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ABSTRACT

This study focused on the preparation of doctoral students enrolled in counselor education and supervision (CES) programs for their future responsibilities as teachers. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching, as measured by the Self-Efficacy toward Teaching Inventory (SETI), and several teaching preparation strategies identified in the CES literature and accreditation standards: formal coursework on college teaching, fieldwork experiences in teaching, and supervision of teaching fieldwork experiences.

Data were collected from 171 CES doctoral students through an electronic survey tool. This study found that all of the identified teaching preparation variables were significantly related to the students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. These findings support the requirement, by individual CES doctoral programs or nationally by CACREP, that CES students take formal coursework on college teaching, engage in numerous teaching fieldwork experiences, and receive weekly, high quality supervision of these fieldwork experiences. The results of this study suggest that a substantial number of CES programs are not requiring these experiences.

Although this study found that fieldwork in teaching, coursework in teaching, and supervision of teaching were all significantly related to self-efficacy toward teaching, the results suggested that the quality of supervision is particularly important in strengthening efficacy beliefs. This finding represents a notable contribution to the literature, as previous quantitative research in CES did not include the frequency or quality of supervision of teaching as a variable.

Implications are provided for leaders of CACREP, CES doctoral programs and faculty,
and current and future CES doctoral students. By emphasizing teaching preparation practices as supported in this and previous research, faculty can better focus time and programmatic resources on training experiences that are most effective in strengthening students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. Suggestions for future research include investigating what elements within coursework, fieldwork, and supervision of teaching are most effective in promoting self-efficacy toward teaching, strengthening the psychometric properties of the SETI, and investigating the relationship between SETI scores and actual teaching effectiveness.
DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated first and foremost to my incredibly supportive, kind, loving, hard-working, creative, and thoughtful wife Kim Suddeath. Without her I could not have finished this project. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to her mother and father Leann and Keith Mitchell. They have been to every graduation, celebration, event, move, and more since I met them. The way in which they have wholeheartedly accepted me into their family consistently reminds me of the unconditional love of God. Thanks for adopting me into your family. Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my daughter Hannah Joy. I doubt you will ever read this Hannah, but in case you do, know that I could not have done this without you. I never knew I could love someone so dearly or be filled with so much joy from being around someone. From the moment you came into my life, I’ve felt grounded. When you are up, we play and laugh. When you slept, I worked, eagerly waiting and anticipating the moment you would wake up again with your sweet heart and spunky spirit. I cannot wait to see you grow up.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Suzanne Dugger, my dissertation chair and mentor. Thank you for having the courage to challenge me to follow my dreams and passions. You have no idea how much your time, energy, and support mean to my family and me. I could not have finished this program without you. I have never met anyone so dedicated to their students’ success both personally and professionally. Thank you for always being a safe place.

I would also like to thank Dr. Marc Showalter. When I think of what it means to be a counselor, friend, counselor educator, and human being I think of you. I often tell people that I want to be like you when I grow up. I would also like to thank Dr. Chandler Dugger, my methodologist. Thank you for your willingness to help me on this journey. Thank you for your timely encouragement, both through the dissertation and job interviews, and willingness to challenge me. I would also like to thank Dr. David Cox, my college teaching professor. Thank you for challenging my paradigm for what it means to be a great teacher and giving me the freedom to pursue my interests in your course. I am a better teacher for having known you!

There are so many others who have helped to shape me both personally and professionally. Specifically, I would like to acknowledge Dr. Alex Kerwin, Dr. Mandy Perryman, Dr. Amanda Winburn, Dr. Josh Magruder, Dr. Mark Hsu, and Kim Chrestman. Without each of these people, I would not be who I am as person and professional.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .......................................................................................................................... ii

DEDICATION ....................................................................................................................... iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ...................................................................................................... v

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................ xii

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................................................... xvi

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................. 1

Problem Addressed by this Study ...................................................................................... 6

Theoretical Framework: Self-efficacy and its Application to Teaching Preparation .......... 7

Significance of the Study ..................................................................................................... 9

Purpose of this Study .......................................................................................................... 10

Research Questions .......................................................................................................... 11

Conceptual Framework .................................................................................................... 14

Definition of Terms ........................................................................................................... 14

Delimitations and Assumptions of the Study .................................................................. 17

Limitations ......................................................................................................................... 18

Organization of the Proposal ............................................................................................ 18
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

History of Doctoral Education and Its Influence on Teacher Preparation

The Changing Academy

Teaching Preparation in Higher Education

Coursework, Seminars, and Workshops in College Teaching

Supervision/Mentoring of Teaching

Fieldwork in Teaching

History of Teaching Preparation in CES

Teaching Preparation Practices in CES

Formal Instruction in College Teaching

Fieldwork in Teaching

Prevalence of fieldwork

Types of fieldwork

Effectiveness of fieldwork in teaching

Supervision of Teaching

Prevalence of supervision

Effectiveness of supervision

Other Factors Influencing Self-efficacy Toward Teaching
Summary of Teaching Preparation Experiences in Higher Education and CES .................. 60

Formal Instruction in College Teaching ........................................................................ 61

Fieldwork in Teaching .................................................................................................. 62

Supervision of Teaching ............................................................................................. 64

Theoretical Framework ................................................................................................. 66

Self-Efficacy .................................................................................................................. 67

Enactive Mastery Experience ....................................................................................... 68

Vicarious Experience .................................................................................................... 69

Verbal Persuasion ......................................................................................................... 70

Physiological and Emotional States ............................................................................. 71

Self-efficacy Toward Teaching ..................................................................................... 72

Self-efficacy Toward Teaching in Higher Education and CES .................................... 73

Chapter Summary ........................................................................................................ 76

CHAPTER III ................................................................................................................. 78

METHODS ..................................................................................................................... 78

Population and Sample ............................................................................................... 78

Approval and Informed Consent ................................................................................. 79

Survey Development ................................................................................................. 79
Research Question 6 .............................................................................................................. 121

Chapter Summary .............................................................................................................. 123

CHAPTER V ............................................................................................................................. 127

DISCUSSION .......................................................................................................................... 127

Prevalence of Teaching Preparation Practices ................................................................. 128

  Formal Instruction in College Teaching .............................................................................. 128
  Fieldwork in Teaching .......................................................................................................... 129
  Supervision of Teaching ....................................................................................................... 130

Summary and Interpretation of Major Findings ................................................................. 132

  Research Question 1 ............................................................................................................ 132
  Research Question 2 ............................................................................................................ 133
  Research Question 3 ............................................................................................................ 136
  Research Question 4 ............................................................................................................ 137
  Research Question 5 ............................................................................................................ 139
  Research Question 6 ............................................................................................................ 139

Implications of Findings ...................................................................................................... 140

  Formal Instruction in College Teaching .............................................................................. 140
  Supervision of Teaching ....................................................................................................... 141
  Fieldwork in Teaching .......................................................................................................... 142
Limitations of the Study.............................................................................................................. 144

Recommendations for Future Research.................................................................................. 146

Conclusion ................................................................................................................................. 148

REFERENCES ........................................................................................................................... 151

LIST OF APPENDICES ............................................................................................................. 167

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT ......................................................................................... 168

APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC AND TEACHING PREPARATION QUESTIONNAIRE. 171

APPENDIX C: SELF-EFFICACY TOWARD TEACHING INVENTORY ................................. 178

APPENDIX D: SUPERVISORY SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE ADAPTED .................... 183

APPENDIX E: EXPERT PANEL REVIEW REQUEST ................................................................. 185

APPENDIX F: COVER LETTER TO PROGRAM LIAISONS .................................................. 187

APPENDIX G: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE ......................................................................... 190

VITA ............................................................................................................................................... 192
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 ........................................................................................................................................ 65

Empirically-Supported Teaching Preparation Practices in Higher Education and CES ........ 65

Table 2 ........................................................................................................................................ 75

Theoretical Conceptualization of Teaching Preparation Experiences and Sources of Self-
Efficacy .................................................................................................................................... 75

Table 3 ........................................................................................................................................ 95

Research Questions, Survey Component, and Data Analysis .................................................. 95

Table 4 ........................................................................................................................................ 100

Descriptive Statistics for Quantitative Variables ................................................................ 100

Table 5 ........................................................................................................................................ 101

Descriptive Statistics for Categorical Variables and Teaching Preparation Experiences and
Requirements ............................................................................................................................ 101

Table 6 ........................................................................................................................................ 102

Descriptive Statistics for Instruments ..................................................................................... 102

Table 7 ........................................................................................................................................ 106

Regression Model with Control Only and Control with Coursework in College Teaching ...... 106

Table 8 ........................................................................................................................................ 106
Table 17 ................................................................................................................................. 114

Summary of t-Test and Levene’s Test: Frequency of Supervision of Teaching ..................... 114

Table 18 ......................................................................................................................................... 116

Regression Model with Control Only and Control with SSQ-A Scores ........................................ 116

Table 19 ......................................................................................................................................... 117

Regression Coefficients for Control Variables and SSQ-A Scores .............................................. 117

Table 20 ......................................................................................................................................... 118

Regression Model with Control Only and Control with All Teaching Variables of Interest ..... 118

Table 21 ......................................................................................................................................... 119

Regression Coefficients for Control Variables and All Teaching Variables of Interest .......... 119

Table 22 ......................................................................................................................................... 120

Structure Coefficients with Control Variables and All Teaching Variables of Interest .......... 120

Table 23 ......................................................................................................................................... 122

Means and Standard Deviations of SETI Scores: Supervision Versus No Supervision of Teaching .......................................................................................................................................... 122

Table 24 ......................................................................................................................................... 122

Summary of t-Test and Levene’s Test: Supervision Versus No Supervision of Teaching ......... 122
Table 25 ............................................................................................................................................... 123

Welch Test: Supervision Versus No Supervision of Teaching ................................................. 123

Table 26 ............................................................................................................................................... 123

Summary of Findings ......................................................................................................................... 123
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Conceptual framework for the relationship between teaching preparation and self-efficacy toward teaching................................................................. 14

Figure 2. Diagram representing the development of the composite survey.................. 80

Figure 3. Diagram representing the method for strengthening content validity of the composite survey........................................................................................................ 89
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Faculty members in higher education are expected to engage in three primary activities: service, research, and teaching (Golde & Dore, 2001). In general, service refers to contributing to the overarching goals of the university through serving students, the university, the community, and the nation (Austin, 2002a; Speck, 2003). Responsibilities associated with service include, but are not limited to, participating in departmental committees, serving on dissertation committees, activity in professional organizations, and utilizing expertise and skills of one’s discipline to make a difference in the community and the nation (Austin, 2002a; Golde & Dore, 2001; The Preparing Future Faculty Program [PFF], 2017).

Another important responsibility for academicians is research. Research is the “inquiry and/or discovery activities of the faculty member” (PFF, 2017, para. 3). Research begins with identifying important problems and questions within one’s discipline. This is followed by collecting and analyzing data and communicating the results to a variety of constituents (Golde & Dore, 2001). One may disseminate research results through publication, presentations at conferences, or even teaching (Golde & Dore, 2001). Conducting methodologically sound and rigorous research expands knowledge and supports the integrity of one’s discipline (Golde & Dore, 2001; Boud & Lee, 2009).

A final responsibility of academicians is teaching. Teaching refers to any action of a teacher designed to facilitate student learning (Nicholls, 2009; Weimer, 2013). Teaching includes the “a) direct interaction between the teacher and the learner, b) the proactive decision-making
process of planning, designing, and preparing the materials for the teaching-learning conditions, and c) postactive redirection (evaluation, redesign and dissemination)” (Good, 1973, p. 588).

Responsibilities outside the classroom also include providing academic advising to students as well as maintaining office hours (Gold & Dore, 2001). Although faculty are expected to engage in service, research, and teaching, teaching takes up a greater proportion of time than service or research, regardless of discipline (Davis et al., 2006; Golde & Dore, 2001; Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Utecht & Tullous, 2009).

Counselor educators are expected to engage in the aforementioned responsibilities, yet also spend a greater proportion of time in teaching. In fact, counselor educators spend more time in teaching or teaching-related activities than in research or service combined (Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, & Hill, 2006). Specifically, Davis et al. (2006) found that on average, assistant professors spent 55% of their time in teaching, while associate professors spent 53% and full professors spent 49% of their time in teaching.

Despite the disproportionate amount of time counselor educators’ reportedly spend on teaching as compared to research or service, historically teaching preparation in counselor education and supervision (CES) doctoral programs has received considerably less attention than research and clinical preparation (Hall, 2007; Lanning, 1990; Zimpfer, Cox, West, Bubenzer, & Brooks, 1997). For example, Hall (2007) stated that, although doctoral programs in CES tend to require students to take several research and advanced clinical courses, “in most counselor education doctoral programs there is only one course offered on college teaching” (Hall, 2007, p. 1). Furthermore, some CES doctoral programs require neither formal coursework in teaching nor actual teaching experience (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2013; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). This leaves future counselor educators at risk of entering the professoriate with
insufficient teaching skills as effective teaching requires a different set of competencies than do research and clinical work (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision [ACES], 2016; Baltrinic 2014; Baltrinic, Jencius & McGlothlin, 2016; Buller, 2013; Isaacs & Sabella, 2013; Malott, Hridaya Hall, Sheely-Moore, Krell, & Cardaciotto, 2014).

The lack of attention to teaching preparation is especially concerning given that the majority of CES doctoral students have “little to no teaching experience, and even doctoral students with prior K-12 teaching experience may not transfer teaching skills to higher education settings” (ACES, 2016, p. 33). This may leave those without any previous knowledge or experience in graduate teaching unprepared to meet their assigned teaching responsibilities once they complete their doctorates and accept faculty positions. In fact, in a series of reports from first, second, and third year CES faculty, researchers found that several new counselor educators felt inadequately prepared for their teaching responsibilities and, as a result, experienced increased stress (Magnuson, Black, & Lahman, 2006; Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, & Norem, 2004). One respondent in the third-year follow-up study reported having received adequate clinical preparation but feeling “completely ill prepared” to teach (Magnuson et al., 2006, p. 176).

This lack of training could also potentially hinder CES graduates’ ability to attain gainful employment as search committees in both teaching and research universities frequently require evidence of teaching knowledge and skill (Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003; Warnke, Bethany, & Hedstrom, 1999). Additionally, with universities hiring more adjunct or part-time faculty, applicants’ experience and demonstrated effectiveness in teaching may prove especially important for those seeking full-time or tenured positions (Isaacs & Sabella, 2013). In light of the amount of time counselor educators spend on teaching, the fact that most CES doctoral students lack previous graduate teaching experience, and the expectation of search committees that
applicants provide evidence of already being competent teachers, it is disconcerting that CES programs give such little attention to teaching preparation.

Inadequate teaching preparation may also negatively impact new counselor educators’ ability to invest time in the other responsibilities of an academician and thereby decrease their likelihood of earning tenure and promotion. Specifically, without sufficient knowledge and skills in teaching, new counselor educators may find it necessary to invest inordinate amounts of time in teaching related activities and therefore lack sufficient time and energy to satisfy the research and service expectations of their institution (Hill, 2004; Meachem, 2002; Magnuson, 2000; Silverman, 2003). This may prove especially true for junior faculty who are preparing courses for the first time. Because service and especially research are often tied to tenure and promotion decisions (Isaac & Sabella, 2013), it is critical that counselor educators feel confident and be competent as teachers (Warnke et al., 1999). Importantly, most institutions in CES also require demonstrated effectiveness in teaching as a part of tenure and promotion (Davis et al., 2006; Isaac & Sabella, 2013; Warnke et al., 1999). Thus, greater attention to teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs can support graduates’ success in obtaining a faculty position and subsequently earning tenure and promotion.

If the teaching preparation component is insufficient for CES doctoral students transitioning to the professoriate, they may also experience stress, burnout, and/or reduced job satisfaction (Hall, 2007). For example, respondents in the Magnuson et al. (2006) not only reported high levels of stress as new faculty members, but also indicated feelings of burnout during their first few years of work as counselor educators. Though a number of factors contributed to the reported stress and feelings of burnout, the lack of teaching preparation was identified as a factor.
Despite increased teaching loads for counselor educators (Davis et al., 2006; Isaacs & Sabella, 2013), CES doctoral students’ lack of graduate teaching experience (ACES, 2016), demand for demonstrated ability in teaching for hiring and tenure and promotion (Warnke et al., 1999; Zimpfer et al., 1997), reported inadequacy of teaching preparation experiences as compared to clinical and research training (Lanning, 1990; Hall, 2007; Zimpfer et al., 1997), and reported feelings of stress and burnout related to this inadequacy in teaching preparation (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2006), there is a paucity of research on what experiences effectively prepare CES doctoral students to teach (ACES, 2016; Barrio-Minton & Wachter Morris, & Yaites, 2013).

As such, CES doctoral programs rely primarily on the CACREP standards for guidance. The CACREP (2016) standards dictate that programs must include curricular experiences designed to achieve nine teaching standards. CACREP (2016) standards also require programs to have doctoral students “complete internships that total a minimum of 600 clock hours…in at least three of the five doctoral core areas (counseling, teaching, supervision, research and scholarship, leadership and advocacy)” (p. 37). Given the specification that doctoral programs need internships in only three of these five areas, CACREP does not require doctoral students to complete any internship hours in teaching. As a result, CES doctoral students can and have finished their program without any actual teaching experience or supervision of that experience (ACES, 2016; Hunt & Gilmore).

Recent studies indicated that CES doctoral students most often received training through formal coursework in college teaching (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011); fieldwork in teaching such as coteaching opportunities, formal teaching internships, teaching assistantships, and independently teaching undergraduate or
graduate courses (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Orr, Hall, & Hulse-Killacky, 2008); and receiving supervision of teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Orr, Hall, & Hulse-Killacky, 2008).

To summarize, the current literature regarding the training of CES doctoral students to teach consists primarily of qualitative studies describing current practices and/or the lived experiences of a few doctoral students. Further, no research within the last 13 years has applied a theoretical framework to investigate the extent to which teaching preparation influences CES students’ perceived teaching capability (Barrio-Minton et al., 2013; Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990). In fact, only two studies (Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990) have applied a theoretical framework (i.e., Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy) to understand the impact teaching preparation has on CES doctoral students. These studies occurred prior to significant changes in CACREP accreditation standards regarding teaching preparation and did not include supervision of teaching as a factor in their studies. Thus, without sufficient knowledge regarding the impact of teaching preparation standards required by CACREP, CES doctoral programs may produce graduates who struggle to find employment and fulfill their responsibilities as counselor educators. In order to adequately prepare CES doctoral students who decide to go into academia, the CES profession needs more research on the experiences that most support students’ development as teachers.

**Problem Addressed by this Study**

Despite the existence of standards designed to prepare counselor educators to teach, there was a lack of attention given to these components in CES research. Specifically, little was known about the relationship between specific teaching preparation strategies as identified by CES research and CACREP (2016) standards (i.e., formal instruction in college teaching,
fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching) and self-efficacy toward teaching in CES doctoral students. Thus, empirical research utilizing a theoretical framework was needed to investigate how these teaching preparation strategies individually and collectively account for change in self-efficacy toward teaching in CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited programs.

**Theoretical Framework: Self-efficacy and its Application to Teaching Preparation**

One way of conceptualizing and strengthening the conclusions drawn about the impact of the previously stated teaching preparation practices on CES doctoral students was through the use of a theory (Creswell, 2015). Researchers conducting quantitative studies utilize theory because it “explains and predicts the probable relationship between independent and dependent variables” (Creswell, 2015, p. 120). Though correlational studies do not allow one to definitively say that the independent variables cause changes in the dependent variables (i.e., correlation does not equal causation), researchers use theory because of extensive support from previous research on the relationship between certain independent and dependent variables (Creswell, 2015). This support comes from researchers testing a theory across multiple populations and contexts to determine whether variables continue to influence one another in expected ways. Thus, using an empirically supported theory allows results of research to be stated with greater confidence. Furthermore, research conducted in this way “represents the most rigorous form of quantitative research” (p. Creswell, 2015, 121).

Bandura’s theoretical construct of self-efficacy (1977; 1997) provides an empirically supported framework to better understand the effectiveness of teaching preparation experiences on increasing perceived confidence in teaching. Researchers have utilized this theoretical construct to not only conceptualize and understand the impact of teaching preparation on the
confidence of teachers (Olguin, 2004; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tollerud, 1990; Tschannen et al., 1998), but also their competence (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000). Broadly defined, self-efficacy is the future-oriented “belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Applied to teaching, it is confidence in one’s ability to select and utilize appropriate teaching behaviors effectively to influence student learning (Tschannen et al., 1998).

Regarding self-efficacy toward teaching and competence in teaching, Goddard et al. (2000) investigated the relationship between elementary teachers’ self-efficacy toward teaching and students’ math and reading achievement scores. The authors found that self-efficacy toward teaching significantly predicted increased reading and math achievement scores. Additionally, self-efficacy toward teaching scores accounted for more of the variability in student achievement than any other variable (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and school size).

In another study, Gibson and Dembo (1984) examined the differences between elementary school teachers with high self-efficacy toward teaching and low self-efficacy toward teaching in regard to “teacher classroom behaviors” (p. 572). Teacher classroom behaviors included time engaged in academic versus nonacademic activities and discussions, type of feedback given to students (i.e., criticism or praise), and persistence when students provided incorrect responses. Though teachers appeared to allocate similar amounts of time to academic and nonacademic activities, teachers with reported higher levels of self-efficacy toward teaching experienced greater student engagement, more on-task student behavior, provided students less criticism and more praise, displayed greater flexibility during setbacks and in-class transitions, and persisted with and “were more effective in leading students to correct responses” (p. 579). In addition to experiencing enhanced confidence and competence, those who feel efficacious
experience greater job satisfaction, reduced stress and emotional exhaustion, and longevity in their profession (Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014). Thus, a greater emphasis on teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs may promote reduced stress for new counselor educators as well as higher levels of self-efficacy toward teaching, confidence and competence in their teaching, overall job satisfaction, and longevity in the profession.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the results of this study lied in its intention to address gaps in previous literature regarding teaching preparation in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs (Tollerud, 1990 & Olguin, 2004), to provide deeper understanding of the relationship between teaching preparation guidelines required by CACREP (2016) standards and self-efficacy toward teaching, and to inform and strengthen best practices in teaching preparation within CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs. Furthermore, this study addressed “unanswered questions” pertaining to teaching preparation as addressed in a recent report by the ACES (2016) teaching taskforce entitled *Best Practices in Teaching in Counselor Education* (p. 35). Specifically, this report posed questions related to investigating the impact of teaching preparation practices on CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching and which strategies students’ perceived as most helpful in their preparation to teach.

The results of this study can also inform CES program faculty. With a better understanding of the relationship between formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching on self-efficacy toward teaching, CES doctoral programs can develop and emphasize training opportunities that most enhance students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. By emphasizing what this and other studies in the CES and higher education literature have suggested, program faculty can better focus time and resources on the suggested
training practices that optimally strengthen students’ development as teachers.

Additionally, results can inform CACREP’s standards revision process and the upcoming 2023 teaching standards. As mentioned previously, current standards do not require CES doctoral students to engage in a formal teaching internship. Although actual teaching experience is cited as the most important teacher training component for strengthening feelings of teaching preparedness (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010) and perceptions of self-efficacy toward teaching (Tollerud, 1990; Olguin, 2004), students can still leave without actual teaching experience. The results of this study also seem to affirm the relationship between increasing amounts of actual teaching experience and additionally the inclusion of weekly supervision of teaching. Because of this, it seems clear that teaching standards for the upcoming CACREP 2023 standards should include a required supervised teaching internship as a part of doctoral training programs.

Finally, the results of this study can also have a significant impact on the quality of services eventually offered by the counselors trained by new counselor educators. Counselor educators have an incredible responsibility to adequately prepare counselors in training (CITs) to provide competent mental health services to clients (Malott et al., 2014). It stands to reason that the better the teaching provided by counselor educators, the better the counseling services to be provided by their students. By identifying and implementing those training practices that most support self-efficacy toward teaching, training programs not only support the development of CES doctoral students, but also CITs and their clients.

**Purpose of this Study**

Thus, the purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between selected teaching preparation experiences offered as a component of CES doctoral programs and
self-efficacy toward teaching for CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited institutions in the United States. Specifically, this study investigated how the frequency and perceived quality of supervision of teaching; the number of courses taught or cotaught; and the number of experiences in formal instruction in college teaching are related to the variability in self-efficacy toward teaching, statistically controlling for post-master’s counseling experience and professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions and their accompanying hypotheses focused on the relationship between teaching preparation experiences (independent variables) and self-efficacy toward teaching (dependent variable).

**Research Question 1:**

Is the self-reported amount of formal instruction in college teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?

**Research Hypothesis 1:**

$H_0$: There is no significant relationship between the amount of formal instruction in college teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.

**Research Question 2:**

Is the self-reported number of courses taught or cotaught related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?
Research Hypothesis 2:

H₀: There will be no significant relationship between the number of courses taught or cotaught and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.

Research Question 3:

How do CES doctoral students with weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?

Research Hypothesis 3:

H₀: There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching.

Research Question 4:

Is the perceived quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?

Research Hypothesis 4:

H₀: There is no significant relationship between reported quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.
Research Question 5:
Is the combined and relative contribution of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?

Research Hypothesis 5:
H₀: There is no significant relationship between the combined factors of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.

Research Question 6:
How do CES doctoral students with no supervision of fieldwork in teaching and those with supervision of fieldwork in teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?

Research Hypothesis 6:
H₀: There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have or have not received supervision of teaching.
Conceptual Framework

The figure below represents the conceptual framework for this study and depicts the proposed research questions.

![Conceptual framework diagram]

**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework for the relationship between teaching preparation and self-efficacy toward teaching.

Definition of Terms

The following section provides definitions of terms used throughout this study. The terms include description of variables, target population, and important constructs.

Fieldwork in Teaching

For the purposes of this study, fieldwork in teaching refers to the experiential training component of teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs in which doctoral students engage in actual teaching responsibilities of a counselor educator (ACES, 2016). Fieldwork in teaching
is provided through coteaching, formal teaching internships, or teaching assistantships and varies in level of responsibility (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Tollerud, 1990).

**Formal Instruction in College Teaching**

For the purposes of this study, formal instruction in college teaching refers to the curricular training component of teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs designed to equip students with “foundations for teaching and learning” (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015, p. 2). Though formal instruction is provided through semester-long coursework in college teaching, seminars, and/or infused within advanced content courses, the most common way this component is offered in CES doctoral programs is through semester-long coursework (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015). The content of this formal instruction should be guided by the specific teaching standards identified by CACREP (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010).

**Minor Responsibility in Teaching**

For the purposes of this study, minor responsibility in teaching is defined as teaching experiences in which CES doctoral students have the responsibility of supporting a faculty member with development and/or delivery of a course, such as offering administrative support and/or grading.

**Primary Responsibility in Teaching**

For the purposes of this study, primary responsibility in teaching is defined as teaching experiences in which CES doctoral students have the responsibility of delivering the majority of a course, which may have been designed by a lead instructor or committee.
Self-Efficacy

For the purposes of this study, self-efficacy is a future-oriented belief or confidence that one has the ability to act effectively in a particular situation or to perform a given task (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy Toward Teaching

For the purposes of this study, self-efficacy toward teaching refers to a person’s confidence in his or her ability to select and utilize appropriate teaching behaviors effectively to achieve student learning (Settlage, Southerland, Smith & Ceglie, 2009; Tschannen et al., 1998).

Shared responsibility in Teaching

For the purposes of this study, shared responsibility in teaching is defined as teaching experiences in which CES doctoral students have approximately equal responsibility for delivery and/or development of a course.

Sole responsibility in Teaching

For the purposes of this study, sole responsibility in teaching is defined as teaching experiences in which CES doctoral students independently design and deliver all aspects of a course.

Supervision of Teaching

For the purposes of this study, supervision of teaching refers to the teaching experiences for which CES students receive oversight and guidance from a faculty member for the purpose of supporting their continued development. Supervision should involve regular meetings between an experienced faculty member and a CES doctoral student for the purpose of providing regular feedback, support, and guidance regarding the students’ teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et
Supervision of teaching may occur in the context of formal internships, coteaching experiences, or teaching assistantships.

