the teaching and learning process throughout the curriculum as part of a systematic competency based approach. (p. 9)

Therefore, the process of teaching is a link between the curriculum of counselor education programs and student learning outcomes. Exploring the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students can provide insight into how doctoral training programs incorporate student learning outcomes into their teaching preparation.

Counselor education researchers have commented on the relationship between the rise of empirically-based literature on current teaching practices and the introduced (CACREP, 2009)
and expanded (CACREP, 2015) requirements for assessing student learning outcomes within the CACREP standards (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). However, there are no known empirical studies that examine the relationships between student learning outcomes and doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education. Addressing student learning outcomes within the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students may fill a gap in scholarship and practice within counselor education doctoral training. Regardless, the scholarship and practice of teaching within counselor education is central to student learning outcomes assessment (Barrio Minton et al., 2016).

**Summary of Student Learning Outcomes**

Although there is a lack of evidence on the relationship between the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students and the assessment of student learning outcomes, there is a practical connection between teaching and student learning outcomes (Barrio Minton et al., 2016; Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Ewell, 2009). Likewise, student learning outcomes are essential to CACREP accreditation and reaccreditation. Within counselor education, the assessment of student learning outcomes includes the evaluation of the academic, clinical, and interpersonal development of students (Haberstroh et al., 2014). Therefore, expanding the knowledge base on student learning outcomes and doctoral teaching preparation can support the quality assurance of counselor education programs and the effectiveness of teaching within these contexts.

**Counselor Cognitive Complexity**

**History of Cognitive Complexity**

The origins of cognitive complexity trace back to the work of the American psychologist George A. Kelly who in 1955 published the multivolume work *The Psychology of Personal Constructs: A Theory of Personality*. In this magnum opus, Kelly (1955) outlined the principles
of personal construct theory, introduced a measure of constructs through the Role Construct Repertory Test (RCRT), and described the fixed role therapy approach. Kelley derived his psychology of personal construct on the philosophy of constructive alternativism. Generally, the philosophical position of constructive alternativism maintains that the interpretations of individuals are capable of modification (Kelly, 1955). Regarded as a forerunner of constructivism, Kelly’s philosophical assumption of constructive alternativism deviated from the prevailing psychodynamic and behavioral theories of the psychological landscape at the time (Winter, 2012). Before constructivism and social constructionism, constructive alternativism rejected notions of objective reality that restrict our interpretations and limit individually compatible alternative interpretations of our experiences (Paris & Epting, 2015). In summary, constructive alternativism claims there are many possible means of interpreting and constructing our realities.

**The Psychology of Personal Constructs.** Kelly (1955) synthesized the philosophical position of constructive alternativism into a single postulate and 11 corollaries to form the theoretical foundation of personal construct theory. The “fundamental postulate” of the psychology of personal constructs states, “A person’s processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which they anticipate events” (Kelly, 1955, p. 46). This postulate claims that individuals direct their cognitions and interpretations to predict future experiences accurately. The continuous adjustment and addition of constructs based on the outcomes of experiences are intended to reduce future uncertainty by developing more complex systems of constructs. Kelly (1955) annotates the fundamental postulate through 11 corollaries that support the framework of personal construct theory. To measure personal constructs, Kelly (1955) developed the RCRT as a method of assessing personal construct system complexity about significant others in a
person’s life. Various quantitative analyses can be employed based on the scores generated through the RCRT measure of similarities and differences between specific interpersonal elements and cognitive constructs.

**Alternative Approaches to Cognitive Complexity.** So far, this discussion has focused solely on the theory of personal constructs outlined by Kelly (1955). At the same time, several other seminal theorists have influenced the corpus of cognitive development (e.g., Dewey, 1910; Piaget, 1952, Vygotsky, 1934/1986). However, this specific review considers Kelly’s theory as one point of departure. The following survey reviews cognitive-developmental theories primarily related to cognitive complexity that originated after Kelly’s work and employed in counselor education research.

**Cognitive Complexity-Simplicity.** Bieri (1955), a mentee of Kelly, conducted a study in which he used the RCRT to measure the construct systems of teacher education students. Commenting on the study’s theoretical framework, Bieri (1955) stated:

> For our present purposes, we have designated the degree of differentiation of the construct system as reflecting its cognitive complexity-simplicity. A system of constructs which differentiates highly among persons is considered to be cognitively complex. A construct system which provides poor differentiation among persons is considered to be cognitively simple in structure. (p. 263)

Although prior references had been made about the complexity of construct systems (Kelly, 1955), this articulation by Bieri is the first known reference to cognitive complexity along a continuum of complexity-simplicity.

Bieri (1955) hypothesized that a statistically significant positive relationship between cognitive complexity and predictive behavior accuracy should exist between grid scores. Based
on his independently formulated index of cognitive complexity, Bieri’s study represented a specific investigation into the fundamental postulate of personal construct theory by investigating how individuals differentiate, anticipate, and predict events. Despite limited empirical support for his hypothesis (Adams-Webber, 1979), Bieri’s work established a context for subsequent researchers to investigate cognitive complexity (e.g., Crockett, 1965).

**Cognitive Tuning in Communication.** Whereas Bieri (1955) operationalized cognitive complexity through a measure of differentiation, Zajonc (1960) assessed cognitive complexity through integration. With an emphasis on language and communication, Zajonc’s method focused on assessing an individual’s impressional organization of another person through two experimental designs. Overall, Zajonc’s study (1960) represents an essential contribution to the empirical development of cognitive complexity by providing an integration dimension to conceptualizations of cognitive structures and development. Subsequent studies by Harvey et al. (1961) and Crockett (1965) drew upon Zajonc’s attention to integration and Bieri’s regard for differentiation to further develop the empirical foundation of cognitive complexity.

**Conceptual Systems.** Harvey et al. (1961) described cognitive complexity in terms of conceptual systems. According to Harvey et al. (1961), concepts are an aspect of the cognitive system of ordering and evaluating stimuli. In this view, conceptual systems vary in complexity from abstractness to concreteness. Harvey et al. (1961) offer additional cognitive structural continuums that include (a) clarity to ambiguity; (b) compartmentalization to interrelatedness; (c) centrality to peripherality; (d) openness to closedness. Cognitive development in Harvey et al.’s (1961) model of conceptual systems occurs through a process of integration and differentiation, leading to higher levels of abstract conceptual functioning. Multiple assessments of concept systems have emerged from the work of Harvey et al. (1961). These assessments include the
Conceptual Systems Test (Harvey & Hoffmeister, 1967) and the Paragraph Completion Method (PCM; Hunt et al., 1978). The PCM has been used by several counselor education researchers to support the empirical development of cognitive complexity in counselor education (e.g., Holloway & Wolleat, 1980; Brendel et al., 2002).

**Cognitive Complexity.** Another student of Kelly, Crockett (1965), studied cognitive complexity within the context of impression formation. Acknowledging the definitional variation of cognitive complexity across the literature, Crockett provided a specific conceptualization of cognitive complexity. Crockett (1965) explained, “A cognitive system will be considered relatively complex in structure when (a) it contains a relatively large number of elements [differentiation] and (b) the elements are integrated hierarchically by relatively extensive bonds of relationship” (p. 49). Crockett built upon the integration and differentiation of Hunt et al.’s (1961) formulation of conceptual systems. Also, Crockett (1965) introduced domain-specificity as a factor in measuring cognitive complexity. Within the domain of interpersonal interaction, cognitive complexity would be present if a large number of interpersonal constructs are integrated at a high degree. Crockett’s perspective of the domain-specific nature of cognitive complexity has conceptual and operational implications in that cognitive complexity in one domain does not inherently transfer into other domains. Expanding the work of Kelly (1955) and Bieri (1955), Crockett (1965) developed the Role Category Questionnaire (RCQ) to measure the interpersonal cognitive complexity of adults. This assessment has been used by counselor education researchers to measure cognitive complexity (e.g., Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Greenleaf et al., 2015; Little et al., 2005; Rashid & Duys, 2015) and to support the development and validation of a counseling domain-specific assessment of cognitive complexity (Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b).
**Epistemological Development.** Perry (1970) extended the theoretical development of the cognitive complexity corpus through his work *Forms of Ethical and Intellectual Development in the College Years: A Scheme.* Within this text, Perry (1970) indicated that Kelly (1955), Harvey et al. (1961), and other developmental psychologists influenced the advancement of his theory of cognitive development. This theory holds that individuals move along a continuum from absolutist to pluralistic worldviews as they become more cognitively complex (Perry, 1970). Perry’s scheme (1970), as it is known colloquially, identified nine stages of epistemological development that range from basic duality to committed relativism. The cognitive structures of this model are contained in our ways of understanding and knowing. Furthermore, Perry (1970) described these cognitive structures as the assumptions held at a particular time regarding the character and sources of knowledge and values. In terms of assessment, Moore (1989) developed the Learning Environment Preferences (LEP), a quantitative measure based on Perry’s theory of cognitive development. Moreover, studies in the counselor education field have used Perry’s scheme (McAuliffe & Lovell, 2006) and the LEP instrument to investigate overall cognitive complexity (Granello, 2002; Granello, 2010; Lloyd-Hazlett & Foster, 2017; Lloyd-Hazlett et al., 2017; Lovell, 1999a, 1999b).

**Ego Development.** Loevinger (1976) offered a robust, empirically supported approach to cognitive development. In her theory, Loevinger (1976) outlined nine hierarchical stages of ego development that progress across the lifespan. Each progressive stage represents increasing degrees of differentiation and integration based on an individual’s perception of self in relation to the world. Thus, as individuals approaching more advanced stages of ego developmental display less self-centric behavior and more empathy toward others and oneself (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Building from her theory, Loevinger developed The Washington University Sentence
Completion Test (WUSCT) to measure an individual’s degree of ego development (Hy & Loevinger, 1996; Loevinger, 1998, 1976; Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). Compared to the previously discussed models of this review, WUSCT is one of the most widely used measures for understanding and assessing cognitive complexity in counselor education (Borders & Fong, 1989; Borders et al., 1986; Fong et al., 1997; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b; Welfare et al., 2013). The broad moral, ethical, and cognitive range of Loevinger’s theory, along with emphases on interpersonal style and character, may explain some of the usefulness of this theory and method within the broader counselor education literature.

**Cognitive Complexity in Counselor Education**

The following discussion of cognitive complexity within counselor education extends the general historical arrangement of the preceding section on the theoretical development of cognitive complexity. Specifically, this section addresses the literature on cognitive complexity within counselor education based on the decade of publication date. The purpose of this approach is to outline the chronologic trajectory of cognitive complexity research as it emerged and developed within counselor education.

1970s. Cognitive complexity first emerged within the body of counseling literature during the 1970s (Blaas & Heck, 1978; Goldberg, 1974; Heck & Davis, 1973; Lichtenberg & Heck, 1979). Research on cognitive complexity within counseling during this time examined the relationship between cognitive complexity and empathy (Heck & Davis, 1973), counselor style of relating to clients (Goldberg, 1974), counseling process and client type (Blaas & Heck, 1978), and counselor-client interaction patterns (Lichtenberg & Heck, 1979). Together, these studies share a common theoretical and methodological orientation toward cognitive complexity through conceptual systems (Hunt et al., 1961). Forecasting developments regarding the measurement of
cognitive complexity in counseling, Blaas and Heck (1978) described the limitations of using a general measure of cognitive complexity within a domain-specific context.

**1980s.** By the 1980s, a notable volume of empirical studies on cognitive complexity in counseling existed (Holloway & Wampold, 1986). The emerging prominence of developmental models of supervision contributed to the expansion of the cognitive complexity corpus during the 1980s (Blocher, 1983; Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981). Counseling research on cognitive complexity generated during this time explored clinical supervision (Hillerbrand, 1989; Holloway, 1987; Worthington, 1987), teaching and training of counselors (Borders, 1989; Borders & Fong; 1989; Borders et al., 1986; Fuqua et al., 1984; Hill et al., 1981; Kurpius et al., 1985; Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982; Strohmer et al., 1983), client conceptualization (Holloway & Wolleat, 1980; Martin et al., 1989), empathy (Alcorn & Torney, 1982; Benack, 1988), and counselor performance (Holloway & Wampold, 1986). The development of cognitive complexity through the education and teaching of counselors emerged during the 1980s.

**1990s.** Cognitive complexity research in counselor education in the 1990s included a wider variety of theoretical perspectives on cognitive development. Throughout this decade, studies emerged based on personal construct theory (Spengler & Strohmer, 1994; Walker & Spengler, 1995), conceptual systems theory (Lutwak, 1993), Perry’s theory of epistemological development (Lovell, 1999a; Lovell, 1999b), and Loevinger’s ego development theory (Fong et al., 1997). Research topics during the 1990s demonstrated a variety of clinical and education-related research in counseling on cognitive complexity. Studies of cognitive complexity explored conceptual level and therapeutic responsiveness (Lutwak, 1993), clinical judgment (Walker & Spengler, 1995), supervisees (Lovell, 1999b), and level of empathy (Lovell, 1999a). In a longitudinal study of counseling students throughout their training program, Fong et al. (1997)
showed how cognitive growth occurs at different stages of graduate counseling education and recommended that cognitive development in counseling training programs be prioritized similarly to skill development. In a meta-analysis of cognitive complexity research in counseling, McLennan (1995) continued the call for a counseling domain-specific operationalization of cognitive complexity.

**2000s.** The decade of the 2000s saw a growth of evidence in support of promoting cognitive complexity throughout the experience of graduate counseling training (Brendel et al., 2002; Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Granello, 2002; Ladany et al., 2001; Lambie et al., 2009; Lyons & Hazler, 2002). Additionally, cognitive complexity research in counselor education continued to emerge within addictions (Sias et al., 2006), school (Lambie, 2007), and rehabilitation (Sheaffer et al., 2008) counseling specialty areas, along with group work (Granello & Underfer-Babalis, 2004), social justice advocacy (Wendler & Nilsson, 2009), and faculty advising (Choate & Granello, 2006). Also, a traditional qualitative inquiry into the cognitive complexity of counselor education students emerged through the work of McAuliffe and Lovell (2006).

**2010s.** Through the work of Welfare and Borders (2010a, 2010b), an empirically validated instrument to measure domain-specific counselor cognitive complexity, derived from personal construct theory (Crockett, 1965; Kelly, 1955) and counselor developmental models (Blocher, 1983; Loganbill et al., 1982; Stoltenberg, 1981) entered the corpus of counselor education. In a study of practicing counselors, Granello (2010) found that higher levels of cognitive complexity were predicted by more years of professional counseling practice. During the 2010s, counselor education studies have investigated cognitive complexity in relation to (a) strengths-based case conceptualization (Welfare et al., 2013); (b) ethical development in school counselors (Lambie et al., 2011) and counselors-in-training (Lloyd-Hazlett & Foster, 2017;
Lloyd-Hazlett et al., 2017); (c) counselor awareness of client barriers (Greenleaf et al., 2015); (d) career counseling assessment (Rashid & Duys, 2015). Additionally, Castillo (2018) provided a recent review of the cognitive complexity literature in counselor education. Furthermore, Wilkinson and Dewell (2019) recommend the use of phenomenological methods to develop cognitive differentiation and integration, fundamental processes to counselor cognitive complexity.

**Teaching Preparation and Cognitive Complexity**

Despite the rich history of scholarship on cognitive complexity within counselor education, researchers have not investigated the relationship between cognitive complexity and teaching or teaching preparation. Although there exists empirical evidence supporting the development of cognitive complexity among counselors-in-training, it remains unclear how counselor educators understand and promote cognitive complexity within graduate counseling training programs. More specifically, no empirical study has examined the interplay of cognitive complexity and the teaching role in counselor education. Additionally, there are no studies that explore cognitive complexity within the context of teaching preparation within counselor education doctoral programs. The current study did not measure the cognitive complexity of counselor education doctoral students nor were conclusive findings regarding the relationship between cognitive complexity and counselor education doctoral teaching preparation sought. Instead, this exploratory study on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students acknowledges the possibility that if cognitive complexity is a vital component of counselor preparation, it may also play a role in counselor education doctoral teaching preparation.
Summary of Counselor Cognitive Complexity

Based upon the theories of Kelly (1955), Harvey et al. (1961), Crockett (1965), Perry (1970), and Loewinger (1976), numerous definitions of cognitive complexity are found in the counselor education literature that integrate these different theoretical frameworks (e.g., Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Granello, 2010; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b). Furthermore, studies within counselor education have investigated the development of cognitive complexity across graduate training (Brendel et al., 2002; Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Fong et al., 1997; Granello, 2002), after the practicum (Borders, 1989, 1990), and in counseling professionals (Granello, 2010). The aggregate counselor education literature on cognitive complexity points to the occurrence of cognitive growth during counselor training and endorses conclusions about the relationship between cognitive complexity and counselor effectiveness (Borders, 1989, 1990; Granello, 2010; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b). Despite the breadth of empirical evidence on the cognitive complexity of counselors-in-training, it is unclear how counselor educators foster cognitive development within graduate counseling training programs. Additionally, there is a lack of evidence concerning the role of cognitive development within the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

History of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Ernest Boyer (1990), is credited with introducing scholarship of teaching and learning into the lexicon of higher education. In Scholarship Reconsidered, Boyer (1990) called for the recognition of four types of scholarship that include discovery, application, integration, and teaching. Through these four types of scholarship, Boyer (1990) sought to reshape the nature and purpose of higher education and expand the work of the academy into the public intellectual life.
Boyer’s (1990) work provided the foundation for the subsequent conceptualization of scholarship of teaching and learning by his predecessors Hutchings and Shulman (1999). According to Hutchings and Shulman (1999), the scholarship of teaching and learning broadly refers to the process of combining the practice of teaching with research. The progenitors of the scholarship of teaching and learning desired to offer a definition that captures a broad range of inquiry into teaching (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). A challenge of this broad definition of the scholarship of teaching and learning is distinguishing it from good teaching, scholarly teaching, and reflective teaching.

A widely-referenced definition of the scholarship of teaching and learning considers it to be the systematic study of teaching and learning in higher education that results in findings that can be shared, reviewed, and built upon within the appropriate scholarly community (McKinney, 2007). Additionally, the scholarship of teaching and learning is concerned with reflective teaching practice to improve teaching and student learning (Prosser, 2008) and identifying discipline-specific signature pedagogies (Chick et al., 2012; Gurung et al., 2009; Shulman, 2005). Furthermore, Kern et al. (2015) situated the scholarship of teaching and learning at the intersection of teaching and research within the tripartite mission of higher education. Scholarship of teaching and learning is considered to be a form of evidence-based practice for the context of higher education (Kern et al., 2015). While summarizing 25 years of the scholarship of teaching and learning, Kern et al. (2015) wrote:

SoTL [scholarship of teaching and learning] has a vital and important role for students in the form of enhanced learning outcomes and for academia as a learning-centered enterprise. At this point it is a vastly under utilized resource at many universities. By appropriately defining the role of SoTL within their missions and valuing SoTL within
The process of further defining scholarship of teaching and learning can benefit the institutions, faculty, and students. Adding precision to the scholarship of teaching and learning in counselor education can enhance the practice of teaching and training counselors from a base of scholarly evidence.

**Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Counselor Education**

Counselor education has made recent progress in developing the scholarship of teaching and learning (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). In a series of quantitative content analyses that analyzed the peer-reviewed teaching and learning articles published in American Counseling Association (ACA) journals, Barrio Minton et al. (2014) and Barrio Minton et al. (2018) demonstrated an overall increase in teaching and learning within the counselor education literature. Several characteristics of the scholarship of teaching and learning in counselor education were observed by Barrio Minton et al. (2014) and Barrio Minton et al. (2018). These characteristics include (a) an emphasis on specific teaching techniques; (b) nearly exclusive attention to social and cultural diversity, counseling and helping relationships, and group counseling; (c) a primary focus on clinical mental health counseling and school counseling with little scholarship on other specialty areas; (d) a lack of scholarship on doctoral preparation (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014). These findings demonstrate a relatively narrow research agenda on the scholarship of teaching and learning within counselor education. Although these findings demonstrate the need for expanding the evidence base of teaching and learning scholarship in counselor education, Barrio Minton et al. (2018) found a 79.95% increase in empirical studies on teaching and learning from the initial quantitative content analysis.
completed by Barrio Minton et al. (2014). This finding points to a growing body of the empirical literature on the scholarship of teaching and learning in counselor education.

**Teaching Preparation and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

Particularly relevant to this study that explores the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students is the finding from the Barrio Minton et al. (2018) study that doctoral-level preparation received a lack of scholarly attention. From 2011 to 2015, Barrio Minton et al. (2018) found four peer-reviewed articles related to the preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Barrio Minton et al. (2014) previously identified five peer-reviewed articles about the preparation of counselor education doctoral students from 2001 to 2010. Between the Barrio Minton et al. (2014) and Barrio Minton et al. (2018) studies, nine out of a total of 363 peer-reviewed articles related to doctoral preparation. Among these nine found by Barrio Minton et al. (2014) and Barrio Minton et al. (2018), only one article focused on doctoral-level teaching and learning.