**Teaching Preparation**

For the purposes of this study, teaching preparation refers to the curricular, experiential teaching, and supervision of teaching components of CES doctoral programs designed to prepare future counselor educators to competently fulfill their responsibilities as teachers (ACES, 2016).

**Delimitations and Assumptions of the Study**

Though previous studies have suggested the positive impact of post-master’s counseling experience (Buller, 2013; Olguin, 2004) and professional teaching experience gained prior to one’s doctoral program (Tollerud, 1990; Olguin, 2004) on self-efficacy toward teaching, the primary focus of this study was on examining the influence of teaching preparation practices in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs on self-efficacy toward teaching. Thus, the factors of post-master’s counseling experience and professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program were controlled for statistically. Additionally, only students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs were surveyed.

Finally, participation in this study was limited to doctoral students. Like Golde and Dore (2001), this researcher assumed, that the study of current doctoral students would result in a more accurate and current representation of training practices than would a retrospective study asking faculty members to report on their past teaching preparation experiences. Additionally, it was assumed that the participants in this study would be able to understand the questions and subsequently respond honestly.
Limitations

One limitation in examining teaching preparation across CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs involves variation in instructional methodology. Because programs are guided by CACREP’s teaching standards rather than by specific methods of implementing standards, there are differences in how formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork experiences, and the quality and consistency of supervision of teaching are conducted. This influenced the internal validity of the study (Creswell, 2015). This was important to keep in mind as this researcher drew conclusions regarding the influence of teaching preparation experiences on self-efficacy toward teaching.

Another potential limitation of this study was the instrument used for measuring self-efficacy toward teaching. The Self-Efficacy toward Teaching Inventory (SETI) was created to assess CES doctoral students’ and faculty’s perceived capability in teaching (Tollerud, 1990). In Tollerud’s (1990) initial study, she found the instrument possessed sufficient reliability and validity. Though many others have utilized and further supported its psychometric properties (e.g., Nugent, Bradshaw, & Kito, 1999; Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto, Yamokoski, & Meyers, 2007; Richardson & Miller, 2011), these studies were conducted in counseling psychology rather than in CES.

Organization of the Proposal

This dissertation is presented in five chapters. This chapter provided an introduction to the study, an overview of teaching preparation practices in CES, and a description of the proposed theoretical framework for conceptualizing teaching preparation in CES. This chapter also included the statement of the problem, significance and purpose of this study, research questions and hypotheses, conceptual framework, definition of terms, delimitations and
assumptions, and limitations. Chapter 2 will provide an extensive literature review to provide greater context and support for the problem and purpose of this study. Chapter 3 will provide a description of the proposed methodology to answer the research questions and hypotheses. Specifically, chapter 3 will include planned procedures for acquiring permission and access to the proposed sample, a description and operationalization of variables and associated instruments, and a plan for data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 will provide the results of the study, guided by the aforementioned research questions and hypotheses. This will include both descriptive and inferential statistics. Chapter 5 will discuss the results, implications of the results, and will conclude with ideas for future research.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2 of this proposed study provides a review of relevant literature. Specifically, this chapter will give greater context to the problem and support for the purpose of this study. It is divided into the following sections: (a) history of doctoral education and its influence on teacher preparation, (b) the changing academy, (c) teacher preparation in higher education, (d) teacher preparation in counselor education and supervision (CES), (e) summary of teacher preparation practices in higher education and CES, (f) self-efficacy and teaching, and (g) self-efficacy in higher education and counselor education.

History of Doctoral Education and Its Influence on Teacher Preparation

In 1861, the first doctorate was awarded in the United States (Golde & Walker, 2006). Originally, the doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) was recognized as a “research doctorate” (Boud & Lee, 2009, p. 2) and stood in contrast to other professional doctorates that prepare individuals for a specific practice (e.g., doctor of medicine, M.D.; doctor of jurisprudence, J.D.; or doctor of psychology, Psy.D.). Although individuals awarded the Ph.D. often served as faculty members and engaged in teaching and service to the university (Golde & Dore, 2006), this degree predominantly prepared them to competently conduct and disseminate research in order to advance knowledge and protect the integrity of his or her discipline (Boud & Lee, 2009; Golde, 2006).

In the United States, the Ph.D. was patterned after the German model of doctoral education, which placed emphasis on research (Nicholls, 2005; Nyquist, Woodford, & Rogers,
Those who adopted this model viewed universities as “a haven of pure research…where professors were free to pursue their research without hindrance or interference” (Nicholls, 2005, p. 12). In addition to the influence of this model, emphasis on research in the United States was further strengthened after World War II when generating and publishing research became increasingly important in universities (Austin & Wulff, 2004; Nyquist et al., 2004). Given the cultural and historical context of the doctorate, the focus and emphasis on research within doctoral training and universities in general is clear.

**The Changing Academy**

Even though the Ph.D. is still primarily recognized as a research doctorate and preparing doctoral students to effectively conduct research is essential for success in academia, much more than competency in research is expected of individuals who become faculty members (Austin & Wulff, 2004; Boud & Lee, 2009; Buskist, 2013; Nicholls, 2005; Nyquist et al., 2004). This is due in part to changes within society and higher education in general (Austin & Wulff, 2004; Boud & Lee, 2009). Specifically, with

The increasing diversity of students, the possibilities and challenges raised by technology-mediated instruction, and the trend toward emphasizing learning outcomes over teaching techniques all require that faculty members develop knowledge and skills as effective teachers. In short, prospective faculty members must become knowledgeable about learning processes, about how individual differences relate to learning, and about a range of teaching strategies and their relative benefits. Developing proficiency as a teacher also requires a deep understanding of one’s discipline and how novices engage with the discipline. (Austin, 2002a, p. 125)

Thus, in order to equip doctoral students for the ever-increasing demands of the academy,
Ph.D. programs must prepare students with a wider array of knowledge and skills. Despite these changes in higher education and increased expectations for faculty in regard to teaching, many have reported a ‘disconnect’ between doctoral education and the shifting needs of the academy (Austin & Wulff, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2004; Fagen & Wells, 2004). Additionally, many who train Ph.D. students continue to cling to training paradigms they experienced (Golde, 2006; Prieto & Scheel, 2008). In fact, the historical focus and preeminence of research in Ph.D. programs continues to pervade graduate training (Reneau & Reneau, 2016). This approach has adequately prepared doctoral students to conduct research (Austin, 2002a; Austin, 2002b; Golde, 2006; Golde & Dore, 2004), but inadequately prepared them for their responsibilities in teaching and providing service to the academy (Austin & Wulff, 2004; Golde, 2006; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). This is concerning given that teaching takes up a greater proportion of time than service or research, regardless of discipline (Davis et al., 2006; Golde & Dore, 2001; Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). Furthermore, teaching is asserted as the most important factor for many students pursuing a Ph.D. (Golde & Dore, 2001). Given that the majority of these students intend to enter academia (Golde & Dore, 2004; Utecht & Tullous, 2009), research and especially teaching preparation are essential for their successful transition to the professoriate. Without adequate preparation, students may fail to attain employment or meet the challenges facing higher education. Given the importance of teaching preparation specifically, and to support inclusion of certain teaching preparation practices in this proposed study, the next section of this proposal will address best practices in teaching preparation within higher education.
Teaching Preparation in Higher Education

A thorough search for literature related to teaching preparation in higher education utilized Academic Search Premier, ERIC, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, SocINDEX, and Google Scholar with the keywords teach* preparation, teach* training, graduate teaching assistant, higher education, teaching internship, teaching practicum, and doctoral. This literature search identified several articles related to teaching preparation within higher education. Articles of particular interest included those that provided a thorough description of doctoral training practices across disciplines as well as the effectiveness of those practices on teaching preparedness. Several of the identified articles are considered important works within doctoral preparation in higher education (i.e., Fagan & Wells, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2004; Wulff, Austin, Nyquist, & Sprague, 2004) as researchers continue to cite them in research across disciplines (e.g., Buskist, 2013; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Silverman, 2003). In addition to these important works, the literature search uncovered several articles related to the impact of teaching preparation practices on doctoral students’ confidence and feelings of preparedness in teaching (Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto, Yamokoski, & Meyers, 2007; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Across studies, researchers reported common ways of training doctoral students to teach. In general, teaching preparation typically included coursework, seminars, or workshops in college teaching, teaching supervision and/or mentoring, and fieldwork in teaching (i.e., teaching assistantship). The following section will describe teaching preparation practices as identified within the higher education literature and, in particular, findings related to coursework, seminars, or workshops in college teaching, teaching supervision and/or mentoring, and fieldwork in teaching.
Coursework, Seminars, and Workshops in College Teaching

In the higher education literature, equipping doctoral students with foundational knowledge for effective teaching most often occurs through coursework, seminars, and workshops in college teaching (Golde & Dore, 2004; Prieto et al., 2007; Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004; Silverman, 2003). Though expertise in the knowledge of one’s field is essential for teaching, supporting student learning requires a different set of competencies (Silverman, 2003). Andragogy, which is principally concerned with educating adults, provides a theoretical framework and set of methods by which to approach teaching and adult learning (Holton, Wilson, & Bates, 2009). Andragogy, is based upon a “constructivist approach to learning that involves facilitating adults to draw on their experience and so create new learning based on previous understandings” (Cox, 2015, p. 29). From this guiding framework, engagement and deriving meaning from learning experiences is tied to previous experiences within the life of the adult (Cox, 2105).

Additionally, Holton et al. (2009) and Yonge (1985) suggested that teachers must tailor their instructional strategies to match the developmental needs and learning goals of the adult learner (Holton et al., 2009; Yonge, 1985). This idea rests on androgogical assumptions related to the adult learner and interactions with an instructor. Namely, the adult learner “is perceived to be a mature, motivated, voluntary, and equal participant in a learning relationship with a facilitator whose role is to aid the learner in the achievement of his or her primarily self-determined learning objectives” (Rachal, 2002, p. 219). These assumptions shift focus from the traditional teacher-centered approach to a learner-centered approach (Holton et al., 2009). Specifically, teacher-centered instructors utilize lecture as the “principal mode of delivery” and hold that the transmission of knowledge is best accomplished by exposing students to content through lecture
delivered by an experienced expert to inexperienced novices (Morrison, 2014, p. 1). In contrast, instructors who use a learner-centered approach to teaching focus on empowering students to take greater responsibility for and ownership of their learning experiences (Weimer, 2013) as well as on inspiring “students to think deeply about how they might apply what they are learning” (Moate & Cox, 2015, p. 379). Ideally, then, coursework, seminars, and/or workshops in college teaching should ground future faculty in the knowledge and principles that equip them to discern how and when to implement instructional strategies to best support adult learning (Silverman, 2003).

In addition to emphasizing the importance of adopting a guiding framework for teaching, Silverman (2003) suggested several topics that this aspect of teaching preparation should optimally include. Specifically, Silverman recommended that courses should focus on adult learning and development, syllabus creation, preparing and structuring of course content, teaching methods (e.g., lecturing, facilitating discussion, group processing, using technology, purpose and use of assignments in promoting learning), assessment and grading, strategies for improving one’s teaching, and ethics regarding student-teacher relationship and academic discipline.

In a study examining the relationship between teaching preparation experiences and self-efficacy toward teaching of 149 graduate teaching assistants across multiple disciplines, Prieto et al. (2007) reported results in support of Silverman’s proposed topics. Specifically, Prieto et al. found that when faculty addressed assessment of student learning, managing student-teacher relationships, creating and structuring course materials, teaching methods, and managing academic discipline during pedagogical training, doctoral students felt “most competent in the classroom…[and] prepared the for future teaching careers” (p. 40). Though the authors reported
that this aspect of teaching preparation strengthened self-efficacy toward teaching scores in graduate teaching assistants, on average, only 23% of the respondents received training in college teaching through workshops and 8% received training through coursework.

A study investigating the relationship between doctoral teaching preparation experiences and perceived teaching preparedness of 545 junior faculty members across 16 states in eight different disciplines attained similar results (Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Though this study did not provide details regarding the content covered within respondents’ coursework in college teaching experiences, overall, junior faculty indicated that coursework during their doctoral training increased their feelings of preparedness. Specifically, results indicated a mean of 5.18 out of 7 with 1 indicating the experience was not at all effective, and 7 indicating that the experience was very effective. Despite a high mean score for this experience, almost a third of respondents indicated that coursework in college teaching was not offered in their program.

In regard to the prevalence of this aspect of teaching preparation, a national study investigating graduate program experiences of 4,114 doctoral students from 11 disciplines in 28 universities reported that only 51.2% of doctoral students have access to seminars and workshops in college teaching and 46.4% have access to a semester long course in college teaching (Golde & Dore, 2001). These results seem discouraging given the responsibility of institutions to adequately prepare doctoral students to teach as well as providing undergraduate students’ quality education (Austin, 2002a).

In an effort to address this gap between doctoral education and the actual responsibilities of the academician, the Council of Graduate Schools and the Association of American Colleges and Universities collaborated to develop the Preparing Future Faculty Program (PFF). This national program is primarily aimed at training doctoral students for their future roles and
responsibilities in teaching, research, and service across a variety of institutional types. Each doctoral student is immersed into each of these respective responsibilities while under faculty mentorship. This gives doctoral students experiences that emulate the actual roles and responsibilities of a faculty member as a part of socialization for the professoriate (Austin, 2002b, p. 95). In order to accomplish this, the PFF Programs are organized and implemented around the core concept of the “cluster,” a new form of institutional collaboration that brings the institutions that hire Ph.D.’s (“consumers”) together with the institutions that educate them (“producers”). A cluster is a formal cooperative arrangement involving doctoral degree granting universities with a range of other institutions or departments—“partners”—in a joint working relationship. Anchored by a doctoral degree granting university, cluster institutions usually include primarily undergraduate institutions such as liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, and community colleges. Experience with the different institutions in the cluster helps prospective faculty gain a broad understanding of the higher education workplace. (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004, p. 181)

In regard to coursework, seminars, and workshops in college teaching, partner universities usually require at least one course that is discipline specific. The focus of these training experiences include a variety of topics aimed at equipping students in current best teaching practices. Due to the national recognition of this program, participating in PFF has aided some in attaining employment as well as reportedly supporting the transition to the professoriate (Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, Sims, & Denecke, 2003).

Though coursework, seminars, and workshops in college teaching provide foundational knowledge for teaching, many suggested that programs should offer this component of teaching
preparation in combination with fieldwork in teaching (Golde & Dore, 2001; Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004; Silverman, 2003) and supervision of teaching (Meacham, 2002; Prieto & Scheel, 2008; Prieto et al., 2007; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). This recommendation may reflect the reported insufficiency of coursework, seminars, and workshops in college teaching alone to support the development of actual teaching skills (Meacham, 2002; Prieto et al., 2007; Silverman, 2003). The following sections will describe supervision and mentoring in teaching as well as fieldwork in teaching, two other teaching preparation practices supported by the higher education literature.

**Supervision/Mentoring of Teaching**

Another aspect of teaching preparation in higher education involves supervision and/or mentoring of teaching designed to cultivate greater knowledge and stronger teaching skills in doctoral students (Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003; Prieto, 2001; Prieto et al., 2007). Optimally, supervision of teaching should include ongoing, regularly scheduled meetings focused on providing support and feedback regarding how students can improve teaching effectiveness (Prieto & Scheel, 2008; Silverman, 2003). Additionally, within higher education, practices within supervision meetings also include opportunities for students’ self-reflection on teaching (Meacham, 2002; Wulff et al., 2004); sharing of teaching resources with students (Silverman, 2003; Reneau & Reneau, 2016); discussions regarding students’ teaching philosophies (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004; Reneau & Reneau, 2016); formative and summative assessment of students’ teaching to determine needs and monitor their growth (Wulff et al., 2004); and conversations concerning “how learning occurs in the specific field, how curricular choices are made, assumptions about the roles of learners and teachers, and how to address difficulties that arise in the classroom” (Austin, 2002b, p. 117).
Although both novice and experienced doctoral students report a preference for supervision characterized by support, friendliness, and care (Prieto et al., 2001; Wulff et al., 2004), different levels of experience are associated with different needs within the supervision context. Therefore, it is suggested that supervisors and mentors should tailor supervision based upon the doctoral students’ current teaching knowledge, skill, and experience (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004; Prieto, 2001; Prieto et al., 2007). For example, doctoral students with less experience reported a preference for concrete feedback on their teaching as well as greater direction and structure in their teaching supervision (e.g., specific readings, role-plays of teaching interventions, or directives). This provides novice teachers crucial support during the “predictable difficulties that all [teaching assistants] (and veteran teachers) inevitably face” (Prieto, 2003, para. 8). Doctoral students who possess greater confidence and skill in teaching, on the other hand, preferred a collegial or consultative approach to teaching supervision (Prieto, 1999; Prieto et al., 2007). This allows experienced doctoral students to “fine tune their teaching skills and develop a personalized approach to teaching” (Prieto, 2001, p. 115). Thus, adapting supervision to the developmental needs of the doctoral student seems essential in guiding them to increased confidence and effectiveness in teaching (Prieto, 2001).

In regard to the effectiveness of supervision/mentoring of teaching, research in higher education suggests that supervision provided by a faculty supervisor or mentor enhances doctoral students’ development as teachers (Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto et al., 2007; Fagen & Wells, 2004; Wulff et al., 2004). However, great variability exists in the prevalence, consistency, and adequacy of this teaching preparation practice. Without supervision of teaching experiences, doctoral students may lose the “opportunity to use the graduate teaching experience as a way to increase skills as a classroom teacher” (Prieto & Scheel, 2008, p. 50). Thus, supervision is
“highly advisable so as to maximize the potential for these students to be as effective as possible in their instructional duties as early as possible in their careers” (p. 50).

One poignant example of the adequacy and impact of teaching supervision is Wulff et al.’s (2004) qualitative, four-year longitudinal study of a national sample in which the lived experiences of 66 graduate teaching assistants across 22 disciplines were examined. These authors identified teaching preparation and other contextual factors that contributed to changes in students’ development as educators. Participants reported that ongoing opportunities to reflect on their teaching experiences with experienced and supportive faculty during supervision allowed them to think deeply about and develop skills in their teaching.

Although ongoing supervision by an experienced faculty member reportedly supported teaching development, some teaching assistants reported receiving mixed messages regarding the importance and relative value of teaching. For example, though many reported overt support of teaching through institutional mission statements, some received negative feedback from faculty members about spending too much time engaged in teaching responsibilities and not enough time in research. Moreover, some students received little or no supervision of their teaching. Many students interpreted the lack of oversight as an implicit message devaluing teaching and the importance of their development as teachers. Wulff et al. found that students who did not receive ongoing supportive feedback from experienced faculty members based their approaches to student learning and appropriate student/teacher relationships on previous educational experiences or students’ evaluations and/or grades. Because teaching assistants often look to their supervisors and/or mentors as models (Austin, 2002b), faculty members must model and openly discuss the value of teaching and discuss ways to balance this responsibility with research and service activities (Wulff et al., 2004).
In their national, cross-sectional study investigating the educational experiences of more than 32,000 doctoral students in 5,000 programs across 400 universities, Fagen and Wells (2004) reported similar results concerning supervision of teaching given through mentors. In general, respondents indicated that supervision proved an incredibly important experience for their development as teachers and perceived successful transition to the professoriate. Ideal mentors provided ongoing monitoring, support, and constructive feedback concerning students’ growth focused on their needs and career aspirations (Baltrinic, Gimenez Hinkle, & Moate, n.d.; Fagen & Wells, 2004). Mentors who provided supervision characterized by these components proved most helpful to students’ perceived teaching preparedness (Fagen & Wells, 2004). However, when the goals and aspirations of students conflicted with faculty mentors, doctoral students reported experiencing little support and guidance. The authors found that, if a student who is especially interested in teaching is paired with a faculty member who is primarily focused on research, the student may not receive sufficient guidance in teaching (Fagen & Wells, 2004). One student even experienced a harmful mentoring relationship stating that the mentor “does little to aid in my education. He is extremely negative, and offers absolutely no positive feedback. He has stripped me of my confidence and feelings of self” (Fagen & Wells, 2004, p. 82).

As part of their study on teaching preparation and perceived teaching preparedness, Reneau and Reneau (2016) also investigated the perceived effectiveness and prevalence of teaching supervision. Junior faculty members affirmed this factor as supporting their teaching preparedness with a mean score of 5.59 out of 7 with 1 indicating the experience was not at all effective, and 7 indicating that the experience seemed very effective. The authors also found supervision of teaching significantly related to junior faculty members’ perceived preparedness.
to teach. Despite the reported importance of respondents’ supervision of teaching experiences, they indicated this aspect of teaching preparation occurred the least often out of the more than 20 teaching preparation experiences identified. Importantly, for those who did have supervised teaching experiences, supervision was rated as higher than any other experience besides those associated with actual teaching experience (Reneau & Reneau, 2016).

Encouragingly, in a study examining the relationship between teaching preparation experiences and self-efficacy toward teaching, Prieto et al. (2007) reported that 78% of the sample received teaching supervision. Of the 78% that received supervision, “52% received individual supervision, 11% received group supervision, and 37% received a combination of both group and individual supervision” (Prieto et al., 2007, p. 36). Even though a majority of doctoral students reported supervision of their teaching experiences, only slightly more than half received it weekly and over a third received it through appointment only. Prieto et al. found that self-efficacy toward teaching scores were strengthened by supervised teaching experiences.

Again, in an effort to address this gap between doctoral education and the actual responsibilities of the academician, PFF requires doctoral students to have at least one mentor who oversees the students’ teaching (Gaff et al., 2003; Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004). Within the PFF program, mentors who are selected possess expertise in teaching and are expected to provide supportive and ongoing feedback about the students teaching performance (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004). Moreover, PFF mentors are expected to tailor supervision to the developmental needs of the student in order to foster teaching knowledge and skills.

To summarize, supervision of teaching that is offered on an ongoing basis (Golde & Dore, 2001), addresses topics to increase knowledge and skill in teaching (Austin, 2002b), and is tailored to the developmental needs of the doctoral student (Prieto et al., 2007), appeared to
strengthen the teaching confidence of doctoral students (Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto et al., 2007).

**Fieldwork in Teaching**

In higher education, fieldwork in teaching is cited as the most common teaching preparation practice and is typically offered through teaching assistantships (Buskist, 2013; Fagen & Wells, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2001; Prieto et al., 2007; Wulff et al., 2004; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Typically, responsibilities for teaching assistants include either assisting a faculty member with course responsibilities or serving as instructor of record for an undergraduate course (Buskist, 2013; Wulff et al., 2004). Assisting with course responsibilities may include delivering course content, grading, offering clerical support, or providing tutoring. Those who serve as instructor of record “assume full responsibility for all aspects of teaching a course” (Buskist, 2013, p. 333).

The prevalence of this component of training is attributed to several factors. First, across disciplines, teaching assistants “handle a large amount of undergraduate teaching on many university campuses…[and] play a large and important role in undergraduate students’ education” (Prieto et al., 2007, p. 33). In addition to serving as “a labor pool of junior instructors” (Golde & Dore, 2001, p. 21), teaching assistants also benefit from the experience as it provides an opportunity to prepare for their future teaching responsibilities (Meacham, 2002; Prieto et al., 2007; Silverman, 2003). Additionally, teaching assistantships provide an important source of funding for doctoral students (Golde & Dore, 2001). However, despite the extensive use of teaching assistantships, some students do not receive any prior coursework in college teaching or ongoing supervision of their teaching before engaging in the teaching assistantship (Fagen & Wells, 2004; Gale & Golde, 2004; Prieto et al., 2007). Additionally, some teaching
assistantships do not mimic the actual responsibilities of an educator (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004).

For example, Fagen and Wells (2004) found that 45% of students did not feel adequately prepared or trained (i.e., coursework in college teaching) to teach before their teaching assistantship experience (Fagen & Wells, 2004). Additionally, 49% percent stated that they did not receive sufficient supervision of their teaching activities. One comment captured the sentiment of many: “‘teaching assistants are thrown into teaching environments in a sink-or-swim manner. No advice, preparation, or supervision is given’” (Fagen & Wells, 2004, p. 84). Those who primarily engaged in clerical duties and grading also reported dissatisfaction with their teaching assistantship experience as it did not equip them for the full range of tasks of an educator.

Golde and Dore (2001) reported similar results. Of the 4,114 doctoral students who participated in the study, 53.6% of indicated their programs required a teaching assistantship. Additionally, in response to a question regarding teaching preparation and how doctoral students’ perceived the effectiveness of this training for preparing them to teach, 74% reported that they did not receive preparation to teach through lecture, 42% reported not receiving preparation for teaching discussion sections, and 77% reported that they had not received preparation for teaching graduate courses.

Despite these findings, engaging in actual teaching is reported as the most influential component of teaching preparation for perceived preparedness to teach (Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Prieto et al., 2007). However, it is not simply participating in a teaching assistantship, but rather how the experience is developmentally structured and supported through other training components, that supports preparedness (Golde & Dore, 2001; Fagen & Wells, 2004; Wulff et
al., 2004). Specifically, research indicates that the most important factors for fostering teaching knowledge and skill are previous training in college teaching through coursework, seminars, and/or workshops (Prieto et al., 2007), gradual increase in responsibility and autonomy in teaching through multiple supervised teaching assistants (Gaff et al., 2003; Golde & Dore, 2001; Silverman, 2003; Wulff et al., 2004), and ultimately engaging in opportunities to teach with full responsibility (Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Prieto et al., 2007; Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004).

In addition to confirming the importance of coursework in college teaching, discussed elsewhere in this proposal, research also supports the gradual increase of responsibility and independence in teaching through multiple supervised teaching experiences (Golde & Dore, 2001; Wulff et al., 2004; Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004). For example, in a national, qualitative, four-year longitudinal study examining the lived experiences of 51 doctoral-level and 15 master’s-level graduate teaching assistants, participants reported increased “confidence and comfort” in their ability to teach and impact student learning when they experienced multiple opportunities to teach, with “progressively challenging assignments, involving new and additional responsibilities over time…particularly when those responsibilities were accompanied by helpful mentoring and supervision” (Wulff et al., 2004, p. 54-55). In fact, Wulff et al. (2004) found that over time, teaching assistants demonstrated sophistication in their teaching including “appropriate relationships between teacher and student…how students learn and how teachers can facilitate this learning...teaching methods appropriate for their content...and from standing in front of the room to lecture to guiding students to gain new understandings” (p. 53). Similarly, Golde and Dore (2001) suggested that “a teaching assistantship for a term or so is not an adequate foundation for a lifetime of teaching. Like research, it is a skill best developed over
time, with guidance and practice” (p. 22). Thus, giving doctoral students multiple, developmentally structured teaching experiences allows them to gradually develop expertise in the actual skill of teaching in higher education (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004).

Ideally, increasingly independent supervised teaching opportunities should culminate in doctoral students teaching an entire course with full responsibility (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004). As doctoral students transition to teaching independently, Pruitt-Logan and Gaff (2004) as well as Silverman (2003) suggested that doctoral students should continue to have access to trusted mentors and supervisors for consultation. Independently teaching a course enhances doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching (Prieto et al., 2007) and supports self-perceived teaching preparedness (Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Prieto et al. (2007) found that, when students had full responsibility to teach a class as compared to the occasional lecture or administrative duties, their self-efficacy toward teaching significantly increased. However, the authors did not indicate which of the approximately 60 respondents who taught with full responsibility had previous teaching experience, received coursework in college teaching, or participated in ongoing supervision.

Reneau & Reneau (2016) obtained similar results. Specifically, Reneau and Reneau found that independently teaching an entire course from beginning to end, more than any other teaching preparation experience, proved most effective in increasing perceived teaching preparedness as measured by the Preparation For Teaching Scale, an instrument created by Hall (2007). Additionally, respondents also indicated that activities associated with assuming full responsibility for a course (e.g., designing a course, creating a syllabus, constructing course assignments, and grading exams or papers) also supported perceived preparedness.

In summary, fieldwork in teaching is a complex experience that should ideally include
increasingly independent supervised teaching opportunities (Golde & Dore, 2001; Wulff et al., 2004), supported through coursework, seminars, or workshops in college teaching (Silverman, 2003) and culminating in teaching independently (Pruitt-Logan & Gaff, 2004). As found in the aforementioned studies, coursework in teaching, supervision/mentoring in teaching, and actual teaching experiences are supported as best practices in teacher preparation within the wider context of higher education in general (Gaff et al., 2003; Fagen & Wells, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2001; Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Wulff et al., 2004). These findings are especially useful given the relative dearth of research focused on teaching preparation specifically within CES. The next section will focus on the CES profession, provide an historical overview of the doctorate in CES, present research findings regarding teaching preparation specifically within CES doctoral programs, and summarize best practices in teaching preparation within CES.

**History of Teaching Preparation in CES**

Many attribute the genesis of the doctorate in CES to the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 (Adkison-Bradley, 2013; Hosie & Glosff, 2001; Sweeney, 2002; West Bubenz, Brooks, & Hackney, 1995). In 1957, within the context of the space race between the United States (U.S.) and the Soviet Union (Dugger, 2016), the Soviets succeeded in launching the first ever satellite, named *Sputnik*, into orbit (Bradley & Cox, 2001). The U.S., already suspicious of the Soviet Union because of the events of the Cold War, perceived this as a threat to national defense (Bradley & Cox, 2001) and to their success in the space race (Dugger, 2016). Because of this, the U.S. government became determined to “attract and train people to work within the aerospace industry” (Dugger, 2016, 356). This resulted in the NDEA, federal legislation which provided financial support to train individuals in fields related to the aerospace industry, expand school counseling programs, and train school counselors (Bradley & Cox,
2001; Dugger, 2016). Through NDEA, the federal government “established funding for the training and hiring of school counselors, who were viewed as essential in identifying talented students and guiding them toward college majors that would prepare them for work in… science, math, technology, and foreign languages” (Dugger, 2016, p. 356). In addition to funding the training of individuals wishing to become school counselors, NDEA also provided funding for fellowships to those interested in pursuing a doctorate in counseling and funding to universities to “improve, expand, or develop programs that would train counselors” (Adkison-Bradley, 2013, p. 44). This led to an important change in counselor training in general in that it “improved counselor education programs across the country by setting training standards and by serving as the training programs for the next generation of counselor educators” (Bradley & Cox, 2001, p. 34).

The Community Mental Health Centers Act (CMHCA) of 1963 further influenced the growth of doctoral CES programs and the field of counseling in general (Adkison-Bradley, 2013). This act provided 150 million dollars for the “construction of community mental health centers” across the nation (Adkison-Bradley, 2013, p. 44). As a result, many counselors began to seek employment in community mental health and other settings outside of kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12; Adkison-Bradley, 2013; West et al., 1995). The deinstitutionalization of state mental hospitals further strengthened the expansion of counselors into these settings (Buller, 2013). Specifically, many state hospitals experienced significant budget cuts as a result of the CMHCA, forcing institutions to discharge an incredible number of patients. These patients then integrated into surrounding communities as well as community mental health centers.

The NDEA and CMHCA federal initiatives had important implications for master’s and doctoral counselor training as well as the establishment of counseling as a distinct profession.
First, as the need for competently trained counselors in clinical and school settings grew, so did the need for knowledgeable faculty members. With the growing number of counselors and counselor educators, conversations surrounding the purpose of training and the future of counseling ensued. For example, Adkison-Bradley (2013) noted that the “counseling profession had been characterized as having flexible standards and an ambiguously defined focus of practice, which, in turn, made it problematic for students to compete for jobs” (p. 44). Additionally, many counselor educators at that time “referred to themselves as counseling psychologists” (p. 44). In order to distinguish counseling from psychology and further legitimize the field, efforts were made to establish licensure specifically for counselors as well to develop standards for doctoral counselor education.

In 1978, ACES drafted the first counseling doctoral standards (ACES Guidelines For Doctoral Preparation in Counselor Education [ACES Guidelines], 1978). These standards provided guidelines for training students in counselor education doctoral programs across the nation (Adkison-Bradley, 2013; Buller, 2013). This document also identified the three core areas of required training for doctoral students as (a) individual and group counseling, (b) consultation, and (c) research. Though the document suggested other areas of development, none were required (ACES Guidelines, 1978). Additionally, no mandate for teaching preparation was included in this first set of guidelines.

In 1981, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) was founded and served as the national accreditation body for master’s-level counseling and doctoral-level counselor education programs (Adkison-Bradley, 2013). The founding of this organization represented an important step in further legitimizing the counseling profession and differentiating it from psychology. Upon its inception, CACREP adopted the
ACES Guidelines as its standards. CACREP’s first revision of these standards took place in 1988. In this revision, CACREP amended the title of the doctoral program from ‘counselor education’ to ‘counselor education and supervision.’ The change in name reflected the new, explicit requirement that doctoral students should be trained in the theory and practice of counseling supervision (CACREP, 1988, p. 66). Although these revised standards required advanced training in research and supervision and counseling, they still did not require that CES students receive any training in the theory and practice of teaching.

Six years later, CACREP produced its second revision of standards and, for the first time, explicitly required that CES students receive training in the theory and practice of teaching (CACREP, 1994). Specifically, the 1994 standards required that doctoral programs provide students with “instructional theory and methods relevant to counselor education” as well as opportunities to “collaborate with program faculty in teaching” (CACREP, 1994, p. 63). The mandate for teaching preparation in this revision marked a significant milestone in CES doctoral programs in that it obligated “program faculty to examine their own craft as teachers as well as require[ed] them to design curricular experiences that enable doctoral students to become thoughtful, well-prepared instructors” (West et al., 1995, p. 175).

The next revision of standards (CACREP, 2001) added one additional teaching preparation standard to those included in the 1994 standards. Specifically, the 2001 standards also included a mandate for training CES doctoral students in culturally sensitive pedagogy (CACREP, 2001, p. 57).

Eight years later, CACREP developed the fourth revision of their standards. The CACREP 2009 standards provided even greater specificity regarding CES doctoral training by expanding requirements and introducing doctoral learning outcomes for five core areas. Rather
than providing a general standard regarding training in each core area, CACREP mandated programs to provide evidence for how curricular and other training experiences fostered knowledge and skills in teaching, counseling, supervision, research and scholarship, and leadership and advocacy.

Like the 2009 standards, current CES doctoral standards state that CACREP programs are to prepare students to become competent teachers, clinicians, researchers and scholars, leaders and advocates, and supervisors in both clinical and academic settings (CACREP, 2016). The 2016 standards also require programs to demonstrate how they prepare students in each of the five core areas through curricular experiences. Similar to the 2009 standards, programs are required to document how key performance indicators (KPIs) is addressed in training. For example, the 2016 CACREP KPIs related to teaching consist of:

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, 2016, pp. 34-35)

Despite the increased attention to and recognized importance of teaching preparation in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, the standards do not prescribe any standardized
methods for how programs are to deliver the content or measure student mastery of it. This gives latitude to institutions to tailor programs to faculty strengths as well as the purpose and vision of the program faculty. This flexibility also allows programs to create emphases and specializations within the program to make them unique. On the other hand, this ambiguity within standards can make it difficult for educators to develop appropriate curricula and training experiences to generate knowledge and skill in teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Gibson, 2012).

Additionally, this freedom in how programs implement standards has had the unintended consequence of leaving some with insufficient training in teaching (ACES, 2016; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2006). For example, in addition to specifying content standards for each of the doctoral core areas, CACREP also requires a 600-hour internship as part of CES doctoral students’ training. However, because CACREP requires doctoral students to engage in only three of the five professional core areas during their internship, doctoral students can and have finished their program without any actual teaching experience (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; CACREP, 2016, p. 37). Without an opportunity to engage in and reflect on actual teaching experience, doctoral students may lack confidence and competence to teach (Orr et al., 2008).

In a report from first and second-year faculty members who graduated from CES doctoral programs, some indicated that they were not provided the experiences or the educational opportunities to feel competent as educators (Magnuson et al., 2004). Others have also reported a lack of androgogical training and preparation for their future teaching responsibilities (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). Hunt and Gilmore (2011) could not locate any research related to how doctoral students’ androgogical training met CACREP standards (p. 145). Similarly, Barrio-Minton et al. (2013) located only five articles out of 230 pertaining to teaching preparation in CES doctoral
programs in their 10-year content analysis “of all peer-reviewed articles regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning…published by ACA and its divisions from January 2001 through December 2010” (p. 153). Of the five articles identified, only one (Orr et al., 2008) proposed a model for preparing students to teach. Since Barrio-Minton et al.’s (2013) content analysis of publications between 2001 and 2010, only a few peer-reviewed articles specifically addressing teaching training for doctoral students have been published (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). This gap in the literature confirms the need for more research on effective teaching preparation practices for CES doctoral students. An explanation of teaching preparation in CES and the specific methods for acquiring literature in this regard are addressed in the next section.

Another potential consequence of inadequately preparing CES doctoral students as teachers is the potential negative impact on the knowledge and skill development of counselors in training (CITs) for whom they serve as instructors (Barrio-Minton & Gibson, 2012; Malott et al., 2014). In examining training practices for CITs within their 10-year content analysis, Barrio-Minton et al. (2013) only located 34 articles out of 230 that “were clearly grounded in learning theory or instructional research” (p. 170). If this research is any reflection of CES doctoral students’ teaching preparation, then many doctoral students do not receive evidenced-based training in teaching. Thus, teaching is likely grounded in “previous educational experiences, tradition, the opinion of experienced practitioners, ideology, faddism, marketing, politics, or personal experience gained through trial and error” which may or may not foster learning in CITs (Groccia & Buskist, 2011, p. 5). This, along with inconsistent training practices among some CES doctoral programs (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011), could lead future faculty members to engage in teaching practices that do not adequately support learning
by CITs (Malott et al., 2014). Furthermore, if CITs are not given the tools they need to provide competent counseling services, they may struggle to find employment, may provide poor patient care, or may feel incompetent in their jobs (Malott et al., 2014). Thus, the consequences of inadequate teaching preparation may not only adversely affect CES doctoral students, but also CITs and the clients whom they will serve. This affirms the need for “rigor in teaching about teaching” (Barrio-Minton et al., 2013, p. 162).

Finally, a lack of preparation in teaching has also led to difficulty in transitioning to the professoriate (Magnuson et al., 2004). Within counselor education, many hiring committees require evidence of teaching competency (Warnke, Bethany, & Hedstrom, 1999). Additionally, some CES programs hiring new counselor educators will place greater emphasis on teaching, with less time devoted to service and scholarship activities (Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, & Hill, 2006). In these institutions that require greater teaching responsibilities, knowledge about and skill in teaching are essential for new faculty members to possess upon arrival (Silverman, 2003). Furthermore, Silverman (2003) notes that increased focus on teaching preparation could have the secondary effect of increasing time for other responsibilities of the academician. Specifically, when CES doctoral students receive adequate preparation in teaching, they may find more time to engage in research and service responsibilities. Thus, adequately preparing doctoral students to teach may help to buffer against occupational stress related to poor teaching preparation as well as support a successful transition to the professoriate. In light of this, it is crucial that CES doctoral programs provide their doctoral students opportunities to develop their confidence and competence as teachers. The following section will provide a description of doctoral teaching preparation practices in CES, and the influence of these practices on the students.
Teaching Preparation Practices in CES

In order to locate literature related to teaching preparation in CES, this researcher searched ERIC, PsycARTICLES, PsycINFO, SocINDEX, and Google Scholar using the keywords teach*, preparation, coteach*, team teach*, counselor education, pedagogy, collaborative teaching, teaching internship, teaching practicum, and doctoral. Additionally, this researcher contacted authors who currently publish on this topic to locate additional resources not in print. Though this literature search identified several articles related to teacher preparation in the wider context of education and higher education, few articles specifically addressed teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs.

Of the resources that specifically addressed teacher preparation practices in CES doctoral programs, most utilized descriptive or qualitative research methods (i.e., Baltrinic, 2014; Baltrinic et al., n.d.; Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008). Baltrinic (2014) utilized qualitative methods in his dissertation addressing the coteaching experiences of CES doctoral students. A subsequent article was published using the same data from that dissertation study (Baltrinic et al., 2016). A more recent qualitative study by Baltrinic, not yet published, investigates the role of mentoring in supporting teaching training in CES doctoral students (Baltrinic et al., n.d.). Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) conducted a descriptive study to determine current teaching preparation practices and their relation to CACREP 2016 standards. Hunt and Gilmore (2011) used qualitative methodology to investigate the frequency and reported experiences of CES doctoral students in their teaching internships and coursework in college teaching. The final qualitative study offered a specific model, called collaborative teaching teams (CTT), for preparing future faculty members to teach (Orr et al., 2008).
The literature search for this study yielded only four quantitative studies. These studies examined the influence of teaching preparation on CES doctoral students’ perceived self-efficacy toward teaching (Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990) and perceived preparedness for their responsibilities as educators (Hall, 2007; Hall & Hulse-Killacaky, 2010). Olguin (2004) and Tollerud (1990) examined the relationship between doctoral teaching preparation experiences (e.g., teaching experience and coursework in teaching) and self-efficacy toward teaching. As part of her dissertation, Hall (2007) developed an instrument, Preparation For Teaching Scale, to investigate the relationships between doctoral teacher training experiences and overall feelings of teaching preparedness of counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs. Hall based her research on a conceptual model from the works of Meacham (2002) and Lanning (1990). Three years later, Hall and Hulse-Killacaky (2010) re-analyzed the Hall (2007) data to examine the relationship between teaching preparation experiences and perceived preparedness for participants’ current responsibilities as counselor educators. This literature search found no quantitative research on this topic since the publication of Hall and Hulse-Killacaky.

Across studies, several common ways of preparing doctoral students to teach were identified. In general, preparation typically included formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching. The following section will address the aforementioned studies that specifically address teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs. Emphasis will be given to findings related to formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching.

**Formal Instruction in College Teaching**

Though preparation practices vary across institution, most CES doctoral programs require at least one formal course in college teaching (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall, 2007; Hunt &
Gilmore, 2011; Tollerud, 1990). Though training in college teaching is most commonly provided through a semester-long course (ACES, 2016), some programs also reportedly use seminars (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Tollerud, 1990). Programs may also infuse teaching preparation into advanced content courses in which doctoral students develop lesson plans, assignments, and activities for master’s courses as well as deliver content. Despite the widespread use of formal instruction in teaching, in general, research in CES indicated that this training component has not proved helpful in strengthening teaching preparedness (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011, Olguín, 2004, Tollerud, 1990).

For example, in Hunt and Gilmore’s (2011) qualitative study investigating the types, prevalence, and perceived effectiveness of teaching preparation practices in all CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, doctoral students reported that though there were helpful aspects of their college teaching course, most found the course unhelpful. Students identified poor course texts and too few opportunities to engage in actual teaching as particularly unhelpful aspects of the course.

Overall, quantitative research in CES also indicated that formal instruction in college teaching neither strengthened perceived preparedness for the teaching (Hall, 2007; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010), nor increased CES students’ perceived self-efficacy toward teaching (Olguín, 2004; Tollerud, 1990). In fact, in the Hall and Hulse-Kilacky (2010) study examining the relationship between counselor education faculty members’ doctoral teaching preparation and perceived preparedness to teach, respondents gave coursework in college teaching a mean score of 1.34 out of 7 for enhancing teaching preparedness with 1 indicating the experience was “not at all effective,” and 7 indicating that the experience was “very effective” (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010, p. 5). When asked how to improve this experience, respondents indicated that courses
could better prepare doctoral students to teach if they were “more practical…more in-depth and concentrated, and [focused on] talking about the role of instructor, grading, assessing goals and objective, creating assignments, and engaging adult learners” (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010, p. 7). Like Hunt and Gilmore (2011), this feedback indicates that respondents would have preferred coursework focused on the actual responsibilities of teaching.

Tollerud (1990) also found little support for the effectiveness of formal instruction in college teaching. Tollerud’s study investigated the relationship between descriptive variables, variables related to doctoral-level teaching preparation, and teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program on self-efficacy toward teaching. Respondents included CES doctoral students and junior faculty members in CACREP-accredited programs. In order to measure self-efficacy toward teaching, the author developed the Self-efficacy Toward Teaching Inventory (SETI), a 35-item self-report measure in which participants indicated their confidence to implement specific teaching skills and behaviors in five teaching domains: (a) course preparation, (b) instructor behavior, (c) materials, (d) evaluation and examination, and (e) clinical skills training. Regarding factors contributing to higher levels of confidence, Tollerud found that increased number of courses, seminars, and/or individual meetings with program faculty concerning college teaching neither significantly strengthened nor diminished SETI scores. Thus, regardless of the amount or type of formal instruction in college teaching training, perceived confidence in teaching did not significantly change.

Results from Olguin’s (2004) study also coalesce with the findings of Hall (2007), Hall and Hulse-Killacky (2010), and Tollerud (1990). Olguin (2004) investigated how teaching experience gained prior to and during one’s doctoral program, doctoral-level teaching training, and counseling experience of CES doctoral students from CACREP-accredited programs related
to self-efficacy toward teaching. To measure self-efficacy toward teaching, Olguin developed the Teaching Appraisal for Counselor Educators (TACE), a 35-item self-report measure in which participants indicate their confidence to implement specific teaching skills and behaviors across five factors: (a) classroom competency, (b) professional competency, (c) intrapersonal competency, (d) student competency, and (e) interpersonal competency. Concerning formal instruction in college teaching, Olguin found no significant difference in TACE scores between respondents with no coursework or seminar in college teaching, counselor education specific coursework or seminars in college teaching, and general coursework or seminars in college teaching. Though Olguin did not inquire about the content of these courses, these findings again demonstrate the insufficiency of relying upon formal instructional experiences for bolstering doctoral students’ self-efficacy in teaching.

In regard to the type and prevalence of this training component, eight out of nine program liaisons in the Hunt and Gilmore (2011) study indicated that their programs required students to take coursework in college teaching. Of those who required this experience, approximately half offered it within the department and half offered it outside the department. Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) reported similar findings regarding the prevalence of this teacher training experience. In their national descriptive study examining reported teaching preparation practices in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, Barrio-Minton and Price found that of the 29 doctoral programs that responded, 97% of programs required coursework in teaching. Of those who required coursework, 93% of programs offered the course within the CES. The remaining 4% of programs offered the course outside the department. Though a majority of programs reportedly required students to take coursework, the authors discovered some inconsistencies
between reported teaching preparation practices and the actual experiences as identified in the content of the syllabi.

As evidenced from the aforementioned studies, formal instruction in college teaching is a widely utilized form of teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs. Overall, research suggested that coursework does not sufficiently prepare doctoral students to teach (Hall, 2007; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990). These studies demonstrated that coursework alone may prove insufficient for preparing CES doctoral students for their future responsibilities as educators. In order to strengthen the usefulness of formal instruction in college teaching, Tollerud (1990) and Hunt and Gilmore (2011) suggested that programs should consider combining coursework with actual teaching experience. In addition, Tollerud also suggested that programs give greater attention to tailoring these courses to support the fieldwork in teaching experience. The next section will present research findings regarding the prevalence and effectiveness of fieldwork in teaching for preparing doctoral students to teach.

**Fieldwork in Teaching**

Fieldwork in teaching refers to the experiential training component of teaching preparation in CES doctoral programs in which doctoral students engage in actual teaching responsibilities of a counselor educator (ACES, 2016). Research in CES suggests fieldwork most often occurs through coteaching opportunities, formal teaching internships, or teaching assistantships (ACES, 2016). CES doctoral students may also independently teach undergraduate or graduate courses (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). Coteaching or teaching assistantships may or may not take place during a teaching internship experience (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008). Additionally, CES doctoral students who teach an undergraduate or graduate course independently, coteach, or participate in teaching assistantships...
may or may not receive supervision of their teaching (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008). Though one might assume supervision occurs within teaching assistantships or coteaching experiences, faculty members may or may not provide post-classroom guidance, feedback, or support (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008). This section will provide an overview of research in CES regarding the prevalence, types, and effectiveness of this component of teaching preparation.

**Prevalence of fieldwork.**

The research in CES consistently affirms the effectiveness of fieldwork in teaching for preparing students for their responsibilities as counselor educators (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008; Tollerud, 1990). However, the types and consistency of this component of teaching preparation in CES varies greatly across institutions (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). In fact, some doctoral students do not complete any fieldwork in teaching during their doctoral program (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall, 2007; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2010). Specifically, Hall and Hulse-Killacky (2010) reported that 46.7% of respondents did not have fieldwork in teaching experience during their doctoral program. Similarly, Tollerud (1990) found that 44% of respondents (doctoral students and junior faculty members) did not receive any teaching experience during their graduate program. In a recent study, Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) stated that 14% of CES doctoral programs did not require any fieldwork in teaching. This is discouraging, given the reported connection between increased opportunities for actual teaching experience and CES students’ perceived preparedness for this important faculty role (e.g., Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore; Tollerud, 1990).
Types of fieldwork.

As mentioned previously, fieldwork in teaching is most offered through coteaching, formal teaching internships, and teaching assistantships. The following paragraphs will describe relevant research within each type of fieldwork experience.

Coteaching.

According to Baltrinic et al.’s. (2016) phenomenological study, coteaching is the process of pairing an experienced faculty member with a doctoral student for the purpose of increasing his or her knowledge and skill in teaching through supervised teaching experiences. General themes generated from participant responses included: the primacy of a strong and caring relationship between coteachers; intentionality in structuring the coteaching experience; and the importance of tailoring teaching experiences developmentally through a gradual increase in the amount and complexity of teaching responsibilities. Overall, Baltrinic et al. (2016) found that consistent supervision (e.g., one hour a week) while CES students engage in actual teaching experiences allowed doctoral students to gain “increased confidence and competence in their teaching” (p. 42). Furthermore, Baltrinic et al. also suggested that the lack of consistent teaching supervision may greatly discourage or hinder doctoral students’ growth as teachers, as could prematurely requiring CES doctoral students without previous teaching experience to take full responsibility for a course. These findings highlight the importance of providing doctoral students with progressively demanding experiences to support their development of greater teaching skill, confidence, and autonomy over time.

Collaborative teaching teams (CTT; Orr et al., 2008) represent one formal coteaching model described in the CES literature. Orr et al. (2008) found that coursework and fieldwork in teaching did not adequately prepare CES doctoral students for their future jobs as educators. In
response to this, Orr and Hulse-Killacky created CTT, an approach to coteaching which incorporates student self-reflection, direct feedback regarding classroom management, creating a syllabus, engaging in evaluation of student learning, facilitating classroom discussion, refinement of teaching philosophy, delivering course content, and structured weekly supervision and mentoring from an experienced faculty member. In general, doctoral students who participated in the model reported that the gradual increase in course responsibilities (i.e., moving from observation of faculty member teaching to presenting on selected topics, and finally taking the lead role in teaching a master’s-level course) while undergoing weekly, structured supervision proved most helpful in increasing their “confidence and competence” in teaching (Orr et al., 2008, p. 159).

To support doctoral students as they prepare to take the lead role in teaching a course, the authors suggested that the faculty supervisor provide students with

Materials and resources for designing the chosen course. These resources may include previous course syllabi, texts and other course reading assignments, tests from previous classes, class lecture notes, and sample assignments. Additionally, the lead instructor is provided materials that describe the rationale for constructing a particular course, general goals and objectives for the course, a statement of the faculty supervisor’s teaching philosophy, and a description of context for the course within the overall counseling program curriculum. (Orr et al., 2008, p. 150)

Though faculty supervisors are not necessarily responsible for delivering course content in courses for which doctoral students are serving as lead instructors, Orr et al. recommend that they attend every class and function as a “resource for the lead instructor” (Orr et al., 2008, p. 152). In this way, the doctoral student has support if issues arise and live supervision of his or
her teaching both in and out of the classroom. Doctoral students who participated in CTT expressed an appreciation for how closely the experience resembled the actual responsibilities they would face as future faculty members.

**Teaching internship.**

Another type of fieldwork experience in teaching addressed by in the CES literature is the teaching internship (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). Teaching internship experiences are often required as a part of CES doctoral coursework. Although they may or may not be credit-bearing, these teaching internships are often mandatory graduation requirements. As stated previously, however, CACREP neither requires that CES doctoral students complete teaching internships nor prescribes a certain model for this component of training (CACREP, 2016). Thus, CES programs have autonomy to determine how to meet the CACREP standards and whether to require formal instruction in college teaching and/or internships in teaching. However, CES programs choosing to require teaching internships must demonstrate adherence to CACREP requirements that interns receive an average of at least one-hour of individual or triadic supervision and “regular” group supervision during the internship experience (p. 37).

**Teaching assistantships.**

Finally, some CES doctoral students also acquire teaching experience through teaching assistantships (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008). Unlike teaching internships (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011) and the coteaching experience as described by Baltrinic et al. (2016) and Orr et al. (2008), teaching assistantships may or not involve consistent supervision and are not necessarily intended to aid the CES doctoral student in the development of knowledge and skills in teaching (Orr et al., 2008). Instead, some teaching assistantships place emphasis on meeting the needs of the instructor of record (Orr et al., 2008).
As such, many teaching assistants do not have the same responsibilities or oversight as they would in a coteaching or teaching internship experience, and this could limit their overall preparedness to teach (Buller, 2013; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008). To illustrate, Hall and Hulse-Killacky (2010) found that, although doctoral students reported that providing the “occasional lecture” as a teaching assistant was helpful, “it is clear that more teaching experience allowed participants to feel more prepared overall for teaching, [and] that the experience of teaching an entire course, rather than single presentations, is key” (p. 7). For those students without previous experience in teaching, Hunt and Gilmore (2011) and Baltrinic et al. (2016) caution against throwing doctoral students into a classroom without any support. Without adequate support, students may lack the ability to utilize the experience to increase their effectiveness as teachers.

**Effectiveness of fieldwork in teaching.**

In regard to the effectiveness of fieldwork experiences in teaching, research suggests that fieldwork enhances feelings of preparedness (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011) as well as self-efficacy toward teaching (Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990). Hall and Hulse-Killacky found that, of all the teaching preparation experiences of counselor education faculty members, experiences associated with fieldwork in teaching (i.e., teaching a course from beginning to end, engaging in a teaching practicum, designing a course, creating a syllabus, preparing course assignments, grading written assignments) received the highest mean scores. All of the aforementioned experiences were also significantly related to self-perceptions of teaching preparedness.

According to Hunt and Gilmore’s (2011) study, doctoral students who engaged in teaching internships found participation in the actual teaching responsibilities required of a
counselor educator, while receiving constructive feedback from peers and professors during their teaching internship, most helpful for increasing their confidence to teach independently (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). In addition, doctoral students also noted the importance of engaging in multiple teaching opportunities across a variety of master’s-level courses for strengthening their feelings of preparedness.

In Tollerud’s (1990) study, results indicated a significant relationship between increased opportunities to engage in actual teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching. The author grouped participant responses according to the number of graduate courses taught (no courses taught, one to two, three to four, and five or more). Interestingly, mean self-efficacy toward teaching scores proved higher for those with no teaching experience than for those who had taught one to two courses. Respondents’ mean scores increased again after they taught three to four courses and were significantly higher once accruing five or more graduate teaching experiences. Tollerud (1990) suggested that the greater self-efficacy toward teaching mean for those with no experience might be due to a lack of awareness “of what skills they actually lack for effective teaching” (p. 138). With little experience (one to two courses), respondents became more aware of deficiencies, reducing perceived efficacy. Then, with three or more graduate courses, respondents began to develop realistic appraisals of their ability to effectively perform teaching tasks.

Although Olguin (2004) found no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores regardless of students’ teaching assistant experiences, the author achieved similar mean difference patterns to that of Tollerud. Specifically, the author discovered higher mean scores for those with no teaching experience than for those who taught one to two courses. Scores then improved again after students taught three to four courses and increased again after accruing five
or more graduate teaching experiences. Though Olguin did not identify significant differences between groups, it is important to note the overall increase in mean scores with more fieldwork in teaching experiences.

Though many report the importance of fieldwork in teaching for preparing CES doctoral students to teach, little is known about the extent to which this experience, especially in combination with other aspects of teaching preparation, enhances students’ confidence to teach. Specifically, understanding the impact of fieldwork in teaching along with formal instruction in college teaching and supervision of teaching provided a clearer picture for how to adequately prepare students for their future responsibilities as educators.