Few articles have addressed the specific doctoral teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students since 2015 (e.g., Baltrinic et al., 2016; Elliot et al., 2019; Waalkes, 2018). Only the studies published by Baltrinic et al. (2016) and Waalkes (2018) fit within the sampling frame used by Barrio Minton et al. (2014) and Barrio Minton et al. (2018) that excluded articles published outside of refereed ACA journals. Overall, the scholarship of teaching and learning that focuses on doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education is limited. Given the importance of teaching to the comprehensive process of training counselors, expanding the scholarship of teaching and learning related to doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education is an obligation for the field.
Summary of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Situated at the intersection of teaching and research, the scholarship of teaching and learning is an emerging field of practice and inquiry focused on teaching and learning in higher education (McKinney, 2007). Similar to the emphasis on evidence-based practice in many fields, including counseling, the scholarship of teaching and learning is a form of evidence-based practice within higher education (Kern et al., 2015). Some recent progress has been demonstrated related to the evidence base of the scholarship of teaching and learning in counselor education (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Although some progress has been made in bolstering the scholarship of teaching and learning in counselor education, doctoral-level preparation continues to receive a lack of attention from counselor education researchers (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Receiving even less attention within the scholarship of teaching and learning in counselor education is the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. This present study contributes scholarly evidence to the nascent body of literature on the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students.

Andragogy

Historical and Theoretical Development of Andragogy

Andragogy refers to the theory and practice of adult learning (Knowles, 1970). Whereas pedagogy is often used to describe the broader landscape of teaching and learning, the specific etymological meaning of pedagogy is grounded in the teaching and learning of children (Knowles et al., 2015). While pedagogy, the foundation for the education system of the United States, tends to be centered around teachers and curricula, andragogy primarily focuses on the processes that facilitate adult learning (Knowles et al., 2015). The contemporary origins of adult learning theory trace back to Lindeman (1926) and Thorndike et al. (1928). Although the ideas
of Thorndike et al. (1928) ideas are closely associated with operant conditioning and behaviorism (Ormrod, 2016), Lindeman (1926) contributed humanistic and progressive educational ideas to the development of adult learning theory (Knowles et al., 2015). Furthermore, humanism continues to influence the development of andragogical and learner-centered learning theory (Knowles et al., 2015).

Knowles (1970, 1973, 1984) introduced the andragogical theory of adult learning. Originally, Knowles (1973, 1984) described four assumptions about the uniqueness of andragogy that include (a) changes in self-concept; (b) the role of experience; (c) readiness to learn; (d) motivation to learn. Also, Knowles (1984) maintained that adult learners ought to contribute to the preparation and assessment of problem-based, experiential, and proximal learning that has a meaningful connection to their professional and personal life. Andragogical theory developed to include six assumptions. According to Knowles et al. (2015), adult learners (a) need to know why something is necessary to learn; (b) need to be responsible for their own decisions; (c) bring a higher volume and quality of prior experience to learning than non-adult learners; (d) are ready to learn in order to address practical situations; (e) are oriented to learning that is life-, task-, and problem-centered; (f) are motivated primarily by internal stimuli.

**Andragogy in Counselor Education**

Andragogy is referenced among the doctoral teaching expectations of the 2016 CACREP Standards (6.B.3.c; CACREP, 2015). Specifically, the CACREP standards require that counselor education doctoral curriculum address, “models of adult development and learning” (p. 39). Therefore, understanding adult development and learning is an essential feature of the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Andragogy is a common approach to the theory and practice of adult learning (Knowles et al., 2015). However, the inclusion of
andragogy and adult learning theories within the counselor education literature is unclear. In a recent peer-reviewed conceptual article, Luke (2017) outlined an innovative method of teaching counseling theory that draws from student-centered or learner-centered learning theory and andragogy. Additionally, Luke (2017) noted the relationship between Rogers’ (1969) student-centered learning theory and Knowles’ andragogical theory of learning. Andragogy represents a classroom-based application of Rogers’ humanistic approaches to counseling, teaching, and learning (Knowles et al., 2015; Luke, 2017). Although there are limited references to andragogy within the literature of counselor education, references to learner-centered pedagogy within counselor education relate to andragogical approaches to teaching (e.g., Moate & Cox, 2015). The limited presence of andragogical learning theory within the literature of counselor education is reflective of the documented scarcity of learning theories utilized within the counselor education scholarship on teaching and learning (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014; Sheely-Moore, 2016).

Teaching Preparation and Andragogy

There is a lack of empirical studies that specifically examine teaching preparation and andragogy within counselor education. In one of the only empirical studies meeting these criteria, Taylor and Baltrinic (2018) investigated the teaching preparation, teaching practice, and teaching evaluation experiences of counselor educators. Based on a convenience sample of 120 counselor educators, Taylor and Baltrinic (2018) found that a majority of counselor educators in their study indicated they engaged in andragogy coursework, coteaching, and a teaching practicum or internship during their doctoral training. Whereas Taylor and Baltrinic (2018) featured andragogy in their descriptive quantitative research design, it is unclear how the authors operationalized the construct of andragogy. The extent to which Taylor and Baltrinic (2018)
described andragogy is as, “pedagogy for adult learners” (p. 26). Furthermore, 62.6% of counselor educators in the Taylor and Baltrinic (2018) study reported taking an andragogy course as a part of their doctoral teaching preparation. However, Taylor and Baltrinic (2018) did not supply the specific nature of these andragogy courses. Although this study provided favorable evidence regarding teaching preparation and andragogy, additional detail regarding the coursework described would allow for distinctions among these courses as pedagogy courses that included aspects of andragogy or as courses that focused primarily on andragogy. With this limitation in mind, the counselor education literature on teaching preparation can benefit from empirical studies investigating the relationship between teaching preparation and andragogy.

**Summary of Andragogy**

The primary focus of andragogy is on the facilitation of adult learning (Knowles et al., 2015). In consideration of the unique characteristics of adult learners, andragogy assumes a learner-centered approach to teaching and learning (Knowles, 1970, 1973, 1984; Knowles et al., 2015). Furthermore, the *2016 CACREP Standards* acknowledge the relevance of andragogy to counselor education through the doctoral teaching standards that call for counselor education doctoral curriculum to address adult development and learning (CACREP, 2015). Although the CACREP doctoral teaching standards require counselor education doctoral students to understand adult development and learning, there are scant references to the learning theory of andragogy within the counselor education literature on teaching and learning.

**Summary of Literature Review**

The *2016 CACREP Standards* offer specific curricular expectations for the preparation of counselor education doctoral students. These expectations fall within the domains of counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy (CACREP, 2015).
Despite its critical role in the development of future counselor educators, doctoral-level preparation continues to receive relatively little attention within the counselor education literature (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Although recent studies have demonstrated a progressive increase in the research and scholarship on teaching in counselor education (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014), doctoral teaching preparation continues to be an underdeveloped area of study within the counselor education literature. The following discussion summarizes some of the literature related to the current study that aims to explore the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Additionally, the following discussion describes how this current study helps to fill a gap in the literature on doctoral teaching preparation within counselor education.

The preparation of doctoral students for the professoriate has received extensive attention within the higher education literature (Austin, 2002; Berelson, 1960; Jepsen et al., 2012; Sutherland, 2017; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). Doctoral students across higher education generally engage in preparation experiences that include graduate assistantships, faculty mentorships, and formal preparatory coursework (Golde, 1998; Lovitts, 2001; Weidman et al., 2001). However, graduates of doctoral programs who seek academic positions perceive themselves to be unprepared for the roles and expectations of the professoriate (Austin, 2002; Bieber & Worley, 2006; Meacham, 2002). Although the higher education literature broadly contextualizes doctoral teaching preparation, this literature does not include discipline-specific variations regarding the expectations for preparing doctoral students. The present study sought to provide a discipline-specific exploration focused on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.
Several modalities are currently present that support the teaching preparation of
counselor education doctoral students. The modalities of coteaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hunt
& Weber Gilmore, 2011; Malott et al., 2014; Orr et al., 2008), mentorship (Baltrinic et al., 2018;
Borders et al., 2011; Hall & Hulse, 2010; Limberg et al., 2013; Warnke et al., 1999), and formal
teaching coursework (Elliott et al., 2019; Hunt & Weber Gilmore, 2011; Waalkes et al., 2018)
have been found to contribute to the teaching preparation of counselor educators and counselor
education doctoral students. Although research in counselor education has addressed these
specific teaching preparation modalities separately, no study has addressed the teaching
preparation experiences of counselor education students. The study completed by Waalkes et al.
(2018) presented an account of doctoral teaching preparation that allowed for the teaching
preparation experiences of participants to emerge through consensual qualitative research
methodology. The methodology utilized by Waalkes et al. (2018) examined various types and
frequencies of teaching preparation experiences. However, the Waalkes et al. (2018) study
explored the doctoral teaching preparation experiences of beginning counselor educators. The
present study differs from Waalkes et al. (2018) by exploring the teaching preparation
experiences of current counselor education doctoral students through the use of IPA
methodology. In their suggestions for future research, Waalkes et al. (2018) recommend
forthcoming studies focus on the teaching preparation experiences of current doctoral students.
The present study sought to help fill the gap in doctoral teaching preparation research within
counselor education identified by Waalkes et al. (2018).

Student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive development, scholarship of teaching and
learning, and andragogy relate to dimensions of the doctoral teaching domain of the 2016
CACREP Standards. These dimensions inform some of the processes of teaching preparation
related to understanding the assessment, instruction, and development of adult learners within counselor education. Regarding student learning outcomes, there is a connection between teaching practice and the assessment of student learning (Barrio Minton et al., 2016; Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Ewell, 2009). Expanding our understanding of doctoral teaching preparation can enhance the quality of teaching and learning in counselor education programs. Furthermore, the study of counselor cognitive development has a rich history in counselor education (Borders, 1989, 1990; Brendel et al., 2002; Duys & Hedstrom, 2000; Fong et al., 1997; Granello, 2002; Granello, 2010; Welfare & Borders, 2010a, 2010b). Despite this wealth of scholarship on counselor cognitive development, it remains unclear how counselor educators promote cognitive development within counselor education programs and how this influences the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.

Additionally, the evidence base on the scholarship of teaching and learning has increased recently (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014). However, the scholarship of teaching and learning related to doctoral preparation and the specific doctoral teaching preparation of counselor education students continues to receive little attention (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Finally, andragogy (Knowles 1970, 1973, 1984; Knowles et al., 2015) has specific application to the current CACREP doctoral teaching standards that require the doctoral curriculum of counselor education to address adult development and learning (CACREP, 2015). Regardless, the specific learning theory of andragogy has received little attention within the counselor education literature. Given the importance of teaching to student learning outcomes, counselor cognitive development, and scholarship of teaching and learning, and adult development and learning, it is essential that we continue to expand our understanding of the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students.
Although recent empirical research has added to the counselor education literature on coteaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016), teaching mentorship styles (Baltrinic et al., 2018), the doctoral teaching preparation experiences of beginning counselor educators (Waalkes et al., 2018), and doctoral student experiences in a teaching preparation course (Elliot et al., 2019), researchers have not studied the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students in much detail (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students. Through the phenomenological, idiographic, and hermeneutic methodology of IPA, the present study sought to explore the teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students. No study within the counselor education literature has utilized IPA methodology to investigate the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Thus, the following features distinguish the present study from others within the counselor education literature on doctoral teaching preparation (a) the use of IPA methodology; (b) current counselor education doctoral student as study participants; (c) a holistic approach to the phenomenon of doctoral teaching preparation. Additionally, no study within counselor education has asked the following research question of this present study: How do counselor education doctoral students understand and make sense of their teaching preparation experiences?
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. The aim of this chapter is to introduce the research methodology for this IPA study of the teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students. The methodology of IPA allowed for an in-depth understanding of counselor education doctoral students’ meaning and sense-making regarding their teaching preparation experiences. This chapter discusses the distinctive methodological features of IPA along with the appropriateness of this qualitative research approach for answering the research question of this study. Accordingly, the research design, including the methodology, study participants, recruitment, procedures, analytical process, and strategies to ensure rigor, credibility, and trustworthiness are also primary components of this chapter.

Research Design

The following section provides an overview of the research design of this exploratory study. Broadly, this section includes discussions of the research question, the qualitative research approach, participants, recruitment, and the data collection procedures for this study. After a discussion of the specific elements of the research design, the interview guide for this study will be explained, and a rationale will be provided for how the interview guide supported answering the research question of this study.

Research Question

The following research question guided this exploratory study: How do counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences? This research question focused on exploring how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their
teaching preparation experiences. Furthermore, this research question is framed in a way to broadly capture how current counselor education doctoral students make sense of the whole of their teaching preparation which may include curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences.

**Qualitative Research Approach**

A qualitative research approach was used for this study due to the phenomenological nature of the research question that is interested in exploring how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. There are a variety of qualitative research approaches available to answer phenomenological and experiential research questions. According to Creswell (2013), the range of qualitative approaches falls within the qualitative genres of ethnography, narrative research, phenomenology, grounded theory, and case study. Although the research question for the current study fits within the broader phenomenological tradition of qualitative research, the present study sought to integrate an interpretative lens with a focus on the particular contextual accounts of participants in the study. For this reason, the methodology of IPA is an appropriate qualitative approach to respond to the research question of this study. IPA, an interpretative, phenomenological, and idiographic approach to qualitative research (Smith et al., 2009), was used to respond to the research question. The remaining discussion in this section will further explain the methodology of IPA along with the ontological, epistemological, and theoretical background of this qualitative research approach.

**Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis**

IPA is a form of qualitative inquiry being more extensively employed to investigate research questions in counselor education (Cook & Sackett, 2018; Dickens et al., 2016; Farmer & Byrd, 2015; Fullen et al., 2019; Miller & Barrio Minton, 2016; Miller et al., 2018; O’Hara &
Cook, 2018; Osborn et al., 2017). First articulated as a methodology by Jonathan A. Smith (1996), IPA is a contemporary qualitative approach (Miller et al., 2018) with a long history of theoretical development (Smith et al., 2009). The historical development of IPA is traced back to the philosopher Edmund Husserl (1936/1970; 1913/1982) whose work became the foundation for phenomenology as a philosophy and research methodology. Practically, researchers using IPA endeavor to advance knowledge by exploring the contextual meaning-making of individuals related to particular significant experiences (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014; Smith et al., 2009). Furthermore, IPA is especially congruent as a methodology to explore the research question of this study because of the emphasis placed on individual meaning-making processes within an interactive relationship between the researcher and participants (Miller et al., 2018). The following discussion focuses on the ontological and epistemological paradigm of this study.

**Ontological, Epistemological, Methodological Paradigm.** Based on criteria outlined by Lincoln et al. (2018), IPA lies within the ontological, epistemological, and methodological paradigm of constructivism. A constructivist or interpretive research paradigm attempts to gain understanding by interpreting the perceptions of participants (Lincoln et al., 2018). Broadly, the constructivist paradigm holds a relativistic ontology, an epistemology of knowledge created through subjective transactions, and a hermeneutic and dialectical methodology of interpretation (Lincoln et al., 2018). According to Lincoln et al. (2018), the aim of inquiry from a constructivistic paradigm is, “to understand and interpret through meaning of phenomena (obtained from the joint construction/reconstruction of meaning of lived experience); such understanding is sought to inform praxis (improved praxis)” (p. 119). Lincoln et al. (2018) specify that enhancing action and practice is a purpose of constructivist interpretative research. Therefore, an aim of the current study was to inform the practice of doctoral teaching preparation.
in counselor education. The present study focused on exploring how counselor education
doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences and is positioned within
the broader paradigm of constructivism. The following section will review the theoretical
foundation of IPA within the context of the constructivist paradigm of this study.

**Theoretical Foundation.** The purpose of the current study was to explore how counselor
education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. IPA is
concerned with the in-depth exploration of individual lived experience (Smith, 1996; Smith et
al., 2009). The primary goal of IPA is to understand how participants make sense of their
experiences from a theoretical foundation of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and idiography
(Smith et al., 2009). This study sought to explore how counselor education doctoral students
make sense of their teaching preparation experiences through the inductive process that emerges
from the interaction of these theoretical strands. Also, the use of IPA allows for an understanding
of experience, “in its own terms” (Smith et al., 2009, p. 1). In other words, participants were able
to ascribe meaning to their experiences with limited *a priori* construct development. Thus, how
participants make sense of an experience emerged through the data collection and analysis
process. The following discussion describes the theoretical foundation of IPA found through
phenomenology, hermeneutics, and idiography.

**Phenomenology.** The term phenomenology refers to a philosophical movement and
range of research methodologies related to exploring lived experience. According to Smith
(1996), “Phenomenological psychology, developing from Husserl’s philosophy, can broadly be
said to be concerned with an individual’s perception or account of an object or event itself” (p.
263). IPA seeks to understand lived experience by integrating the works of Husserl (1936/1970,
1913/1982), Heidegger (1927/1962), Merleau-Ponty (1945/2012) and Sartre (1947/2007,
1943/2018). The collective works of these phenomenologists contribute to a sophisticated understanding of lived experience that is process-oriented, embodied, and situated to an individual’s unique relationship to a phenomenon (Smith et al., 2009). The phenomenon relevant to this study was the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Developing an understanding of the phenomenon of teaching preparation experiences required an interpretative lens.

**Hermeneutics.** The theory and practice of interpretation, hermeneutics, offers essential insights into the theoretical background and analytical processes carried out through IPA. The influence of hermeneutics on IPA is primarily traced back to the works of Heidegger (1927/1962), Gadamer (1960/2013), and Schleiermacher (1998). Hermeneutics is a distinct body of knowledge, yet the foundations of hermeneutics and phenomenology maintain a close relationship as they converge to form hermeneutic phenomenology (i.e., Heidegger, 1927/1962; Smith et al., 2009). The hermeneutic circle is a concept of hermeneutics and the analytical process of IPA. Smith et al. (2009) wrote:

The hermeneutic circle is perhaps the most resonant idea in hermeneutic theory and is picked up by most hermeneutic writers, rather than being identified with one in particular. It is concerned with the dynamic relationship between the part and the whole, at a series of levels. To understand any given part, you look to the whole; to understand the whole, you look to the parts. This has been criticized from a logical perspective, because of its inherent circularity. In analytical terms, however, it describes the processes of interpretation very effectively and speaks to a dynamic, non-linear, style of thinking. (p. 27)
The data analysis process of this study will be described more extensively in the data analysis section of this study. However, a central data analysis process in IPA occurs through what is characterized as a double hermeneutic or dual interpretation process in which the researcher is making sense of how the participant is making sense of a phenomenon (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014; Smith et al., 2009). Within the context of the current study, a double hermeneutic is present through the researcher’s interpretations of how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Furthermore, the multidirectional analytical process of IPA described in the data analysis section of this chapter is evidence of a hermeneutical foundation (Smith et al., 2009).

**Idiography.** The third significant theoretical influence on IPA is idiography. The work of Harré (1993) explains the importance of idiography to IPA (Smith et al., 2009). Idiography influences IPA through a commitment to the particularities of phenomena, perspective, individuals, and context. Moreover, the idiographic character of IPA emerges through purposive homogeneous sampling and in-depth analysis of single cases (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014). Although a group-level analysis of all participant transcripts does occur in IPA, the process of formulating codes and themes at the group-level only occurs after all individual cases have been guided through the multi-stage analysis process of IPA (Smith et al., 2009). Whereas traditional phenomenological methodologies are concerned with the essence or nature of phenomena, IPA is instead focused on the particular meanings, understandings, and interpretations participants give to a specific lived experience. The idiographic nature of IPA through single-case analysis offers “detailed, nuanced analyses of particular instances of lived experience” (Smith et al., 2009, p. 37). The current study was not focused on making generalizations about the teaching preparation
experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Instead, this study sought to provide in-depth analyses of individual participants’ teaching preparation experiences.

Participants

Population and Sample

The purpose of the present study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Therefore, eligible participants consisted of current or recently graduated counselor education doctoral students who agreed to participate in the study and were (a) enrolled in a counselor education and supervision program accredited according to the 2016 CACREP standards; (b) enrolled in a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree program; (c) have teaching preparation experiences. The sample size was limited to eight participants to adhere to IPA research standards (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2014; Smith et al., 2009). Additionally, recent IPA studies within counseling have drawn from sample sizes of three (Chan, 2018), six (Miller & Barrio Minton, 2016; Sharma, 2019), eight (Osborn et al., 2017), and 10 (Farmer & Byrd, 2015). Based on the idiographic focus on individual cases in IPA, the traditional qualitative notion of data saturation (e.g., Creswell, 2013) was not a necessary sampling condition (Smith et al., 2009). Participants were identified by purposeful sampling, which is theoretically consistent with the methodological orientation of IPA (Smith et al., 2009).

Recruitment

Recruitment commenced after the researcher received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval (see Appendix A for Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board Approval Letter). The researcher identified potential participants by contacting current faculty members of counselor education and supervision doctoral programs that are accredited according to the 2016 CACREP
standards and that offer a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree. The contact information for faculty members was obtained through the university websites of these accredited programs. The researcher shared a participant recruitment email with these faculty who had the option to share the recruitment email with counselor education doctoral students and recent graduates associated with their individual programs and institutions (see Appendix B for Recruitment Email to Program Faculty).

Participants voluntarily self-selected to participate in the study through email indication. The researcher responded to interested participants by email to review the inclusion criteria (see Appendix C for Email Response to Potential Participants), determine their eligibility to participate in the study, and share the informed consent document with the potential participants (see Appendix D for Participant Informed Consent). The informed consent document included sections that describe the aim of the study, confidentiality, participant rights, risks and benefits of participation, audio recording and transcription procedures, and the process of disseminating findings. Participants had a minimum of 24 hours to review the participant informed consent document prior to the scheduled first interview appointment. The researcher obtained verbal consent from participants and signed a document indicating that verbal consent was granted for each of the two interviews. At the beginning of each interview, the researcher reviewed the participant informed consent form, asked for questions from participants, and confirmed the participants’ consent. The researcher began data collection through in-depth semi-structured interviews only after receiving consent from participants.
Data Collection

Semi-Structured Interviews

An in-depth semi-structured interview based on an interview guide constructed to take approximately 60 minutes to complete provided one source data for this study. The data collection method of in-depth interviews, which allow for rich, detailed, and first-person accounts of experiences to be shared, are best suited for IPA (Smith et al., 2009). Semi-structured interviews are the most commonly used interviewing strategy in IPA studies and the broader qualitative research genre (Larkin & Thompson, 2011; Reid et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2009). Concerning semi-structured interviews, Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) wrote, “It is defined as an interview with the purpose of obtaining descriptions of the lifeworld of the interviewee in order to interpret the meaning of the described phenomena” (p. 6). This definition demonstrates a connection between the utility of the semi-structured interview and IPA through acknowledging the interpretative and phenomenological qualities of the semi-structured interview. Providing additional evidence toward the versatility of the semi-structured interview, Brinkmann (2018) stated:

Compared to more structured interviews, semi-structured interviews can make better use of the knowledge-producing potentials of dialogues by allowing much more leeway for following up on whatever angles are deemed important by the interviewee, and the interviewer has a greater chance of becoming visible as a knowledge-producing participant in the process itself, rather than hiding behind a preset interview guide. (p. 579)

The methodological cohesion afforded by this data collection strategy with IPA made semi-structured interviews an appropriate data collection method for this study.
The semi-structured interviews carried out for this study followed an interview guide. Utilizing a semi-structured interview guide allowed the researcher to appropriately respond to the content and process of the interview to collect data for the study. All interviews were audio recorded through secure audio and video conferencing software. Participants had the option to connect to the video conference functionality of the conferencing software. Regardless of participants' selection to engage the video function of the conferencing software, only the audio of the interview was recorded. The audio recordings were transcribed by a trusted third-party agency that meets the confidentiality, privacy, and data security policy of the IRB. The researcher compared each transcript with the audio recording of the interview to monitor the accuracy of the transcript and make any necessary edits. Participants received an electronic version of the transcript of their interview to support participant reflexivity between the initial semi-structured interview and the follow-up interview. Finally, the researcher conducted pilot interviews with a current counselor education doctoral candidate and a recent counselor education doctoral graduate to verify the research design. Also, these pilot interviews assessed the effectiveness and relevance of the interview guide and the interviewing techniques of the researcher. (Smith et al., 2009).

**Interview Guide**

The interview guide approach utilized to collect qualitative data focused on exploring how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. This study followed the IPA guidelines for constructing an interview guide for a semi-structured interview offered by Smith et al. (2009). These guidelines call for:
• Developing an interview guide that allows the participants to feel comfortable and enables them to provide a detailed account of the experience under investigation (Smith et al., 2009).

• Preparing interview questions so that they are open, expansive, and evoke lengthy responses (Smith et al., 2009).

• Sequencing the interview process and questions in a way that moves from narrative or descriptive accounts to more analytic or evaluative accounts from participants (Smith et al., 2009).

• Formulating an interview guide that includes approximately nine to 11 open questions and additional possible prompts (Smith et al., 2009).

The interview guide followed a traditional semi-structured interview process (Smith et al., 2009). The following outline represents the sequencing of the interview guide for this study (see Appendix E for Interview Guide).

**Introduction.** To begin, the researcher welcomed and facilitated introductions with the participant. Then, the researcher initiated a conversation that focused on developing a rapport with the participant. The researcher shared with the participant the purpose of the research study, along with the nature and structure of the interview process. Importantly, the researcher obtained the voluntary verbal consent of the participant to take part in the study. The researcher provided a copy of the informed consent document to participants at least 24 hours prior to the initial interview. Participants will receive a sufficient amount of time to consider the informed consent document on their own before the initial interview meeting. Also, the researcher provided the participant with an opportunity to ask questions about the informed consent document at the beginning of the initial meeting (see Appendix D for Participant Informed Consent). This
occasion allowed the participant to further inquire into the nature of the study and share any concerns about their participation. After all of the participants’ questions were answered, the researcher engaged an IRB-approved verbal consent process. The researcher signed a document that indicated verbal consent was voluntarily granted. Only after the participant confirmed their consent to participate in the study through the verbal consent process did the body of the interview and audio recording begin. Participants received a $10.00 gift card of their choosing to Starbucks, Target, or Amazon.com before the initial interview. This participant incentive was not contingent upon completion of the interview. Regardless of the time a participant chose to end their participation in the initial interview, the participant received the full incentive.

**Body of the Interview.** After confirming the verbal consent of participants, the researcher transitioned into the body of the interview. A semi-structured interview guided this portion of the interview process. The researcher read a written prompt that reviewed the purpose of the study and the aims of the interview. Then, the researcher began by asking the interview questions from the semi-structured interview guide. The questions and prompts for the semi-structured interview included the following:

- [Warm-Up Question] As we begin, I want to understand where you are in your degree program. Could you describe where you are in your doctoral degree program?
  a. Could you describe the typical sequence of coursework and examinations in your doctoral degree program? Where do you find yourself in this sequence?
  b. Are you enrolled in your program on a part-time or full-time basis?

1. Could you describe the features of your teaching preparation experiences?
  a. Could you describe the features of your formal teaching preparation experiences?
b. Could you describe the features of your informal teaching preparation experiences?

2. Could you tell me about your most meaningful teaching preparation experience?
   a. When did this experience occur?
   b. Where did this happen?
   c. Why do you think this experience stands out to you as most meaningful?

3. What teaching preparation experiences do you anticipate needing in the future?
   a. How will you obtain these experiences?
   b. When do you anticipate engaging in these experiences?

4. How have your career aspirations changed as a result of your teaching preparation experiences?
   a. How have your teaching preparation experiences changed your professional goals?

5. How has your view of the teaching role in counselor education changed in response to your teaching preparation experiences?
   a. What has changed for you?

6. How has your view of the general role of counselor educator changed in response to your teaching preparation experiences (i.e., research, supervision, clinical, leadership, and advocacy)?
   a. What has changed for you?

7. How do you perceive your readiness for the counselor educator role of teaching?
   a. How ready are you for the role of teaching?
   b. What factors have contributed to your current sense of readiness?
8. How would you compare your teaching preparation experiences to your preparation for the other professional domains of counselor education (i.e., research, supervision, clinical, leadership, and advocacy)?
   a. What differences do you see between your teaching preparation and the other preparation experiences?

9. How would you evaluate the quality of your teaching preparation experiences?
   a. What qualities of teaching preparation do you think matter most?

10. How would you improve your teaching preparation experiences?
    a. What would you change about your teaching preparation experiences?

11. How will you know when your teaching preparation is finished?
    a. How will you know when you have been adequately prepared for teaching?

Overall, these interview questions attempted to facilitate a semi-structured interview process that allowed participants to provide in-depth descriptions of their teaching preparation experiences as counselor education doctoral students.

The interview questions focused specifically on exploring the first-hand teaching preparation experiences of the participants in this study. Participants were asked a warm-up question inquiring into their current doctoral degree program status and progress to develop a context for their accounts. Interview questions one and two, along with the possible prompts, invited participants to describe their teaching preparation experiences and identify those experiences they perceive to be the most influential to their teaching preparation. Questions one and two elicited narrative and descriptive accounts of participants experience with the phenomenon of teaching preparation. Questions three through seven encouraged participants to reflect on their teaching preparation experiences. Specifically, these questions juxtaposed the
past and present experiences of teaching preparation with participants’ consideration of their future needs and desires. Questions three through seven utilized change language to facilitate participant reflection on their teaching preparation within the broader role of counselor educator. Questions eight through 11 facilitated participant’s self-analysis and evaluation of their teaching preparation experiences. Collectively, these interview questions met the IPA interview guide strategies put forth by Smith et al. (2009). The structure of the interview guide for this present study facilitated an interview process that (a) allowed participants to feel comfortable and enabled them to provide a detailed account of their teaching preparation experiences; (b) was open, expansive, and evoked lengthy responses; (c) was sequenced in a manner that moved from narrative or descriptive accounts to more analytic or evaluative accounts from participants; (d) included nine to 11 open questions and additional possible prompts (Smith et al., 2009).

Summary and closure. After the interview questions within the body of the interview were asked, the researcher thanked the participant for their time and willingness to share about their teaching preparation experiences. At the conclusion of the semi-structured interview, the researcher collected relevant demographic and teaching background information from participants through the use of a secure electronic survey software program (see Appendix F for Demographic and Teaching Background Information Form). Also, the researcher reminded participants they will receive an electronic copy of the initial interview transcript prior to the follow-up interview. The researcher then scheduled a precise date within one to three weeks that was convenient for the participant to take part in a follow-up interview. Finally, the researcher invited the participant to contact the researcher if they had any questions about the interview process or their participation in the study.
**Follow-Up Interview**

Prior to the follow-up interview, the researcher sent an electronic copy of the initial interview transcript to participants through secure and encrypted file sharing. Participants received a $10.00 gift card of their choosing to Starbucks, Target, or Amazon.com before the follow-up interview. This incentive for participation in the follow-up interview was not contingent upon completion of the interview. The researcher discussed the delivery of the gift card at the beginning of the follow-up interview.

After one to three weeks following the first interview, follow-up interviews with participants were facilitated via the same video conferencing software used in the initial semi-structured interview. The follow-up interviews lasted approximately 15 minutes and allowed participants to provide additional information and reflections generated about the phenomenon after the initial interview (see Appendix G for Follow-Up Interview Guide). At the beginning of the follow-up interview, the researcher thanked the participant for their willingness to participate in the follow-up interview. The researcher then provided a general description of the purpose of the follow-up interview and offered the participant an opportunity to share any questions. The researcher engaged in an IRB-approved verbal consent process with participants. Next, the researcher asked the participant if they would like to proceed with the follow-up interview. At this point, if the participant confirmed their consent to participate in the follow-up interview, the researcher began the follow-up interview. At the conclusion of the follow-up interview, the researcher thanked the participant for participating in the follow-up interview and invited them to share any questions or concerns related to their participation in this research study at any time.
Reflexive Journal

The researcher developed a reflexive journal throughout the research design, data collection, and analysis stages of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The use of a reflexive journal allowed the researcher to record and provide a rationale for their methodological choices, logistics of the study, and reflect upon their values and interests within the context of the content and process of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Furthermore, the keeping of a reflexive journal met all the qualitative rigor and trustworthiness criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morse, 2018). This reflexive journal also contributes to the audit trail for this study. Consistent with the interpretive ontological, epistemological, and methodological design of this study, this reflexive journal supported the intersubjective meaning-making and understanding within the process of this study (Angen, 2000). Finally, reflexive journaling supported the researcher’s efforts to engage in the phenomenological method of bracketing during the research process (Husserl, 1936/1970, 1913/1982). The rigor and credibility section of Chapter 3 discusses the researcher’s practice of bracketing within this study.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process for this study was based on the IPA analytical process outlined by Smith et al. (2009). Overall, the IPA data analysis process focused on how individual participants made sense of their experiences. Smith (2007, 2009) characterized the analytic process of IPA as an iterative and inductive cycle (Smith, 2007). Furthermore, the IPA data analysis process used in this study included a sequence of six strategies:

1. Reading and re-reading.

2. Initial noting.
3. Developing emergent themes.


5. Moving to the next case.

6. Looking for patterns across cases (Smith et al., 2009).

The following discussion focuses on describing these strategies and how the researcher employed them during the data analysis phase of the study.

First, the researcher immersed himself in the data of the study through reading and re-reading of the interview transcripts. Beginning with the first interview transcript, the researcher listened to the audio recording of the interview while reading through the transcript. After this first reading of the interview transcript, the researcher read through the transcript a second time. After the second reading, the researcher transitioned to the second stage of the data analysis process.

Second, the researcher engaged in initial noting of the first transcript to establish exploratory comments. This level of analysis, similar to free textual analysis, examined semantic and linguistic content on an exploratory level (Smith et al., 2009). The initial noting strategy was the most detailed and time-consuming stage of the IPA data analysis strategy because of the close attention to each line of text in a transcript. Exploratory comments (i.e., codes) at the initial noting level fell into the categories of descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual (Smith et al., 2009). The established exploratory comments informed the development of themes in the third stage.

Third, the researcher developed emergent themes based on the exploratory comments generated from the process of initial noting of the first transcript. Smith et al. (2009) wrote:

In looking for emergent themes, the task of managing the data changes as the analyst simultaneously attempts to reduce the volume of detail (the transcript and the initial...
notes) whilst maintaining complexity, in terms of mapping the interrelationships, connections, and patterns between exploratory comments. (p. 91).

Emergent themes brought together similar exploratory comments into a theme that reflects the participant’s original words and the researcher’s interpretations (Smith et al., 2009). At this point in the data analysis process, the researcher reduced the data of the first transcript to chronologically ordered emergent themes.

Fourth, the researcher pursued connections across emergent themes contained in the first interview to create superordinate themes. To search for connections, the researcher manually organized how they understood the themes fitting together (Smith et al., 2009). Only emergent themes directly relevant to the scope of the research question were included in this stage of the analysis. That is, emergent themes related to participants’ teaching preparation experiences. At this phase of the data analysis procedure, the emergent themes were drawn together into a meaningful structure that captures the most interesting and important aspects of the participant’s account. By bringing together the emergent themes into a meaningful structure, the researcher created superordinate themes. These superordinate themes subsumed the relevant emergent themes. To aid with the data analysis and to establish an audit trail, the researcher organized the process of initial noting, developing emergent themes, and creating superordinate themes in a tabular representation demonstrates how each step in the process was engaged in by the researcher. Presenting the data in this manner allowed the researcher to move through the data, codes, and themes during the writing up of the results of this study.

Fifth, the researcher transitioned to analyzing the second transcript through the order contained in the first four steps of the outlined data analysis process. The order in which the transcripts were analyzed was determined by the date in which data collection for each interview
occurred. To maintain the idiographic commitment of this study, the analysis of subsequent interviews involved the researcher bracketing, as much as possible, the ideas that emerged through the analysis of the first interview transcript (Smith et al., 2009). The researcher established distinct exploratory comments, emergent themes, and superordinate themes within each interview transcript analysis (Smith et al., 2009). The researcher systematically adhered to this data analysis strategy for all interview transcripts.

Finally, the researcher explored patterns across all interview transcripts after data collection concluded, and each transcript was analyzed individually according to steps one through five. This step involved the researcher simultaneously displaying all tables of themes for each interview transcript and then examining connections, patterns, and themes that emerged from a collective analysis of the interview transcripts (Smith et al., 2009). The purpose of this group-level data analysis was to identify idiosyncrasies within each interview and higher order characteristics across all interviews. The researcher created a master table of group-level superordinate themes based on the cross-case analysis of the individual transcripts. Chapter 4 of this study will present the group-level superordinate themes as results.

Although researcher interpretation influenced all stages of the research design, a specific hermeneutic dialogue with participants’ accounts was developed within the process of data analysis for this study. Evidence of the researcher’s interpretations during data analysis are demonstrated through an audit trail that includes the master table of group-level superordinate themes. Conversely, data analysis continued into the writing of results. According to Smith et al. (2009), “It is also the case that analysis continues into the writing phase so that as one begins to write up a particular theme, one’s interpretation of it can develop” (p. 108). Furthermore, the hermeneutic dimension of IPA is presented in the results section as a coherent, systematic, and
credible narrative account of how the researcher made sense of how participants are made sense of their doctoral teaching preparation experiences. Through an audit trail of the data analysis and the narrative presentation of results, the interpretive, analytical process employed by the researcher is displayed.

**Rigor and Credibility**

Contemporary qualitative approaches to rigor and credibility require methodologically congruent internal methods of quality assurance and overall appraisals of completed studies (Morse, 2018). A framework for establishing rigor that is ontologically, epistemologically, and methodologically congruent with the research design of this IPA study was adopted. Although the use of standards and checklists to establish rigor and credibility are commonplace in qualitative research, these strategies may not account for ontological, epistemological, and methodological variation (Morse, 2018). Therefore, standardized approaches have the potential to invalidate studies that are philosophically incongruent with the method used to establish rigor and credibility (Morse, 2018). The current study sought to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences through a constructivist-interpretivist research paradigm. Because this study occurred through a constructivist-interpretive research paradigm, the researcher adopted strategies to establish rigor and credibility that are congruent with the research paradigm. The selected rigor and credibility strategies that are congruent with the interpretive research paradigm of this study include (a) audit trail; (b) bracketing; (c) methodological cohesion; (d) theoretical coherence; (e) reflexivity (Morse, 2018); (f) implementation of the IPA Quality Evaluation Guide (Smith, 2011).
Audit Trail

First, the researcher used an audit trail as a trustworthiness strategy in this study. The researcher organized all research materials to provide a transparent description of the research steps taken throughout the study. The researcher facilitated the audit trail by curating the (a) initial notes on the research question; (b) the research proposal; (c) the interview guide; (d) annotated transcripts; (e) tables of themes for individual and group-level analyses; (f) emergent themes; (g) exploratory comments (Smith et al., 2009). The researcher’s reflexive journal also supports the audit trail. Providing this amount of information through an audit trail allows a reader to follow the chain of evidence leading from the early stages of study development to the final reporting of the results (Smith et al., 2009). Also, an inspection of the audit trail allows for the researcher’s analytical process to developing codes, themes, and superordinate themes during the individual and group-level case analyses.

Methodological and Theoretical Cohesion

Third, the researcher exercised methodological and theoretical cohesion within this study to ensure qualitative rigor and credibility (Morse et al., 2002). Employing methodological and theoretical cohesion within this study ensured congruence between the research question and the elements of the research method (Morse et al., 2002). Hays et al. (2016), describe coherence as the “justification of trustworthiness criteria and strategies given the research approach; data presentation congruent with goals of research approach” (p. 177). The researcher carefully considered the theoretical and methodological congruence of the research question with the data collection and analysis procedures. The constructivist-interpretivist research paradigm and IPA methodology informed by the philosophical underpinnings of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and idiography represent the methodological and theoretical cohesion criteria of this study. The
review process of the dissertation process and scholarly writing will verify the methodological and theoretical cohesion of this study.

**Bracketing and Reflexivity**

Fourth, the researcher engaged in a form of bracketing that is ontologically and epistemologically congruent with IPA. Bracketing in IPA is a cyclical reflexive process, mimicking the hermeneutic circle, and is facilitated through reflexive practices (Smith et al., 2009). Bracketing in IPA sets to mitigate researcher preconceptions within a methodological commitment to interpretation (Smith et al., 2009). The cyclical reflexive bracketing of IPA occurs throughout the research process and can only be partially achieved (Smith et al., 2009). IPA methodology accepts the importance of bracketing researcher preconceptions and prior experiences to allow for the expression of a phenomenon but acknowledges that the positionality of the researcher informs their interpretations. The researcher in IPA is responsible for bracketing their foreknowledge of a phenomenon and participants' accounts, while simultaneously verifying their interpretations based on the accounts of participants (Smith et al., 2009). In this study, the researcher attended to bracketing by engaging in regular reflexive practices and employing a cyclical hermeneutic approach to interpretation throughout the research process.

To promote reflexivity and bracketing, the researcher engaged in reflexive journaling throughout the study and the reporting of the results, discussion, and implications (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The use of a reflexive journal allowed the researcher to record and provide a rationale for their methodological choices, logistics of the study, and reflect upon their values and interests within the context of the content and process of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Furthermore, the keeping of a reflexive journal meets all the qualitative rigor and trustworthiness
criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Morse, 2018). Finally, reflexive journaling supported the researcher’s efforts to sustain methodological cohesion that is interpretive and phenomenological throughout the research process (Husserl, 1936/1970, 1913/1982; Morse, 2018).

**Researcher Reflexivity**

For this study, the reflexive journal kept by the researcher will serve as the primary repository for reflections on the positionality and process of the study. However, some aspects of the researcher’s positionality related to the research question will be identified in this discussion of bracketing, reflexivity, and trustworthiness. Therefore, the researcher for this study is an adult Caucasian male who lives in a small community in Southwest Virginia. He is currently a counselor education doctoral candidate at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The researcher is a first-generation undergraduate and graduate student. He has a professional goal of acquiring a tenure-track faculty position in a CACREP-accredited counselor education program. The researcher has scholarly and professional interests in the art and science of teaching. The researcher has had coteaching experiences in career development, clinical mental health counseling, and an undergraduate-level counseling course focused on healthy interpersonal relationships. He is the instructor of record for a masters-level assessment and appraisal in counseling course. The researcher has completed doctoral-level courses focused on professional roles of counselor education, instructional design and technology, educational psychology, and the educational philosophy of John Dewey. Taken together, these aspects of the researcher’s positionality represent his teaching preparation experiences.
IPA Quality Evaluation Guide

Finally, the researcher implemented the IPA Quality Evaluation Guide (Smith, 2011) to assess the rigor, credibility, and trustworthiness of this IPA study. To meet the highest category of rigor, this guide recommends that IPA studies demonstrate the following (a) subscribes to the theoretical principles of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and idiography; (b) demonstrates transparency regarding the research design and data analysis process; (c) provides a “coherent, plausible, and interesting analysis”; (d) exhibits sufficient density of evidence for each reported theme; (e) offers sufficient trustworthiness for peer-reviewed publication; (f) provides an in-depth analysis, reliable data interpretation, and enlightening findings (Smith, 2011). As an overall appraisal of the completed research, this study meets the IPA Quality Evaluation Guide criteria (Morse, 2018).