Although the research findings presented in this section clearly support the positive impact of fieldwork in teaching, the relative importance of the actual teaching experience versus faculty supervision and mentoring of those engaged in fieldwork are confounded. Numerous studies suggested that it was the consistent supervision of teaching that proved especially helpful about these experiences (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008). This provides justification for the use of teaching supervision as a separate variable in this proposed study. The next section will describe supervision, its prevalence, and its effectiveness as a strategy for training CES doctoral students to teach.

**Supervision of Teaching**

A third and distinct element of preparing CES students as teachers involves the supervision of their teaching experiences during their doctoral program. The purpose of teaching supervision is to “advance the student’s knowledge and skills” in teaching (CACREP, 2016, p. 37). In order to accomplish this purpose, supervision meetings include, but are not limited to, opportunities to discuss the student’s teaching statement/philosophy (Hall & Hulse-Killacky,
2010), content delivery (Orr et al., 2008), and instructional decisions (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008) as well as to share teaching resources (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008) and provide constructive feedback and opportunities for self-reflection (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore; 2011; Orr et al., 2008).

**Prevalence of supervision.**

In regard to the frequency of teaching supervision, the 2016 CACREP standards require that individuals engaged in a teaching internship receive “an average of one hour per week of individual and/or triadic supervision…[and] group supervision…on a regular schedule with other students throughout the internship” (CACREP, 2016, p. 37). Orr et al.’s (2008) CTT model meets this standard by requiring students and faculty members to engage in weekly structured supervision.

For those engaged in fieldwork experiences in teaching outside of an internship or CTT (e.g., coteaching, teaching internship, or independently teaching), the frequency and structure of supervision of teaching varies (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). In fact, some studies and reports have confirmed that not all students engaging in fieldwork in teaching receive supervision (ACES, 2016; Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hall, 2007). Though ACES (2016) and Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) simply state that not all students receive teaching supervision, Hall (2007) provided quantitative data regarding the prevalence of supervision for doctoral students engaged in fieldwork in teaching experiences. On average, participants in this study reported a frequency of teaching a course while under supervision a 3.12, with 1 indicating respondents “never” receiving supervision and 7 indicating “very frequently” receiving supervision (Hall, 2007, p. 33).
Effectiveness of supervision.

Research in CES suggests that supervision of fieldwork experiences in teaching is essential to strengthening doctoral students’ teaching confidence and competence (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008, Hunt & Gilmore, 2010) and for significantly strengthening the feelings of preparedness to teach (Hall, 2007; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010). More specifically, weekly structured supervision of teaching sessions with caring and competent teachers who tailored supervision to the developmental needs of the doctoral student best supported perceptions of confidence and competence (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008, Hunt and Gilmore, 2010). Hall and Hulse-Killacky (2010) found that respondents perceived supervision of teaching as more helpful on average than any other teaching preparation experience besides teaching an “entire course from start to finish” and creating a course syllabus (p. 5).

Despite clear findings supporting the positive impact of supervision of fieldwork in teaching, this literature search identified no studies investigating the types or quality of supervision on perceived teaching capability (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hunt & Gilmore; 2011; Orr et al., 2008). Given the importance of teaching supervision, further understanding of the extent to which the frequency and quality of teaching supervision enhances teaching confidence seemed essential.

Other Factors Influencing Self-efficacy Toward Teaching

In addition to formal instruction in teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of fieldwork experiences in teaching, CES research has also documented the impact of post-master’s counseling experience and professional teaching experience gained prior to one’s doctoral training on self-efficacy toward teaching. Specifically, Olguin (2004) suggested that confidence in one’s counseling abilities can influence self-efficacy toward teaching of CES
doctoral students. Similarly, Buller (2013) found that counselor educators recognized as excellent teachers attributed previous counseling experience as greatly contributing to their perceived excellence in teaching. Likewise, Buller (2013) and Tollerud (1990) suggested that professional teaching experience prior to one’s doctoral program can influence the level of self-efficacy toward teaching of graduate students.

Because post-master’s counseling and prior professional teaching experiences may be confounding variables in this study’s examination of the relationship between teaching preparation practices and self-efficacy toward teaching, the data analysis procedures will statistically control for the influence of post-master’s counseling and professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program on self-efficacy toward teaching.

**Summary of Teaching Preparation Experiences in Higher Education and CES**

As evidenced by the literature reviewed thus far in this proposal, there is considerable overlap between teaching preparation practices in higher education and CES. Therefore, this section will describe the overarching themes that emerged out of both bodies of literature.

A thorough literature search revealed several common themes in the higher education and CES literature about how to best prepare doctoral students to teach. Identifying common themes within the literature serves several purposes. First, it helps to establish best practices in teaching preparation. As stated previously, the use of empirically-supported training practices is important for strengthening teaching competence and confidence in CES doctoral students (Baltrinic et al., 2015; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011, Orr et al., 2008). Additionally, when CES doctoral students receive effectual training, they are more likely to engage in teaching practices that foster the knowledge acquisition and skill development CITs need to provide competent counseling services (Malott et al., 2014). Finally, identifying key training practices in the higher education
and CES literature provides support for the use of these variables in this proposed study.

**Formal Instruction in College Teaching**

The first theme evident in the literature is the requirement of instruction in college teaching. Many graduate programs, regardless of discipline, partly prepare doctoral students for teaching through some type of college teaching course (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Golde & Dore, 2001; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Silverman, 2003). Though formal coursework and other forms of instruction are pervasive, the reported effectiveness and empirical support of coursework and training varies greatly. In CES, this component of teaching preparation is generally not supported for increasing students’ teaching preparedness (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011, Olguin, 2004, Tollerud, 1990). Though research in CES has yet to yield results demonstrating the effectiveness of this training component, the ACES (2016) *Best Practices in Teaching in Counselor Education*, noted that:

> The implications for the field of counselor education and supervision is clear: a stand-alone class on instructional theory and pedagogy is essential to the development of competent and intentional counselor educators and supervisors…Without such a class the only theoretical background a student of counselor education has to conceptualize their teaching against are counseling theories. Though parallels may exist, and some concepts transferable [sic], the act and process of counseling is not the same as the act and process of teaching. (ACES, 2016, p. 60)

Those in higher education have identified different results. Reneau and Reneau (2016) reported high mean scores regarding the importance of coursework in college teaching. Silverman (2003) stated that formal coursework provides doctoral students foundational knowledge for effective teaching. Additionally, Silverman reported that students who lack a
background in learning theory, models of adult learning, course design, or instructional delivery may enter academia ill-prepared for their responsibilities as teachers.

Though research in higher education has yielded much empirical support for the use of formal instruction in college teaching, research in CES has yet to reveal a significant influence of this practice on self-efficacy toward teaching (Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990) or feelings of preparedness in teaching (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010). Despite a lack of empirical support, this aspect of training is offered more often than fieldwork experiences in teaching (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015). Furthermore, numerous studies have determined that a course in college teaching alone is insufficient for preparing future faculty members (Fagen & Wells, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2001; Hall, 2007; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990). Silverman (2003), Prieto et al. (2007), Tollerud (1990), and Hunt and Gilmore (2011) suggested that teaching preparation should optimally combine formal coursework with actual teaching experience.

**Fieldwork in Teaching**

The next important theme that emerged from the CES and higher education literature is the value of fieldwork experiences in teaching for doctoral students (e.g., Baltrinic et al., 2016; Gaff et al., 2003; Golde & Dore, 2001; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2010; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Across studies, respondents cited actual teaching experiences as the most influential training component for supporting confidence in their teaching (e.g., Hall, 2007; Hunt & Gilmore, 2010; Prieto et al., 2007; Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Wulff et al., 2004).

There are several important caveats to these findings. First, many authors suggested that students have multiple opportunities to teach or coteach an entire course (Austin 2002b; Baltrinic
et al., 2016; Golde & Dore, 2001; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Rather than providing the occasional lecture or primarily attending to administrative duties (e.g., grading, photocopying materials, etc.), many emphasized the importance of experiences related to the full range of responsibilities of an educator (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008; Prieto et al., 2007; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Responsibilities cited as important included selecting text books, crafting syllabi, developing assessments to measure learning, developing and delivering content, managing student discipline, and grading (Golde & Dore, 2001; Orr et al., 2008). These recommendations for the structuring of fieldwork experiences in teaching are important given the incredible variation in this aspect of training (e.g., Golde & Dore, 2001; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008).

Another important caveat to fieldwork in teaching is the importance of giving doctoral students progressively greater responsibility and autonomy within the teaching role while under supervision (Golde & Dore, 2001; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008; Reneau & Reneau, 2016; Wulff et al., 2004). Doctoral students in higher education are used extensively to teach undergraduate courses (Buskist, 2013; Prieto et al., 2007). Unfortunately, some do not receive any coursework, training, or supervision before independently teaching their first course. CES doctoral students also independently teach undergraduate and graduate courses (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). However, it is unclear from CES research how many of these doctoral students who teach independently receive previous formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork experience, or supervision of teaching before taking on full-responsibility for a course (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015). Hall (2007) and Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) reported that some students do not receive any teaching supervision, formal coursework, or fieldwork experience in their programs. This may leave some students without any teaching preparation before
transitioning to the professoriate.

The practice of giving students complete responsibility for teaching a course without any previous teaching experience or supervision is not effective for increasing CES doctoral students’ confidence and competence to teach (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2008). Conversely, research supports the practice of giving students an opportunity to develop and refine teaching skills while under the guidance of an experienced faculty member (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Fagen & Wells, 2004; Gaff et al., 2003; Orr et al., 2008). For example, Baltrinic et al. (2016) emphasizes the use of coteaching as a medium to give support and gradually increase teaching responsibilities. According to this study, as doctoral students’ confidence and competence in teaching increases, they require less guidance from the faculty member and greater responsibility in teaching tasks.

**Supervision of Teaching**

A final theme that emerged from the CES and higher education literature is the importance of the supervision of teaching (Fagen & Wells, 2004; Golde & Dore, 2001; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Orr et al., 2008; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). When faculty supervisors demonstrate care and friendliness (Prieto et al., 2001; Wulff et al., 2004), tailor supervision to students’ developmental needs (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Prieto et al., 2007), provide constructive feedback and support, aid students in meeting their goals, demonstrate effective teaching practices, facilitate reflection of the doctoral students’ style and philosophy of teaching, and provide materials from their own work and experiences, doctoral students reported feeling better prepared to transition to the professoriate (e.g., Baltrinic et al., 2016; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011; Orr et al., 2010; Reneau & Reneau, 2016). Many also noted the importance of experiencing ongoing weekly supervision (Hunt & Gilmore, 2010; Orr et al.,
2008). Though frequency of meetings does not guarantee the quality of the supervision experience, when faculty members provided the support including feedback, sharing of resources, and providing materials on an ongoing basis, students’ self-efficacy toward teaching increased (Prieto et al., 2007) as well as perceived “confidence and competence” in teaching (Orr et al., 2008). Furthermore, when students developed a trusting relationship with their supervisor, they more readily engaged in open communication about their successes as well as their fears, failures, and challenges (Baltrinic et al., 2016). Table 1 lists the previously mentioned teaching preparation themes and corresponding studies in support of these practices.

Table 1

<p>| Empirically-Supported Teaching Preparation Practices in Higher Education and CES |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching preparation practice</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork in teaching</td>
<td>ACES, 2016; Baltrinic, 2014; Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton &amp; Price, 2015; Buller, 2013; Fagen &amp; Wells, 2004; Golde &amp; Dore, 2001; Hall, 2007; Hall &amp; Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt &amp; Gilmore, 2011; Meacham, 2002; Orr et al., 2008; Prieto et al., 2007; Pruitt-Logan &amp; Gaff, 2004; Reneau &amp; Reneau, 2016; Silverman, 2003; Tollerud, 1990; Wulff et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of teaching</td>
<td>ACES, 2016; Baltrinic, 2014; Baltrinic et al., (n.d.); Baltrinic et al., 2016; Barrio-Minton &amp; Price, 2015; Hall, 2007; Hall &amp; Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt &amp; Gilmore, 2011; Meacham, 2002; Orr et al., 2008; Prieto, 2001; Prieto &amp; Meyers, 1999; Prieto &amp; Scheel, 2008; Pruitt-Logan &amp; Gaff, 2004; Reneau &amp; Reneau, 2016; Wulff et al., 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theoretical Framework

The previous section of this proposal outlined the best practices in teaching preparation from higher education and CES. These practices (i.e., formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching) will serve as the independent variables in this study. Next, an explanation of self-efficacy toward teaching, the dependent variable of interest in this study, and how the aforementioned teaching preparation practices are conceptually related to it is warranted. As mentioned previously, much of the training in higher education and specifically in CES lacked direct application of theory to the training of doctoral students. In the higher education literature, “very little research in the area of [teaching assistant] TA development has been theory-driven or has moved beyond investigating simple methods or techniques for training TAs” (Prieto, 2003, para. 3). The literature search for teaching preparation practices in higher education only uncovered a handful of articles that utilized theory to conceptualize teacher training (i.e., Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto et al., 2007). In CES, a 10-year content analysis of all CES literature identified few articles that applied “learning theory or instructional research” to the training of master’s level counselors and none that applied to the training of CES doctoral students to teach (Barrio-Minton et al., 2013). A thorough search of the literature uncovered only two studies (Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990) in CES utilizing theory for investigating the effectiveness of teaching preparation experiences on CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.

Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy (1977; 1997) is one widely used theoretical framework utilized to investigate the impact of teaching preparation on the confidence and competence of teachers (Klassen & Chiu, 2010; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001; Tschannen et al., 1998; Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999). Research indicated that higher levels of self-efficacy
are associated with confidence in the teacher’s ability to successfully perform teaching related
tasks (Prieto & Altmaier, 1994), flexibility and openness to new ideas that might better meet the
needs of students (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), reduced criticism toward students (Gibson &
Dembo, 1984), increased planning and organization (Tschannen et al., 1998), persistence and
resilience when things go poorly in the classroom (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), longevity and
satisfaction in teaching (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2014), increased enthusiasm for teaching and
commitment to students who are struggling (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Tschannen et al., 1998),
and improved student learning outcomes (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy,
2000).

Because of the relationship between self-efficacy and these outcomes, this self-efficacy
provides an appropriate lens to examine the effectiveness of teaching preparation experiences on
CES doctoral students. In order to conceptualize and strengthen conclusions regarding the
relationship between teaching preparation practices identified in this study and their influence on
self-efficacy toward teaching in CES doctoral students, this researcher will utilize Bandura’s
theory of self-efficacy (Tschannen et al., 1998). Thus, the next section will describe self-efficacy
and the four sources of information that influence it, the application of self-efficacy to teaching,
and how teaching preparation practices fit within this theoretical framework.

**Self-Efficacy**

Broadly defined, self-efficacy is a future-oriented belief “in one’s capabilities to organize
and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 2-3).
This belief influences how long a person will persist on a given task, how much time and effort
an individual will give to that task, and how resilient a person will be when experiencing
perceived setbacks (Bandura, 1997). Rather than reflecting “hopeful [or] wishful thinking,” self-
efficacy represents an individual’s sense of “personal mastery” (Bandura, 1977, p. 194). Self-efficacy influences not only one’s beliefs about capability, but also motivation and affect. That is, people are more likely to feel motivated and experience positive affective states when efficacy beliefs are high (Bandura, 1997). How self-efficacy beliefs are “constructed” depends primarily on four sources of information (Bandura, 1997, p. 79). These include enactive mastery experiences, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states.

**Enactive Mastery Experience**

Enactive mastery experiences refer to the repeated practice of an actual experience or task that results in a sense of mastery. Out of all of the sources, enactive mastery experiences are the most influential and direct in their influence on self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1997; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tschanne-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy et al., 1998). As people experience repeated successes on a given task, self-efficacy is almost certainly enhanced (Bandura, 1997). If, however, individuals perceive an experience as a failure, the individuals’ self-efficacy beliefs are often diminished.

Bandura (1997) also suggested that how enactive mastery experiences are structured is important for ensuring success. First, possessing some knowledge about the activity and the associated skills for how to be successful are important. Requisite knowledge provides a foundation for engaging in the task and impacts how the experience is perceived. Next, Bandura suggested “breaking down complex skills into easily mastered subskills and organizing them hierarchically” (p. 80). As successes accumulate over time, individuals begin to expect positive outcomes and are more likely to “develop and maintain new behavioral skills” (Prieto & Meyers, 1999, p. 264).
Vicarious Experience

Bandura (1997) identified vicarious experience as a second source of efficacy information. When observing others, “models,” engage in activities or tasks, people may generate appraisals of their ability to perform those activities or tasks (Bandura, 1997, p. 87). Bandura noted that vicarious experiences have the greatest potential for enhancing efficacy beliefs when the observer perceives the model as possessing similar characteristics to him or her, when the model is especially competent, when the activity or task performed by the model is similar to the activity or task of the observer, or when the observer desires to learn the activity or task being performed by the model (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). In general, if the model performs well or persists in accomplishing a task, the observer’s self-efficacy is strengthened (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1997). On the other hand, if the model performs poorly, the observer’s self-efficacy could potentially diminish.

Though merely observing others who are perceived as similar or exceptional can aid in strengthening self-efficacy beliefs, this may not prove sufficient. Bandura (1997; 2012) suggested that, in order for observation and comparing oneself to a model to strengthen self-efficacy, individuals must also intentionally consider the knowledge, skills, and behaviors exhibited by the models. Specifically, Bandura (1997) suggested that individuals need to attend to and reflect on when, how, and why models engaged in certain actions (e.g., visualizing the rehearsal of skills and knowledge and discussing with others the important components of observed behavior). Additionally, models can help observers by making their thought processes and purposes behind behaviors overt. In this way, “observers learn the rules” of an engaging in a particular skill (Bandura, 1997, p. 90). Once these rules are learned, individuals can then tailor the action taken by the model into his or her context (Bandura, 2012). Though not as influential
as enactive mastery experiences, Bandura (1997) stated that vicarious learning is especially helpful for learning tasks that are new to the learner and for instructional purposes (e.g., teaching assistants or doctoral students with no previous teaching experience guided by a supervisor).

**Verbal Persuasion**

Bandura noted that “social persuasion,” which he also labeled verbal persuasion, “serves as a further means of strengthening people’s belief that they possess the capabilities to achieve what they seek” (1997, p. 101). This source of self-efficacy beliefs includes information regarding a particular task (Tschannen et al., 1998), evaluative feedback, and/or encouragement intended to persuade an individual that he or she can succeed. Verbal persuasion can occur through various mediums (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1997). For example, individuals may receive information related to “the nature of teaching…[through] coursework and professional developing workshops” (Tschannen et al., 1998, p. 230), or important evaluative feedback and encouragement from supervisors, colleagues, or co-workers (Bandura, 1997).

Similar to the vicarious experience, verbal persuasion is most powerful when the entity or individual persuading is seen as competent, reliable, and trustworthy (Bandura, 1997). However, the type and way in which feedback is given also determines how information is interpreted and integrated into efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1986). For example, when a supervisor gives encouragement aimed at specific behaviors (Bandura, 1986), provides constructive feedback, and/or realistically conveys confidence in one’s capabilities to successfully perform a given task, that individual’s sense of self-efficacy is bolstered (Bandura, 1997). In contrast, when feedback or encouragement is disingenuous, does not match the performance, is too general, or is punitive in nature, it may diminish self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

Though verbal persuasion is somewhat influential on its own, it is especially helpful for
strengthening and creating sustained self-efficacy beliefs when used combination with other sources (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997). To illustrate, if a supervisor conveys confidence or provides useful feedback to a teaching assistant who is about to present a lecture (enactive mastery experience), it may cause the student to feel less anxious. In this way, verbal persuasion may influence an enactive mastery experience and an affective state.

**Physiological and Emotional States**

Bandura (1977; 1986; 1997) identified physiological or affective states as the final source of efficacy information. Physiological states refer to somatic sensations such as fatigue, sweating, heart rate, gastrointestinal discomfort, and trembling (Bandura, 1997). Affective states refer to moods, which may be positive, depressed, anxious, etc. (Bandura, 1997). These states affect individuals’ evaluation of their ability to implement desired behaviors for a given task (Bandura, 1977; Bandura, 1986; Bandura, 1997). Although affective states may influence self-efficacy related to most types of tasks, they are often the least influential source of self-efficacy information because of their momentary nature. They do, however, influence and occur within the context of other sources of efficacy information.

During an enactive mastery experience, there are many situational or environmental factors (Bandura, 1997). For example, when a CES doctoral student is teaching a large class, the temperature of the room, the proximity of the students, and the number of students are all factors that may influence the student’s physiological and/or affective state. Self-efficacy information is derived from how the student interprets these states. If the student attributes sweating and feeling anxious as a lack of capability, self-efficacy beliefs are diminished. If, however, the doctoral student attributes the source of his or her physiological and emotional states to the environmental factors or interprets them as normal feelings that even experienced teachers encounter at times,
the individual’s efficacy beliefs are enhanced (Bandura, 1997).

Bandura (1997) suggested that for those “who are prone to misread somatic states, treatments that alter catastrophic thinking or teach ways of controlling emotional arousal reduce negative biases in interpreting bodily sensations” (p. 109). This is where verbal persuasion aimed at normalizing the physiological and affective states, reframing the sensations, and providing a suggestion for how to manage them may prove helpful (Bandura, 1997). This may in turn support successful performance and strengthen efficacy beliefs.

**Self-efficacy Toward Teaching**

Next, this proposal will briefly describe the application of Bandura’s theory of self-efficacy to teaching preparation. Settlage, Southerland, Smith and Ceglie (2009) defined self-efficacy toward teaching as the teacher’s beliefs in his or her ability to impact student learning outcomes and to select appropriate teaching interventions. Similarly, Tschannen-Moran et al. defined self-efficacy toward teaching as “the teacher’s belief in his or her capability to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context” (1998, p. 233).

Two themes arise out of these definitions. First, self-efficacy toward teaching includes a confidence in one’s ability to select and utilize appropriate teaching behaviors for a given task (i.e., efficacy expectations). This first theme is context dependent (Bandura, 1997), as self-efficacy toward teaching could be influenced by level (e.g., higher education versus education), location (e.g., rural versus urban), and population (racial/ethnic make-up). The second theme is outcome expectancy. This is the “individual’s estimate of the likely consequences of performing at the expected level of competence” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 210). Put another way, efficacy expectations may be reflected through questions such as, “do I have the ability to
organize and execute the actions necessary to accomplish a specific task at a desired level?” and outcome expectation may be reflected through questions such as, “if I accomplish the task at that level, what are the likely consequences?” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 210). For the purposes of this study, self-efficacy toward teaching refers to a person’s confidence in his or her ability to select and utilize appropriate teaching behaviors effectively to achieve student learning (Settlage, Southerland, Smith & Ceglie, 2009; Tschannen et al., 1998).

**Self-efficacy Toward Teaching in Higher Education and CES**

As Bandura’s (1977, 1997) theoretical model suggests, increasing self-efficacy for a particular task should optimally include positive experiences in the four sources of efficacy information (i.e., enactive mastery experiences, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and physiological and affective states). Because of the lack of theory-driven research in the area of teaching preparation in CES, and the connection between self-efficacy and increased confidence (Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tollerud, 1990) and competence in teaching (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard et al., 2000), more research is needed to investigate the relationship between best practices in teaching preparation within higher education and CES (i.e., formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching) on self-efficacy toward teaching.

Several studies in higher education and CES have already demonstrated the connection between teaching preparation and self-efficacy toward teaching (Olguin, 2004; Prieto & Meyers, 1999, Prieto et al., 2007; Tollerud, 1990). Researchers have also articulated how experiences within formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and teaching supervision are connected to each of the four sources of self-efficacy (Olguin, 2004; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tollerud, 1990; Tschannen et al., 1998). Though researchers have not directly examined the
relationship between teaching preparation experiences and the four sources of self-efficacy directly, they have used the four sources as a way of theoretically conceptualizing the impact of teaching preparation on self-efficacy toward teaching (Olguin, 2004; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tollerud, 1990; Tschannen et al., 1998). Table 2 below illustrates the theoretical conceptualization of how various experiences within formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching (i.e., the independent variables of interest outlined in this study), fit within each source of self-efficacy. Together, these sources are thought to influence self-perceptions of self-efficacy toward teaching (i.e., the dependent variable of interest in this study; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Tschannen et al., 1998).
Table 2

Theoretical Conceptualization of Teaching Preparation Experiences and Sources of Self-Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of self-efficacy: Dependent variable</th>
<th>Enactive Mastery Experience</th>
<th>Vicarious Experience</th>
<th>Verbal Persuasion</th>
<th>Physiological and Emotional States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Instruction in College Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Providing a practice lecture or facilitating a discussion in a course.</td>
<td>Observing peers and instructor engage in teaching. Reading literature about how to be an effective teacher.</td>
<td>Receiving feedback and encouragement from peers and instructor regarding teaching.</td>
<td>Reading about how to manage stressful teaching situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fieldwork in Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Engaging in a range of teaching and teaching-related activities.</td>
<td>Observing a co-teacher engage in teaching and teaching-related activities. Co-teacher articulating intentions behind instructional decisions.</td>
<td>Receiving feedback and encouragement from co-teacher regarding teaching.</td>
<td>Normalization and validation of nervousness related to teaching through co-teacher support. Strategies and solutions for managing stressful teaching situations and performance anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision of Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Providing a practice lecture or role-playing teaching scenarios in class.</td>
<td>Observing peers engage in teaching through video or practice lectures or role-plays in class.</td>
<td>Receiving feedback and encouragement from peers and faculty supervisor regarding teaching.</td>
<td>Normalization and validation of nervousness related to teaching through peer discussions and faculty supervisor support. Strategies and solutions for managing stressful teaching situations and performance anxiety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

To summarize, Chapter 2 provided a synthesis of the literature related to teacher preparation of CES doctoral students. It began with a discussion of the typical roles and responsibilities of faculty members and argued that, although faculty members tend to spend a majority of their time in activities related to teaching, their preparation as teachers tends to be far less extensive than their preparation as researchers. The chapter then turned to an exploration of specific strategies used within higher education in general, and within CES more specifically, to prepare doctoral students to teach. Three primary strategies, which will serve as this study’s independent variables, emerged: formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork experiences in teaching, and supervision of teaching. Research findings regarding the effectiveness of each strategy in producing competent, confident teachers, was then presented. Finally, this chapter concluded with a thorough discussion of the literature related to this study’s dependent variable, self-efficacy.

Because little is known concerning the effectiveness of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching on self-efficacy toward teaching in CES doctoral students, additional research was needed to update information regarding training practices as well as to investigate how these factors individually and collectively relate to self-efficacy toward teaching in CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited programs. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the influence of these teaching preparation practices on self-efficacy toward teaching for CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited institutions in the United States. Specifically, this study investigated how the frequency and perceived quality of supervision of teaching, the number of courses taught or cotaught, and the number of
experiences in formal instruction in college teaching predict the variability in self-efficacy toward teaching.

In the next chapter, this proposal will outline details of the methodology used in this study. Specifically, Chapter 3 will describe the methodology for this study, including planned procedures for acquiring permission and access to my sample and site, a description and operationalization of variables and associated instruments, and procedures used for data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter provides a description of the methodology used to complete this study. Specifically, this chapter includes planned procedures for how the researcher acquired permission and access to the sample and site, a description and operationalization of variables and associated instruments, processes for strengthening content validity of the composite survey, and a plan and rationale for data collection and analysis. Included at the end of this chapter is a restatement of the research questions and corresponding statistical analyses.

In order to achieve the goals of this study, the researcher utilized a survey instrument delivered via email. The statistical methods utilized for this cross-sectional correlational study included descriptive, multiple linear regression, independent t-test, and one-way ANOVA analyses. Though such an approach does not provide causal results, it may provide a foundation for subsequent studies that may investigate cause and effect.

Population and Sample

The target population of this proposed study includes all CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited institutions within the United States. The assumption underlying this delimitation was that current doctoral students would result in a more accurate and current representation of training practices than would a retrospective study asking faculty members to report on their past teaching preparation experiences. At the time of data collection, there were 83 CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs in the nation (CACREP, 2017). The doctoral program coordinators and departmental websites are available on the CACREP website.
(www.cacrep.org/directory). Because of the potential to access all CES doctoral students in
CACREP programs, this study intended to survey the entire target population. It is important to
note that although the CACREP website designates all 83 doctoral program-types as “counselor
education and supervision,” programs varied in how they labeled the degree (e.g., Counselor
Education at Auburn University, Counselor Education and Counseling at Idaho State
University). In order to capture the variation in how programs labeled the degree, all materials
and eligibility requirements sent out to program liaisons and the target population referred to the
degree as Counselor Education.

**Approval and Informed Consent**

This researcher obtained approval for the proposed study through the University of
Mississippi Institutional Review Board (IRB; Approval #18x-113). The informed consent
document (see Appendix A), which program liaisons and CES doctoral students received via
email, included an explanation of the purpose of the study, procedures of the study, time required
to complete the survey, any potential known risks and benefits of participation, incentives for
completing the survey, confidentiality and measures taken to ensure anonymity, and the
voluntary nature of the study.

**Survey Development**

The composite survey for this study included a questionnaire regarding participants’
demographic information and teaching preparation (see Appendix B) as well as two modified
instruments, the Self Efficacy toward Teaching Inventory (SETI; see Appendix C) and the
Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ-A; see Appendix D). The figure below depicts the
process of developing the composite survey beginning with the literature search and ending with
the completed survey.
The following section describes and operationalizes the variables within the composite survey, whether the component is an independent or dependent variable, a description of how each variable was coded, and the reliability and validity of instruments utilized in this study.

**Description and Operationalization of Variables**

Demographic information collected by the survey included sex, age, and race/ethnicity. The data responses for sex, a categorical predictor variable, were coded dichotomously for male and female (male=0; female=1). Male served as the reference group. Race/ethnicity, a categorical variable, was broken down into seven categories: 0=White or Caucasian, 1=Black or African American, 2=American Indian or Alaska Native, 3=Asian, 4=Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 5=Hispanic/Latino, and 6=Other (Olguin, 2004). For the purposes of this study, White
served as the reference group, and one dummy variable was created to represent the other racial/ethnic groups. Age was treated as a continuous variable.

**Teaching Preparation Variables**

In addition to demographic information, this study gathered information pertaining to each participants’ teaching preparation experiences that when analyzed served as independent variables in the multiple linear regression, \( t \)-test, and one-way ANOVA analyses. Specifically, independent variables included semester credit hours (or equivalent) of college teaching, number and level of responsibility in fieldwork in teaching experiences, frequency of supervision of teaching experiences, and perceived quality of supervision of teaching. Professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience were included as control variables.

Formal instruction in college teaching served as the first continuous independent variable. Though programs may provide instruction through a semester-long course in college teaching, a seminar, and/or infusing instruction within advanced content courses, the most common way this component is offered in CES doctoral programs is through semester-long coursework (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015). Because of this, the study inquired specifically about respondents’ semester credit hours (or equivalent) in college teaching. The focus of these curricular experiences optimally includes, but is not limited to, theories and models of adult learning, course construction, developing and delivering course content, approaches to assessing student learning, classroom management, and methods for online instruction (CACREP, 2016; Hunt & Gilmore, 2010). Participants indicated yes or no to whether they received coursework and the total number of semester (or equivalent) credit hours they acquired. For example, if participants
took a three-credit hour course in college teaching they would type “3.” Responses provided a total numerical score.

The next continuous independent variable, fieldwork in teaching, focused on the number and type of responsibility of graduate teaching experiences in which the student taught or cotaught a course. Participants marked yes or no to indicate whether or not they have engaged in a teaching or coteaching experience during their doctoral program. Fieldwork in teaching might include a formal teaching internship, coteaching opportunity, graduate teaching assistantship, or independently teaching a graduate or undergraduate course. If yes, students indicated how many courses they taught or cotaught and what level of responsibility they had in each. Level of responsibility included sole, primary, shared, and/or minor (Tollerud, 1990). Sole responsibility is defined as independently designing and delivering all aspects of a course; primary responsibility is defined as having the responsibility for delivering the majority of a course, which may have been designed by a lead instructor or committee; shared responsibility is defined as having approximately equal responsibility for delivery and/or development of a course; and minor responsibility is defined as supporting a faculty member with development and/or delivery of a course, such as offering administrative support and/or grading. For the purposes of this study, fieldwork experiences in which the person had sole, primary, shared, and/or minor responsibility were combined into a total numerical score.

A categorical variable addressed in this study was supervision of teaching. If participants indicated participating in fieldwork in teaching, they either marked yes and for how many semesters (i.e., one, two, three, or more than three) or no to indicate whether or not they received supervision of their teaching by a faculty member. Teaching supervision is defined as regular meetings between an experienced faculty member and a CES doctoral student for the purpose of
improving teaching through providing regular feedback, support, and guidance regarding the students’ teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008). Specific practices might include discussing the student’s teaching statement/philosophy, the purpose of instructional decisions, constructive feedback regarding direct observation or indirect (e.g., recording) observation of the student’s teaching, and/or providing opportunities for self-reflection. If yes, participants indicated the general frequency of their group and/or individual supervision of teaching sessions during the semester(s) in which they received supervision of their teaching (CACREP, 2016; Prieto & Scheel, 2008). Categories included weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, or in general no supervision of teaching.

The frequency of supervision of teaching does not give one any indication of the quality of the experience. As DeChenne, Lessieg, Anderson, Li, Stauss, and Barthel (2012) suggested, simply knowing the number and types of experiences graduate teaching assistants receive as a part of their teaching preparation gives researchers a limited understanding of the impact of training on the student’s professional development (p. 7). Additionally, it limits the conclusions researchers can make about the outcome variable of interest (DeChenne et al., 2012). Therefore, this study will utilize a modified version of the Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ-A) as a continuous predictor variable to determine the overall quality of the student’s teaching supervision. Ladany, Hill, Corgett, and Nut (1996) originally developed the SSQ as an adaptation of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ: Larsen, Attkisson, Hargreaves, & Nguyen, 1979). The creators of the SSQ changed the terms counseling and services to supervision. When first developing the CSQ, Larsen et al. (1979) included nine domains related to client satisfaction (i.e., physical surroundings, support staff, kind/type of service, treatment staff, quality of service, amount, length, or quantity of service, outcome of service, general
satisfaction, and procedures) with nine items related to these domains in each category. The authors initially piloted the instrument on two groups of mental health professionals. After revising the instrument from these piloted studies, it was given to 248 counseling clients. The final version of the instrument included one primary scale with eight items. Reliability estimates of items in the CSQ revealed strong inter-item correlations (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .93; Larsen et al., 1979).

Though the SSQ is not a normed instrument, because of its wide use and strong psychometric properties, it is “assumed that the SSQ is also statistically sound” (Bussey, 2015, p. 64). Internal consistency of the SSQ was determined in the original study, with a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .96 (Ladany et al., 1996). In another study, Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, and Wolgast, (1999) further confirmed the reliability of the SSQ, reporting a Chronbach alpha coefficient of .97. In the SSQ, participants rate the perceived quality and satisfaction regarding various aspects of supervision using a 4-point scale (e.g., very satisfied, mostly satisfied, indifferent or mildly dissatisfied, quite dissatisfied). Results from the instrument give researchers an indication of the perceived satisfaction, overall quality, and effectiveness of the supervision (Ladany et al., 1999; Fernando, 2013). Because of the reported similarity between supervision of teaching and clinical work (Orr et al., 2008; Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010) and the general language of the SSQ, it appears an appropriate instrument, with minor alterations, for the purposes of this study. Specifically, counselor and therapist were changed to educator and supervision was changed to supervision of teaching. Additionally, for the purposes of this study, participants were given three of the eight questions from the instrument. These three questions inquired specifically about the overall quality, satisfaction with the amount of supervision, and whether supervision of teaching received helped the student to deal more
effectively in their role as a teacher. The questions produced a total summed score with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with supervision.

**Control Variables**

In addition to the teaching preparation variables of interest, this study also included two control variables identified as potentially influencing confidence in one’s teaching. The first control variable was post-master’s counseling experience. Olguin (2004) suggested that confidence in one’s counseling can influence self-efficacy toward teaching in CES doctoral students. Additionally, Buller (2013) found that counseling skill and experience greatly contributed to perceived excellence in teaching. Because of this, post-master’s counseling experience was included in order to control for its influence on self-efficacy toward teaching. Participants indicated whether or not they have any post-master’s counseling experience. If yes, they provided the number of years.

The final control variable included in this study were professional teaching experience prior to entering one’s doctorate in K-12 settings and/or in postsecondary settings (e.g., community college, technical college, and/or baccalaureate instruction). Buller (2013) and Tolerud (1990) suggested that previous non-graduate teaching experience may influence self-efficacy toward teaching in graduate students. Because of this, this study included previous professional teaching experience in K-12 and postsecondary settings in order to control for their influence on self-efficacy toward teaching. Participants indicated whether or not they engaged in any professional teaching experience in either of these settings prior to their doctoral program. If yes to K-12, then respondents provided the number of years taught in this setting. In a separate question, if respondents indicated engaging in teaching in a postsecondary setting, they provided
the number of years taught. For the purposes of this study, the number of years for both K-12 and a postsecondary setting were combined into a total numerical score.

**Dependent Variable**

The continuous dependent variable of interest in this study was self-efficacy toward teaching. In order to quantify this, participants took a modified version of the Self-efficacy Toward Teaching Inventory (SETI). The original SETI is a 35-item self-report measure in which participants indicate their confidence to implement specific teaching skills and behaviors in five teaching domains: course preparation, instructor behavior, materials, evaluation and examination, and clinical skills training. The modified version of the SETI contains 47 items. Modifications included the creation of five new items and updating item wording to match CACREP 2016 standards. This researcher added and modified items per recommendations from three experts in teaching preparation in counselor education and supervision doctoral programs. Furthermore, great care was taken in the addition and modification of items to ensure items fit within the five domains. Like the original, participants respond to the general question “How confident are you in your ability to…” across each domain on a 4-point Likert-type scale with 1 indicating no confidence in the skill or behavior and 4 indicating “complete confidence in the skill” (Tollerud, 1990, p. 77). Scores ranged from 47 to 188 with higher scores related to greater perceived self-efficacy toward teaching.

The original SETI went through a three-step piloting process (Tollerud, 1990). First, the author generated items that represented various teaching skills and behaviors from a literature review as well as the experiences from experts in counselor education. Second, six associate or full professors in CES, education, and counseling psychology rated items according to their perceived importance in effective teaching. Third, 24 experienced counselor educators outside of
the researcher’s institution received 43 items to have each rated for importance in effective teaching. The final SETI included 35 items.

In addition to the original study (Tollerud, 1990), many have further supported the validity and reliability of the instrument (e.g., Nugent, Bradshaw, & Kito, 1999; Prieto & Altmaier, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto, Yamokoski, & Meyers, 2007; Richardson & Miller, 2011). Tollerud (1990) established content validity by only including items reported in the literature and deemed important for effective teaching by expert opinion. Tollerud established construct validity through relating the theory of self-efficacy to the scores obtained on the SETI. Factor analysis showed items on the SETI converging into a single factor, with loadings from .39 to .78 accounting for 35 percent of the variance. Internal consistency reliability on the SETI produced a Cronbach alpha of .94. In Prieto and Altmaiers’ (1994) study relating pre-graduate training and teaching experience to self-efficacy toward teaching and Prieto and Meyers’ (1999) study relating previous training and supervision of teaching to self-efficacy toward teaching both reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .93 on their adapted version of the SETI, the SETI-A. Their adaptation included deleting three questions that inquired about the participant’s ability to model counseling skills. In a similar study by Prieto et al. (2007) investigating the relationship between teaching preparation experiences and self-efficacy toward teaching, the authors reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .94 on the SETI-A. In Richardson and Miller’s (2011) study examining which factors predicted the use of learner-centered instructional methods by undergraduate social work faculty, the authors reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .96 for the SETI-A. Finally, in a study examining the factors that predict self-efficacy toward teaching in new nursing faculty, the authors found a Cronbach’s alpha of .95 on the SETI-A (Nugent et al., 1999).
Strengthening Validity of Composite Survey

The demographic and teaching preparation questionnaire in this study included items from Tollerud’s (1990) *Teaching and Graduate Training Questionnaire* (p. 77), CACREP (2016) standards, Prieto and Scheel’s (2008) study, and Olguin’s (2004) study. Specifically, items regarding fieldwork in teaching, formal instruction in college teaching, and professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program were derived from Tollerud. Questions regarding post-master’s counseling experience will be based upon Olguin (2004). Finally, items pertaining to the frequency of teaching supervision were derived from CACREP (2016) doctoral standards and Prieto and Scheel (2008). Though psychometric support exists for the SETI (e.g., Prieto & Altmair, 1994; Prieto & Meyers, 1999; Prieto, Yamokoski, & Meyers, 2007) and SSQ (Ladany et al., 1999; Fernando, 2013), no one has used the SETI in CES since its development and no one has adapted the SSQ to measure quality of supervision of teaching. Because of this, the results section presents exploratory factor analyses and reliability estimates (i.e., Chronbach’s alpha) for each instrument.

In addition to exploratory factor analyses and Chronbach’s alpha, this study strengthened the content validity of this composite survey in two ways. First, a carefully selected panel of three expert reviewers received the composite survey in order to elicit feedback regarding content of the items (see Appendix E). Specifically, this researcher requested that experts within the field of CES and teaching preparation comment on items “relevance, representativeness, specificity, and clarity” as well as “suggested additions, deletions, and modifications” of items (Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995, pp. 244, 247). After this researcher incorporated feedback and received approval from his dissertation chair and University of Mississippi IRB, the researcher then piloted the survey using seven recent graduates (i.e., within four years) from
CACREP-accredited CES programs via Qualtrix. At the end of the pilot survey, this researcher requested that respondents provide any comments and/or difficulties encountered in taking the survey as well as any comments and/or difficulties related to any questionnaire item or the instruments. Once this researcher made final modifications based upon the pilot feedback and received final approval from this researcher’s dissertation chair, the survey was launched and data collected. The figure below depicts the method used to develop and strengthen the validity of the composite survey.

![Diagram representing the method for strengthening content validity of the composite survey.](image)

*Figure 3.* Diagram representing the method for strengthening content validity of the composite survey.

The following section will outline the administration of the composite survey and data collection procedures.

**Data Collection Procedures**

After obtaining approval and modifying the composite survey, the researcher recruited participants using two strategies. First, this researcher contacted doctoral program liaisons through sending a pre-notification email regarding the recruitment email (see Appendix F) that
contained an explanation and rationale for this proposed study, a statement about informed consent and approval, a link to the composite survey (i.e., instruments and questionnaire regarding demographic information and teaching preparation experiences), and a request to forward the email containing a link of the survey to doctoral students. In survey research, pre-notification (Creswell, 2015) and personalization (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000; Muñoz-Leiva, Sánchez-Fernández, Montoro-Ríos, & Ibáñez-Zapata, 2010) procedures can enhance response rate. Second, this researcher requested participation of CES doctoral students through email (see Appendix G) via CESNET-L, a professional listserv of counselors, counselor educators, and master’s and doctoral level counselor education students.

Students who agreed to participate clicked the survey link at the bottom of the email. This link took participants to the informed consent information. If they agreed to the terms outlined by the informed consent information, participants then proceeded to answer a basic demographic questionnaire, a questionnaire regarding the teaching preparation experiences, and instruments used in the study. All research data were collected through the survey software Qualtrics.

Upon completing the survey, participants had the option to submit an email address to enter them in a drawing to win one of five $20 Amazon gift cards. To ensure that survey responses and contact information were stored separately, respondents who wished to enter the drawing were directed to a separate incentives survey. To further enhance response rate, this researcher sent two follow-up requests (Cook, Heath, & Thompson, 2000; Creswell, 2015; Shih & Fan, 2008). Specifically, two weeks after the initial email, the researcher sent another email with a personalized request for completing the composite survey along with a copy of the original email to CESNET-L and program liaisons. Two weeks after the first reminder, a final email request for participation was sent to CESNET and program liaisons. After receiving the
completed surveys, the information was coded and input into SPSS. The following section describes how the data were analyzed.

Analysis of Data

This study was a cross-sectional correlational study. One purpose of cross-sectional correlational studies is to compare or relate respondents’ “attitudes, beliefs, and opinions” regarding certain topics or experiences at “one point in time” (Cresswell, 2015, p. 380). In line with this purpose, this proposed study sought to examine the relationship of teaching preparation experiences and self-efficacy toward teaching for CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited institutions in the United States. Specifically, this study investigated how the frequency and perceived quality of supervision of teaching; the number of courses taught or cotaught; and the number of experiences in formal instruction in college teaching related to the variability in self-efficacy toward teaching, statistically controlling for post-master’s counseling experience and professional teaching experience gained prior to their doctoral program. Descriptive statistical tools including measures of central tendency, dispersion of scores, and relative standing of scores were used to analyze data regarding all research questions (Creswell, 2015). Measures of central tendency, dispersion of scores, and relative standing of scores provided information regarding the patterns and trends in the collected data. Descriptive statistics included frequency, minimum and maximum scores, percentages, means, standard deviations, and measures of normality (i.e., kurtosis and skewness).

In addition to computing descriptive statistics, the researcher utilized inferential statistical tools to address research questions and to test their corresponding hypotheses. Specifically, for research questions one, two, four and five, this study investigated how the independent variables (i.e., teaching preparation and demographic variables) individually and collectively related to and
accounted for the change in the outcome variable (i.e., SETI scores) through multiple regression analysis (Wampold & Freund, 1987). For research question three, this study investigated the difference between mean scores on the SETI between those who, in general, received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, or no supervision of their teaching through a one-way ANOVA. A follow-up t-test was conducted as cell size varied greatly across frequency of supervision and due to CACREP 2016 standards requirement of one hour per week of supervision for those in internships. For research question six, this study investigated the difference between mean scores on the SETI between those who had and had not received supervision of teaching through an independent samples t-test.

Multiple linear regression is a type of correlational design used to predict the impact of two or more continuous or categorical independent variables on one continuous outcome variable (Creswell, 2015). The aim of regression analysis is to identify which independent variable(s) best predict and account for the change in the outcome variable (Wampold & Freund, 1987). In addition to reporting $R$, the Pearson correlation coefficient between the actual outcomes scores (i.e., $Y$) and the predicted outcomes scores that fall on the regression line (i.e., $Y$-hat), the researcher also computed $R^2$, the squared correlation coefficient or effect size. The $R^2$ provides an explanation of the individual or combined proportion of variability accounted for by the predictor variable(s) (Creswell, 2015; Wampold & Freund, 1987). In multiple regression, one can calculate structure coefficients (i.e., $r_{ij}^2$), to describe the proportion of variability accounted for by each predictor variable on the predicted outcome variable (Courville & Thompson, 2001). Courville and Thompson (2001) recommend reporting structure coefficients in addition to $\beta$ weights (i.e., standardized slopes) to provide a more comprehensive picture of the contribution of individual predictors on the variability in the outcome variable. In addition to $R$, $R^2$, and structure
coefficients, results of the multiple regression analyses also included standardized and unstandardized slopes, statistical significance of slopes and the regression model, and standard error of estimate (American Psychological Association, 2010; Creswell, 2015). Results also included Variance Inflation Factors (VIF), which detect multicollinearity issues between predictors. In general, if VIF values are less than four, then no multicollinearity issue exists (O’Brien, 2007).

The purpose of a one-way ANOVA is to determine if a significant different exists between two or more mutually exclusive groups on the mean of the dependent variable of interest. In a one-way ANOVA, each distinct group must have one value for the categorical independent variable, often referred to as the grouping variable or factor. Each group must also possess one value for the continuous dependent variable, often referred to as the test variable. In addition to descriptive statistics, results of this analysis included Lavene’s Test, an ANOVA table, which includes sum of squares values, degrees of freedom, means square values, and an $F$-value and its corresponding level of significance. One important assumption in running a one-way ANOVA is that of homogeneity of variance (Hinkle et al., 2003). In order to test this assumption, Levene’s Test was needed to determine if homogeneity of variance was violated (Hinkle et al., 2003). When Levene’s test is significant, one would conclude that the variability in SETI scores for the varying levels for frequency of supervision (i.e., weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching) is significantly different from the variability of those without supervision of teaching. If homogeneity of variance is violated, the $F$ value is not trustworthy. One appropriate statistic to use when this assumption is violated, or when group size is unequal, is the Welch test, which statistically adjusts for these
issues (Hinkle et al., 2003; SPSS Tutorials: Independent Samples t Test, 2017). The results did not detect a violation of homogeneity of variance for research question three.

Because the $F$ test only indicates whether or not a significant difference exists between any of the means for any of the groups, this statistic does show which individual group means differed significantly. To determine which individual group(s) differ, post hoc analyses are run. As results did not indicate a significant difference between SETI mean scores between the different levels of supervision of teaching, the results do not include post hoc tests.

The independent samples $t$-test is used to determine if a significant difference exists between the mean scores of two mutually exclusive groups (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). In an independent samples $t$-test, each distinct group must have one value for the categorical independent variable, often referred to as the grouping variable, and one value for the continuous dependent variable, often referred to as the test variable. In addition to descriptive statistics, results of this analysis included Lavene’s Test, the $t$-value and its corresponding level of significance, degrees of freedom, and the SETI mean difference between those with and without supervision of teaching, (Hinkle et al., 2003; SPSS Tutorials: Independent Samples t Test, 2017). As in a one-way ANOVA, an important assumption in running a $t$-test is that of homogeneity of variance (Hinkle et al., 2003). In order to test this assumption, results also included Levene’s Test. Neither the $t$-test for research question six or the follow-up $t$-test for question three violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance.

The following table summarizes the research questions used in this study, the instruments used to measure identified constructs, and the corresponding analytical approach.
Table 3

*Research Questions, Survey Component, and Data Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Instrument or measure</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1: Is the self-reported amount of formal instruction in college teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>SETI, Demographic and Teaching Preparation Questionnaire</td>
<td>Multiple linear regression, Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2: Is the self-reported number of courses taught or cotaught related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>SETI, Demographic and Teaching Preparation Questionnaire</td>
<td>Multiple linear regression, Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 3: How do CES doctoral students with weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?</td>
<td>SETI, Teaching Preparation Questionnaire</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA, a follow-up t-test, Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 4: Is the perceived quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>SETI, SSQ-A, Demographic and Teaching Preparation Questionnaire</td>
<td>Multiple linear regression, Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 5: Is the combined and relative contribution of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>SETI, SSQ-A, Demographic and Teaching Preparation Questionnaire</td>
<td>Multiple linear regression, Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 6: How do CES doctoral students with no supervision of fieldwork in teaching and those with supervision of fieldwork in teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?</td>
<td>SETI, Teaching Preparation Questionnaire</td>
<td>t-test, Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

Chapter 3 provided a description of the methodology for this proposed study. This included the planned procedures for acquiring permission and access to my sample and site, a description and operationalization of variables and associated instruments, process for strengthening content validity of the composite survey, and a plan and rationale for data collection and analysis. Included at the end of this chapter was a restatement of the research questions and corresponding statistical analysis. Chapter 4 will provide the results of the study, guided by the aforementioned research questions and hypotheses. This will include both descriptive and inferential statistics.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teaching preparation practices in CACREP-accredited doctoral programs in the United States and the self-efficacy toward teaching of Counselor Education and Supervision (CES) doctoral students. This chapter will present the results of this study and is organized into four sections. First, the researcher presents descriptive statistics regarding the demographic characteristics of respondents. The second section will provide descriptive statistics for the variables used in this study (i.e., demographic, teaching preparation, and control variables). Within this section, the researcher also presents information regarding the requirements for and experiences of CES doctoral students in regard to teaching preparation. Third, this chapter will present descriptive statistics for instruments used in this study. Finally, addressing the primary purpose of this study, the fourth section of this chapter presents the outcomes of using inferential statistical tools to answer the research questions and corresponding hypotheses.

Descriptive Statistics for Respondent Characteristics

A total of 171 individuals responded to the survey. Respondents who did not finish the survey or did not satisfy inclusionary criteria were excluded from the sample. Additionally, one individual reported an extreme score (i.e., 40 fieldwork experiences) for total number of fieldwork teaching experiences. This score was excluded from the data analyses as the individual indicated completing only four semesters total of doctoral work and the score exceeded the mean by six standard deviations. This left a total of 149 (n=149) usable responses.
Although the total sample consisted of 149 respondents, it should be noted that response totals for individual items varied. For example, only 143 out of 149 respondents provided their age. Second, of the 149 respondents, only 120 indicated that they had already taken a course on college teaching. Although approximately 15% of programs do not require this training component, several respondents were in their first semester of doctoral work and it is possible that they will take a course in college teaching later in their program. Finally, only 128 of the 149 respondents indicated that they had received supervision of teaching. In the survey, which utilized skip logic, those respondents who had received no supervision of teaching were not asked to respond to the the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ-A) as they could not comment on the quality of their supervisory experience. Regardless of teaching preparation experiences, every respondent completed the SETI as this researcher sought to compare those with and without certain teaching preparation experiences on their self-efficacy toward teaching.

The survey also requested that respondents provide demographic information, including their sex, race/ethnicity, age, and the state in which they lived. Respondents were 79% (n=117) female, 21% (n=31) male, 73% White (n=110), 17% Black (n=25), 4% Asian (n=6), .67% American Indian or Alaska Native (n=1), and .67% multiracial (n=1). Of the 149 responses, 10% (n=15) indicated a Hispanic/Latino ethnicity. Regarding respondents’ geographic region, 39% (n=58) resided in the southern United States, 21% (n=32) in the midwest, 7% (n=10) in the west, and 5% (n=8) in the northeast (United States Census Bureau, 2017). The following section provides descriptive statistics for variables used in this study including demographic, teaching preparation, and control variables.
Descriptive Statistics for Continuous and Categorical Variables

The descriptive statistics for the continuous variables included in inferential analyses are provided in the table below. Statistics include the number of respondents, minimum and maximum scores for each variable, mean, standard deviation, kurtosis and skewness. Respondents indicated a mean age of 34.73 and standard deviation of 7.70 years, a mean of 4.73 and standard deviation of 4.75 for years of post master’s counseling experience, a mean of 1.37 and standard deviation of 2.78 for years of prior teaching experience, a mean of 3.03 and standard deviation of 2.35 for the number of semester (or equivalent) credit hours, and a mean of 5.51 and standard deviation of 4.63 for the number of fieldwork in teaching experiences. In general, the skewness of all variables fell within an acceptable range, indicating symmetry of the distribution for each variable around the mean (George & Mallery, 2016). Only prior teaching experience possessed a positively skewed distribution. As kurtosis values for age and fieldwork in teaching are less than one, the relative peak of these variables approximates the normal curve. The values for post master’s counseling experience, prior teaching experience, and coursework in college teaching are outside the recommended range (i.e., ± 2.0), indicating a deviation from normality. Histograms for these variables reflected multiple modes and/or higher values near the tails of the distribution rather than the mean, causing a larger kurtosis value (George & Mallery, 2016).
Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for Quantitative Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (optional)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>34.73</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of post master's counseling experience</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of prior teaching experience</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework credit hours</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork in teaching</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional descriptive statistics regarding categorical variables as well as students’ teaching preparation experiences and requirements are provided below. Specifically, Table 5 provides the frequency and percentage of respondents who have or have not had coursework in teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching; the frequency and percentage of respondents who are or are not required to participate in coursework, fieldwork, or supervision in their program; the frequency and percentage of those who received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching; the average duration of supervision of teaching; and whether coursework in teaching was offered specifically within CES or if the course was general to teaching in higher education. This information is presented here as it addresses the types of teaching preparation experiences of doctoral students in CACREP-accredited CES programs.