Summary of Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Chapter Three aimed to introduce the research methodology of this IPA study that will explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Specifically, Chapter Three outlined the proposed research design, interview guide, data analysis plan, and credibility and trustworthiness strategies to be utilized in this study. Additionally, this chapter discussed the distinctive methodological features of IPA along with the appropriateness of this approach for this study. Chapter Four will include a discussion of the findings of this exploratory study into the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings from this study that focuses on how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. The findings presented in this chapter reflect responses to the guiding research question: How do counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences? Through the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis, four superordinate themes were identified across all the interviews to illustrate how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. These superordinate themes include (a) Experiential Integration; (b) Contextual Development; (c) Interactive Reflection; (d) Emergent Teaching Values. These themes are based upon the descriptions and reflections of counselor education doctoral students on their teaching preparation experiences.

Chapter Four begins with an introduction of the study participants and their background related to the research question of this study. Then, each of the four superordinate themes is described in depth using excerpts of participants’ accounts and the interpretative lens of the researcher. The double hermeneutic process is characteristic of IPA by presenting a narrative account of participants’ interpretations identified through the interpretative process of the researcher. The researcher provides evidence of how participants made sense of their doctoral teaching preparation experiences within each superordinate theme subsection.

Participants

Participants are referred to through the use of pseudonyms for participant protection and de-identification (see Appendix H for Participant Demographic Information). Eligible participants consisted of current counselor education doctoral students or recent graduates who
are (a) enrolled in a counselor education and supervision program accredited according to the 2016 CACREP standards; (b) enrolled in a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree program; (c) have teaching preparation experiences. These specific criteria were applied to achieve a purposive homogeneous sample compatible with IPA (Smith et al., 2009) based on a small, relatively homogeneous sample ($N=8$). All participants in the study completed at least three semesters of training within a counselor education and supervision doctoral program and identified having engaged in doctoral teaching preparation experiences within their doctoral program. The participant demographic information in Appendix H and participant doctoral teaching background in Appendix I provide evidence of the demographic and doctoral teaching background of participants.

**Themes**

The researcher engaged in the initial five steps of the IPA analytical process (Smith et al., 2009) for all eight transcripts before developing superordinate themes across all interview transcripts. The analysis of individual transcripts included the following steps:

1. Reading and re-reading of the individual transcript.
2. Initial noting to establish exploratory comments.
3. Developing emergent themes.
4. Searching for connections across emergent themes to establish clusters of themes.
5. Moving to the next transcript.

After completing the individual analysis of transcripts, the research then transitioned to analyze the transcripts as a whole to look for patterns across all individual transcripts. This step involved observing all tables of themes for each interview transcript to examine connections, patterns, and themes that emerged from the data. Participant excerpts within the following narrative reporting
of results describe the superordinate themes identified at this stage of the analysis. A recurrence
calculation describes the number and percentage of participants who contributed to each of the
reported superordinate themes (See Appendix J for Recurrence Calculation of Participants
Contributing to Superordinate Themes). Additionally, superordinate themes and corresponding
clusters of themes are reported in tabular form (See Appendix K for Superordinate Themes and
Clustering of Themes Table). Each of the following superordinate themes (i.e., Experiential
Integration, Contextual Development, Interactive Reflection, and Emergent Teaching Values)
represent a manifestation of the double hermeneutic process of IPA, the researcher’s
interpretation of participants’ interpretation of their teaching preparation experiences (see
Appendix L for Double Hermeneutic Process Model).

**Experiential Integration**

Participants described a variety of different experiences that inform their teaching
preparation experiences. Some of these experiences are formal or traditional notions of teaching
preparation in counselor education doctoral programs. Participants identified formal teaching
preparation experiences as pedagogy coursework, coteaching, and graduate teaching
assistantships. Alternately, participants identified a variety of informal or indirect teaching
preparation experiences. These informal teaching preparation experiences include previous
experiences as a learner, clinical experience, research experience, previous secondary teaching,
and experiences related to providing supervision professionally or within the doctoral training
milieu. Experiential integration represents the interplay of a variety of experiences participants
attributed to their teaching preparation experiences. As Kendall put it:

> It's like this developmental process and it really is a developmental process in terms of
we all develop differently in our own ways, based off of our experiences and our training.
And other things that kind of contribute to that. But at the end of the day, it's sort of like we have this gemstone that represents us and this gemstone has all these different facets of our experiences and training. And, you know, life experiences that just come together. And so, although we're all sort of these gemstones, how they're constructed and what they look like are a little bit different and still function the same way in terms of this is a gemstone.

Kendall’s use of the metaphor of the gemstone described an integrative process of various teaching preparation experiences. The theme of experiential integration describes how the “different facets” of counselor education doctoral student participants’ teaching preparation experiences “come together.”

Most participants described the influence of conventional or formal teaching preparation experiences within their respective counselor education doctoral programs of study. Within a didactic learning context, participants emphasized the experiential nature of pedagogy and other structured experiences. For example, Kerry described the integrative nature of teaching preparation experiences embedded within her coursework:

I feel like there've been many aspects. Obviously there's a course just on teaching in general, which I took and I really liked that class. I think it was helpful to kind of get the vocabulary knowledge for teaching, but in all the classes I took after that, they incorporated it into the lesson. So, depending on whatever the class was, part of the assignment would be if this was your class, how could you teach it? What would it look like? And so, we would do a lesson, whether it was the theories course, ethics course, whatever it would be, to kind of start thinking of how we could do lesson plans and what activities we can incorporate when working with students.
Kerry’s account described an outcome of teaching preparation experience related to considering the process of teaching across her counselor education coursework. Kerry’s process-oriented language that emphasizes the “how” and “what” of teaching within counselor education describes this outcome of her teaching preparation experiences. Kendall further discussed the process-orientation and influence of a specific counselor education pedagogy course:

That for me, I will always remember that experience. It was very experiential learning oriented in that class. In that class we developed a master's curriculum program for a rehab counseling program. We went through this process of starting very broadly thinking about curriculum development and then focusing more specifically on taking one class and developing a syllabus for one class and making sure that both the curriculum and the class are aligned with the CACREP accreditation standards. We would deliver from that syllabus, then we would deliver an hour long example of how we might deliver the content for the class that we developed. I think about that. I always, any time I, well, let me say it this way, as I’m going into this next semester and teaching my own masters level course without... This is my first experience at the master’s level without actually having someone there as a co-teacher, I feel like I’m on my own. So, this is it. I think I always go back to that class in terms of that was really the foundations for me. That was really impactful.

Not only does the explanation provided by Kendall highlight the experiential qualities of this pedagogy course, but she also described the relationship between this specific teaching preparation experience and future teaching opportunities as an instructor of record. For example, embedded within Kendall’s account is a scaffolding of formal teaching preparation experiences that progressed from pedagogy coursework to coteaching, culminating in an independent
instructor of record teaching experience for her as a doctoral student. In a later reflection on the totality of her teaching preparation experiences, Kendall explained, “I think about those experiences, bringing those experiences to who I am as an educator as I’m going through this Ph.D. program.” For Kendall and most all other participants, “those experiences” carried and reflected upon through the process of doctoral training include formal and informal teaching preparation experiences.

A recurrent dynamic observed within most all of the participants’ accounts was the role of previous non-teaching experiences. Several participants considered their previous learning experiences as a form of teaching preparation. AsJaime put it:

I've been in school basically my entire life, so I obviously I guess this is more informal, but I feel like I learned a lot from just being a student and watching professors. Well even before that, K through 12 and then professors in undergrad that you work closely with or you get close with. You just see their teaching style.

Jaime attributed her experiences as a learner in primary, secondary, and higher education as contributing to her teaching preparation experiences. Jaime classifies the nature of this learning as being influenced by observational learning and relationships with teachers.

Several participants provided examples of the observational, experiential, and relational aspects of learning that contribute to their teaching preparation experiences. While discussing an occurrence of receiving feedback on a written assignment, Justice provided a specific experience within her graduate counseling training:

And I've noticed that's been hard because most of my instructors don't do that. It's like APA, blah, blah, blah. And I'm like, "I don't want to look. I don't want to look this shit up. I'm tired. Like what did I do?" And I'm like, "What did I do?" And so even she's like,
"I keep giving you all this feedback but you're not understanding the concepts and understanding why." And I'm like, "I don't because you're just telling me that I need to change this area, but I don't understand why."

Justice described how feedback presented to her as a learner influences her approach to providing feedback to students. Justice described that understanding the purpose and rationale of feedback was helpful to her as a learner. Alternatively, she found feedback without purpose or rationale unhelpful as a learner. Additionally, Kerry explained that faculty motivation to update course materials and integrate feedback influenced her experience as a learner. Talking about her previous experiences as a learner that inform her teaching preparation experiences, Kerry said:

Yeah, I think we've all had the one professor that is tenured and has the same slides from 10 years ago and never updates it. And I just feel like you end up getting less out of those courses. I think the more you can kind of incorporate the feedback of what's working and what's not working. You can just also help your own skills to figure out what areas do I want to get better with? Whether it's even just, "What technology do I know how to use and how can I get better at that?"

The accounts of Justice and Kerry characterize the experience of the learner as central to the enterprise of teaching. As such, they regard their experiences as learners as dimensions of their teaching preparation experiences.

A view shared among participants was that previous professional counseling experiences contributed to their teaching preparation experiences. While discussing the role of professional counseling experience toward her teaching preparation experiences, Kerry noticed the emergence of a desire for teaching. As Kerry put it:
I think it was a huge influence for me. So, the same place that I worked at in the leadership role, I also did my internship with them. And so, as part of their internship, in addition to the one-on-one hourly supervision, they also provided a weekly didactic training and a weekly group supervision training on the models that that agency used. And that ended up being my favorite part of internship was that training piece. I'm like, I like this more than, I like the counseling. I love talking with all of the students about their ideas and where they're at with it. And the more I kind of discovered that, that's when I decided to kind of do more teaching with this as well.

A multifaceted process of professional counseling experience informing the motivation to engage in counselor education doctoral training along with how the interpersonal skills of counseling practice translate into the classroom.

Most participants discussed how their current and previous professional counseling experience serves as an experiential base for their teaching preparation experiences. Kendall described the foundational nature of her professional counseling experience concerning teaching:

My clinical experience, I pull from a lot when thinking about how do I develop a rapport with students? How am I interacting with students? How am I supporting their growth and development? How am I building a meaningful experience throughout the course for them?

In addition to the consideration of interpersonal and developmental dynamics being a transferrable experience, Kerry provided a nuanced description of the role of different types of professional counseling experiences in informing teaching preparation experiences. For example, Kerry stated:
Yeah. I think, two things come to mind. The first is that, for a lot of my professors in my master's program, they also were clinicians outside of the classroom. And I think that that experience and that lens was really helpful for me. And that was part of the reason why I decided to switch to private practice.

This account that describes the influence of observing the counselor educator role led Kerry to differentiate between types of professional counseling experience and the types of examples that are brought into the classroom by teachers. For example, Kerry explained how her different professional counseling experiences inform the experiences she can bring into the classroom:

> When I was working at the PSR [psychosocial rehabilitation], I loved that population and what I was doing, but it's not what every counselor's going to go into, and it was very, I think more specific examples, where in private practice I can give more general examples, to students that I'm working with.

Contained within Kerry’s account is a relationship between professional counseling and teaching preparation experiences. Similar to the observational learning contained within Jaime’s description of her experiences as a learner contributing to her teaching preparation experiences, observational learning played a role in Kerry’s experiences in seeking out professional counseling experience in private practice. Additionally, Kerry was able to integrate her experiences within not only private practice, but also the specific treatment modality of psychosocial rehabilitation, into what she considers her teaching preparation experiences.

Most participants identified supervision as contributing to their teaching preparation experiences as counselor education doctoral students. Participants expressed a variety of perspectives regarding the influence of their supervisory experiences with their teaching
preparation experiences. For example, Skyler discussed the influence and nuances of her experience providing supervision to practicum-level master’s students:

I think my program really had those pieces together. Supervision, it was really good. My teacher, he was really helpful, and the students actually really appreciated that we were teaching them as well. They were in practicum, they had practicum supervisor, they had school supervisor, and they had us. You know what I realized? We didn't give them any grades. We were there to support them. They opened up to us. We, of course, talked about them in our supervision class, but they opened up to us how challenging that first year in practicum for them is and asked for help that they were not comfortable asking the professor or site supervisor. It was kind of eye-opening. You're like, "Oh, wow." How much they actually need. They are in a way searching for it on their own. They had us, but they've been doing this since then, so doc students are mentoring the Masters level students, so it's been in a process. I think my professor did it for us as an experience, so we can apply all our theories relating about supervision and we can learn all the techniques, but also have this experience as a supervisor.

Skyler described the integrative nature of her teaching preparation experiences and her experiences as a counselor education doctoral student. As she put it, “To me, it was amazingly eye-opening because... I was like, ‘Oh my God.’ I think we had pieces in our program that worked separately and together toward research and teaching and supervision.” Quinn also offered a perspective on the integrative role of supervision and teaching preparation experiences. As Quinn put it:

I didn't know how much I was going to enjoy supervising in that capacity and I think that was a big focus for them. I think they prepared us really well for that, and I think that
experience just makes for a stronger attitude when you go into a teaching experience, too.

I feel like those situations, in which I was in front of a group of people talking, was just like teaching anyways. You know what I mean? And maybe you don't think about it because you're a little bit more like a counselor in certain times there.

Quinn’s evaluation of her teaching and supervision preparation experiences within her doctoral program, along with professional counseling experiences, described the integrative nature of her teaching preparation experiences.

Furthermore, Alex also spoke about how his supervision coursework contributed to his teaching preparation experiences. In a description of a particular supervision course within his doctoral program, Alex said:

I had a class in the Spring semester and it really encompassed more of the supervision aspect of counseling and part of the discussion we had was having the ability to teach, using specific teaching moments, not just in supervision, but in regular classroom settings because the degree that I'm in is in rehabilitation counselor education, so there may be teaching moments outside of say the practicum or the internship that take place in a classroom. So, we talked about being sensitive to those moments, those situations, and being able to assess whether that situation can lead into a teaching moment. I'm trying to think if there's any ... as far as formal mode, I think that would be the extent of any formalized instruction. The rest of it is, I'm really pulling from my experience as a counselor and the dynamic and just the understanding of guiding interns. Because when I worked for the [state] as a rehab counselor, and we would have interns intern at our office.
In addition to the specific supervision course contributing to his teaching preparation experiences, Alex described how his professional counseling supervision informed his teaching preparation as he supported master’s-level interns within his counseling practice. Quinn further elucidates the dynamic of “teaching moments” within supervision that Alex described.

According to Quinn:

So, I feel like, well and because I'm a teacher, anyways, and I totally like more discrimination model than anything else. I always notice when I'm going between, and I'm stuck in that teacher role a lot of the time because that's where I'm comfortable. So even being in some of these supervision experiences, that was very teacher-like for me as well, you know? So, and I just, I don't know, I always manage to bring in a lot of what was going on, things that have happened to me in my experiences counseling, just to inform discussions and stuff. And that's what made it a great experience for me and them, too, I hope.

Not only do the experiences of Alex and Quinn describe how their experiences within teaching, supervision, and professional counseling practice inform their teaching preparation experiences, these experiences highlight how each participant negotiates their previous experiences into their teaching preparation experiences.

Most participants described how their supervision experiences that contribute to teaching preparation had supported their development of views and approaches to the practice of teaching. Kerry demonstrated this development within a discussion about the process of integrating her experiences supervising master’s-level interns with her professional counseling experience:

So, in my past job as the director, I was able to do a lot of supervision and we also were lucky enough to work with interns and I feel like that was a really great opportunity. And
so, I think similarly when you're counseling someone, meeting those students where they're at and discussing goals together. So, I would always check with my interns at the start of their internships, see what were they hoping to get out of it, how would they know that they were making progress? And we would check in on them periodically throughout their course of their internship. And I hope that that's something I can similarly do with students, helping them through their program to see what they want to get out of this. What would success look like for them?

Kerry directly connected her experiences as a supervisor to how she desires to approach teaching students as a counselor educator. Jaime also described how her doctoral supervision training contributes to her teaching preparation experiences:

As it relates to supervision, I took a supervision class in the spring of this year. I want to say it was Theories of Counseling Supervision. That again I think it helped with just understanding what's new and relevant and how that can be conveyed. I can give you an example. So, I wrote a paper and did a presentation in that class on one of the supervision models called the 'critical events supervision model'. And I am, I guess you could say, teaching/presenting on it to a bunch of supervisors in the local area here in two weeks. So, reading and doing that research and just understanding the way the model works and how it can be applied to a supervision relationship or just a supervision environment, that's helped me understand it better. My plan is to spark a discussion on how the supervisors in the audience can use this model in their professional work.

Jaime’s account describes a process of engaging in formal supervision preparation that led to teaching and presenting opportunities within her local community. In addition to the integrative experience of supervision experiences toward teaching preparation, Jaime began to express
teaching strategies through her development within a supervision milieu. Taken together, the accounts of Jaime and Kerry suggest that there is a relationship between supervision and doctoral teaching preparation. Additionally, their views demonstrate how supervision experiences contribute to their teaching approaches and strategies.

Although most participants acknowledged supervision as a teaching preparation experience, a process of discrimination between teaching and supervision preparation with counselor education doctoral training. Kendall explained how she was making sense of the difference between teaching and supervision preparation:

Yeah, I was thinking in terms of, you know, I think the part that I am still working on um, let me think about my wording here. Maybe resolving. I don't know if that's the right word. But the part that I'm thinking about is as an educator I will have relationships with students in the classroom, but I also might have relationships with students, as in in their supervision experiences as a supervisor, so that for me. I'm, I'm thinking about how do I balance, both of those. So, you know, the pedagogy is in the classroom environment and or online environment and then sort of the art and science of supervision and where how do those overlap and where do they not overlap.

Kendall’s account acknowledges the integrative nature of the counselor educator role. Explicitly, Kendall expressed a desire to balance the different roles of being a counselor educator. The overlap between teaching and supervision described by Alex and Quinn connects with the account of Kendall, who presented an account of how she is making sense of the differences between teaching and supervision. Kendall described the breath of this integrative making sense process:
And you know I think about when does teaching and supervision begins, because in the classroom you are also having those experiential opportunities with students outside of the classroom as in doing supervision. If you can't just process everything out in the classroom. And so now you have a blend of all of these different components and facets of relationship development with students that you're bringing with you, both in the classroom, but in an office setting or maybe out in the community. If you're doing visits. You know, an internship and practicum sites and that sort of thing.

Kendall outlined, through the use of language, similarly used to describe the gemstone metaphor of her teaching preparation experiences, how her experience with overlapping student relationships through teaching and supervision contributes to the “components” and “facets” of her teaching preparation experiences.

Similar to the integrative role of their experiences, most participants discussed the role of relationships as contributing to their teaching preparation experiences. Specifically, most participants integrated their experiences through relationships. For example, Justice explained the role of faculty feedback related to teaching in encouraging her transition into counselor education doctoral training. In referring to a specific interaction with a faculty member before matriculation into a counselor education doctoral program, Justice explained:

And they were like, "We really want you to consider it [counselor education doctoral training]." And like she knew that she already had me bombarded with someone else. I was like, okay, like why? Explain why. And she's like, "Students respond to you in class." She's like, "At minimum they go through the program, consider being an adjunct faculty professor and work with students during the practicum and internship." She's like,
"If you don't want to teach, that's fine. You're good at it. You may not like it, but you're good at it." And I was just like, okay.

Justice’s account describes the role that faculty feedback, specifically about observing student giftedness for teaching, can support the development and progress toward preparing to become a teacher in counselor education. Additionally, Jaime discussed the role of feedback within the context of relationships with counselor education faculty as a counselor education student:

And I don't think this answers your question necessarily, but the most gratifying experience with teaching is being able to help students or guide students or give knowledge to students. So, I think just getting that feedback along the way from professors that have been in the profession for 30, 40 years makes you feel like you're doing good things in the world.

Jaime continued to discuss the influence of feedback from counselor education faculty while navigating a current instructor of record experience. As Jaime put it:

I think receiving feedback [from full-time faculty] is the most meaningful for me because I think ... This is sort of my feeling is that when you're appointed a teaching opportunity, especially as a doctoral student, you're well-respected human in the department, maybe more so than other levels of other programs. So, when you're appointed into a position, you are given guidance and prep, but you feel like you're being thrown into the fire a little bit. And not that I felt that necessarily but I mean not that I felt that 100% but I did sort of feel that way. But it just made me think that my professors see my potential or that they see that I can handle this or I can do this.

Jaime’s account describes how feedback from faculty adds a lens through which she makes sense of her teaching preparation experiences. She also added:
So, it's nearing towards the end of the semester and I haven't received my student evaluations yet, but I have received really good feedback from the department, and especially my department chair at the moment. Not that he's necessarily come into my class and watched me teach, but just being a doc student and having a lot of hands in a lot of things. As a doc student, you're in class, you're teaching, you're involved with research, you're collaborating, you're putting together events. Just to hear feedback from professors about these are skills that you have that can be transferred into a teaching role, and not that this has been a clear message, but to just know that you've been able to create that relationship and get that feedback from your professor that you know okay, I could do this when I graduate, or there's opportunities for me in the future that would make me a great professor.

Jaime’s account describes how the feedback available within faculty relationships informs not only her teaching preparation experiences but her motivation and self-efficacy for serving as a counselor educator.

Kerry discussed the influence of faculty relationships and how faculty members influence the learning environment within the context of her doctoral program. She situates this discussion within a conversation about faculty-student mentorship. Referencing the layered relationships she has with faculty, Kerry explained:

I also just think being able to just have that open communication and that trust. I think sometimes when, to have a supervision relationship be effective, you need to be comfortable sharing your areas of weakness. And I think depending on how the system is set up, if it feels very competitive or it doesn't feel safe, people feel less comfortable sharing the areas that they want to grow in, because it feels like it could be used against
them. And I've heard other students in just either different disciplines of a doctoral program or different schools where that seems to be more the case. And in my experience with my mentors, that hasn't happened.

Kerry continued to draw a connection between mentorship relationships with faculty and her teaching preparation experiences. Moving from a broad view of mentorship from faculty to specific claims about mentorship within the context of teaching preparation, Kerry further remarked:

I feel like the mentorship that I've been given and the support and just being able to go to my professors openly with just either concerns that I have about my own development and kind of insecurities that come along with being a doc student and what it would look like to teach, and just letting them be a place to kind of be a sounding board and then also kind of give that extra support and guidance.

Kerry identified critical characteristics of teaching mentorship that help her navigate her teaching preparation experiences. These characteristics of teaching mentorship included listening, feedback, support, and guidance. Kerry’s account describes how faculty relationships, mainly teaching-specific mentorship, help her through the process of integrating and making sense of her teaching preparation experiences.

Additionally, Jaime discussed an interrelated dynamic of relationships with faculty and peers within her doctoral program and how these supported her teaching preparation experiences. While discussing the relational interplay of peer and faculty feedback, Jaime explained:

I have a peer in my class who is similar in age to me. Similar sort of experience. I'm a little bit older, a little bit more experienced only by a couple years and she claims all the time that we really, or she checks in with me and she's like, you know, we really didn't
get much preparation and I just sort of had that thought in my head that like, no, we really
didn't we kind of were thrown into the fire because our faculty just kind of like trusted us
to you know, make it happen. And just knowing us being doctoral students, they kind of
just, you know, like I said, trusted us to be successful and we are and we you know I’m
not I’m definitely happy with that. And I think she's just as successful.

Jaime continued to reflect on the role of peers toward her teaching preparation experiences
within her counselor education doctoral program and future development as a counselor educator
in general. In a reflection on faculty and peer relationships that contribute to her teaching
preparation experiences, Jaime summarized:

But I think peers really help too because I think two heads are better than one sometimes
when it comes to putting together lectures or putting together a class. Especially if it's a
class that you know this person has taught before and they know what was really
receptive with their students. So, I think peers networking is something I'll need.

Jaime’s account describes how, within the context of relationships, she can draw from the
teaching preparation experiences of peers and integrate this experience into her teaching
preparation process.

Contextual Development

Participants described a variety of contextual variables that contributed to their teaching
development and the quality of their teaching preparation experiences. As Skyler put it, “There
are many factors to this: it is maybe experienced... Many factors are contributing to it, but I think
slowly in any profession, you probably become better and more efficient.” Participants provided
broad perspectives on the developmental and contextual milieu and how these factors contributed
to their teaching preparation experiences. Also, participants identified faculty and programmatic
variables that influence their teaching development and the quality of their teaching preparation experiences. Participants’ accounts that described recommendations for enhancing the developmental process toward teaching within the counselor education program highlighted the dialogic and reflective nature of their experiences. Also, developmental experiences situated within a specific learning context contributed to the development of integrative views on their development and the developmental role participants desire to support as teachers.

Most participants shared broad perspectives related to their views of their development within the context of their counselor education doctoral program. Some of these broad perspectives indicated how participants interpreted and evaluated the programmatic structure and contextual variables of their counselor education doctoral program. Reflecting on her teaching preparation experiences within the context of her counselor education doctoral program, Quinn explained, “But I think that, and I think that is a lot of stuff in our program that was multi-folded. Do you know what I mean? Like one experience, kind of informing multiple different kinds of other experiences.” For example, Kerry explained this “multi-folded” process within the context of her counselor education doctoral coursework:

In my experience, I feel like there's been a lot of overlap with it ‘cause a lot of my courses were focused on not only making sure that we understood the material at an even higher level as doc students, but also that we were able to communicate that and teach it to other people.

While discussing her teaching preparation experiences within her doctoral program, Quinn attributed the integrative nature of her teaching preparation experiences to the structural factors of her doctoral program. As Quinn explained:
Yeah, there's definitely been moments where I've been like, I see why they structure it and do it the way they do it. Like it's some kind of, oh you got us ready for, you know what I mean? And you didn't even realize that it was happening.

Although Quinn recognized how the structure of her doctoral program supported her overall development for the counselor educator professional role of teaching, Jaime expressed curiosity about the absence of a standardized approach to teaching preparation across counselor education doctoral programs. Jaime described her thought process in this way:

And the question that popped in my head was, is there a reason that there isn't a formal structure for preparing counselor educators [for teaching] and is it because we are supposed to kind of put our own twist on things and be creative and um, you know, like, same thing with counseling.

As Jaime evaluated the quality of her teaching preparation experiences within the context of her doctoral program, she explained:

Yeah, I kind of knew this question was coming. I thought about it. I didn't really know the best answer here. I don't regret anything. I love the way things happened. I think that the class, the Counselor Ed class was really helpful. I think throwing me into guest lectures helped me get comfortable.

The combination of the previous two excerpts from Jaime led to some insights into her process of development and putting her “own twist on things and be creative.” As Jaime put it:

Actually, what I noticed is a lot of times when you are diving into something they don't really prepare you for everything. So, you just have to dive in and hope for the best and just work your way out of situations if you get stuck or just think quick on your feet.
Among the various approaches to teaching preparation experienced by participants in their respective doctoral programs, most participants expressed an awareness of the contextual and developmental implications of their doctoral training experiences. While discussing how her doctoral program approached teaching preparation within the context of other professional counselor educator roles and the various backgrounds of her peers, Quinn said:

I mean, I would say pretty even, because almost in every class there was something that we had to teach the class. Like there was some project where maybe we were working in groups, or by ourselves, but we would have to present something to the class. And I think it was just that experience that just starts to get us more comfortable and get a feel for, and it's awesome to see my cohort members, who I know don't have the background that I have, and that doesn't matter. They still, you know what I mean, are getting their feet wet and getting comfortable in front of us and doing a great job, too. So, in those moments, I see that not everybody had to have the same background as me. You know what I mean? I don't think that's required for success in the program in general, but it's just interesting, though, to see that through the different interactions with my cohort members and we all have different backgrounds. So that's what's cool about it. So, I think the program, in general, did a really good job of being very well rounded in the way that it has prepared us.

Quinn’s account describes the possibility for the developmental structure, and contextual variables can influence the overall teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Quinn, who has 16 years of experience as a secondary educator, implies that the developmental milieu of her counselor education doctoral program downplays the need for requisite teaching experience for students entering the doctoral program.
In addition to the broad perspectives on context and development, most participants offered viewpoints on the influence of individual and programmatic contextual variables. For example, Alex shared experience of navigating time within the context of coteaching with a faculty member. Talking about this experience preparing for upcoming class meetings, Alex said:

Yeah. Sometimes the discussion for next week does not happen. And that's happened to me multiple times. And then I'm left to kind of figure out what to do. But at the same time, I'm at the mercy of feedback. Right? And I'm at the mercy of time, not just my time, but faculty's. And knowing that, it would be highly stressful because the class is on Tuesdays. And the class takes place 30 minutes after my class, so there's not a lot of wiggle room there.

After discussing his “stressful” moments of navigating time with faculty to plan for upcoming class meetings and managing transitions from his doctoral courses, Alex explained how these factors inform his development as a teacher. As Alex put it:

I think, for the most part, the experience taught me what not to do rather than what I should be doing. Because, I think, generally, I have an idea of what should be done and the faculty and I understand that and we both understand their schedules and you really try to match that up was quite a challenge.

In addition to viewing himself within the context of his teaching preparation experiences, Alex discussed his process for negotiating contextual factors that impact his development. For example, Alex explained:

But then my learning is dependent on my instructor's availability, willingness to teach with me. Or a maybe research engagements that makes it difficult for the instructor really
engage me in the teaching process and provide that teaching. There's so many variables associated with it. So, I would say, at least for my experience, I feel I have to figure out how I learned first myself, what I need, and see what the program can offer for me to help me get to say be a better teacher, for instance. You kind of work it out from there.

Alex’s account describes a variety of individual contextual factors that influence learning, development, and counselor education doctoral teaching preparation.

Participants expressed a variety of perspectives regarding various programmatic variables that participants have encountered throughout their teaching preparation experiences. In an account that bridges both individual and programmatic variables, Casey described how the instructor of her pedagogy course, along with the timing of a pedagogy course, influenced her development in a meaningful way. As Casey explained:

Yeah. So that explains a little bit. So, he [pedagogy instructor] is two years from retirement. He has published everything you could possibly, right, he’s that person. And he taught my pedagogy class. So that was important to me because first of all it was in my first year and it alternates every other year. So, the people coming in behind me didn't get that class until their second year. I think that's really important because that class definitely informed the way that I teach. And if I had not had access to it until I'd already been teaching for a year, I imagine that would have been different. So, most meaningful thing for me was going through the process of that class, learning what pedagogy is, learning how it's applied, learning how you take that philosophy and you kind of put it into practice from a person who is a leader in our field. That was very meaningful.

In addition to the contextual factors exemplified in Casey’s account, Jaime discussed the inherent opportunities to engage in teaching preparation through her counselor education doctoral
program and the encouragement to engage in this process. While considering the broad context of her doctoral training, Jaime reflected:

So yeah, that was one thought and then my second thought was I'm I feel like I've only had the opportunity to teach because I am a doctoral student and it's sort of part of, I mean, I don't know if you had a similar experience, but at [institution], It's almost encouraged to teach and there's like classes almost basically saved for us to be able to teach and have the opportunity to teach and I don't. I think if it wasn't for that, I wouldn't ever have another opportunity to teach again...

Jaime’s account acknowledges a uniqueness to the opportunity of engaging in doctoral education and teaching preparation. Evident through her description is an awareness of the structural support and faculty encouragement for participating in doctoral teaching preparation.

Although programmatic factors have the potential to support the doctoral teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students, some participants explored inconsistencies they experienced within their doctoral programs. For example, Casey explained:

But in theory what you do is you either co-teach or you have someone come in and watch your class and then give you analysis. And I took that class, but I never got that. I taught the entire term myself. I did what I always do, designed my syllabus. Did the class, nobody ever came in and looked at me, nobody ever checked on me. So, I didn't get any evaluation. And that is where I feel the biggest need is. There's no evaluation built in or if it is, it's not being adhered to. So, I don't know what's going to change with CACREP if that's going to shift a little bit. I'm not sure.

Not only did Casey perceive a lack of observation and evaluation within her teaching practicum experience, but she also noticed the relationship between teaching preparation experiences and
CACREP standards for doctoral teaching preparation. Casey further discussed the potential implications of inconsistent feedback and evaluation of teaching within counselor education doctoral programs. As she put it:

But I often sit in my own doctoral classes and watch my colleagues like present and just think, "If this is how you present, how are you teaching? Because it's not good." Right? And that's not being an ass or anything that's just like, "Oh, this isn't good. It's objectively not good." But if no one's going to check you, you're going to get hired and then you're going to go teach as a faculty member. And no one ever told you, "Hey, here's some ways to develop your teaching." So that's where I really see the need is like the eval, where is the eval and the constructive, kind critique of how to be a better teacher? But if it's not prioritized then it's not going to happen, right?

Additionally, some participants made recommendations that relate the contextual and developmental structure of their teaching preparation experiences. During a reflection on her teaching preparation experiences, Kerry explained:

And I think that that practice from the get go and more experience throughout, I think would have been helpful in hindsight, just to kind of start getting more acclimated to what that looked like earlier on and then just having more opportunities throughout my program.

Kerry’s account describes a need for more teaching preparation experiences occurring earlier within her program of study. Casey made a recommendation for the integration of additional curriculum design coursework. After differentiating between pedagogy and curriculum design courses, Casey stated:
I would incorporate curriculum design into my curriculum. I think that that class should be available and it should be required. I would require teaching experience rather than it being left to the fate of what kind of assistantship you get.

Casey also expressed concern about the incongruence between the programmatic structure of her doctoral program and evidence-based approaches to teaching and learning. As Casey put it during a reflection on her experiences as a learner:

And so, it's like if we're going to teach about evidence based practice, then why are we not using evidence based practice in education. So, like for example the comps process... they didn't mirror the philosophies that we have about education... The only answer I have is, you know, the, the system of higher education and the hierarchy of higher education, and I did it this way so you're going to do it this way, even though we know it's not good. ‘I had to memorize, you know, 30 sources. So that's what you all have to do too.’ So, I guess just wondering if that's a piece of it too is like how do we put into practice all of this pedagogy because I don't see it very often, you know.

Although Casey provided a broad critique of her experiences within higher education, her account seems to be indicative of challenges related to integrating the pedagogical training contained within her teaching preparation experiences with her experiences as a learner.

The accounts of some participants illustrated how their teaching preparation experiences currently inform their views and approaches to supporting student development as a teacher. For example, Justice said:

And when I presented in class, one of my professors kept saying, I wouldn't have taught that this way. I wouldn't have taught that that way. And I remember him, like he, we were almost going back and forth in front of the class during my presentation and I stopped
and I said, well, how would you teach it and then he told me and I said, okay, well you need to take, I respect that but you need to understand that I am teaching this from a different perspective. What I'm listening to and hearing is that you're wanting me to do it the way you would do it and that's not helping my development. And I ended up back in the teacher's office again as always.

Justice proceeded to describe how she synthesized the feedback she received through this interaction with a coteaching faculty member into a view of student development. Explaining the influence of this interaction, Justice stated:

We need to share this feedback so that we don't continue to keep pushing how we do things on to our students. And I keep that in mind when I'm talking and preparing lessons was like, okay, this is how I would do this. But I want them to think about how they [students] want to do this.

Skyler described the developmental approach to teaching and learning she carries with her into a current undergraduate teaching experience as an instructor of record. As Skyler explained:

I'm not a fan of busy work. When I was a student, I've done so much busy work my instructors made me do. Any time I do a class, I ask them, "Do you like to do it? Would you want to do it?" I explained to them why you'd want them to do it. I allowed them to actually vote on the things they have in the class. I tell them what the requirements will take. I'm teaching psychotherapy class, it's a senior class. I tell them, "You have to write the paper here. I have to give you a test, basic form, whichever way you want." I say, "You have to have participated because it's a discussion based. It's a higher level class. That's it. There's no more. You've advanced already in here."
Skyler’s account describes how she actively considers her experiences as a learner within the setting of teaching undergraduate learners and works within a given learning context to support the autonomy and development of learners.

Jaime described a parallel developmental process between teaching and learning. While sharing a perspective on development within the context of her teaching preparation experiences, Jaime explained:

Oh, it's never going to finish. I think that that's obvious. I read somewhere very recently, can't recall exactly where, but actually it was my supervisor yesterday. We had a supervision session, and he was saying that essentially as a professor, as an educator, you never stop learning. You never stop acquiring knowledge. And I think I agree completely. I haven't stopped acquiring knowledge since I was born. And I don't plan to stop ever until maybe even after I die. Because I think it's so important to stay on top of the most relevant topics, the most applicable methods to things. And also, the generation of students is going to change as well. So maybe showing YouTube videos are going to be outdated by two years from now. Or I won't have my Netflix account anymore to show them a certain video of like Carl Rogers or whatever.

Jaime underscored her desire to continuously engage in experiences that support her teaching preparation beyond her doctoral program to account for changes in knowledge, teaching methods, learners, and technology.

Interactive Reflection

During the interviews, participants illustrated a variety of ways in which they were making sense of their teaching preparation experiences through interactive reflection. Participants' reflective process related to how they made sense of themselves within the context
of their teaching preparation experiences and higher education in general. Participants provided examples of their internal reflective process, navigating self-doubt and insecurities, their views of the development of self-efficacy, and views on the development of their emerging approaches as teachers and counselor educators. This interactive reflection contributes to the emergence of teaching values as counselor educators.

Participants shared details about their internal self-reflective process of making sense of themselves within the context of their teaching preparation experiences. Jaime shared her private self-reflective response to the structure of her counselor education doctoral program. She said:

You think one way and then you're trained in a field to like to think of another way or be another way it causes some clashing so obviously like, you know, these, these ideas pop into your head. Like, I wonder if it's specific like I wonder if it's normal, and purposeful that we don't necessarily received formal structured training to be a teacher because that's not what you're really supposed to do in the class certain like there's a basic foundation and understanding of counseling and there's ethics and, you know, especially, you know, and teaching. There's ethics and a foundation with teaching and counseling but there's not really like a structure and is that purposeful?

While reflecting on his overall teaching preparation experiences, Alex stated, “So, I said I’ve been feeling like a fish out of water or since I started my education here. So, I’m slowly figuring out where I fit, where I belong.”

To mitigate the experience of “feeling like a fish out of water” and “clashing” of ways of thinking and being, participants described having an internal negotiation process between themselves and their teaching preparation experiences. For example, Alex provided insight into his reflective process to negotiate self and experience:
I was thinking about that for the past several months because I kept thinking I don't think I belong in academia because I'm a clinician. And I really enjoyed and loved my work. And so, yeah, I felt distanced reading the literature. I felt they don't know what they're talking about and they felt they do. And I was going back and forth that they don't, and they do, and they don't, and they do. And plus, whenever I would go to the conferences, it would feel I'm in a vacuum of people who think the same, and actual practitioners are not in there. I mean, we have all this breadth of knowledge, collected knowledge.

Alex’s account demonstrates a process of integrating prior experience as a clinician and his current teaching preparation experiences as a counselor education doctoral student. Similarly, Casey spoke about her process of negotiating her developing identity as a counselor education within the context of her teaching preparation experiences within a research-intensive institution.

As she put it:

So, I definitely had a bit of a shift in my first year, kind of just drinking that Kool-Aid and having to step back within myself as an adult, as a person and think about what kind of person do I want to be, what kind of life do I want to have? And so, I decided to really focus on my teaching development. So, I asked for those assistantships. I asked for 400 level classes, I asked for masters level classes, which I'll be doing next year because my, I have shifted to, I think I'd really like to do a full time teaching faculty rather than R1 two and two. I'm looking at more like three and three or four and four. So, I think that my joy in teaching and I'm a very applied person, so like I get that in my counseling.

Casey highlighted the interactive nature of the self-reflective process described by participants. Through her teaching preparation experiences within a particular context, Casey considered existential questions such as “what kind of person do I want to be, what kind of life do I want to
have?” As Jaime said about this reflective process, “It’s just about how to incorporate it into my life.”

The interactive nature of self-reflection among participants also describes the various reflective foci within counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation experiences. Justice conveyed this by reflecting on her experiences as a learner that inform her teaching preparation experiences:

And I feel like it's so hard because I'm trying to develop as a researcher and a writer and you're trying to help me develop, but you're not. And I told one of my classmates, I said, "I feel like sometimes I'm that student that's helping my teacher learn more about themselves," which is interesting because I know clients do that as well. And I reflected on it and I'm like, I've learned from my students. So, I'm like, "Okay, what can I do or say to help like make this person better?" I feel like that's what they're supposed to have, but it does take more away from my personal life or my focus or anything else. And then I noticed that a lot of times I'm able to just sit back and say, "Yeah, that student really helped me learn how to give feedback, or that student really helped me understand to be mindful of the content of my presentations."

Similarly, while reflecting on her teaching preparation experiences as a doctoral student and sharing her views of the counselor educator role within the counselor training milieu, Kendall said, “I still want to be me authentically me, but I’m playing different roles. I have different roles in those different spaces. So how do I show up authentically as me in those different spaces.”

Most participants discussed self-doubts and insecurities that emerged through their self-reflective processing. For example, Kendall explained:
One of the things that I learned about myself is I really like doing research, but I also really like teaching. I've had a ton of research experience, not as much with teaching. So, I feel like this teaching component still feels unknown to me. I'm very curious still about this teaching component that I feel like I'm not on very solid ground with. I want to be on more solid ground when I transition into whatever is going to be post-graduation.

One specific area of teaching that Kendall identified as contributing to her sense of self-doubt was in facilitating the classroom experience:

When I think about graduating, I'm a little apprehensive, I'll be honest in saying, I'm a little apprehensive because I just don't know what that's going to look like. I have some self-doubt about how good am I going to be in the classroom and how meaningful is this experience going to be for students?

In response to a question about her perceived readiness for teaching as a counselor educator, Kerry explained:

So that's... I feel like for me, that's a difficult question, because I think I'm still working through some of the self-doubts. So, I think sometimes I tend just to rank myself lower, but I think for the class next semester I feel fairly confident in it. I also think even though it's not part of my internship course, I'll be meeting weekly with, and I try to act like supervision, with one of my professors and another student that's teaching the same course, just a different section. And so, I feel like I'm getting a lot of that support I need along the way, so if things do come up, that I'm not necessarily sure how to navigate, that I'll be able to ask those questions and have a space for it.
Through future teaching-related supervision, Kerry described how her current self-doubts might be potentially mitigated. Similarly, Kendall identified a variety of teaching preparation experiences that could potentially decrease her feelings of insecurity related to teaching:

I feel like I'm entering into this last phase of my PhD program and feeling I'm balancing this gratitude of I'm so grateful that for the experiences that I've had, but I'm also balancing some insecurity in terms of I wish I had more opportunities to teach and to get that direct feedback from faculty, from students, about my teaching style and areas that I can continue to grow. But also getting the reflection of what some of my strengths are.