In general, the majority of respondents reported completing coursework in college teaching (79.2%), engaging in some form of fieldwork in teaching (93.3%), and receiving
supervision of their teaching (87.2%). A substantial minority of students indicated that their programs did not require any coursework in college teaching (15.4%), fieldwork in teaching (21.5%), or supervision of their teaching (24.8%). Regarding the frequency of supervision, in general, respondents received either weekly supervision of teaching (51%) or little to no supervision of their teaching (16.1%). For those who received supervision of their teaching, 32.9% received 1-30 minutes of supervision and 41.6% received 31-60 minutes of supervision. Of those who took a course in college teaching, approximately 79.2% of the respondents reported taking coursework in college teaching specific to CES, while only 20.8% reported taking a general college teaching course.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Categorical Variables and Teaching Preparation Experiences and Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you taken any coursework in college teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is coursework in college teaching required?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you engaged in any fieldwork in teaching?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is fieldwork in teaching required?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you receive any supervision of your teaching during your fieldwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Descriptive statistics continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is supervision of teaching required?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of supervision of teaching</th>
<th>In General, No Supervision of Teaching</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average duration of supervision of teaching in minutes</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>14.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-180</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework in college teaching general to teaching in higher education or CES specific</th>
<th>General to Teaching in Higher Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific to Teaching in Counselor Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics for Instruments

Descriptive statistics for the instruments included in the inferential analyses are provided in Table 6 below. Statistics include the mean, standard deviation, kurtosis and skewness.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summed SSQ-A</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summed SETI</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>154.50</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An analysis of responses from those who received supervision of their teaching yielded a mean SSQ-A score of 9.82 out of 12 possible points and a standard deviation of 1.95. Values for skewness and kurtosis for the SSQ-A suggest that this variable was normally distributed (George & Mallery, 2016). On the SETI, the mean score was 154.50 out of 188 with a standard deviation of 21.01. Values for skewness and kurtosis for the SETI also suggest that this variable was normally distributed.

Because the SETI and SSQ-A instruments needed modification for the purposes of this study, this researcher also performed exploratory factor analyses and calculated reliability estimates on the SETI and SSQ-A. The exploratory factor analysis and Chronbach’s alpha provided an estimate of the validity and internal consistency of items for both instruments.

To match changes in CACREP standards, changes to the SETI included the addition of eight items and modification of wording for 12 items. The modified SETI had a Chronbach alpha of .97, suggesting strong internal consistency of items. Because Tollerud (1990) originally conceptualized items on the SETI as falling into a single factor, the exploratory factor analysis was constrained to one factor. The modified SETI, which contained a total of 47 items, had factor loadings ranging from .45 to .76 (representing 40.40% of the variance). Tollerud reported factor loadings from .38 to .78 in the original study. All items except one (i.e., item 47 “model counseling skills”) received factor loadings above .54. Given Costello and Osborne’s (2005) suggestion that, in the social sciences, factor loadings of .40 and higher are considered within the acceptable range, the factor analysis results provide additional strong evidence of the SETI’s construct validity.

The SSQ, which is a slightly modified version of the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ), also contained one factor (Ladany, Hill, Corgett, & Nut, 1996). Though the literature
review for this study did not uncover information regarding factor loadings for the SSQ, Nguyen, Attkisson, and Stegner (1983) reported that the CSQ “showed only one factor” (p. 311). The adapted SSQ (SSQ-A), containing a total of three items, had factor loadings ranging from .88 to .90 (representing 79.77% of the variance). The analysis of the SSQ-A produced a Chronbach alpha of .87, which suggests strong internal consistency. The next section provides results for inferential statistics used to address the research questions and corresponding hypotheses for this study.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The research hypotheses were tested through the use of multiple linear regression, independent $t$-test, and one-way ANOVA analyses. For all regression analyses, the control variables of sex, race/ethnicity, post-master’s counseling experience, and total prior teaching experience were entered into the first block to control for their influence on self-efficacy toward teaching. Next, depending on the research question, the teaching preparation variable(s) of interest were placed into the following block. This allowed the researcher to ascertain the proportion of variability accounted for by the teaching preparation variables of interest on SETI scores.

Additionally, while checking for multicolinearity issues for research questions that required multiple linear regression, this researcher found that age significantly correlated with post-master’s counseling experience ($p < .001; r = .65$) and professional teaching experience prior to entering one’s doctorate ($p < .001; r = .36$). Because age related significantly to two other control variables, and because age appears conceptually related to post-master’s counseling experience and previous teaching experience (i.e., the older someone is, the more likely he or she is to have more experience), this variable was excluded from all regression analyses.
Research Question 1

The first research question and corresponding hypothesis addressed the relationship between the number of courses in college teaching and scores on the self-efficacy toward teaching inventory. Specifically, the first research question, “Is the self-reported amount of formal instruction in college teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?” had a null hypothesis of “H₀: There is no significant relationship between the amount of formal instruction in college teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.”

To test the hypothesis for research question one, the researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis which included the control variables and the quantity of coursework in college teaching. The $R$, $R^2$, $F$-statistic and corresponding $p$-value are located below in Table 7. The first block included the control variables of sex, race/ethnicity, post-master’s counseling experience, and prior teaching experience. In this model, the control variables accounted for a statistically insignificant ($p = .07; F = 2.23$) 6% of the variability in SETI scores. Notably, the $p$-value was .07 which is close to the threshold of significance. Perhaps with a larger sample, or with a more careful selection of the sample, this analysis would produce a significant result.

After including coursework in college teaching, the proportion of variability explained by the statistically significant regression model ($p = .07; F = 3.75$) increased by an additional 6%, for a total of 12%. Furthermore, the addition of coursework in college teaching to the regression model produced a significant change in $R^2$ (i.e., $\Delta R^2$). Because the $p$-value of 0.003 for the regression model that included coursework in college teaching was less than the specified alpha
level of .05, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the amount of formal instruction in college teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores. Thus, the results of this study indicated that coursework in college teaching can significantly linearly predict SETI scores.

Table 7

Regression Model with Control Only and Control with Coursework in College Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables and coursework in college teaching</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents the results of a regression analysis that included demographic variables and coursework in college teaching, the independent variable of interest in this research question.

Table 8

Regression Coefficients for Control Variables and Coursework in College Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>147.41</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post master’s counseling experience</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior teaching experience</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in college teaching</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 8, coursework in college teaching was the only significant (p = .003; t = 3.05) predictor in this regression model. The unstandardized coefficient for coursework in
teaching indicates that, holding all other variables constant, an individual’s SETI score will increase 2.20 points on average with each semester (or equivalent) hour of coursework. The VIF values indicated no multicollinearity issues. Notably, in this regression analysis, and similarly in the regression analyses for research questions two, three, and five, the standardized coefficients for race/ethnicity and prior teaching experience yielded relatively low $p$-values. As the $p$-values for these predictors approach the specified alpha-level .05, this may indicate that prior teaching and race/ethnicity can aide in the linear prediction of SETI scores, but values fail to meet the threshold of .05.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question and corresponding hypothesis addressed the relationship between the amount of fieldwork in teaching and level of self-efficacy toward teaching. Specifically, this research question asked, “Is the self-reported number of courses taught or cotaught related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?” and the corresponding null hypothesis was, “$H_0$: There will be no significant relationship between the number of courses taught or cotaught and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.”

Based upon previous research (Tollerud, 1990; Olguin, 2004), this researcher first grouped respondents according to the number of fieldwork in teaching experiences. Similar to findings by Tollerud (1990) and Olguin (2004), individuals in this study who reported no fieldwork in teaching experience indicated higher mean SETI scores ($M=161.00; SD=16.19$) than those with one to two fieldwork experiences ($M=145.60; SD=21.41$) and three to four
fieldwork experiences ($M=148.41; SD=20.90$). Once respondents accumulated five or more fieldwork experiences, the mean SETI score rose above that of those with no, one to two, and three to four fieldwork in teaching experiences ($M=154.50; SD=21.01$).

Table 9

*Frequency, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Fieldwork in Teaching Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of experiences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No fieldwork in teaching</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>161.00</td>
<td>16.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 fieldwork in teaching experiences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>145.59</td>
<td>21.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 Fieldwork in teaching experiences</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>148.41</td>
<td>20.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more fieldwork in teaching experiences</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>161.06</td>
<td>19.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see from the table above, scores begin high, drop off after one to two experiences, slightly rise after three to four, and then increase substantially after five or more experiences. This information influenced the decision of whether to conduct and report results for a linear or non-linear multiple regression analysis. After producing linear, quadratic, and cubic regression models, the amount of variability accounted for by the linear regression model exceeded that of the curvilinear and cubic multiple regression. Furthermore, the $\Delta R^2$ from the linear to quadratic model and the linear to cubic model was not significant. In addition to examining a scatter plot of fieldwork in teaching and SETI scores, a test of linearity ($p = .002; F=9.94$) and deviation from linearity ($p = .345; F=1.11$) supported a linear relationship between fieldwork in teaching and SETI scores. Because of this, the results presented are from the linear multiple regression analysis.

To test the hypothesis for research question two, this researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis which included the control variables and the amount of fieldwork in teaching. The $R, R^2, F$ statistic and corresponding $p$-value are located below in Table 10.
Table 10

Regression Model with Control Only and Control with Fieldwork in Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables and fieldwork in teaching</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first block included the control variables of sex, race/ethnicity, post-master’s counseling experience, and prior teaching experience. In this model, the control variables accounted for a statistically insignificant ($p = .069; F = 2.23$) 6% of the variability in SETI scores. After including fieldwork in teaching, the proportion of variability explained by the statistically significant regression model ($p = .004; F = 3.67$) increased by an additional 6%, for a total of 12%. Moreover, the addition of fieldwork in teaching to the regression model produced a significant change in $R^2$ (i.e., $\Delta R^2$). Because the $p$-value of 0.004 for the regression model that included fieldwork in teaching was less than the specified alpha level of .05, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the number of courses taught or cotauited and self-efficacy toward teaching scores. Thus, the results of this study indicate that fieldwork in teaching can significantly linearly predict SETI scores.

Table 11 presents the results of a regression analysis that included demographic variables and fieldwork in teaching, the teaching preparation variable of interest for this research question.
Table 11

Regression Coefficients for Control Variables and Fieldwork in Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>147.25</td>
<td>34.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-3.52</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post master’s counseling experience</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior teaching experience</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork in teaching</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 11, fieldwork in teaching was the only significant \( p = .003 \) predictor in this regression model. The unstandardized coefficient for fieldwork in teaching indicates that for every additional fieldwork experience, on average, an individual’s SETI score will increase 1.10 points, holding all other variables constant. The VIF values indicated no multicollinearity issues.

Research Question 3

The third research question and corresponding hypothesis addressed the difference between varying frequencies of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching. Specifically, the research question asked, “How do CES doctoral students with weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?” and the null hypothesis was, “\( H_0: \) There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of
teaching.” To test this hypothesis, the researcher conducted a one-way ANOVA which included all five levels of frequency of supervision.

In order to determine whether the data violated the assumption of homogeneity of variance, the researcher conducted Levene’s Test. As seen in Table 12, the data did not violate homogeneity of variance as it produced an insignificant test statistic.

Table 12

Test of Homogeneity of Variance: Frequency of Supervision of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003), with an alpha of .05, power of .80, and effect size of 1.25, sample size per cell required at least 12. This condition was met, with the following number of respondents per cell: 77 who received weekly supervision of teaching; 19 who received bi-weekly supervision of teaching; 12 who received monthly supervision of teaching; 18 who received supervision of teaching through appointment only; and 24 who, in general, did not receive supervision of teaching.

Table 13 provides the SETI means and standard deviations for each frequency of supervision of teaching.

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of SETI Scores: Level of Supervision Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of supervision of teaching</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly supervision</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>159.28</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-weekly supervision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>151.37</td>
<td>24.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly supervision</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>146.00</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment only supervision</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>149.11</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general no supervision</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>150.13</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 12, those with weekly supervision reported the highest mean SETI score of 159.28 and standard deviation of 19.84. Those with bi-weekly supervision had a mean SETI score of 151.37 and a standard deviation of 24.46. Respondents with monthly supervision had a mean SETI score of 146.00 and a standard deviation of 16.80. Those with supervision by appointment only had a mean SETI score of 149.11 and a standard deviation of 25.60. The group who in general did not receive supervision of their teaching had a mean SETI score of 150.13 and a standard deviation of 17.46. Similar to respondents who did not report any fieldwork in teaching experience, those who received supervision by appointment only or in general did not receive supervision of teaching reported mean SETI scores higher than those who received monthly or bi-weekly supervision.

Next, as shown in Table 14, a one-way ANOVA revealed no significant difference in SETI scores between the five levels of supervision ($p = .07, F = 2.21$).

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3769.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>942.31</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>61552.02</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>427.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65321.25</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this traditional one-way ANOVA, the researcher conducted a Welch test, which can be utilized when there is an unequal number of respondents in each group and/or when homogeneity of variance is violated. As shown in Table 15, the results of the Welch test also indicated an insignificant difference between groups ($p = .07$, Welch’s Statistic = 2.40). Because the $p$-values for the one-way ANOVA (.07) and Welch test (.07) were greater than the specified alpha level of .05, this researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no
significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching. It is important to note that the $p$-value of .07 was close to the threshold of .05, which indicates that there is likely a difference between mean SETI scores, but it fails to meet the specified value. Perhaps with a larger sample, or with a more careful selection of the sample, this analysis would produce a significant result.

Table 15

*Welch Test: Frequency of Supervision of Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In recognition of the large difference between cell sizes for frequency of supervision and the CACREP 2016 doctoral teaching standard requirement of weekly supervision for those who engage teaching internships, a follow-up independent samples $t$-test comparing mean SETI scores for those with weekly supervision of teaching and any other frequency was conducted. The collapsing of bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching groups into “any other frequency” resulted in almost an equal number of respondents in each cell. Specifically, 76 respondents indicated receiving weekly supervision of their teaching and 73 respondents indicated receiving some other frequency of supervision of their teaching. The independent samples $t$-test was used to test the null hypothesis that no significant difference existed in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who received weekly and any other frequency of supervision of teaching. The results of this independent samples $t$-test are presented in Table 16.
Table 16

*Means and Standard Deviations of SETI Scores: Weekly Versus Any Other Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Supervision</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Other Frequency</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>149.52</td>
<td>21.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Supervision</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>159.28</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see from the Table 16, below, those with weekly supervision had higher SETI scores than those who received some other form of supervision of teaching (i.e., bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, or in general no supervision of teaching). Specifically, the 76 respondents receiving weekly supervision of their teaching had a mean SETI score of 159.28 and a standard deviation of 21.17, and the 73 respondents indicated receiving some other frequency of supervision had a mean SETI score of 149.52 and a standard deviation of 19.84.

Before running the independent samples *t*-test, this researcher conducted Levene’s Test in order to determine if the data met the independent samples *t*-test’s assumption of homogeneity of variance between the groups. After determining that the of homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated, the researcher conducted an independent samples *t*-test to test the follow-up null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences in SETI scores between those who received weekly and those who received any other frequency of supervision of teaching. The results of both the Levene’s Test and the independent samples *t*-test are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

*Summary of *t*-Test and Levene’s Test: Frequency of Supervision of Teaching*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test</th>
<th><em>t</em>-test for equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>F</em></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>145.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings revealed a statistically significant difference between the mean SETI scores ($p = \cdot 004; t = -2.90$) of those receiving weekly supervision and those receiving any other frequency of supervision of teaching. Because the $p$-value of 0.004 for the independent samples $t$-test was less than the specified alpha level of .05, this researcher rejected the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have received weekly and any other frequency of supervision of teaching. The results of this study indicate that, on average, those who do not receive weekly supervision of their teaching had a SETI score that was 9.76 points lower than those who received weekly supervision of their teaching. Again, possible scores on the SETI ranged from 47 to 188.

**Research Question 4**

The fourth research question and corresponding hypothesis addressed the relationship between CES doctoral students’ satisfaction with the supervision of teaching they received and their level of self-efficacy toward teaching. Specifically, the fourth research question asked, “Is the perceived quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?” and the null hypothesis was, “$H_0$: There is no significant relationship between reported quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.”

To test the hypothesis for research question four, this researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis which included the control variables and summed scores for the SSQ-A. The $R, R^2, F$ statistic and corresponding $p$-value for this analysis are presented in Table 18.
Table 18

*Regression Model with Control Only and Control with SSQ-A Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables and SSQ-A scores</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first block included the control variables of sex, race/ethnicity, post-master’s counseling experience, and prior teaching experience. In this model, the control variables accounted for a statistically insignificant ($p = .066; F = 2.27$) 7% of the variability in SETI scores. After including SSQ-A scores, the proportion of variability explained by the statistically significant regression model ($p < .000; F = 9.02$) increased by an additional 21%, for a total of 28%. Moreover, the addition of SSQ-A to the regression model produced a significant change in $R^2$ (i.e., $\Delta R^2$). Because the $p$-value was less than .000 for the regression model that included the SSQ-A scores was less than the specified alpha level of .05, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between reported quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores. Thus, the results of this study indicate that quality of supervision of teaching can significantly linearly predict SETI scores.

As shown in Table 19 below, scores for the SSQ-A, the teaching preparation variable of interest in this research question, was a significant ($p < .000; t = 5.79$) predictor in the regression model. The unstandardized coefficient for the SSQ-A indicates that, holding all other variables constant, an individual’s SETI score will increase 4.96 points, on average, for every one point increase in SSQ-A scores reflecting satisfaction with supervision. Race/ethnicity was also a significant ($p = .049; t = 1.99$) predictor in the regression model. With White as the reference group, the unstandardized coefficient for race/ethnicity indicates that as compared to Whites, all
other races are expected on average to have SETI scores that are 7.73 points higher, holding all other variables constant. The VIF values indicated no multicollinearity issues.

Table 19

*Regression Coefficients for Control Variables and SSQ-A Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>105.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-5.50</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post master’s counseling experience</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior teaching experience</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSQ-A</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 5**

The fifth research question and corresponding hypothesis addressed the relationship between the combination of coursework in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and the frequency and perceived quality of supervision, and CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. Specifically, this research question asked, “Is the combined and relative contribution of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?” and the null hypothesis was, “H₀: There is no significant relationship between the combined factors of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy.
toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.”

To test the hypothesis for research question five, this researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis which included the control variables and all the teaching preparation variables of interest. The $R, R^2, F$ statistic and corresponding $p$-value are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

| Regression Model with Control Only and Control with All Teaching Variables of Interest |
|---|---|---|---|
| Model | $R$ | $R^2$ | $F$ | $p$ |
| Control variables | .27 | .07 | 2.27 | .066 |
| Control variables and all teaching variables of interest | .61 | .37 | 8.58 | <.000 |

The first block included the control variables of sex, race/ethnicity, post-master’s counseling experience, and prior teaching experience. In this model, the control variables accounted for a statistically insignificant ($p = .066; F = 2.27$) 7% of the variability in SETI scores. After including all teaching preparation variables of interest, the proportion of variability explained by the statistically significant regression model ($p < .000; F = 8.58$) increased by an additional 30%, for a total of 37%. Moreover, the addition of teaching preparation variables of interest to the regression model produced a significant change in $R^2$ (i.e., $\Delta R^2$). Because the $p$-value was less than .000 for the regression model that included the teaching preparation variables of interest was less than the specified alpha level of .05, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the combined factors of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision.
of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores. Thus, the results of this study indicate that
the teaching preparation variables of interest can significantly linearly predict SETI scores.

As shown in Table 21 below, with the exception of frequency of supervision, all
standardized coefficients for the teaching preparation variables of interest proved significant.

Table 21

*Regression Coefficients for Control Variables and All Teaching Variables of Interest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>96.60</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>-5.30</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Master’s Counseling Experience</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Teaching Experience</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework in College Teaching</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fieldwork in Teaching Experiences</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Supervision</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSQ-A</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>&lt;.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifically, coursework in college teaching (p = .010; t = 2.62), fieldwork in teaching (p = .015; t = 2.48), and SSQ-A (p < .000; t = 5.53) were significant predictors in the regression model. The unstandardized coefficient for coursework in college teaching indicates that, holding all other variables constant, an individual’s SETI score will increase 1.84 points, on average, for
every one semester (or equivalent) hour of coursework on college teaching. The unstandardized
coefficient for fieldwork in teaching indicates that, holding all other variables constant, an
individual’s SETI score will increase .91 points, on average, for every additional fieldwork
experience. The unstandardized coefficient for the SSQ-A indicates that, holding all other
variables constant, an individual’s SETI score will increase 4.73 points, on average, for every
one-unit increase of perceptions of satisfaction and quality of supervision. The VIF values
indicated no multicollinearity issues.

Courville and Thompson (2001) recommended reporting structure coefficients in addition
to β weights (i.e., standardized slopes) to provide a more comprehensive picture of the
contribution of individual predictors on the variability in the outcome variable. Thus, to better
understand the individual contributions of the identified teaching preparation variables of interest
on predicted SETI scores, structure coefficients are provided in Table 22.

Table 22
Structure Coefficients with Control Variables and All Teaching Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Post master’s counseling experience</th>
<th>Prior Teaching experience</th>
<th>Coursework in College Teaching</th>
<th>Fieldwork in Teaching</th>
<th>Frequency of supervision</th>
<th>SSQ-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r_{ij}^2$</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in this table, sex accounted for 1% of the total proportion of variability of
predicted SETI scores, whereas race accounted for 6%, post master’s counseling experience
accounted for 5%, prior teaching experience accounted for 9%, coursework in college teaching
accounted for 23%, fieldwork in teaching accounted for 21%, frequency of supervision (i.e.,
weekly versus all other frequencies) accounted for 21%, and the quality and satisfaction of
supervision as measured by the SSQ-A accounted for the most proportion of variability, at 56% of the total variability for predicted SETI scores.

**Research Question 6**

The sixth research question and corresponding hypothesis addressed the difference in self-efficacy toward teaching between those who had and had not received supervision of teaching. Specifically, this research question asked, “How do CES doctoral students with no supervision of fieldwork in teaching and those with supervision of fieldwork in teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?” The null hypothesis was, “H₀: There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have or have not received supervision of teaching.” To test this hypothesis, the researcher conducted an independent samples t-test which included those with and without supervision of teaching.

According to Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003), for an alpha of .05, power of .80, and effect size of 1.25, sample size per cell required at least 12. As reported earlier, 130 respondents received some form of supervision of teaching and 19 did not receive any supervision of teaching. Table 23 below provides the means and standard deviations for those with and without any supervision of teaching. Specifically, respondents with supervision of teaching had a mean SETI score of 155.07 and standard deviation of 21.32. Those who did not receive supervision had a mean SETI score of 150.58 and a standard deviation of 18.76. As evident from Table 23, overall those with supervision had larger mean scores than those without. Importantly, this question differs from research question three in that it examines the presence or absence of supervision rather than comparing varying levels of frequency of supervision. Thus, mean SETI scores for those who received supervision (n=130) included all respondents who received some frequency of supervision, while the mean SETI scores for those who did not receive supervision
(n=19) included the majority of respondents who indicated that they did not receive supervision of teaching in general.

Table 23

Means and Standard Deviations of SETI Scores: Supervision Versus No Supervision of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision of teaching</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>155.07</td>
<td>21.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No supervision</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>150.58</td>
<td>18.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before running the independent samples t-test, this researcher conducted Levene’s Test in order to determine if the data met the independent samples t-test’s assumption of homogeneity of variance between the groups. After determining that the of homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated, the researcher conducted an independent samples t-test to test the follow-up null hypothesis that there would be no significant differences in SETI scores between those who received supervision of teaching and those who did not. The results of both the Levene’s Test and the independent samples t-test are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Summary of t-Test and Levene’s Test: Supervision Versus No Supervision of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>25.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings revealed an insignificant difference between the mean SETI score ($p = .39; t = .87$) of those with and without supervision of teaching. In addition to an independent samples t-test, a Welch test was run as the groups had an unequal number of respondents. As shown in
Table 25, the results of the Welch test also indicated an insignificant difference between groups
\( p = .35; \) Welch’s Statistic = .92).

Table 25

**Welch Test: Supervision Versus No Supervision of Teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the \( p \)-values for the independent samples \( t \)-test (.39) and Welch test (.35) were greater than the specified alpha level of .05, this researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have or have not received supervision of teaching.

**Chapter Summary**

Table 26 below provides a summary of the results of this study. Specifically, for each research question, it identifies the corresponding hypothesis; the statistical analysis and results; and the conclusion based on the results.

Table 26

**Summary of Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>Analysis and results</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1: Is the self-reported amount of formal instruction in college teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>( H_0 ): There is no significant relationship between the amount of formal instruction in college teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.</td>
<td>Linear Multiple Regression ( p &lt; .05 ) Reject the ( H_0 )</td>
<td>Coursework in college teaching can significantly linearly predict CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question (continued)</td>
<td>Null hypothesis (continued)</td>
<td>Analysis and results (continued)</td>
<td>Conclusion (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2: Is the self-reported number of courses taught or cotaught related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>$H_0$: There will be no significant relationship between the number of courses taught or cotaught and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience.</td>
<td>Linear Multiple Regression $p &lt; .05$ Reject the $H_0$</td>
<td>Fieldwork in teaching can significantly linearly predict CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 3: How do CES doctoral students with weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?</td>
<td>$H_0$: There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching.</td>
<td>One-way ANOVA $p &gt; .05$ Fail to reject the $H_0$</td>
<td>There was no significant difference in CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching scores between those with weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-Up Analysis for Research Question 3.</td>
<td>$H_0$: There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have received weekly and any other frequency of supervision of teaching</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test $p &lt; .05$ Reject the $H_0$</td>
<td>On average, CES doctoral students who did not receive weekly supervision of their teaching had a self-efficacy toward teaching score that was 9.76 lower than those who received weekly supervision of their teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question (continued)</td>
<td>Null hypothesis (continued)</td>
<td>Analysis and results (continued)</td>
<td>Conclusion (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 4: Is the perceived quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>H₀: There is no significant relationship between reported quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master's counseling experience</td>
<td>Linear multiple regression</td>
<td>The quality of supervision of teaching, as measured by the SSQ-A, can significantly linearly predict CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 5: Is the combined and relative contribution of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching related to self-efficacy toward teaching scores in students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs?</td>
<td>H₀: There is no significant relationship between the combined factors of formal instruction in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching and self-efficacy toward teaching scores for students enrolled in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs, controlling for professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program and post-master’s counseling experience</td>
<td>Linear multiple regression</td>
<td>The teaching preparation variables of interest (college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and frequency and quality of supervision of teaching) can significantly linearly predict CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 6: How do CES doctoral students with no supervision of fieldwork in teaching and those with supervision of fieldwork in teaching differ in terms of self-efficacy toward teaching scores?</td>
<td>H₀: There is no significant difference in self-efficacy toward teaching scores of CES doctoral students who have or have not received supervision of teaching</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>There was no significant difference in CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching scores between those with and without supervision of teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the results of this study indicate that the identified teaching preparation variables of interest (coursework in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, frequency of teaching, and the perceived quality of supervision) were significantly related to self-efficacy toward teaching.
Individually, each teaching preparation variable produced a significant regression model. Together, the teaching variables of interest produced a significant regression model and accounted for over 30% of the variability in SETI scores. Although a one-way ANOVA did not detect significant mean differences between those who received weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching, an independent samples $t$-test revealed a significant difference between those who received weekly and any other frequency of supervision of teaching. Finally, an independent samples $t$-test did not detect significant mean differences between those with and without supervision of teaching. Chapter 5 will discuss these findings in relation to teaching preparation in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs as well as implications for the findings and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Counselor educators spend a greater proportion of time in teaching and teaching-related responsibilities than in research and service combined (Davis et al., 2006). In addition, evidence of teaching effectiveness is necessary not only for getting a job in counselor education (Silverman, 2003; Warnke, Bethany, & Hedstrom, 1999), but also for obtaining tenure and promotion (Isaacs & Sabella, 2013). Despite this, teaching preparation in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs has historically received considerably less attention than training in research and additional clinical preparation (Hall, 2007; Lanning, 1990; Zimpfer, Cox, West, Bubenzer, & Brooks, 1997). Within the CES profession’s literature base, there is a dearth of research on how to effectively prepare future counselor educators for their teaching responsibilities (ACES, 2016; Barrio-Minton, Wachter Morris, & Yaites, 2013). More specifically, little is known about the relationship between specific teaching preparation strategies offered by CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs and students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate how these teaching preparation strategies; frequency and perceived quality of supervision of teaching; the number of courses taught or cotaught; and the number of experiences in formal instruction in college teaching related to the variability in self-efficacy toward teaching, statistically controlling for post-master’s counseling experience and professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program. This chapter will discuss the results related to this primary purpose as well as
results regarding the prevalence of teaching preparation practices in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs in the United States. Specifically, this chapter is organized into five sections: (a) the prevalence of teaching preparation practices; (b) a summary and interpretation of the major findings broken down by research question; (c) implication of findings; (d) limitations of this study; and (e) suggestions for future research.

**Prevalence of Teaching Preparation Practices**

This study collected data on the prevalence of three different teaching preparation practices. Specifically, it examined formal coursework in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, and supervision of teaching as three strategies through which doctoral CES programs may prepare future counselor educators for their responsibilities as teachers. This section will compare and contrast this study’s findings with previous research and will discuss their implications.

**Formal Instruction in College Teaching**

In previous research, Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) found that 97% of CES doctoral programs required students to take a course in college teaching, and Hunt and Gilmore (2011) reported that 89% of their sample required students to take a course in college teaching. In the current study, 84.6% of the respondents indicated that their programs required coursework in college teaching. Hunt and Gilmore did not collect data regarding whether required coursework in college teaching was specific to CES or more general in nature, but Barrio-Minton and Price reported that 93% of CES doctoral programs required a course specific to teaching within CES. In this study, of those respondents who had taken a course in college teaching, 79.2% indicated that the course was specific to CES.
Though the reason for these discrepancies is unclear, a lower percentage of respondents in this study indicated that coursework on college teaching was required and a lower percentage of respondents in this study identified the college teaching coursework as specific to CES. One possible explanation for these discrepancies is that the previous two studies (Barrio-Minton & Price, 2015; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011) collected data from doctoral program liaisons, whereas this study collected data directly from doctoral students. Alternatively, the discrepancies may reflect variability in teaching preparation across CACREP-Accredited CES doctoral programs in the United States; a decrease in the number of CES programs requiring coursework in college teaching; or a sampling bias. For example, liaisons from programs without strong teaching components may have chosen not to participate in the previous studies.

Fieldwork in Teaching

Previous research suggests that the requirement for fieldwork in teaching is becoming more common. In 1990, Tollerud found that only 56% of respondents (doctoral students and junior faculty members in counselor education) engaged in any fieldwork in teaching during their doctoral program. Similarly, Hall and Hulse-Killacky (2010) reported that only 53.3% of respondents (current counselor educators) had any fieldwork in teaching experiences during their doctoral programs. In a recent study, however, Barrio, Minton, and Price (2015) reported that 86% of CES doctoral programs required fieldwork in teaching. Results from this study indicated that the majority of students received some form of fieldwork in teaching experience, regardless of whether it was required or not. Specifically, 93.3% of respondents indicated that they had engaged in some form of fieldwork experience and 78.5% of respondents reported their programs required it.
These results differ greatly from those of Tollerud (1990) and Hall and Hulse-Killacky (2010). The year in which these researchers conducted their studies and the demographics of respondents may have contributed to this difference. Specifically, Tollerud’s study took place before CACREP standards explicitly required doctoral programs to provide teaching preparation. Hall and Hulse-Killacky’s study included all counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs, which could have included faculty members trained before explicit teaching preparation was required.

Findings from this study were most consistent with those of Barrio-Minton and Price (2015), who conducted a national descriptive study examining the prevalence of teaching preparation practices in CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs. However, a smaller percentage of respondents in this study identified a requirement for fieldwork in teaching than did the respondents in Barrio-Minton and Price’s study. Whereas 21.5% of the doctoral students in this study reported that their programs did not require fieldwork in teaching, only 14% of program liaisons in Barrio and Price’s study reported that fieldwork in teaching was not a requirement. Similar to coursework in college teaching, one possible explanation for this discrepancy is that Barrio-Minton and Price (2015) collected data from doctoral program liaisons, whereas this study collected data directly from doctoral students. This discrepancy may also reflect variability in teaching preparation across CACREP-Accredited CES doctoral programs in the United States, a decrease in the number of CES programs requiring fieldwork in teaching, or sampling bias.

Supervision of Teaching

Finally, there is a dearth of CES literature related to the supervision of teaching. According to Barrio-Minton and Price, program liaisons reported that most students had
“supervision arrangements with a mentoring faculty member” (p. 2). The authors did not, however, specify the details of the arrangements (e.g., frequency or duration). Although they, like Barrio-Minton and Price, did not provide data regarding the prevalence of supervision of teaching within CES programs, Baltrinic et al. (2016) did address frequency and duration issues by suggesting that supervisors and supervisees should ideally meet weekly for one hour. In another study addressing supervision of teaching, Orr et al. (2008) proposed a formalized coteaching model that required students and faculty members to engage in weekly structured supervision. Consistent with the recommendations of Orr et al. and Baltrinic et al., the most recent CACREP standards (2016) now require one-hour of weekly individual supervision for those who engage in teaching internships.

This is the first known study to explicitly address the prevalence, frequency, and duration of supervision of teaching experiences in CES doctoral programs. In the current study, only 87.2% of respondents indicated that they received supervision of their teaching, and only 75.2% of respondents reported that their programs required it. Approximately 51% of respondents indicated that they received weekly supervision of teaching, whereas 12.8% received it bi-weekly, 8.1% received it monthly, 12% received it by appointment only, and 16.1% received in general no supervision of their teaching. For those who engaged in fieldwork in teaching, 14.1% received 0 minutes of supervision of their teaching, 33.6% received 1-40 minutes of supervision, 40.9% received 45-60 minutes of supervision, and 11.5% received 90-180 minutes of supervision. Of those who engaged in a fieldwork in teaching experience, 47.7% received 40 minutes or less of supervision of their teaching. Moreover, nearly half of the respondents indicated not receiving weekly supervision of teaching (49%).
These results suggest that nearly half of CES doctoral students in CACREP-accredited programs are not receiving the frequency or duration of supervision as specified by CACREP (2016).

**Summary and Interpretation of Major Findings**

The six research questions guiding this study focused on the individual and collective impact of three teaching preparation practices on the self-efficacy toward teaching experienced by CES doctoral students. The results of the inferential statistical analyses for each research question were presented in Chapter 4. This section, organized by research question, will discuss these results as they pertain to the preparation of CES doctoral students for their future responsibilities as teachers.

**Research Question 1**

To test the hypothesis for the first research question, this researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis. The regression model which included the control variables and coursework in college teaching produced a significant regression model and accounted for 12% of the variability in SETI scores. Thus, coursework in college teaching can significantly linearly predict SETI scores. These results suggest that, on average, respondents found their coursework in college teaching experiences increased their overall confidence in teaching.

Results from this study differ substantially from previous research in CES. Specifically, respondents in Hunt and Gilmore’s (2011) study indicated that coursework in college teaching proved unhelpful in preparing them to teach and attributed this to too few opportunities to engage in actual teaching. Tollerud (1990) also found that courses and seminars concerning college teaching neither significantly strengthened nor diminished respondents’ SETI scores. Similarly, Olguin (2004) found no significant difference in CES students’ confidence in their
teaching among those who had taken a CES-specific teaching course, a general college teaching course, or no college teaching.

Previous researchers have found that CES students viewed a more practical approach to college teaching coursework as more likely to strengthen their overall preparedness and confidence in teaching (Hall & Hulse-Killacky, 2010; Hunt & Gilmore, 2011). It is possible that college teaching coursework has become more practical in nature than it was at the time of these previous studies. This study’s finding that coursework in college teaching experiences increased CES doctoral students’ overall confidence in teaching may also reflect their programs’ implementation of CACREP 2009 and CACREP 2016 standards for teaching preparation, as requirements for training greatly expanded in these revisions. For example, the majority of respondents in this study indicated that they had taken a course specifically for teaching within CES. Further research is needed to clarify how coursework in college teaching is supporting students’ development.

Research Question 2

To test the hypothesis for research question two, this researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis. In the regression model which included the control variables, fieldwork in teaching produced a significant regression model and, similar to coursework in college teaching, accounted for 12% of the variability in SETI scores. Thus, fieldwork can significantly linearly predict SETI scores. These results suggest that, on average, as respondents engaged in more fieldwork in teaching experiences, their overall confidence in teaching increased.

This finding, that fieldwork in teaching has a statistically significant impact on teaching self-efficacy, is consistent with previous CES research. Specifically, Hall and Hulse-Killacky
(2010) found that, of all the teaching preparation practices, experiences associated with
fieldwork in teaching received the highest mean scores. Hunt and Gilmore (2011) also affirmed
the influence of fieldwork for increasing students’ confidence in teaching. Notably, respondents
in the Hunt and Gilmore study identified engagement in multiple supervised teaching
opportunities that mimicked the actual teaching responsibilities required of a counselor educator
as particularly helpful. Also consistent with the results of this study, Tollerud (1990) and Olguin
(2004) found that the more teaching experiences individuals acquired during their doctoral
programs, the higher their self-efficacy toward teaching was.

However, this study’s findings regarding the relative importance of fieldwork, differ from
previous research and theory-based predictions. Specifically, although fieldwork in teaching was
significantly related to SETI scores in this study, it was surprising that it only accounted for 12%
of the variability and was identical to the regression model for coursework in college teaching. In
this study, even after excluding those without any fieldwork in teaching experience (i.e., those
whose SETI scores appeared to reflect unfounded confidence), the proportion of variability
explained by the regression model containing fieldwork only increased only by 1%, for a total of
13%. In contrast, Prieto et al. (2007) found that experiences related to teaching explained 31% of
the variability in students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. Because of these conflicting findings
and the limited research addressing the impact of fieldwork in teaching on SETI, future research
is needed to clarify the relationship between fieldwork in teaching and self-efficacy toward
teaching.

It should also be noted that this finding is not consistent with Bandura’s (1997) theory
that actual experience in a particular task has the most direct and influential impact on
perceptions of self-efficacy. Though one might assume that, according to Bandura’s theory, as
respondents acquired additional teaching experience their SETI scores would have increased, the initial pattern from no experience to one to two teaching experiences did not support this. Based upon previous research (i.e., Tollerud, 1990; Olguin, 2004), this researcher first grouped respondents according to their number of fieldwork in teaching experiences. In this study, and similar to studies by Tollerud (1990) and Olguin (2004), scores for individuals who reported no fieldwork began high ($M = 161.00$), dropped after one to two experiences ($M = 145.49$), slightly rose after three to four experiences ($M = 148.41$), and then increased substantially and surpassed those with no fieldwork after five or more experiences ($M = 161.06$).

However, it is important to note that self-efficacy is not necessarily a measure of actual capability, but rather one’s confidence to engage in certain behaviors to achieve a certain task (Bandura, 1997). Because of this, one’s estimation of capability and actual capability may differ. Stone (1994) suggested that, across tasks and disciplines, people often initially overestimate their own abilities and level of control over new complex tasks. In the absence of direct experience, other sources of self-efficacy influence these initial levels of self-efficacy. In particular, Bandura (1997) and Stone (1994) suggested that social comparison especially impacts efficacy expectations in individuals without previous experience in a particular task. Individuals often “gauge their expected and actual performance by comparison with that of others” (Stone, 1994, p. 453). The “other” who possesses the greatest potential for influencing efficacy beliefs of the observer is one who is perceived as possessing similar characteristics to him or her, is especially competent, and/or is engaging in an activity or task similar to the activity or task of the observer (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Regarding teaching, social comparisons used to generate appraisals of efficacy beliefs may be taken from “previous educational experiences, tradition, [or] the opinion of experienced
practitioners” (Groccia & Buskist, 2011, p. 5). Thus, the respondents in this study who lacked prior teaching experience may have initially overestimated their capability as a result of previous educational experiences. When individuals initially overestimate their abilities to perform a new task, they may not put in the time or effort needed to succeed at a given task. As a result, as Tollerud (1990) suggested, those without any actual prior teaching experience may not have realized the complexity of this task, the effort required, or “skills they actually lack[ed] for effective teaching” (p. 138). This realization may be reflected in respondents’ initial drop in mean SETI scores from no teaching experiences to one to two teaching experiences.

Future research is needed to examine how CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching changes over time as they move from having no actual teaching experience, begin their fieldwork in teaching, and accrue substantial experiences with fieldwork in teaching.

**Research Question 3**

Initially, this research question investigated the mean SETI score differences between five frequencies of supervision of teaching; weekly, bi-weekly, monthly, by appointment only, and in general no supervision of teaching. A one-way ANOVA and Welch test revealed no significant difference between the levels of supervision, \( p = .07, F = 2.21 \) and \( p = .07, \) Welch’s Statistic = 2.40, respectively. However, although mean comparisons did not detect a significant difference between groups, those who received weekly and bi-weekly supervision reported the highest mean SETI scores. A follow-up independent samples \( t \)-test comparing mean SETI scores for those with weekly supervision of teaching and any other frequency revealed a significant difference between mean SETI scores (\( p = .004, t = -2.90 \)). Those who received weekly supervision of their teaching also indicated a statistically significant, higher mean SETI score than those who received some other frequency of supervision of their teaching.
This finding seems to emphasize the importance of frequent supervision of teaching and supports the CACREP 2016 doctoral teaching standard that requires weekly supervision. These findings are also consistent with previous research. Specifically, Orr et al. (2008) identified weekly supervision of teaching as an important training component for supporting students’ development as teachers. Prieto & Scheel (2008) identified supervision as especially important for those without any previous teaching experience, as supervision of teaching should ideally provide needed support and feedback to help students use fieldwork in teaching experiences “as a way to increase skills as a classroom teacher” (p. 50). They concluded that supervision is “highly advisable so as to maximize the potential for these students to be as effective as possible in their instructional duties as early as possible in their careers” (p. 50). Future research could focus on what aspects of weekly supervision most strengthen self-efficacy toward teaching.

**Research Question 4**

To test the hypothesis for the fourth research question, this researcher conducted a linear multiple regression analysis. The regression model which included the control variables and perceived quality of supervision of teaching as measured by the SSQ-A, produced a significant regression model and accounted for 28% of the variability in SETI scores. Thus, respondents who indicated greater satisfaction with the quality of their supervision experienced higher self-efficacy toward teaching. This result indicates the crucial role that supervisor behavior plays in strengthening SETI scores (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). Respondents also indicated a mean SSQ-A summed score of 9.82, suggesting that on average, students found the quality of supervision of teaching good to excellent.

Results from this study are consistent with previous findings regarding the supervision of teaching. Respondents in Hall and Hulse-Killacky’s (2010) study reported their supervision of
teaching as more helpful on average than all other teaching preparation experiences except teaching an “entire course from start to finish” and creating a course syllabus (p. 5) for preparing them to teach. Qualitative studies in CES suggested that supervision of teaching with caring and competent supervisors who tailored supervision to the developmental needs of the doctoral student best supported CES students’ teaching confidence and competence (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008, Hunt and Gilmore, 2010).

This study’s findings regarding the relationship between SSQ-A scores and SETI scores also align with Bandura’s (1997) theory that verbal persuasion (e.g., constructive feedback and encouragement) is an important determinant of self-efficacy. As stated previously, supervision of teaching most readily aligns with verbal persuasion (Prieto & Meyers, 1999). Although Bandura did not identify verbal persuasion as the most influential source of self-efficacy, he described it as especially helpful when used in combination with enactive mastery experiences (Bandura, 1997). Furthermore, the results of this study also support the idea that the type and way in which feedback is given determine how information from enactive mastery experiences are interpreted and integrated into efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1986). To use a previous example, when a supervisor gives encouragement aimed at specific behaviors (Bandura, 1986), provides constructive feedback, and/or realistically conveys confidence in one’s capabilities to successfully perform a given task, the individual’s sense of self-efficacy is strengthened (Bandura, 1997). In contrast, when feedback or encouragement is disingenuous, does not match the performance, is too general, or is punitive in nature, it may diminish self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997). Thus, findings from this study suggest it is not merely the provision of supervision that strengthens SETI scores, but the overall quality of the supervisory experience, as perceived by the supervisee.
Research Question 5

To test the hypothesis for the fifth research question, the researcher utilized a regression model that combined all the teaching preparation variables of interest (i.e., coursework in college teaching, fieldwork in teaching, frequency of supervision [weekly versus all other frequencies], and quality of supervision as measured by the SSQ-A) produced a significant regression model and accounted for 37% of the variability in SETI scores. Notably, the combined model accounted for a greater amount of variability than any of the individual models.

Additionally, with the exception of frequency of supervision, all other teaching preparation variables of interest were significant predictors in the regression model. Regarding the individual proportion of variability accounted for by each significant teaching preparation variable, structure coefficients revealed that coursework in college teaching accounted for 23% of the variability, fieldwork in teaching accounted for 21%, and satisfaction with supervision accounted for the most variability at 56%. Thus, these teaching preparation variables of interest can significantly linearly predict SETI scores. In other words, those who accumulate more credit hours in college teaching, participate in more fieldwork in teaching experiences, and especially those who have greater satisfaction with the quality of supervision received, on average, will report greater self-efficacy toward teaching. The proportion of variability explained by coursework, fieldwork, and the quality of supervision suggests that programmatic attention to these components is important for strengthening CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy.

Research Question 6

The sixth research question investigated the mean SETI score differences between those who had and had not received supervision of their teaching. A t-test revealed no significant difference among the five levels of supervision ($p = .39, t = .87$). Although those who received
supervision of any kind reported higher mean SETI scores than those who did not receive supervision, the difference was not statistically significant. These findings seem surprising given the reported importance of supervision of teaching for fostering teaching knowledge and skill in CES doctoral students (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Orr et al., 2008) and for graduate students across disciplines (Prieto et al., 2007). One potential explanation could be that the presence or absence of supervision is not as important as the quality of the supervisory experience. For example, the lack of significance may be attributed to the presence of low-quality supervision for those who received it, which may not be better than no supervision at all. This is supported by the fact that SSQ-A scores in this study accounted for the greatest proportion of variability as compared to any other teaching preparation variable of interest. Because of this, further research could focus on what aspects of the supervisory experience most increase SSQ-A scores.

**Implications of Findings**

Results from this study suggest that certain approaches to teaching preparation are more effective than others for strengthening CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. Thus, CES programs should carefully consider the types of teaching preparation they provide. Beyond the programmatic level, the results of this study also have relevance to individual faculty members who provide supervision of teaching, to current and prospective doctoral students, to CACREP, and to researchers interested in the training of future counselor educators. The following sections will identify specific implications of the results of this study.

**Formal Instruction in College Teaching**

The current study identified coursework in college teaching as a significant predictor of self-efficacy toward teaching scores and therefore supports the use of coursework for fostering self-efficacy toward teaching. Despite this finding, approximately 15% of respondents indicated
that their programs do not require this component of teaching preparation. Findings from this study support the addition of a requirement that CES doctoral students take coursework in college teaching. This requirement could be added voluntarily by CES doctoral programs or could be prescribed by CACREP. If programs do not require this training component, current or prospective CES doctoral students should strongly consider taking a course in college teaching.

**Supervision of Teaching**

This study also identified supervision of teaching as another important component of teaching preparation for strengthening students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. As measured by the SSQ-A, the quality of supervision in this study referred not only to the respondents’ rating of the overall quality of supervision they received, but also their satisfaction with the amount of supervision they received and their report about whether the supervision increased their effectiveness as teachers. SSQ-A scores in this study accounted for the greatest proportion of variability as compared to any other teaching preparation variable of interest. More specifically, both the frequency and quality of supervision were significantly related to respondents’ self-efficacy toward teaching. Thus, results from this study suggest the need for weekly, high quality supervision.

With regard to the frequency of supervision, respondents who received weekly supervision of their teaching had significantly higher mean SETI scores than those who received any other frequency of supervision. Despite this finding, nearly 25% of respondents indicated that their programs do not require this component of teaching preparation. The results of this study support the addition of a requirement that CES doctoral students receive weekly supervision of their teaching. It is recommended that revisions to CACREP doctoral teaching standards in 2023 include a required internship in teaching as CACREP 2016 doctoral teaching standards.
standards currently require weekly supervision during internships. CES doctoral programs could also add this requirement voluntarily. If programs do not require this training component, current or prospective CES doctoral students should strongly consider requesting weekly supervision of teaching.

Regarding the quality of supervision, respondents who indicated greater satisfaction with the quality of their supervision reported higher self-efficacy toward teaching. In spite of this finding that high quality supervision is significantly related to SETI scores, this study found no significant difference in SETI scores between those with and without supervision of teaching. This may be because the presence of low-quality supervision may be no better than no supervision at all. Thus, it is not sufficient for CES programs to simply provide supervision of teaching, even if that supervision is offered on a weekly basis. Instead, it is essential that the supervision be high quality. Attending to the quality is also an important consideration for faculty providing supervision of teaching to CES as it is within the context of supervision that students can receive the ongoing structure, support, and intentional feedback needed to strengthen students’ confidence in teaching.

Fieldwork in Teaching

This study also identified fieldwork in teaching as a significant predictor of self-efficacy toward teaching scores and, as such, supports the use of fieldwork for training future counselor educators to teach. Consistent with studies by Olguin (2004) and Tollerud (1990), the current study found an initial drop in self-efficacy from zero experiences to one to two teaching experiences, a slight increase in self-efficacy after three to four teaching experiences, and a substantial increase in self-efficacy after five or more teaching experiences. Because of the initial drop in self-efficacy toward teaching, it seems essential that CES doctoral programs require
students to engage in multiple – and preferably at least five – supervised teaching opportunities. In this study, only 47 percent of respondents reported having completed five or more supervised teaching experiences in their doctoral program and 21 percent indicated that their programs required no supervised teaching experiences whatsoever.

In light of the results of this study, it is recommended that future revisions of the CACREP doctoral teaching standards include at least five required internships in teaching. By having CACREP require teaching internships, this researcher assumes programs would give students teaching experiences geared toward fostering their development as teachers as well as the frequency of supervision as supported from this study.

Furthermore, given the initial drop in self-efficacy toward teaching scores after CES doctoral students’ acquired one to two fieldwork in teaching experiences, it also seems essential to require fieldwork before students transition to the professoriate. If future faculty members are not made reasonably aware of the responsibilities, knowledge, and skills required for effective teaching before transitioning, they may “become demoralized and lose interest in teaching because they do not have sufficient training or guidance to help them through the predictable difficulties that all [teachers] inevitably face” (Prieto, 2003, para. 8). Providing CES doctoral students with supervised fieldwork in teaching experiences before they begin their first faculty position may serve as a buffer against occupational stress, burnout, and poor job satisfaction (Magnuson et al. 2004; Magnuson et al., 2006). This represents yet another reason CES doctoral programs and CACREP should require supervised teaching experiences. In the absence of such requirements, CES doctoral students enrolled in programs should strongly consider voluntarily engaging in multiple, supervised fieldwork experiences during their programs.
Limitations of the Study

There were several limitations the researcher considered when drawing conclusions from the results. The first potential limitation was the variability in respondents’ teaching preparation experiences. Although CACREP (2016) provides standards for doctoral teaching preparation, it does not prescribe specific methods for how programs are to deliver the content or measure student mastery of it. As such, institutions have flexibility in how they address standards. This flexibility allows for the differences across programs in teaching preparation practices. Examples of this variability included the frequency in which students received supervision of teaching, the number of fieldwork in teaching experiences, and whether students took coursework specific to teaching in CES or general to college teaching.

A second potential limitation relates to the unknown representativeness of the sample. Though many CACREP-accredited CES doctoral programs post links to their outcome reports on cacrep.org, details regarding student demographics vary from program to program. For example, some post general information regarding the percentage of students who graduated and/or have attained employment post-graduation. Other programs provide a comprehensive assessment report that includes graduation, employment, and relevant demographic information. Still other institutions do not provide links to their outcome reports, do not post outcome reports on their website, and/or have not updated links to their outcome reports on the CACREP website. Because of this, it was difficult to ascertain the number and demographic make-up of doctoral students in CACREP-accredited CES programs in the United States and, as a result, to determine the representativeness of the sample for this study. This is important, as the representativeness of the sample influences the confidence the researcher has in generalizing the results from the sample to the target population (Creswell, 2015). Because of the unknown representativeness of
the current sample, it limits the generalizability of the findings regarding the relative importance of the teaching preparation practices to all CES doctoral students in the United States.

A third limitation was the voluntary nature of this study. Because of this, individuals who decided to participate may have been quite different from those who did not participate. For example, those who responded may have had a particular interest in teaching and/or teaching preparation. This also relates to the representativeness of the respondents in this study and influences the confidence in generalizing the results from the sample to the target population (Creswell, 2015). Specifically, if those who volunteered for this study were different than the target population, it limits the generalizability of the findings from the sample to all CES doctoral students in the United States.

A fourth potential limitation was the use of CESNET-L, a listserv for professional counselors, counselor educators, and master’s and doctoral level counselor education students. Doctoral students who do not subscribe to this listserv may not have received the invitation to participate. To address this potential limitation, the researcher directly contacted doctoral program liaisons and requested their assistance in distributing an invitation to participate in this study. However, despite prompting doctoral program liaisons on three different occasions, the researcher received responses from only 13 out of the 84 program coordinators. It is not known how many coordinators forwarded the invitation. This again relates to the representativeness of the respondents in this study and the generalizability of the results from the sample to the target population of all CES doctoral students in the United States. Specifically, it is unclear how many individuals in the target population neither received an invitation to participate from their program liaison nor CESNET-L, limiting the generalizability of the results.

A fifth limitation related to normality. Specifically, an assumption in inferential statistics
is that data reflect a normal distribution. (Creswell, 2015). This allows one to draw inferences from the sample to the target population. Because values of kurtosis and skewness for post master’s counseling experience, prior teaching experience, and coursework in college teaching were outside the recommended range for normality, this could potentially influence the confidence in inferences drawn from the sample to the population for the research question one and five as they included these variables.

A sixth limitation of this study relates to the SETI. Though previous research has found a positive correlation between self-efficacy toward teaching and actual teaching effectiveness (Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Goddard et al., 2000), self-efficacy is merely a measure of one’s confidence in executing certain behaviors to accomplish a certain task. As such, the SETI does not measure one’s actual competence in teaching. As evidence that mismatches occur, the results from this and other studies demonstrate that individuals may initially over-estimate their capability. This was important to consider in drawing conclusions and, as addressed in the following recommendations for future research, demonstrates the importance of follow-up studies to investigate the relationship between SETI scores and actual effectiveness in teaching.

An seventh and final limitation relates to the variables chosen for this study. As with any research, other variables may have influenced SETI scores. In fact, the combined model that included all the teaching preparation variables of interest only accounted for 37% of the variability in SETI scores. Potentially confounding variables include supervisors’ actual approaches to supervision.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Based upon the results and limitations of this study, the researcher recommends additional research in the following areas. First, this researcher updated the SETI based upon
CACREP 2016 teaching standards and the input from experts in teaching preparation. Further research should focus on strengthening the psychometric properties of this instrument and norming it on a contemporary and representative group. Moreover, though Tollerud (1990) initially conceptualized the SETI as measuring a single factor, Tollerud grouped items into five distinct domains. Because of this, and to strengthen the validity of this instrument, future research could also include conducting an exploratory factor analysis to determine how items load on these five domains.

Based upon the results related to the coursework component of training, future research could investigate what elements of college teaching coursework contribute most to students’ self-efficacy toward teaching. Acquiring information about students’ experiences may give programs greater insight into how to best structure college teaching courses to strengthen self-efficacy toward teaching. Similarly, future research, could also investigate potential differences in the effectiveness of general college teaching courses and CES-specific teaching courses.

As mentioned previously, fieldwork in teaching accounted for less variability in self-efficacy toward teaching scores than anticipated based upon previous research (Prieto et al., 2007) and Bandura’s (1997) theoretical construct of self-efficacy. Because of these findings and the limited research addressing the impact of fieldwork in teaching on self-efficacy toward teaching, future research is needed to investigate what elements of the fieldwork in teaching experience most strengthen students’ self-efficacy toward teaching.