Both accounts from Kerry and Kendall illustrate how the interactive process of teaching preparation through teaching-related supervision, teaching opportunities, and feedback contribute to their views of self as a teacher in counselor education.

Kerry reflected on how reflecting on previous experiences as a learner helps her to navigate self-doubts and insecurities related to her teaching preparation experiences:

Yeah and I think with that, I think imposter syndrome is something that a lot of doctoral students face and I think it's finding when is that normal, where you're going to have these doubts and go through these growing pains and when is it too extreme and maybe there just needs to be some personal growth when it comes to that. I think that they're, I've gone through a lot of self-doubt. I remember in my undergrad towards the end of it writing a paper, I'm not doing a master's program because I just, I won't make it. I'm not going to do it. And I ended up staying, I did my master's where I did my undergrad because it felt really safe to me and I was successful in that. And then started the doc program. Those same doubts came up of, well I don't know if I can do this part of it.
Alternatively, Kendall engaged in a future-focused reflection on how she imagines the progress of her teaching preparation experiences. Kendall described her process in this way:

But I think about there will, I'm guessing, that there will be a day that we'll wake up and say, all right, I got this. I'm feeling really good about how my development. I've gotten to a place where I have a lot of experiences under my belt. I feel that I know I have all the tools that I need. It's just going to be a matter of using those tools and seeking out additional tools as I'm exposed to a variety of different pedagogies and content and blending that together. Just continuing to add tools to that tool belt. But I look forward to that day where I'm like, ‘all right, I got this’.

Most participants reflected on how their teaching preparation experiences relate to their teaching self-efficacy. Alex spoke about his reflective process related to teaching self-efficacy:

I think it comes down to self-efficacy, the perception that I feel that I am ready. Whether if you don't objective testing, I mean, I feel so. But regardless of that, it's how I feel about it. Right? So, I think, for me, if I have taught it more than once, then I can pull from that experience. If I have any reservations in the future, then I can pull in from those experiences and then sew pieces things together because I didn't think I would ever be fully prepared to look at it objectively. But I think it's just a matter of whether I'm feeling confident that at least I've had some skills to pull from some ideas. And you recognize how students tend to respond, tend to answer when asked certain questions and the dynamic that takes place in a classroom. So really all of these experiences put together. Alex also spoke about alternatives and potential implications related to reduced teaching self-efficacy. As he reflected:
There are specific experiences though that I'm hoping to get before I graduate so that I can feel at least a sense of self efficacy in order to teach. Because, I think, on the flip side, I don't want to be at a point where I freeze and tense out there because I don't know how to move forward, I don't know how to proceed teaching.

Justice described an example of an in vivo reflective process related to her teaching self-efficacy when guest lecturing for a class of doctoral students:

Because they had this ... It's like know your audience. They had such a different [way] as doc students. And I'm like, a lot of them are professionals. Some of them have been clinicians longer than I have. Some of them are teaching. Academically, they were all the same. And I was like, I only felt more confident because I've completed all my courses and they hadn't, so they were still in class. And I was just like, "Okay." And I learned it was so different. It was like the level of content and energy and response was so different from doc students versus when I've been teaching master level students. And so, I noticed that I developed a level of comfort because I could talk to them at my level.

This example illustrates an in-the-moment reflective process of Justice that integrates thoughts and feelings related to teaching self-efficacy, her standing as a doctoral student teaching, and the characteristics of learners.

Quinn conveyed several reflections related to her view of teaching self-efficacy. As she put it:

So, I feel like it's just going to be one of those things that's going to come. I don't know, I can prep, as far as whatever the curriculum is, whatever the topic is I'm teaching, I'm confident in my abilities to research whatever that topic is and get comfortable on it. So, I think it's just doing it that's going to be the stuff that I need more.
Quinn’s reflection about the development of self-efficacy references to confidence and comfortability “that’s going to come.” She attributed her experiences as a secondary educator as contributing to her sense of teaching self-efficacy. Regarding the transferability of her professional experience as a secondary educator, Quinn explained:

I feel pretty confident, and I don't know if most of that is because of my background. I feel after all of these years’ experience, I feel like I could pretty much teach anything you put in front of me. And so, I think it's the fact that I've been trying that stuff for so long that once I do get into a classroom of adults, I feel like that stuff's going to transfer and kind of be there pretty easily for me.

Quinn also reflected on how her experiences as a counselor support her confidence and self-efficacy for teaching:

But I feel like I could do whatever if I had to, just like a group, you know? Get to work and like, "Oh, can you do group in 10 minutes?" Oh, sure. It just becomes something that is just part of what you do.

Similarly, Kendall compared her teaching and general counselor education doctoral preparation for her development as a counselor:

I think about when I was in my clinical practice when I first started out my first couple of years where really like, wow, who am I? What am I doing? Am I doing it right? I hope it's helpful. Then I got into a place where I found my style and I blended the art and science of counseling. I see my teaching development being parallel to that. After I graduate, thinking about being a faculty member, an educator, and a scholar, I think about how it will probably be very similar where the first couple of years, maybe even five years, I might be like, what is going on? I have no idea. Holy moly. Deer in headlights
look. Then over time as I continue to be self-reflective, get feedback from others, and have mentors that will help me along the way, I will develop my style and feel more comfortable and confident in that style. Hard question to answer.

Kendall’s account describes how interactive reflection, contextual development, and experiential integration inform her self-efficacy for teaching and the overall counselor educator role.

Some participants reflected on ways in which their teaching preparation experiences inform their emerging approaches to teaching and learning within counselor education. For example, Kendall reflected on her anticipated experiential and contextual needs related to her teaching preparation. She stated:

Moving forward, when I think about the next year and a half in my program, what my needs are mostly related to mentorship and feedback so that I can understand, again, what my strengths and areas for growth are. I think about when I graduate my needs might shift a little bit. I'm not quite sure what that will look like, because I don't know what type of institution I'm going to end up at in terms of, is it going to be a teaching institution? Is it going to be something in the middle? Is it going to be more of a research heavy institution? Either way, I'm still going to be teaching. It's just going to depend on what my teaching load is going to look like.

While discussing how her view of teaching has changed through her teaching preparation experiences, Kendall articulated, “I think it’s, for lack of a better way of saying it, I feel like it’s become super real, real quick... I realize that it’s important to develop my own style as who I am as an educator.”
Casey’s self-reflective process of making sense and integrating her teaching preparation experiences led her to critique processes of conditioning, oppression, and advocacy within higher education and the counselor educator’s professional role of teaching. She explained:

Yeah, I'm always thinking about that, especially that humility piece because I feel like, you know, we talked a lot about conditioning and there's so much conditioning in higher ed to be the expert, but there's not a lot of conditioning to be humble. Yeah. And if you value, humility, where does that fit? Like if that's how you're presenting to others. What's going on inside and then where does that take you. I think it takes you 30 years down the line, or you're treating other people the same way and not giving space for them to be authentic, because, well, I wasn't allowed to do it. So why are you, you know, and then and then we're in a whole conversation about, you know, systemic oppression.

Casey then described her response to processes she perceives, contributing to systemic oppression and how she views her role teaching in counselor education. As she put it:

I think it's important to be evidence-based, but what I find in my university often, is we have all this evidence about how to do education, but we don't do it ourselves. So, I find that very problematic. And it's something that I try to push back on my level. And I hope that I can push back on as an instructor, because I would like to be faculty level instructor. But when thinking about needs, I think support from faculty to be exploratory, to be radical, to be different in evaluation. That's really where I see a lot of us moving.

Casey’s account describes a form of pedagogical advocacy “to push back on as an instructor” to support the future development of teaching in higher education.
Emergent Teaching Values

Through the observed combination of experiential integration, contextual development, and interactive reflection, participants illustrated a variety of values related to teaching that emerged through their teaching preparation experiences. These qualities relate to the continuous process of self-exploration and improvement, learner-centered values, ways in which participants employ their described teaching values, and an ontological view of the role of teaching within counselor education. Each of the previously described themes of this study contributes to the emergence of teaching values. Through experiences, relationships, contextual factors, and self-reflection, participants were able to identify specific aspects they desire to integrate into their teaching role as counselor educators.

Most participants described self-reflection as a value that emerged through their teaching preparation experiences. For example, Kendall expressed the importance of being a reflective practitioner of teaching in counselor education. As she put it:

I don't know that my teaching preparation will ever end. I feel like it's always going to be important for me to be self-reflective and look at what do I feel like is going well and what areas could be improved.

Alternatively, reflection for Quinn took the form of observing how her experience “starts coming back.” As she explained:

But I feel like when I get to the point where I know that I've helped or inspired somebody, like other professors have done for me, then I think once that stuff starts coming back, then I feel like you'll know.

Quinn described this reflective knowing process when referring to her teaching preparation experiences and development as a teacher in counselor education.
Furthermore, some participants described processes of continuous development and improvement as values that emerged through their teaching preparation experiences. While illustrating processes of continuous development and improvement, Kerry explained:

But keeping in mind too, once you know your students, you know what the class is going to look like, adapting things. If a method that I'm using isn't working, what can I do to shift it? And so, if you need to shift it during the semester, but then also at the end of the semester reflecting on what went well, what didn't, and then also using the students' feedback for that. So that way to enhance the course for next time.

Skyler also provided insight into her process of continuous improvement within the context of her teaching and teaching preparation experiences. As she explained:

It's a little bit different preparation for me because I try to maximize, I never do busy work, I try not to give them busy work. I really take an effort to explain to them what my assignments are, why am I making them do them, what's the goal, what are they supposed to learn, to me that's important. I constantly try to change assignments. I try to make it better.

Through the examples provided by Kerry and Skyler, the primary purpose of valuing change and improvement within their teaching preparation experiences centers on the learning experience of students. Skyler described her development teacher-centered to learner-centered teaching values:

I've been experimenting in all of my classes to see what's the best factors to help them. I was not doing it six years ago; this is a more recent change like five years ago. I'm like, "Okay, let me try to constantly work on myself in helping students." There's many factors to this...
Most participants described similar developmental patterns toward valuing learner-centered pedagogical approaches through their doctoral teaching preparation experiences.

Most participants provided specific descriptions that support a valuing of learner-centered pedagogical approaches. For example, Kendall described how she understands the influence of herself with the learning and development of students. As she put it:

How has my view in the role of teaching changed over time? I think I take teaching very seriously. I want to show up as the best person that I can show up to be in the classroom. I want to be very present. I want to be able to connect with students in the classroom in a way that's meaningful and helpful for their personal growth and development, but also for my own personal growth and development too. I think that my awareness as a result of the experiences that I've had in this program, my awareness of who I am as an educator in the classroom has heightened. I've realized how important it is to be self-reflective and to think about what my style of teaching is.

Justice described the influence of self and self-awareness concerning the learning and development of students. While discussing the influence of her clinical experience on her teaching preparation, Justice stated:

And I think that helps me develop because I'm being considerate. It's almost like you have to be empathetic and compassionate and considerate to clients. I have to be that way to students as well. But I have to understand that that's still with my teaching hat on and not my clinician hat on. And so that's something that I'm learning how to separate, you know what I'm saying?

Regarding the influence of self within the context of teaching diverse students, Casey drew from the metaphor of traveling to describe meeting students’ needs within the learning environment.
As she explained, “It’s just trying to think about how do you... travel with your pedagogy? How do you travel with your curriculum, and how do you make it accessible but also meaningful because it’s not just about access, right?”

Participants described how accessibility and meaningful learning were achieved through an awareness of student backgrounds and valuing the identities and life experiences of students. Justice observed how non-white students were approached differently during a coteaching experience with a full-time counselor educator. Justice explained:

It's switched when I realized how different students were being perceived, especially with papers, their writing wasn't where it should have been and I knew it became, it was a lot about their backgrounds, their education. I was just saddened by it. I had a moment where I felt like this is just really sad that we have master level students that are not reading at a master's level because of their race.

Justice also described how her awareness of student personal backgrounds informed the way she navigated challenging student interactions within the classroom. As she explained:

I knew I couldn't respond to his question directly because the question was, it was just so obvious that it was more about his family issues than the information I presented. And that to me was just probably one of the most heartwarming, I was just like, oh my God. I finally learned how to answer those questions as sensitive as possible. You know what I mean, because it's like I can do that as a clinician, as a counselor. I'm like, okay, I don't want all of the students to know what his problem is. And I don't want him to know what his problem is, but I want to answer this so that maybe he would consider the possibilities and also consider the fact that this isn't the right environment for you and your family issues to be discussed in class.
Justice also proceeded to discuss how she learned to intentionally use course activities to enhance her awareness of student backgrounds and areas where she can supplement students' prior knowledge and experience. She explained:

Having that time to just go back and read those discussion posts and get a sense, okay, this student is working at this site and this student is interested in this and this student is admitting they don't know much about opioids or this student has a bias towards the medication or the student feels like they don't understand clinically depression as it correlates to substance use. Then I'm making note of all this information just from the discussion post so that I can incorporate that when we're openly discussing in class.

Justice’s experiences illustrate how her doctoral teaching preparation experiences supported her development of a learner-centered approach to teaching.

Many participants provided specific examples from their teaching preparation experiences that influenced the emergence of their teaching values. While reflecting on how her approach to teaching has changed over time, Skyler described how a faculty member within her doctoral program influenced her view of supporting student learning. Skyler explained:

I think in my class a long time ago, in my PhD my first semester when I did, I think what my professor was saying is really motivating students to learn and to engage. This is the message I have remembered five years later, it's motivating students to be engaged with material pretty much by all means necessary, "This will help them to learn."

Kendall described the value she places on being present and engaged within learning environments. As she put it:

Something that's really important to me is continued growth and development personally and professionally. When I feel like I've gotten to a point where there's nothing more than
I can learn, then I'm a little concerned, because my fear is that I will slip into a space of being on autopilot and that's not necessarily a space that I want to be in because I can very easily miss important features in a classroom exchange, or in a personal exchange, if when I'm on autopilot.

Kendall proceeded to identify strategies to mitigate the potential for slipping “into a space of being on autopilot.” As she explained:

Some of the things that I think that will be important for me in the future is to find mentors and colleagues that I can reach out to and ask for feedback on. Also, ideas in terms of delivering content in a way that's meaningful, valuable, and helps connect the dots for students. I'm always open to thinking about creative ways of doing that. The best way to do that is by connecting with other individuals that have teaching experience and to explore things that worked well for them and things that didn't work well for them.

Kendall’s account describes how features of her doctoral teaching preparation are supportive of her teaching development in the future as a counselor educator.

While discussing the value of interaction within the classroom, Skyler described receiving empirical permission to integrate an interactive approach to teaching after attending a continuing education workshop. She explained:

One of the things, it was in the back of my head, but it was just giving me a permission to do it. What they found is lecturing is not necessarily the best way. The way they described it is all of us instructors, we think, "Okay, we have to give them as much information and just lecture them because they're here for a certain period of time." In the training, they were saying, "You know what? It doesn't work. Students don't learn this
way the best. You have to make it interactive, even large lecture classes. You can tell them everything and they're not going to remember."

Alternatively, Kendall discussed the value of authenticity and integrating her clinical experiences into the classroom. As she put it:

I think it's really important that I bring my clinical experience with me in defining who I am in the classroom as a guide and mentor. Clinically, I have worked in private rehab settings. I've worked in public vocational rehabilitation. When I think about who I am as a counselor in those settings, and really finding my authenticity in those settings and thinking about how can I bring that authenticity into the classroom and frame it in a way that's a little bit different of a framing in the classroom setting, but still thinking about mentorship, guidance, and support. Because much like counseling, growth and development is the foundations of what we're doing in the classroom setting.

The accounts of Skyler and Kendall emphasize the importance of feedback and support in supporting their teaching preparation experiences as doctoral students and counselor educators.

Alex used the metaphor of a bridge to describe his emerging view of his role as a teacher within counselor education. For example, Alex described his view as a bridge between practice and research as a counselor educator in this way:

So far, from my experience, because the breadth of knowledge is there, the advancements in research, and in thinking, are there, I feel I have the responsibility to express that, to tell students that, to share the knowledge that I received, and figure out how that bridges with practice. Because in practice is very technical skill, technique driven. But with research is more philosophical, it can be technique too, but it can be philosophical. It can be more of inspiration or more of an idea what I can do next.
Further illustrating his use of the bridge metaphor, Alex explained:

[T]he master's degree, is a very practical degree. It should not really be theoretical based or just theoretical discussions. It's really we're trying to bridge the theory into practice and having them practice more and understanding nuances and talk to people in the entire counseling process. And these nuances, from my experience, are best taught on the spot rather than in a classroom away from the actual event.

Alex further described the role of technology in bridging counseling practice and research. As he put it:

But then it can be a person or it can be an entity or a technology. It can be a means, it can be a software or hardware or a building, whatever it is. But there is an element that bridges them. And then also understanding how knowledge disseminates, that there are people who adapt the technology right away, and there are people who will lag.

This account explores the possible utilization of new media and technology within the context of teaching in counseling. Regardless, Alex contended that technology and media could serve as a bridge between counseling research and practice. Reflecting on her development as a counseling practitioner, Kerry also utilized the bridge metaphor to describe her view of the role of teaching in counselor education:

Yeah, I think one thing that kind of stuck out to me as I was creating my syllabus for next semester and kind of feeding my teaching philosophy into a paragraph, was kind of like you spent all these years in the classroom gaining this book knowledge and looking to see how that's going to be implemented. And what that's going to look like in the classroom? I think similarly to kind of that bridge. Get that you have to do when you're getting your
masters in counseling like you learn all about it. And then when you start your practice
my experience, I fit in those things together.

An aspect of the bridge that Alex and Kerry described is the importance of being conversant in
both the practice and research of counseling.

Some participants identified the cognitive processes they desire to help students develop
as teachers. For example, Casey discussed the value of critical thinking and considering the
generation differences of students. As she put it:

And when we start thinking about what works in the classroom and what doesn't, my
students... and I imagine you hear this from others or you've experienced it yourself, but
there's a lot of talk about the millennials and what the millennials do and how they learn
and how they don't learn. And people talk shit, right? Like, "Oh, they don't care about
anything. They just show up and they can't do anything. They don't have any life skills."
But what I find is there is a lack of critical thinking. And it's not because people are
dumb, right? It's because they've never been taught to critically think. They've been
taught to check boxes.

On the other hand, Alex described the operationalization of the thinking process that goes into
counseling practice. While describing the value of experiential learning in operationalizing
counseling cognitive processes, Alex explained:

And in the future, I'd like to have it as a goal to try get in that moment in teaching. To
understand, how to say it, operationalize is the word that comes to mind. But how they
operationalize the thinking process, because it's one thing to have something written
down on paper and then you use to talk about it. And it's another thing when the student
sees it firsthand and then engages in that process.
Through the development of critical thinking and experiential learning, Casey and Alex described the cultivation of counseling students’ cognitive processes.

Some participants described spatial-temporal values related to teaching that emerged through their doctoral teaching preparation experiences. For example, Casey reflected on her view of the classroom within the context of learning:

So, and then in my counseling class it's the same kind of thing. Like here is evidence based counseling, here's how it's taught, here's how we can think about it. But let's have a conversation about what would you do if your client said this, or did this, or looked like this, or came from this place? Because that's the things that aren't in the textbooks, right? So, I'm trying to be more supplemental by assuming if you want to read, you can read, you can read whatever you want. My class is not a space for you to read your textbook. My class is a space to build on all of this information that's available to you. I don't know if that works or not but we have good discussions and my evaluations are good, so that's good.

Alex described a spatial-temporal view of teaching when he explored knowledge generation and discussed the importance of teaching across generations. As Alex explained:

[W]e're a bit more old school in terms of how knowledge is cultivated. I think we tend to look at knowledge as something where we’re just filling a bucket, for instance. It's just a matter of filling the bucket, checking the boxes. But if we're going to instill inspiration, if we're going to, I guess, enrich the profession with new counselors coming in, younger minds, I think we have to teach through time.
Summary of Results

The purpose of this study is to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Chapter Four presented results from the data that explored how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Results from the data organized into four superordinate themes: (a) Experiential Integration; (b) Contextual Development; (c) Interactive Reflection; (d) Emergent Teaching Values (see Appendix M for Superordinate Theme Characteristics). Each superordinate theme represents convergence across participants, while the excerpts from the interview transcripts illustrate divergent experiences and interpretations of participants toward the superordinate theme. Additionally, the corresponding appendices within Chapter Four illustrate the interpretative process of the research with regards to the individual analysis of transcripts and the development of superordinate themes. Chapter Five focuses more deeply on the researcher’s interpretations of the results through a discussion of the findings and implications for counselor education doctoral students, counselor educators, counselor education doctoral programs, and accreditation. The following section also addresses the limitations of this study, future research directions, and the conclusions of the research.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this present study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. This chapter will include a discussion of the results of this study, along with implications for selected findings. Chapter 5 will also identify specific limitations of the current study and provide areas of future research.

The results of this study provide an in-depth, nuanced, and narrative account of how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Eight current or recently graduated counselor education doctoral students were interviewed to understand their teaching preparation experiences. This study fills a gap in the counselor education literature on counselor education doctoral teaching preparation by focusing on the experiences of current and recently graduated counselor education doctoral students. Although Waalkes et al. (2019) completed a recent study that took a retrospective view of counselor education doctoral teaching preparation through the lenses of beginning counselor educators, this present study provides a lens into the phenomena of counselor education doctoral teaching preparation through the current and recent teaching preparation experiences as experienced by current counselor education doctoral students. The superordinate themes that emerged in this study reflect the lived experiences and meaning-making processes of counselor education doctoral students as they navigate their teaching preparation experiences. The results of this study suggest that Experiential Integration, Contextual Development, and Interactive Reflection can lead to Emergent Teaching Values among teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.
Discussion

As mentioned previously, this study is a response to calls from counselor education researchers for more scholarship on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Waalkes et al., 2018). The present study focused on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students, an area of research that has received a relative lack of attention within the counselor education literature on teaching (Barrio Minton et al., 2018). Although researchers have not studied the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students in much detail (Barrio Minton et al., 2018; Barrio Minton et al., 2014), the present study focused on providing a nuanced and detailed exploration of the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Specifically, the holistic approach to teaching preparation experiences taken in this study that considers the experiences deemed to be relevant to participants provides a unique contribution to the counselor education literature on doctoral teaching preparation. Above all, the findings from the present study strengthen our understanding of the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students to enhance the quality of the teaching, learning, and development facilitated through counselor education and supervision doctoral programs.

Broadly, the current study found that counselor education doctoral students viewed their teaching preparation experiences as a multifaceted experiential, relational, and contextual developmental process. It is encouraging to compare this finding with those found by Baltrinic et al. (2016), who identified relational, operational, and developmental descriptions of coteaching structures. Although Baltrinic et al. (2016) studied the specific doctoral teaching preparation modality of coteaching through phenomenological methodology, connections exist with the
present IPA study on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral
students. Through the holistic view of doctoral teaching preparation taken in the present study,
individual participants’ experiences described through the themes of *Experiential Integration* and
*Contextual Development* share similarities to the structural descriptions found by Baltrinic et al.
(2016). These similarities can be observed through the importance of relationships and the
contexts of development within doctoral programs that support doctoral teaching preparation
identified by participants in the present study.

An important finding from this study with implications for counselor education doctoral
programs relates to the contextual developmental factors identified by participants as being
meaningful to their teaching preparation experiences. Each of the eight participants in this study
identified programmatic structures and dynamics that supported the developmental process of
their teaching preparation experiences. Participants described specific contextual developmental
factors embedded within the doctoral training milieu as ranging from unhelpful to facilitative
processes. This finding supports previous research into beginning counselor educators’ doctoral
teaching preparation, which links the quality of teaching preparation experiences to intentional
program design and programmatic support related to teaching preparation (Waalkes et al., 2018).
Additionally, Baltrinic et al. (2016) found operational and developmental considerations relevant
to the structure of coteaching within counselor education. These overlapping themes related to
the structure and contexts of development related to the teaching preparation experiences of
counselor education that emerged across multiple qualitative studies warrant further empirical
investigation.

The juxtaposition of the findings from this present study with those of Baltrinic et al.
(2016) further describes how essential structures of coteaching inform the totality of the teaching
preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Common overlapping characteristics of coteaching and the overall teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students exist between the findings of Baltrinic et al. (2016) and those from the present study. It is through reflective processing of relational and contextual experiences that counselor education doctoral students in the present study identified values and philosophies about teaching they desired to integrate into their future teaching roles as counselor educators. Each of the eight participants in this study identified programmatic structures and dynamics that supported the developmental process of their teaching preparation experiences. Participants described specific contextual developmental factors embedded within the doctoral training milieu as ranging from unhelpful to facilitative processes. This finding supports previous research into beginning counselor educators’ doctoral teaching preparation, which links the quality of teaching preparation experiences to intentional program design and programmatic support related to teaching preparation (Waalkes et al., 2018). These findings enhance our understanding of how interpersonal and programmatic characteristics influence the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Given the importance of addressing the CACREP doctoral teaching preparation standards, the findings contained in the theme of Contextual Development describe teaching preparation experiences that are implementable within counselor education doctoral programs that lack the time and resources to support formal coteaching models. Some of the transferable contextual factors identified by participants in the current study that enhanced their teaching preparation experiences include trusting faculty relationships, regular feedback on teaching, and programmatic scaffolding of teaching experiences.
Scaffolding is a term used to conceptualize and structure developmental processes developed initially from theories of child learning and development (Bruner, 1978; Vygotsky, 1934/1986). A thematic thread related to the design and structure of teaching preparation experiences across the studies completed by Baltrinic et al. (2016) and Waalkes et al. (2018) with the superordinate theme of Contextual Development in this current study, further reinforce the need for programmatic scaffolding of teaching preparation experiences within counselor education doctoral programs. Some participants in the current study described the design and structure of their teaching preparation experiences in a progressive sequence of experiencing from introductory pedagogical coursework, coteaching or supervised teaching, and eventual instructor of record teaching. Other participants described unscaffolded teaching preparation experiences and, according to one participant, “literally being thrown into the fire...”. This lack of intentionality within the design and structure of these types of teaching preparation experiences may lead to deficiencies in the quality of counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation experiences (Waalkes et al., 2018). Despite differences in reported programmatic intentionality toward teaching preparation as experienced by the participants in this study, all participants described feeling prepared for the next stages of their teaching preparation experiences and development.

One of the most scaffolded teaching preparation experiences articulated by participants in this study was coteaching. Among the participants in this study who had engaged in coteaching experiences (n = 4), the defining features of coteaching, as explained by Baltrinic et al. (2016), were detected. These characteristics included (a) a trusting relationship with a supervising faculty member; (b) scaffolding of teaching experiences within and outside the classroom; (c) supervising faculty guidance and supervision; (d) development of transferrable teaching
competencies (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Interestingly, participants in this study who had not engaged in coteaching also described features across their teaching preparation experiences similar to those described by the Baltrinic et al. (2016) definition of coteaching. A possible explanation for these findings is the existence and distribution of the relational and developmental qualities of coteaching experiences throughout counselor education programs. An implication of this distribution of the relational and developmental qualities of coteaching experiences is that counselor education programs may be able to enhance the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Counselor educators and doctoral programs can support the scaffolding of teaching preparation through coteaching and the creation of deliberately developmental cultures of teaching preparation within counselor education doctoral programs. The present study provides evidence that coteaching is a meaningful teaching preparation experience among counselor education doctoral students.

Triangulating the findings of Baltrinic et al. (2016), Waalkes et al. (2018), and the present study indicate that coteaching is a teaching preparation experience deserving of expansion and continued development within counselor education doctoral programs.

An additional finding related to the theme of Contextual Development is the influence of faculty and peer relationships. All participants identified one or both of these types of relationships as influencing their teaching preparation experiences. Among the participants in this study, faculty relationships that support teaching preparation occurred more often than peer relationships. Overall, participants described being the recipients of teaching mentorship within the context of a variety of roles and activities throughout their doctoral program. Within the contexts of supervisory, advising, and other collaborative relationships with program faculty, participants described faculty relationships in support of teaching and teaching mentorships.
similar to teaching mentorship styles found by Baltrinic et al. (2018). The styles identified by Baltrinic et al. (2018) include supervisor, facilitator, and evaluator. However, participants in the present study identified personal factors of counselor educators as also influencing the quality of their teaching preparation experiences. Regardless of the role or teaching mentorship style of counselor educators (e.g., supervisor, facilitator, and evaluator), participants in this study seemed to describe personal factors and the nature of their relationships with faculty as contributing to their teaching preparation experiences. Also, participants’ accounts in this study related to the influence of faculty relationships within the context of teaching preparation experiences described a social learning dynamic. For example, some participants described their observations of counselor education faculty who modeled the role of teaching as a socialization process of their teaching preparation experiences. Participants also described various constellations of teaching mentors within their current counselor education doctoral program, prior learning experiences, and professional networks. Taken together, the findings from this study support formal and informal teaching mentorship as forms of teaching preparation experiences.

Another important finding relates to the variety of experiences participants attributed to their teaching preparation experiences. Although participants identified pedagogy coursework, coteaching, supervised teaching, and instructor of record teaching as domain-specific teaching preparation experiences, domain-general experiences were also identified as contributing to their teaching preparation experiences. The general and domain-specific teaching preparation experiences identified by participants was expected due to the inductive research design of this IPA study. Without an a priori operationalization of possible emergent constructs, this study was able to supply a holistic exploration into the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students that include domain-general and domain-specific experiences. The finding that domain-
general and domain-specific experiences contributed to the teaching preparation experiences of the participants in this study seem to be consistent with the andragogical learning theory (Knowles, 1970, 1973, 1984).

A specific connection exists between the theoretical assumption of andragogy that contends that adult learners have a vast background of previous experiences that serve to promote learning and development (Knowles, 1973, 1984) and the domain-general teaching preparation experiences identified by participants in this study. This finding suggests that domain-general and domain-specific experiences may contribute to the teaching preparation of counselor education doctoral students. Furthermore, this finding has important implications for designing reflective-developmental processes and structures within counselor education doctoral programs that promote student integration of domain-general and domain-specific teaching preparation experiences. The findings from this study suggest that regular reflective practices through supervision and advising relationships within counselor education doctoral programs facilitate doctoral student integration of their domain-general and domain-specific teaching preparation experiences.

A particular example of domain-general teaching preparation experiences that emerged through the interviews was the relationship participants noted between supervision and teaching. Participants described how their supervision experiences before and during their doctoral education contributed to their teaching preparation experiences as counselor education doctoral students. As mentioned in the literature review, supervision is described by some as the signature pedagogy of counseling (Bernard & Goodyear, 2019). The influence of supervision among the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students is somewhat
unsurprising, given that several models of clinical supervision incorporate teaching as a supervisory role based on the developmental level of supervisees.

The attribution by participants of supervision experiences contributing to their teaching preparation experiences as counselor education doctoral students raises questions about the commonalities and differences between supervision and teaching preparation within counselor education doctoral programs. For example, Bernard and Goodyear (2019) contend that curricula or protocols drive teaching while the individual needs of supervisees and their clients guide supervision. As teaching in counselor education continues to integrate learner-centered pedagogy and andragogical theories of learning (e.g., Luke, 2017; Moate & Cox, 2015), the differences and similarities between teaching and supervision within counselor education may require additional exposition. Additionally, participants expressed values and approaches to teaching that are guided by the individual needs of learners. The consideration of the individual needs of learners is similar to the differentiating features of supervision from teaching identified by Bernard and Goodyear (2019). An implication of this is the possibility that doctoral supervision preparation may also inform the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. An additional empirical exploration into the relationship between supervision and teaching preparation may contribute insights into strategic ways of organizing the curriculum of counselor education doctoral programs. Future studies may be able to differentiate the counselor educator roles of teaching and supervision further as counselor education continues to be informed by andragogical learning theories and inclusive pedagogies.

Across the interviews, participants identified a variety of needs related to their teaching preparation needs. The researcher’s juxtaposition of participants’ needs with the CACREP standards corresponding to the professional role of teaching within counselor education show
some discrepancies between the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students and doctoral teaching preparation accreditation standards. Specifically, the 2016 CACREP Standards require the curriculum of counselor education programs to address (a) roles and responsibilities related to educating counselors; (b) pedagogy and teaching methods relevant to counselor education; (c) models of adult development and learning; (d) instructional and curriculum design, delivery, and evaluation methods relevant to counselor education; (e) effective approaches for online instruction; (f) screening, remediation, and gatekeeping functions relevant to teaching; (g) assessment of learning; (h) ethical and culturally relevant strategies used in counselor preparation; (i) the role of mentoring in counselor education (CACREP, 2015, p. 39). This finding has important implications for the CACREP Standards Revision Committee charged with preparing the 2023 CACREP Standards.

Across all of the participants’ accounts in this study, all of the CACREP doctoral teaching standards mapped onto the needs related to participants’ teaching preparation experiences. A possible explanation for this discrepancy is that current counselor education doctoral students are currently engaged in their doctoral teaching preparation experiences and thus have not yet encountered the experiences they have identified as current needs. Furthermore, most participants identified a desire for more teaching preparation experiences focused on pedagogy, teaching methods, and curriculum design and delivery. This finding is consistent with the shortcomings identified by Waalkes et al. (2018) based on beginning counselor educators’ reflections on their doctoral teaching preparation experiences. Beginning counselor educators in the Waalkes et al. (2018) study reported they desired more pedagogy, teaching methods, and theory-based teaching courses within their doctoral programs. Along with the findings from Waalkes et al. (2018) that focused on beginning counselor education doctoral
students’ reflection on their teaching preparation experiences, the findings from this study on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students, suggest a persistence of previously documented deficits within teaching preparation experiences focused on teaching methods and instructional theory (viz., Barrio Minton et al., 2018, 2014). As the CACREP Standards Revision Committee prepares the 2023 CACREP Standards, this combination of findings may support decision-making related to the addition of supplementary doctoral teaching standards or focusing on closing pedagogy, teaching method, and curriculum design training gaps that potentially persist within counselor education doctoral programs.

The findings of this current study associated with the theme of Interactive Reflection are consistent with those of Elliot et al. (2019) who found the combination of formal instructional theory coursework, teaching experience, and self-reflection heightened the teaching self-efficacy of counselor education doctoral students. Notably, the superordinate theme of Interactive Reflection within the current study describes the experiential and contextualized reflective processing of participants’ teaching preparation experiences. The interactive process of reflection described by participants was informed by their current and prior teaching preparation experiences, along with the specific contexts of their teaching preparation and more general doctoral training milieus. Several participants in the current study described feeling a greater sense of teaching self-efficacy as a result of their teaching preparation experiences and the contextual factors of their counselor education doctoral program in supporting their development. Although the current study did not intend to explore teaching self-efficacy, many participants supplied insights into their beliefs about their capacity to execute teaching roles as emerging counselor educators. In addition to teaching self-efficacy, the interactive, reflective processing of their teaching preparation experiences also contributed to participants identifying
teaching values and philosophies. These findings suggest that reflectively making meaning of teaching preparation experiences may lead to emergent teaching values of counselor education doctoral students. It is possible, therefore, that establishing deliberately developmental cultures within counselor education doctoral programs that facilitate contexts for teaching-related reflection may bolster the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.

**Implications**

The results of this study provide an in-depth, nuanced, and narrative account of how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Four superordinate themes were identified across all the interviews to illustrate how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. These superordinate themes illustrate that counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences as a multifaceted experiential, relational, and contextual developmental process. Furthermore, the findings of this study have several important implications for counselor education doctoral students, counselor educators, counselor education doctoral programs, and accreditation.

**Implications for Counselor Education Doctoral Students**

The findings of this study suggest several implications for current counselor education doctoral students. Teaching, similar to counseling, is a long-term professional development process that extends beyond formal graduate education and training experiences. Additionally, teaching is one of the five professional roles (i.e., counseling, supervision, teaching, research and scholarship, leadership and advocacy) identified as core areas among doctoral programs in counselor education (CACREP, 2015). Given the time-limited nature of doctoral training, a long-
term perspective on teaching preparation and development across the career span is necessary. The identified teaching preparation experiential needs of participants in this study, along with perceived teaching preparation deficiencies reported by Waalkes et al. (2018), suggests challenges to obtaining comprehensive teaching preparation within counselor education doctoral programs. Therefore, counselor education doctoral students desiring to enhance their teaching preparation experiences can benefit from engaging in a seeking-out approach with intentionality. A resource to assist counselor education doctoral students intentionally identify areas of teaching practice to explore and develop is the 2016 report of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) Teaching Initiative Taskforce (2016) *Best Practice in Teaching in Counselor Education*.

Counselor education doctoral students can also use deliberate practice to intentionally seek-out teaching preparation experiences. Miller et al. (2007) provide a cycle of excellence model for developing superior performance in clinical supervision (Goodyear & Rousmaniere, 2017) and training that integrates features of deliberate practice. The components of this model include: (a) establishing baseline strengths and skills that need improvement; (b) obtaining systematic, ongoing, formal feedback; (c) engaging in deliberate practice (Rousmaniere et al., 2017). Counselor education doctoral students and counselor educators can use this model to intentionally support their teaching preparation and development across the career span. Furthermore, deliberate practice in counseling and psychotherapy contends that we should practice skills that lead to better client outcomes (Wampold, 2017). What teaching practices and skills lead to better student learning outcomes? Swank and Houseknecht (2019) utilized the Delphi method with 19 teaching experts to identify 152 teaching competencies for counselor education within the domains of knowledge, skills, professional behaviors, and dispositions.
Counselor education doctoral students and counselors educators may find Swank and Houseknecht’s (2019) list of teaching competencies foundational to engaging in deliberate practice for teaching in counselor education.

**Implications for Counselor Educators**

There are also implications related to the role of counselor educators within the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. The findings of this study imply that counselor educators play an essential role in how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Through mentorship, advising, supervisory, and other relationships with counselor education doctoral students, counselor educators serve as social learning models within counselor education doctoral programs. Modeling and engaging teaching best practices and competencies in counselor education as outlined by Swank and Houseknecht (2019) and the ACES Teaching Initiative Taskforce (2016) can influence the quality of counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation experiences. Additionally, counselor educators can employ phenomenological methods to support the differentiation and integration of counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation experiences. In addition to supporting the integration of teaching preparation experiences, phenomenological methods have been found to enhance integrative complexity and higher-order constructs of psychological experience (Wilkinson & Dewell, 2019).

This study also identifies implications for counselor educators related to feedback given to counselor education doctoral students about their teaching preparation. The findings from this study describe the value and influence feedback from counselor educators has toward the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Regular feedback from counselor educators provided to counselor education doctoral students influences how they
make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Systematic and ongoing feedback from counselor educators can also support counselor education doctoral students who engage in deliberate practice focused on their teaching development. Additionally, counselor educators can also provide feedback to counselor education doctoral students engaging in deliberate practice for teaching through the Expertise-Development Model of Supervision (Goodyear & Rousmaniere, 2017).

**Implications for Counselor Education Doctoral Programs**

The findings of this study have some important implications for the structure of counselor education doctoral programs. Participants in this study identified a variety of programmatic features of their doctoral training that influenced the quality of their teaching preparation experiences. There is, therefore, a definite need for administrators of counselor education doctoral programs to consider how their programs are structured to facilitate the teaching preparation and development of counselor education doctoral programs. A structural priority of counselor education doctoral programs should be scaffolding of teaching preparation experiences. Coteaching is one type of scaffolded teaching preparation experience that adheres to sociocultural theories of learning and development (Vygotsky, 1934/1986). Additionally, the development of undergraduate programming offered through counselor education departments can create opportunities for counselor education doctoral students to obtain teaching preparation experiences. Furthermore, administrators of counselor education doctoral programs should consider the feedback structures within programs (e.g., advising, supervision, mentorship) that interact with teaching preparation experiences.
Implications for CACREP

There are also implications for the CACREP accreditation of counselor education doctoral programs. The findings of this study imply some inconsistencies in the frequency of individual and group supervision provided to doctoral students through the 600-hour doctoral-level internship. Some participants in this study reported not receiving consistent supervision during their teaching internships. Accountability strategies to monitor the documentation and delivery of doctoral internship supervision can support not only the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students, but also their development in the areas of counseling, supervision, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy. The findings of this study also support the expansion of doctoral teaching standards to include specificity related to the use of instructional technology. Participants specifically identified a desire for knowledge and experience related to the use of instructional technology within face-to-face, hybrid, and online course delivery methods. Although the current CACREP doctoral teaching standards require students to know effective approaches for online instruction, the use of instructional technology is not limited to online environments. Counselor education doctoral students can benefit from knowledge and experience related to leveraging instructional technology across all teaching contexts.

Limitations

There are several limitations of this study that explored how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. The purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth, nuanced, and narrative exploration of how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. The guiding research question asked: How do counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation
experiences? Given the purpose of the study and guiding research question, IPA was identified as a qualitative research methodology to conduct this study. The reader should bear in mind the distinctiveness of IPA from other phenomenological research designs (e.g., descriptive, hermeneutic, transcendental). Whereas phenomenological research designs seek to provide an essential description of the nature of the particular phenomenon (Creswell, 2013), IPA aims to explore individualized meaning-making processes regarding specific life experiences (Smith et al., 2009). Although superordinate themes derived from group-level cross-case analyses of all participants’ transcripts are presented as the results, the relationships between the themes do not represent an essential structure of the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. As such, there are limits to the transferability due to the contextualized idiographic focus of the current study.

The interpretive research design of this study presents another possible limitation. First, the IPA methodology seeks the interpretations of study participants regarding a phenomenon they are currently experiencing. The interpretative and phenomenological traditions that inform this study assume the accuracy of participant accounts regarding the phenomenon of the study. Second, the research in IPA seeks to make interpretations of the interpretations of the participants through a double hermeneutic interpretation process. Although the interpretative emphasis of IPA allows for the meaning and sense-making processes of individual participants to be understood, the interpretative nature of the study presents limitations and subsequent opportunities to attempt to mitigate interpretative bias. A variety of credibility and trustworthiness strategies were employed throughout the analytic process of this study (i.e., audit trail, bracketing, methodological cohesion, theoretical coherence, reflexivity) to acknowledge and minimize the limitations of the researcher’s interpretations.
Limitations also exist within the research design related to data collection. In-depth semi-structured interviews were the primary data collection strategy used in this study. The use of self-report as the only means of data collection is a limitation of the study. The use of semi-structured interviews meant that not every interview was identical or standardized. Although the researcher minimally asked all the questions contained in the interview guide, follow-up questions, probes, and prompts varied between each interview. Despite limitations to the replicability of this study, in-depth semi-structured interviews are widely accepted as a form of data collection within IPA studies (Smith et al., 2009).