In addition to identifying what elements of fieldwork in teaching most strengthen self-efficacy toward teaching, future research is needed to examine how CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching changes over time as they move from having no teaching experience, begin their fieldwork in teaching, and accrue substantial experiences in fieldwork in teaching.
One could investigate how supervision and/or coursework in college teaching provided before or during students’ first teaching experiences could buffer against the initial drop in self-efficacy toward teaching. Supervision and/or coursework could intentionally include opportunities for promoting realistic expectations of students’ first teaching experiences. Similarly, researchers could also use qualitative methods to better understand how supervisors of teaching balance Stone’s (1994) suggestion of helping individuals to adjust their overestimation of self-efficacy while not “inducing the sometimes accompanying self-defeating belief that effort is irrelevant to performance” (p. 468).

Based upon the results related to the supervision of teaching component of training, future research could investigate what aspects of the supervisory experience most increase SSQ-A scores. As mentioned previously, the SSQ-A included a rating of the overall quality of supervision, satisfaction with the amount of supervision received, and whether the supervision increased perceived effectiveness in one’s role as a teacher. Researchers could use qualitative approaches to investigate each of these components. Similarly, future research could also focus on what aspects of weekly supervision most strengthen self-efficacy toward teaching scores.

Finally, the current study focused on students’ confidence in teaching as measured by the SETI. As the SETI only measures a person’s confidence in his or her ability to select and utilize appropriate teaching behaviors, it is unclear as to whether or not there is a relationship between SETI scores and actual effectiveness in teaching. Because of this, future research could investigate the relationship between SETI scores and actual teaching effectiveness.

**Conclusion**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine what relationship existed between current teaching preparation practices and the self-efficacy toward teaching of CES doctoral
students enrolled in CACREP-accredited programs in the United States. Specifically, this study investigated how CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching is related to the frequency and perceived quality of supervision of teaching; the number of courses taught or cotaught; and the number of experiences in formal instruction in college teaching, statistically controlling for post-master’s counseling experience and professional teaching experience gained prior to entering a doctoral program.

Regarding the types of teaching preparation they experienced in their doctoral programs, the majority of respondents reported that they had taken some coursework in college teaching, engaged in fieldwork in teaching, and received supervision of teaching, even if their program did not require the training component. Overall, the results of the analyses indicated that the identified teaching preparation variables of interest (the frequency and perceived quality of supervision of teaching; the number of courses taught or cotaught; and the number of experiences in formal instruction in college teaching) related to self-efficacy toward teaching as measured by the SETI. Individually, each teaching preparation variable produced a significant regression model. Together, the teaching variables of interest produced a significant regression model and accounted for over 37% of the variability in SETI scores. In addition, results also indicated a significant difference in mean self-efficacy toward teaching scores between those who received weekly and those who received any other frequency of supervision of teaching.

Results from this study seem to support emerging best practices as identified by a recent report from the ACES (2016) teaching taskforce entitled Best Practices in Teaching in Counselor Education. Although fieldwork in teaching, coursework, and weekly supervision of teaching all significantly related to self-efficacy toward teaching, the results from this study identified the perceived quality of supervision as particularly important in strengthening efficacy
beliefs. Similar to other studies in CES (Olguin, 2004; Tollerud, 1990), this study also indicated that the more actual experience in teaching students acquired during their doctoral program, the greater their self-efficacy toward teaching.

Despite the encouraging results regarding the impact of current teaching preparation practices on CES doctoral students’ self-efficacy toward teaching, some programs continue to not require students to engage in coursework, fieldwork, or supervision of teaching. In order to best prepare CES doctoral students for their future teaching responsibilities, CACREP-accredited programs should emphasize teaching preparation. Without specific training in teaching, and especially training practices that most support self-efficacy toward teaching as identified in this study and previous research, students may not feel confident to successfully transition to the professoriate or train future counselors.
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LIST OF APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT
STUDY TITLE
The Relationship Between Doctoral-Level Teaching Preparation Strategies in CACREP-Accredited Counselor Education Programs and Self-Efficacy Toward Teaching

INFORMED CONSENT
In accordance with the Office of Human Subjects Research at the University of Mississippi and the ACA code of ethics, the following information provides you, the potential participant, with an explanation of the purpose of the study, procedures of the study, time required to complete the survey, any potential known risks and benefits of participation, incentives for completing this survey, confidentiality and measures taken to ensure anonymity, and the voluntary nature of the study.

ABOUT THE STUDY
Study Purpose and Procedures
The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between your teaching preparation experiences and their impact on your confidence to engage in certain teaching behaviors and skills. If you choose to participate in this study by clicking on the link below, you will be asked to respond to an electronic survey. This survey will ask approximately 65 questions. The survey will request demographic information, ask questions about your experiences in your training program, and explore your level of confidence in your preparedness to teach as a future faculty member. The survey is online and is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Eligibility and Incentives
You may participate in this study if you are:
1. 18 years of age or older
2. Currently enrolled in a doctoral-level CACREP accredited Counselor Education program
If you participate you will have the opportunity to win one of five $20 dollar Amazon gift cards.

Confidentiality
Your responses to this survey will be anonymous. In order to ensure anonymity of your responses to this research study, your IP addresses will not be collected. To ensure confidentiality, a separate survey will be used for entering the drawing for one of five $20 Amazon gift cards. This will keep your survey responses separate from your contact information. The personal email address you provide will only be used to notify you if you have won one of the gift cards.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal
Your decision to participate or decline participation in this study is completely voluntary. Once you begin, you have the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Additionally, withdrawal will not affect your current or future relationship with this researcher or with the University of Mississippi in any way.

Possible Risks from your Participation
The risks associated with this study are minimal and are not considered to be greater than risks
ordinarily encountered in daily life.

**Possible Benefits from your Participation**
Possible benefits of this study include participants’ increased awareness of their confidence and abilities in implementing certain teaching behaviors and skills. The study results may also provide important information about which teaching preparation practices most enhance confidence in one’s teaching abilities. Additionally, it may strengthen the rationale for the requirement of a teaching internship for all counselor education doctoral students in CACREP accredited programs.

**IRB APPROVAL**
This research has been approved by the University of Mississippi Institutional Review Board (Approval #18x-113). The IRB has determined that this study fulfills the human research subject protections obligations required by state and federal law and University policies. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482 or irb@olemiss.edu.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**
**Principal Investigator**
Eric Suddeath  
University of Mississippi  
(662) 915-7069  
egsuddea@go.olemiss.edu

**Faculty Sponsor**
Suzanne Dugger, Ed.D  
Professor of Counselor Education  
University of Mississippi  
(662) 915-8821  
smdugger@olemiss.edu

If you have questions at any time about this study, or you experience adverse effects as the result of participating in this study, please contact the principal investigator whose contact information is provided above or his dissertation chair Dr. Suzanne Dugger (smdugger@olemiss.edu), or the Office of Human Subjects Research at the University of Mississippi (irb@olemiss.edu).

**CONSENT**
- I understand the above and by clicking this button, I consent to participate.
- I do not wish to participate in this study.
Demographic and Teaching Preparation Questionnaire

Q1.1 Are you 18 years of age or older?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Are you 18 years of age or older? = No

Q1.2 Are you currently enrolled in a doctoral-level CACREP accredited Counselor Education program?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Skip To: End of Survey If Are you currently enrolled in a doctoral-level CACREP accredited Counselor Education program? = No

End of Block: Verification of Eligibility

Start of Block: About You

Q2.1 Sex

☐ Male (1)

☐ Female (2)

☐ Other (Please Specify) (3) ________________________________________________

Q2.2 Age (Please Indicate in Years)

___________________________________________

Skip To: End of Survey If Age (Please Indicate in Years) < 18

Q2.3 In which state do you live?

___________________________________________
Q2.4 What is your racial background? *Select one or more*

- [ ] Black or African American (2)
- [ ] American Indian or Alaska Native (3)
- [ ] Asian (4)
- [ ] Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (5)
- [ ] White or Caucasian (1)
- [ ] Other (Please Specify) (7)

Q2.5 Are you Hispanic or Latino? *Select one*

- [ ] No, I am not Hispanic or Latino (1)
- [ ] Yes, I am Mexican or Chicano (2)
- [ ] Yes, I am Puerto Rican (3)
- [ ] Yes, I am Cuban (4)
- [ ] Yes, I am Other Hispanic or Latino (5)

Q2.6 How many semesters, including summer sessions, have you completed in your doctoral program thus far?

______________________________________________________________
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Q2.7 Do you have any post-master's counseling experience

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*Skip To: Q2.7 If Do you have any post-master's counseling experience = No*

Q2.8 How many years of post-master's counseling experience do you have?

________________________________________________________________

Q2.9 Prior to entering your doctoral program, did you engage in at least one year of professional teaching in K-12 educational settings?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*Skip To: Q2.9 If Prior to entering your doctoral program, did you engage in at least one year of professional teaching in K-12 educational settings = No*

Q2.10 How many years of professional teaching experience in K-12 prior to your doctoral program do you have?

________________________________________________________________

Q2.11 Prior to entering your doctoral program, did you engage in at least one year of professional teaching in postsecondary settings (e.g., community college, technical college, and/or baccalaureate instruction)?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

*Skip To: End of Block If Prior to entering your doctoral program, did you engage in at least one year of professional teaching in postsecondary settings = No*

Q2.12 How many years of professional teaching experience in postsecondary settings prior to your doctoral program do you have?

________________________________________________________________

End of Block: About You

Start of Block: About Your Doctoral Program
Q3.1 While in your doctoral program, have you received instruction in college teaching through a semester-long course(s) focused on increasing your knowledge and skills in teaching (e.g., theories and models of adult learning, course construction, developing and delivering course content, approaches to assessing student learning, classroom management, and methods for online instruction)?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q3.2 Is taking a semester-long course in college teaching a **required** program component?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q3.3 Please indicate the **total number of semester (or equivalent) credit hours** you have acquired in coursework related to college teaching. For example, if you took a three-credit hour course in college teaching then you would put “3” in the blank below. **If you have not taken any coursework, please put a "0" in the blank.**

| ____________________________________________________________________ |

**Skip To: Q3.5 If** Please indicate the total number of semester (or equivalent) credit hours you have acquired in co... = 0

Q3.4 If you have taken a semester-long course in college teaching during your doctoral program, was the course specific to counselor education or more general with regard to teaching within higher education?

- Specific to Teaching in Counselor Education (1)
- General to Teaching in Higher Education (2)

Q3.5 While in your doctoral program, have you engaged in any fieldwork in teaching experience(s) in which you taught or co-taught a course? Fieldwork in teaching experiences might include a formal teaching internship, co-teaching opportunity, graduate teaching assistantship, or independently teaching a graduate or undergraduate course.

- Yes (1)
- No (2)
Q3.6 Is engaging in fieldwork in teaching experience(s) a required program component?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q3.7 Please indicate the **number** of course sections you have taught or co-taught in each of the following levels of responsibility. **Place a "0" in the boxes that do not apply to your experience.**

- **Sole Responsibility** (number): Defined as independently designing and delivering all aspects of a course. (21) ________________________________

- **Primary Responsibility** (number): Defined as having the responsibility for delivering the majority of a course, which may have been designed by a lead instructor or committee. (2) ________________________________

- **Shared Responsibility** (number): Defined as having approximately equal responsibility for delivery and/or development of a course. (3) ________________________________

- **Minor Responsibility** (number): Defined as supporting a faculty member with development and/or delivery of a course, such as offering administrative support and/or grading. (4) ________________________________

Q3.8 While teaching in your doctoral program, did you receive supervision of your teaching by an experienced faculty member for the purpose of improving your knowledge and skill in teaching through providing feedback, support, and guidance regarding your teaching?

- No (2)
- Yes, for 1 semester (1)
- Yes, for 2 semesters (3)
- Yes, for 3 semesters (4)
- Yes, for more than 3 semesters (5)
Q3.9 Does your program require you to receive supervision of your teaching?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q3.10 Which best describes the general frequency of your supervision sessions during the semester(s) in which you received individual and/or group supervision of your teaching?

- In general, I did not receive supervision of my teaching. (1)
- In general, I received weekly supervision of my teaching. (2)
- In general, I received bi-weekly supervision of my teaching. (3)
- In general, I received monthly supervision of my teaching. (4)
- In general, I received supervision of my teaching by appointment only. (5)

Q3.11 For the semester(s) in which you received supervision of your teaching, which best describes the average duration of your supervision sessions in minutes (e.g., 30, 60, or 90 minutes)? Please indicate the number of minutes. If you did not receive any supervision of your teaching, please put a "0" in the blank.

____________________________________________________________________________________

Skip To: End of Block If For the semester(s) in which you received supervision of your teaching, which best describes the... = 0
APPENDIX C: SELF-EFFICACY TOWARD TEACHING INVENTORY
Self-Efficacy Toward Teaching Inventory

Please rate how confident you are in your ability to be effective in each of the following teaching skills and behaviors on a scale from 1 to 4. Circle the number that best reflects your confidence level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Confident (1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Completely Confident (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State goals and objectives clearly for class (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan lectures (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write a course syllabus (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan discussions (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan class exercises (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate models of adult learning into teaching (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select textbooks and reading for the course (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student assignments matched to learning objectives (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop procedures for evaluating course assignments (e.g., rubrics and grading forms) (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate course expectations to students (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliver lectures (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apply adult learning theories to teaching practice (12)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate and redirect class discussions based upon course objectives (13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draw students into discussions (14)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicate at a level that matches students' ability to comprehend (15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmentally structure course experiences (16)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ask open, stimulating questions (17)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attend to issues of social and cultural diversity (18)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respond to individual differences in an inclusive way (19)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead small group discussions as a part of class (20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manage disagreements between students (21)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manage student disagreements with instructor (22)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communicate consistently both verbally and non-verbally (23)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Show respect for student ideas and abilities (24)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respond to students' questions (25)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respond to student difficulties in a timely manner (26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respond to student emotional reactions in class (27)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate readings and lectures into class periods (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select multimedia aids relevant to class plans (29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize technological resources to enhance learning (30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize web-based learning management systems (e.g., Blackboard) for designing and delivering online courses (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize web-based learning management systems for managing in-person courses (e.g., grading, supplemental readings, assignment submissions) (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct multiple choice exams (33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct examinations aligned to learning objectives (34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score and interpret examinations (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate student assignments (36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize exams as learning tools (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide constructive feedback on exams and assignments (38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize student evaluations of teaching to improve teaching performance (39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize self-evaluation in teaching (40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange for constructive peer feedback and suggestions (41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and facilitate counseling skills simulations and exercises (42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide supportive feedback for counseling skills (43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide challenging feedback for counseling skills (44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and manage ethical issues related to teaching (45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and respond to student disposition concerns (46)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model counseling skills (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: SUPERVISORY SATISFACTION QUESTIONNAIRE ADAPTED
## Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire-Adapted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How would you rate the quality of the supervision of teaching you received?</th>
<th>Poor (1)</th>
<th>Fair (2)</th>
<th>Good (3)</th>
<th>Excellent (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with the amount of supervision of teaching you received?</th>
<th>Quite Dissatisfied (1)</th>
<th>Indifferent or Mildly Dissatisfied (2)</th>
<th>Mostly Satisfied (3)</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has the supervision of teaching you received helped you to deal more effectively in your role as a teacher?</th>
<th>No, Definitely Not (1)</th>
<th>No, Not Really (2)</th>
<th>Yes, Generally (3)</th>
<th>Yes, Definitely (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E: EXPERT PANEL REVIEW REQUEST
Expert Panel Review Request

Date: XXXXX

Dr. XXXX
XXX University

Dear Dr. XXX:

I am a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision from the University of Mississippi conducting research for my dissertation. My dissertation is focused on investigating the relationship between teaching preparation practices in CACREP accredited counselor education and supervision doctoral programs and teaching self-efficacy.

As part of this research, I am constructing and piloting a composite survey that includes a demographic questionnaire, a questionnaire regarding teaching preparation experiences, an adapted form of the Supervisory Satisfaction Questionnaire (SSQ), and the Self-Efficacy Toward Teaching Inventory (SETI). In order to ensure that the questionnaire adequately captures current teaching preparation practices and measures behaviors and skills associated with effective teaching (as identified by the SETI), I am seeking your help as experts in teaching preparation in counselor education and supervision doctoral programs. Drawing from your own expertise, I would like for you to comment on the relevance of items, how well items represent training practices as well as effective teaching in counselor education, and the specificity and clarity of items. In addition, if you would also please provide suggestions for how you might modify, delete, or add to any items as you see fit.

After I receive feedback from all of the expert reviewers, I will then incorporate this feedback into the composite survey and pilot it before launching it to my target population.

Additionally, I know I have spoken with you on the phone and in person in leading up to this study and I am very grateful for all of the support and feedback you have provided already. I appreciate your passion for this topic and sincerely thank you for your time and input on how to strengthen the validity of this composite survey.

Take care,

Eric Suddeath, M.A., LPC
APPENDIX F: COVER LETTER TO PROGRAM LIAISONS
Cover Letter to Program Liaisons

Date: XX/XX/XXXX

Dear Dr. XX XXXX

My name is Eric Suddeath and I am a doctoral candidate in counselor education and supervision at the University of Mississippi. I am contacting you because you were listed as the doctoral program contact on cacrep.org. I am conducting my dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Suzanne Dugger, Professor of Counselor Education and Program Coordinator for the Department of Leadership and Counselor Education. In order to locate participants for my study, I need your help.

I am interested in surveying doctoral students’ from CACREP-accredited counselor education programs regarding their teaching preparation experiences and the impact of these experiences on their confidence to engage in certain teaching behaviors and skills. To be eligible, students must be 18 years of age or older and currently enrolled in a doctoral-level CACREP accredited counselor education program.

In order to locate eligible participants, would you please do one of the following:

• Forward the recruitment email below to all eligible doctoral students in your program.

Or

• Provide a legitimate email address so that students can be reached directly.
  o In order to ensure anonymity for those who respond through the online survey, email address will be kept separate from survey responses and IP addresses will not be collected. Upon completion of the study, any list of names or emails you provide to me will be destroyed.

As part of the composite survey, all potential participants will receive an informed consent document that provides an explanation of the purpose of the study, procedures of the study, time required to complete the survey, any potential known risks and benefits of participation, incentives for completing this survey, confidentiality and measures taken to ensure anonymity, and the voluntary nature of the study.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding this study. I can be reached through email at egssuddea@go.olemiss.edu or through phone at (901) 607-3705. You may also reach out to my dissertation chair, Dr. Suzanne Dugger, with any questions about this study. Her email is smdugger@olemiss.edu.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. If you are interested in the results of the study, please indicate this and I will send them to you upon completion of the study.

Warm regards,
APPENDIX G: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE
Invitation to Participate

Dear Colleague,

I would like to invite you to participate in my dissertation research study examining the relationship between your teaching preparation experiences and their impact on your confidence to engage in certain teaching behaviors and skills. This research has been approved by the University of Mississippi Institutional Review Board (Approval #18x-113).

About the Study:
The overall objective of this study is to examine the relationship between your teaching preparation experiences and their impact on your confidence to engage in certain teaching behaviors and skills. The survey is anonymous and takes only about 15 minutes to complete.

Eligibility and Incentives:
You may participate in this study if you are:
1. 18 years of age or older
2. Currently enrolled in a doctoral-level CACREP accredited Counselor Education and program

If you participate you will have the opportunity to win one of five $20 dollar Amazon gift cards.

About the Researcher:
My name is Eric Suddeath and I am a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision at the University of Mississippi. If you have any questions regarding this study you may contact me at eg suddea@go.olemiss.edu. My dissertation chair is Dr. Suzanne Dugger and she may be reached at smdugger@olemiss.edu.

How to Help:
To participate in this study, please click here. This link will take you to the consent form and composite survey. Please forward this e-mail announcement to eligible colleagues, friends, and relevant listservs.

Thanks in advance for your help with this project!

Sincerely,

Eric Suddeath, MA, LPC
Doctoral Candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision
University of Mississippi
VITA

Eric Suddeath

EDUCATION

M.A.; Counseling: Dual-Track Couples & Family Therapy and Clinical Mental Health
Harding School of Theology, Memphis, TN
May 2015
GPA: 4.0

B.A.; Major: Youth and Family Ministry, Minor: Psychology
Harding University, Searcy, AR
May 2011
GPA: 3.9

LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION

Licensure
Licensed Professional Counselor in the State of Mississippi
License Number 2201-Issued 7/2017

Certification
Gottman Method Couples Therapy
Level One and Two of Three Trainings Completed
Certified in Prepare/Enrich
September 2012

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Instructor of Record

University of Mississippi
Spring 2016, Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Summer 2017

Psychology of Human Growth and Development (undergraduate level)
Developed curriculum for online developmental psychology course. Provided supplemental material to increase meaningful interaction with course material. Collaborated with other online support staff to ensure successful student progression through course.
Harding School of Theology  
Testing and Assessment in Counseling (graduate level)  
Fall 2016

Created curriculum for a testing and assessment in counseling course based on CACREP 2016 Standards. Utilized a web-conferencing tool to have synchronous class meetings. Also used Canvas, a web-based learning management system, for all grading and feedback of course assignments.

Teaching Assistant

University of Mississippi  
Internship in Counseling  
Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Spring 2017

Provided individual and group supervision to master’s level internship students utilizing a developmental model. Assessed ethical and competent delivery of counseling services through review of counseling videos, case presentations, and case conceptualization and facilitated clinical, personal, and professional growth of counselors-in-training.

University of Mississippi  
Family Counseling  
Spring 2016

Co-developed curriculum for and taught the history, development, and practice of couple and family counseling. Fostered the development of skills related to clinical work, case conceptualization, treatment planning, and progress note writing using theories of couple and family counseling.

University of Mississippi  
Counseling Skills  
Fall 2015

Co-taught 20 master’s level counseling students to prepare them for a supervised counseling practicum. Aided in course responsibilities including providing feedback for written assignments, self-assessments, and recorded counseling skills demonstrations.

Harding School of Theology  
Internship in Counseling  
Spring 2015

Assisted with course responsibilities including monitoring and providing feedback for discussion posts and facilitating group supervision to engender student growth.

Harding School of Theology  
Counseling Skills Practicum  
Fall 2014, Spring 2015

Provided live supervision utilizing a developmental approach for master’s level counseling students. Focused on application of counseling ethics and increased awareness of biases related to multicultural competency.
Guest Lecturer

University of Mississippi
Family Counseling
Spring 2017
Created and provided interactive classes for masters students on Narrative Family Therapy and Gottman Method Couples Therapy.

University of Mississippi
Counseling Theories
Fall 2016
Delivered a class for master’s students on behavior therapy including the history, development, key concepts, and interventions associated with behavioral theory.

Guest Lecturer

University of Mississippi
Introduction to the Teaching Profession
Spring 2016
Facilitated an experiential multicultural activity called Level Playing Field and a process group for 20 undergraduate students.

PUBLICATIONS AND WORKS IN PROGRESS


PRESENTATIONS

National

Suddeath, E., & Dugger, S. (October, 2017). Forging the Future-Emerging Best Practices for Supervised Teaching Experiences in Doctoral Programs. Presentation to counseling professionals, students, counselor educators, and supervisors at the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision biannual meeting, Chicago, IL.


presentation to faculty, researchers, graduate students, and other professionals at the American Educational Research Association, San Antonio, TX.


**Regional**

Suddeath, E. (2016, October). *Training Future Counselors to Support Families Through Divorce: An Evidence-Based Approach*. Presentation to counseling professionals, students, counselor educators, and supervisors at the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision biannual meeting, New Orleans, LA.

**State**

Magruder, J., & Suddeath, E. (2017, November). *Supervise Like Adler*. Presentation to counseling professionals at the Mississippi Counseling Association annual meeting, Tupelo, MS.


**Local**

Magruder, J., & Suddeath, E. (2017, April). *Ethical Decision Making from a Social Constructivist and Narrative Approach*. Presentation to counseling professionals, students and faculty at Delta State University, West Cleveland, MS.


Suddeath, E. (2016, May). *Instilling Hope and Reducing Blame With Narrative Family Therapy*. Presentation to counseling professionals, students and faculty at the Tennessee Association for Marriage and Family continuing education luncheon, Memphis, TN.

Suddeath, E. (2016, April). *Narrative Family Therapy: Legal and Ethical Considerations*. Presentation to counseling professionals, students and faculty at Delta State University, Cleveland, MS.
CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

**Director of Counseling/Ministerial Counselor**
**Oxford Church of Christ**
December 2016-Present

Provide ministerial counseling services while adhering to the ACA Code of Ethics to individuals, couples, and families of Oxford church of Christ and the Oxford community for a variety of spiritual, mental health, and relationship difficulties. Collaborate in hiring additional counseling staff and market counseling services to other congregations and the community. Coordinate ethical client care through staff training and maintaining of client records.

**Graduate Assistant**

**Counselor Education Clinic for Outreach and Personal Enrichment**
May 2016-May 2017

Conducted individual, couples, and family counseling with adolescents and adults. Presenting issues included grief and loss, conflict in romantic and parental relationships, life transitions related to school, work, and family, low self-esteem, anxiety, depression, and substance use issues.

**University of Mississippi Counseling Center**
August 2015-May 2016

Co-facilitated process groups and provided individual counseling for a variety of mental health disorders for students of the University of Mississippi. Provided crisis counseling to on-campus residents in response to a completed suicide. Received training and utilized Titanium Schedule, an electronic medical record system, to manage client files.

**Counseling Intern**

**Harding School of Theology**
August 2013-May 2015

Provided counseling services for career issues, mood disorders, and issues related to life adjustment to students from Harding School of Theology and the Memphis community.

**The Exchange Club Family Center**
August 2014-May 2015

Conducted individual and group counseling with adults and adolescents. Provided play therapy and group counseling for children affected by domestic violence, trauma, and abuse. Led psychoeducation groups for anger management, transitions related to divorce, and healthy parenting practices.

**La Paloma Treatment Center**
May 2014-August 2014

Provided individual, group, and family counseling in a residential treatment facility for substance abuse and other mental health disorders. Developed curriculum for and taught a life skills class covering emotional intelligence, communication skills, stress management, boundaries, and family roles for over 60 patients. Co-led weekend family retreats focused on psychoeducation and the impact of the family system on addiction.
SUPERVISION EXPERIENCE

**Doctoral Student Supervisor**  
*University of Mississippi*  
Fall 2015-Spring 2017  
Provided individual and group clinical supervision to master’s level practicum and internship students utilizing a developmental model. Assessed ethical and competent delivery of counseling services through review of counseling videos, case presentations, and case conceptualization to facilitate personal and professional growth.

SERVICE

**Doctoral Teaching Internship Ad Hoc Committee Member**  
*University of Mississippi*  
Fall 2016-Spring 2017  
Assisted with the development a three-semester teaching internship sequence and formative and summative evaluation tools based on higher education and counselor education research and CACREP 2016 standards.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

**Graduate Admissions Assistant**  
*Harding School of Theology*  
August 2011-May 2015  
Cultivated relationships with prospective students to facilitate career guidance and mentoring. Responsible for ensuring successful matriculation.

**Residential Counselor**  
*Capstone Residential Treatment Center*  
January 2010-May 2010  
Provided on-site direct behavioral health care services to patients in substance abuse recovery. Responsible for assisting clients with daily living skills, care needs, case management, medication monitoring, recreational and social activities.

AWARDS

- Third Place-Three Minute Thesis Competition (3MT®)  
  Fall 2017
- Janie Rugg Alumni Scholarship (Mississippi Counseling Association)  
  Fall 2017
- Dissertation Fellowship  
  Fall 2017
- Best Paper Award Advanced Quantitative Research Methods  
  Fall 2016
- Best Paper Award Educational Statistics II  
  Spring 2016
- Master of Arts in Counseling Academic Award  
  May 2015
- Who’s Who Among America’s College Students  
  2009

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND ACADMIC ORGANIZATIONS

- American Mental Health Counselors Association (AMHCA)  
  Summer 2016-Present
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)  
  Spring 2016-Present
- American Counseling Association (ACA)  
  Spring 2014-Present
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (SACES)</td>
<td>Spring 2015-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Educational Research Association (AERA)</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Counseling Association (MCA)</td>
<td>Fall 2015-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors (MACES)</td>
<td>Fall 2015-Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>