The cross-sectional nature of the data collection for this study also presents some limitations. A cross-sectional research design was the most efficient and resource-conservative research design for the time-limited nature of this dissertation study. A more robust and resource-intensive longitudinal research design, such as a cohort study that explores the research question of this study, may provide a context for increased understanding about the development of participants throughout their doctoral training. The researcher attempted to mitigate some temporal concerns of this cross-sectional study through the semi-structured interview protocol that includes questions that ask participants to interpret and reflect on their current and previous teaching preparation experiences. Collecting data through an additional follow-up interview with participants also reduced the inherent limitations of this cross-sectional study.

Associated with the interpretative limitations of the researcher, another limitation of this study lies in the use of purposive homogeneous sampling. This limitation relates to the achievement of a homogenous sample of participants necessary for IPA research. The employment of a purposive sampling strategy relies on the judgment of the researcher to make informed choices regarding the delimiting criteria of the study and participants included in the
final study sample. Although this study does not intend to make broad generalizations to the study population based on a representative study sample, the purposive sampling strategy of this study may present limitations based on the researcher’s ability to achieve a homogeneous sample of participants. Related to some of the time limitations that impact the findings, the purposive sampling procedure used in this study allowed participants at various stages of doctoral training to be included in the final study sample. Although the IPA research methodology allows for some sampling variation, this study did not achieve an entirely homogeneous sample due to experiential, institutional, programmatic, and geographic differences between the participants. A possible explanation for the sampling limitations of the present stay may be due to the relatively low response rate to study recruitment. The researcher utilized a systematic and recruitment strategy by contacting program faculty at every counselor education doctoral program within the United States accredited under the 2016 CACREP Standards.

This study is also limited by the current state of research on doctoral teaching preparation within counselor education. Although this current study offers an exploratory contribution to the body of research on doctoral teaching preparation within counselor education, there continue to be limited empirical studies that focus on this phenomenon. Including the current study, there are only three known studies that explore the doctoral teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students (see Baltrinic et al., 2016; Elliot et al., 2019; Waalkes et al., 2018). Despite the qualitative methodological diversity among the scholarship of doctoral teaching preparation (i.e., phenomenology, consensual qualitative research, autoethnography, interpretative phenomenological analysis), there are currently no quantitative studies of doctoral teaching preparation that can serve to complement the discussion and implications of these
findings. Additionally, there are no existing theories specifically regarding doctoral teaching preparation within counselor education.

**Areas of Future Research**

To address the lack of existing theory on doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education, future research utilizing grounded theory methodology could set out to construct a theory of doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education. This theory-building approach would require a robust sample size along with disciplined methodologically-specific data collection and analysis. The development of a theory of doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education could allow for the creation of a model of doctoral teaching preparation that could be implemented by counselor education doctoral programs. Counselor education doctoral programs may be able to more efficiently and rigorously assess student learning outcomes related to doctoral teaching preparation if the current CACREP doctoral standards also inform this model.

Creating a model or theory of doctoral teaching preparation within counselor education could allow for doctoral teaching preparation to be studied using quantitative methods and various statistical analyses. Progress toward quantitative studies of doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education could lead to the creation and validation of teaching preparation assessment instruments. Quantitative studies of doctoral teaching preparation could focus on attaining a stratified random sample of current counselor education doctoral students to achieve a representative sample of the target population to support generalizability.

Alternatively, a traditional phenomenological study of counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation could provide insights into the structure and essence of doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education. Data from this type of qualitative study could help
counselor educators and program administrators to inform the structure and contexts of teaching preparation within their doctoral programs. Future qualitative research could also use a case study approach to explore the experiences and contexts of teaching preparation within a small number of counselor education doctoral programs. This type of research would likely provide in-depth knowledge into the structure and dynamics of doctoral teaching preparation at the program level.

Future research using a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, along with longitudinal research design, could investigate the doctoral teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students from matriculation to graduation. Potentially, this longitudinal study could follow counselor education doctoral students as they transition into faculty roles within colleges and universities. Insights from a study that follows doctoral students as they transition through doctoral training and into counselor education faculty roles could provide findings that could inform instructional and curriculum development specific to teaching preparation within counselor education doctoral programs.

Future studies could specifically focus on investigating particular variables found among the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. Some of these variables could include further exploring the various modalities of teaching preparation (e.g., coursework, coteaching, supervised teaching, instructor of record), prior experiences (e.g., personal, professional, clinical, teaching), institutional context, curriculum delivery format (e.g., online, hybrid, in-person) and teaching self-efficacy among counselor education doctoral students. Also, empirical investigation is needed to understand how counselor educators utilize andragogical learning theory and evidence-based teaching methods and theories in preparing counselor education doctoral students for the role of teaching.
Conclusion

This study extends our knowledge of counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation experiences. The purpose of this study was to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. This study utilized IPA methodology to offer an extensive and process-oriented exploration of the meaning counselor education doctoral students ascribe to their teaching preparation experiences. This study is the first to use IPA methodology to explore counselor education doctoral students’ teaching preparation experiences. Eight current or recently graduated counselor education doctoral students were interviewed to understand their teaching preparation experiences. The results of this study provide an in-depth, nuanced, and narrative account of how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Four superordinate themes were identified across all the interviews to illustrate how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. Overall, these superordinate themes illustrate that counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences as a multifaceted experiential, relational, and contextual developmental process. These findings add to a growing body of literature on doctoral teaching preparation in counselor education.
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Recruitment Email to Program Faculty

Subject line: Doctoral Teaching Preparation Research Request

Dear (insert faculty member title and name),

My name is Jonathan Wiley, and I am a doctoral candidate at Virginia Tech. My dissertation research is an interpretative phenomenological analysis on the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students.

My dissertation chairperson is Laura E. Welfare, Ph.D., and this study is approved by the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (insert IRB number). I believe this research will fill a gap in counselor education literature by exploring the teaching preparation experiences of current counselor education doctoral students.

- **Participants**
  - Counselor education [**doctoral students** or **recent graduates**] who have teaching preparation experiences
- **Online Interviews** (approximate times)
  - 60 minute initial interview
  - 15 minute follow-up interview
- **Incentives**
  - $10 gift card to Starbucks, Target, or Amazon.com for each interview

If you know of potential participants within your program, will you forward this email to them? If students are interested in learning more about this research, they may contact me directly by email at jonwiley@vt.edu.

Thank you for your time and consideration in assisting me with my dissertation research.

Thanks,
Jonathan D. Wiley

186
Subject line: Doctoral Teaching Preparation Research Participation

Dear (insert potential participant name),

Thank you for your response! I am glad you are interested in participating in my research study. I want to be sure that you meet the criteria for this study. The criteria is as follows:

- enrolled in or a recent graduate of a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree program
- have teaching preparation experiences.

Please let me know if you do not fit the above criteria.

I want to respect your time and other commitments so I would like to schedule our interview as soon as possible. The following are times I am available to meet with you (insert multiple date and time options). If these dates and times do not work for you, please offer some dates and times that you are available.

I am attaching the consent form for this study to this email so you can review it before we meet. I will gather your verbal consent to participate in the study prior to the first interview as an acknowledgement that you understand the consent form, the conditions of the project, and that all your current questions have been answered. If you have any questions about the consent form before our meeting, please let me know.

Thank you again for your willingness to contribute your understanding and experiences to this research study.

Sincerely,
Jonathan D. Wiley
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Participant Informed Consent

19-889 An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of Counselor Education Doctoral Students' Teaching Preparation Experiences

Participant Informed Consent

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Consent to Take Part in a Research Study

Title of research study: An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of Counselor Education Doctoral Students' Teaching Preparation Experiences

Investigator: Jonathan D. Wiley, 540-312-9187, jonwiley@vt.edu

Principal Investigator: Dr. Laura E. Welfare, 540-231-8194, welfare@vt.edu

Key Information: The following is a short summary of this study to help you decide whether or not to be a part of this study. More detailed information is listed later on in this form. The purpose of this research study is to explore how counselor education doctoral students make sense of their teaching preparation experiences. This study involves phenomenological, interview-based research to investigate the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. You are invited to participate in the study if you are/were: (a) enrolled in a counselor education and supervision program accredited according to the 2016 CACREP standards; (b) enrolled in a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree program; (c) have teaching preparation experiences.

Detailed Information: The following is more detailed information about this study in addition to the information listed above.

Who can I talk to?

If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to the research team at 540-312-9187 or jonwiley@vt.edu.

This research has been reviewed and approved by the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may communicate with them at 540-231-3732 or irb@vt.edu if:

● You have questions about your rights as a research subject
● Your questions, concerns, or complaints are not being answered by the research team
● You cannot reach the research team
● You want to talk to someone besides the research team to provide feedback about this research

How many people will be studied?

We plan to include approximately 8 people in this research study.
19-889 An Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of Counselor Education Doctoral Students' Teaching Preparation Experiences

What happens if I say yes, I want to be in this research?
You are being asked to participate in a phenomenological, interview-based research study about your teaching preparation experiences. If you agree to participate in this study, Jonathan D. Wiley will meet with you for two interviews via Zoom conferencing software. The initial interview will last approximately 60 minutes. Basic demographic and teaching preparation background information will also be gathered during the initial interview through the use of electronic survey software (i.e., Qualtrics). In the time between the initial and follow-up interview, the interview transcript from the initial interview will be shared electronically with you to review and reflect on your responses. One to three weeks after the initial interview, the researcher will call to follow-up and inquire about any additional reflections you have had after the initial interview. The follow-up call may last approximately 15 minutes. In total, you will participate in an initial interview and follow-up interview requiring approximately 75 minutes. Both interviews will be conducted and recorded through the use of Zoom video conferencing software, thus allowing you to participate in the interview from a private location that is most convenient for you.

The researcher will obtain your verbal permission for the interviews to be audio recorded.

You agree to have both interviews audio recorded: ☐

You DO NOT agree to have both interviews audio recorded: ☐

What happens if I say yes, but I change my mind later?
You can leave the research at any time, for any reason, and it will not be held against you. It is important for you to know that your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you choose to withdraw from the study, any information about you and any data that you have provided will be destroyed promptly. You are also free to choose not to answer any question or respond to what is being asked of you, and this choice will result in no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Is there any way being in this study could be bad for me?
The risks associated with participating in this study are considered minimal because you will be describing aspects of your teaching preparation experiences that are routine for counselor education doctoral degree programs. This information may include descriptions of experiences that you determine to be relevant to your doctoral teaching preparation. Foreseeable risks may include discomfort discussing feelings about your teaching preparation experiences. Please note you have the right to stop the interview at any time, to choose what you disclose, or to opt out of the study at any time during or after the interview.
What happens to the information collected for the research?

Every effort to limit the use and disclosure of your personal information to only people who have a need to review this information. We cannot promise complete confidentiality. Organizations that may inspect and copy your information include the IRB, Human Research Protection Program, and other authorized representatives of Virginia Tech. The results of this research study may be presented in summary form at conferences, in presentations, academic papers, and as part of a dissertation. Also, direct quotations will be selected from interview transcripts and used in publications and presentations to describe patterns and themes that emerge through the coding process of this study. As described below, the researcher will take special precautions to ensure that any information report cannot be traced back to your identity. The data collected from you during the interview procedures may include information that could potentially identify you, such as your (a) name; (b) email address; (b) university affiliation; (c) current stage in the program; (d) academic department. However, the information listed in the previous sentence will not be analyzed or shared. Any additional information in the audio recording that could potentially identify you or anyone else whom you mention will be altered during the transcription process. The audio recordings of the interview will be transcribed through a third-party transcription service that stores and transmits files through TLS 1.2 encryption using a 128-bit AES key. The investigator will complete in the coding and data analysis. Your name and email address will only be used sharing the study invitation and scheduling interview times. Information regarding your university affiliation, stage in the program, and academic department are only confirming the study eligibility criteria. The audio recording of the interview, all paper and electronic copies of the interview transcript, and all paper and electronic copies of the data analysis will be securely stored on a password protected device that only the investigator can access. Also, the signed consent form that is retained by Jonathan D. Wiley and the audio recording of the interview will be stored securely in a separate location from the remainder of the interview data. Within five years after the completion of the study, the audio recording of the interview will be erased, and the signed consent form destroyed.

Can I be removed from the research without my OK?

The person in charge of the research study can remove you from the research study without your approval. Please note that there may be circumstances under which Jonathan D. Wiley determines that you should not continue in the study.

What else do I need to know?

Benefits of participating in this study may include gaining clarity about your teaching preparation experiences and adding to greater knowledge within the field about the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education doctoral students. If you decide to take part in the initial interview, you will receive a $10 gift card to Starbucks, Target, or Amazon.com.
If you choose to participate in the follow-up interview, you will receive a $10 gift card to Starbucks, Target, or Amazon.com. It is important to note that these incentives are not contingent upon your completion of the interviews. If at any point, you end your participation in the study, you are still entitled to the incentive corresponding to that interview. These incentives will be sent to you before your participation in each interview.

**Participant Verbal Consent**

*Do you agree to participate in this study? By agreeing, you acknowledge that you understand the consent form and conditions of the project, and that all of your current questions have been answered.*

_______ Yes _______ No

*Do you agree to have this conversation audio-recorded?*

_______ Yes _______ No

_______ I certify that I have explained the study to this participant, answered any questions, and obtained permission to proceed with the interview.

_______ I certify that I have explained the study to this person, answered any questions, and politely terminated the telephone call when the person declined to participate.

**Participant Name:** ___________________________________________________________

**Date Verbal Consent Obtained:** _______________________________________________

**Investigator’s Printed Name:** _________________________________________________

**Investigator’s Signature:** _____________________________________________________

**Date:**  _________________________________________________________________
I want to begin by thanking you for taking the time to talk with me about your teaching preparation experiences. Do you have any questions about the consent form I shared by email? At this point, I would like to obtain your verbal consent to participate in this study. By agreeing, you acknowledge that you understand the consent form and conditions of the project, and that all your current questions have been answered. Also, do you agree to have this conversation audio-recorded? (Complete Participant Verbal Consent) I have sent your $10.00 gift card electronically to the email address from which you initially corresponded with me. (Send the consent form to the participant before the interview. Participant consent will be obtained verbally prior to the interview. Interviewer will send the gift card electronically to the email address of the participant from which they initially corresponded).

Semi-Structured Interview

Introduction

As I mentioned to you earlier, this interview is about your teaching preparation experiences. You are invited to describe and reflect on any experiences you determine to be relevant to your doctoral teaching preparation (e.g., curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences). There are no right or wrong answers to the following interview questions. Also, I want to remind you that you do not have to answer any questions I ask you and that you are free to disclose or not disclose anything you choose. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Warm-Up Question

- As we begin, I want to understand where you are in your degree program. Could you describe where you are in your doctoral degree program?
  - Could you describe the typical sequence of coursework and examinations in your doctoral degree program? Where do you find yourself in this sequence?
  - Are you enrolled in your program on a part-time or full-time basis?

Questions and Probes

1. Could you describe the features of your teaching preparation experiences?
   
   Probes
   a. Could you describe the features of your formal teaching preparation experiences?
   b. Could you describe the features of your informal teaching preparation experiences?
2. Could you tell me about your most meaningful teaching preparation experience?
   Probes
   a. When did this experience occur?
   b. Where did this happen?
   c. Why do you think this experience stands out to you as most meaningful?

3. What teaching preparation experiences do you anticipate needing in the future?
   Probes
   a. How will you obtain these experiences?
   b. When do you anticipate engaging in these experiences?

4. How have your career aspirations changed as a result of your teaching preparation experiences?
   Probe
   a. How have your teaching preparation experiences changed your professional goals?

5. How has your view of the teaching role in counselor education changed in response to your teaching preparation experiences?
   Probe
   a. What has changed for you?

6. How has your view of the general role of counselor educator changed in response to your teaching preparation experiences (i.e., research, supervision, clinical, leadership, and advocacy)?
   Probe
   a. What has changed for you?

7. How do you perceive your readiness for the counselor educator role of teaching?
   Probes
   a. How ready are you for the role of teaching?
   b. What factors have contributed to your current sense of readiness?

8. How would you compare your teaching preparation experiences to your preparation for the other professional domains of counselor education (i.e., research, supervision, clinical, leadership, and advocacy)?
   Probe
   b. What differences do you see between your teaching preparation and the other preparation experiences?

9. How would you evaluate the quality of your teaching preparation experiences?
   Probe
   a. What qualities of teaching preparation do you think matter most?
10. How would you improve your teaching preparation experiences?
   a. What would you change about your teaching preparation experiences?

11. How will you know when your teaching preparation is finished?

   Probe
   a. How will you know when you have been adequately prepared for teaching?

Thank you for your time and effort participating in this interview. It has been great to talk with you and to hear about your experiences. Before we say goodbye, I want to share a demographic and teaching preparation background questionnaire with you. (Electronically share demographic and teaching preparation background questionnaire with participant). Please let me know if you have any questions as you complete this form. (Participant completes the demographic and teaching preparation background questionnaire). Thank you for sharing this background information with me. Also, I will send an electronic copy of the transcript from this initial interview to you before the follow-up interview for your review and reflection prior to the follow-up interview. I want to go ahead and schedule a date and time to follow-up with you in one to three weeks. Do you have a date and time in mind that will work best?
Appendix F

Demographic and Teaching Background Information Form

What is your age in years? [drop down menu]

How do you currently describe your gender identity? [text entry]

What is your racial or ethnic heritage? (mark all that apply) [checklist]
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin
- Middle Eastern or North African
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- White
- Some other race, ethnicity, or origin, please specify:__________________
- I prefer not to answer.

Please choose the counseling specialty area that best describes your counseling training background. [drop down menu]
- Addiction Counseling
- Career Counseling
- Clinical Mental Health Counseling
- Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling
- College Counseling and Student Affairs
- Marriage, Couple, and Family Counseling
- School Counseling
- Rehabilitation Counseling

Please rank the following roles based on your professional goals as a counselor educator. [rank order drag and drop question]
- Counseling
- Supervision
- Teaching
- Research and Scholarship
- Leadership and Advocacy
Please rank the following roles based on what is prioritized within your doctoral program. [rank order drag and drop question]

- Counseling
- Supervision
- Teaching
- Research and Scholarship
- Leadership and Advocacy

Please list any professional counseling experiences you have provided since you completed your master’s degree. [text entry]

Please list any teaching preparation, pedagogy, or learning theory courses you have taken as a part of your doctoral coursework. [text entry]

Please list any courses you have co-taught with a faculty member. [text entry]

Please list any courses you have taught on your own under the supervision of a faculty member (not coteaching). [text entry]

Please list any courses you have taught as an instructor of record. [text entry]

Please list any prior teaching experience you had before you entered your doctoral program. [text entry]
Appendix G

Follow-Up Interview Guide

(The follow-up interview is to occur 1-3 weeks after the initial interview and will occur via the same video conferencing software as the initial interview. Interview will have sent the transcript of the initial interview to the participant prior to the follow-up interview. Interviewer will send the gift card electronically to the email address of the participant from which they initially corresponded).

Introduction

Thank you for participating in this follow-up interview. The questions for this follow-up interview are expected to take approximately 15 minutes to complete. These questions focus on any additional thoughts, reflections, experiences, and observations you may have had since the initial interview and also based on your review and reflection of the initial interview transcript. Before we begin the follow-up interview what questions do you have at this point? At this point, I would like to obtain your verbal consent to participate in this follow-up interview. By agreeing, you acknowledge that you understand the consent form and conditions of the project, and that all your current questions have been answered. Also, do you agree to have this conversation audio-recorded? I have sent your $10.00 gift card electronically to the email address from which you initially corresponded with me (Interviewer will send the gift card electronically to the email address of the participant from which they initially corresponded). Would you like to proceed with the follow-up interview?

Follow-Up Interview Questions

1. Have you had any additional reflections or experiences related to your teaching preparation since the initial interview?
   - If yes, ask the participant to share and elaborate.

2. Have you noticed anything different about your teaching preparation experiences since the initial interview?
   - If yes, ask the participant to describe the differences they noticed. Also, ask the participant to share any reflections about the differences they have noticed.

3. What additional thoughts about your teaching preparation experiences would you like to share?
Conclusion

Again, thank you for participating in this follow-up interview and completing this research study. You have made a significant contribution to this study and the future of teaching preparation for counselor education doctoral students. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns related to your participation in this research study.
Appendix H

Participant Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Racial or Ethnic Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Middle Eastern or North African, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyler</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Middle Eastern or North African, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Participant Doctoral Teaching Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Courses Taken</th>
<th>Coteaching</th>
<th>Supervised Teaching</th>
<th>Instructor of Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Recurrence Calculation of Participants Contributing to Superordinate Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Theme</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Integration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Reflection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent Teaching Values</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix K

Superordinate Themes and Clustering of Themes Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superordinate Theme</th>
<th>Clustering of Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiential Integration</strong></td>
<td>Experiential Processes of Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Teaching Preparation Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Teaching Preparation Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences Informing Teaching Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Preparation Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiences of Teaching Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contexts of Teaching Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences on Teaching Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth-Fostering Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Preparation Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View of Teaching and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextual Development</strong></td>
<td>Developmental Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critiques of Programmatic Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrative Programmatic Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Dynamics and Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contexts of Scaffolded Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View of Teaching and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive Reflection</strong></td>
<td>Self as a Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View of Teaching Self-Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Directed Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Teaching Identity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom to Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discovering Self within Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-of-the-Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Development Self-Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developmental Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Identity Development Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navigating Self within Teaching Milieus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergent Teaching Values</strong></td>
<td>Ways of Thinking and Knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of Media and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Philosophy of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy of Teaching Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>View of Teaching and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrating Diverse Student Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perspective on Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy of Teaching and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Double Hermeneutic Process Model
Appendix M

Superordinate Theme Characteristics