WORK-BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS IN CACREP-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

By

KATHLEEN M. FALLON

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2004

This dissertation is dedicated to my family, friends, teachers, students, and colleagues who inspire and nurture my creativity, questioning, inquiry, love of learning, and my personal and professional development.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I offer thanks to those who inspired, challenged, and nurtured me through this process. Thanks go to my doctoral committee for their guidance and encouragement. I am grateful to Dr. Sondra Smith-Adcock for her mentorship. It has been a gift to witness Dr. Connie Shehan's passion for teaching and learning. I appreciate Dr. Larry Loesch's commitment to the education of counselors and his attending to the professional development of future faculty. Finally, I am indebted to Dr. Peter Sherrard for generously sharing his time, ideas, and support. Without fail, I left our lunches at Joe's with note-filled napkins and more questions than answers.

I am grateful to friends, colleagues, and students for their support and the many ways in which they nurtured my passion as a counselor educator and scholar. Extraordinary thanks go to Candy Spires and Patty Bruner for their limitless support, encouragement, and tenacious reminders to finish this dissertation! To my fellow doctoral students, there is comfort in the shared journey. Particularly, I am in awe of Lyn Goodwin and Ana Puig for how they masterfully model the quintessential scholar-practitioner. I am inspired by how they embody the art and science of scholarship at its finest. My deep gratitude goes to Dave and Brian Marshall for their guidance with data analysis. With what began as the most challenging aspect of this process, they helped me discover the adventure and fun within data analysis. Miraculously, with recognizing the fun came understanding more about statistical analysis than I ever expected to know. It is no understatement to comply with their one request to document

that the Marshall brothers are indeed “Freakin’ Geniuses”! I look forward to seeing how my doctoral student colleagues create our next phases of life. My many friends who extended their shoulders and moments of relaxation, you provided the colorful backdrop to these exciting years.

Finally, I thank my immediate and extended family, who shared their gifts and resources. Although they often wondered if I would be forever a student, they never stopped believing in me. To my brother, Andrew M. Fallon, I extend thanks for his limitless artistry and creative inspiration. I thank my mother, Helen B. Fallon, for modeling meticulous organizational skills. I am indebted to my father, John S. Fallon (a fellow counselor, healer, and professor) for his gift of wisdom. Finally, my life partner, Elaine J. Casquarelli, blessed me with her challenge to put my money where my mouth was, and by nurturing me to discover my best self.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

WORK-BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS OF COUNSELOR EDUCATORS IN CACREP-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

By

Kathleen M. Fallon

December 2004

Chair: Peter A. D. Sherrard
Major Department: Counselor Education

My study investigated important and frequently engaged work behaviors of counselor educators working in academic departments housing programs accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). An Internet-based survey was distributed to counselor educators. Findings indicated important and frequently engaged work behaviors within twelve conceptual categories: program administration, clinical counseling practice, scholarship, teaching and mentoring, clinical supervision, shared governance, infusing technology, community building, consultation, counselor-educator professional development, program evaluation, and research oversight. My study has implications relevant to counselor educators, counselor-education doctoral students, counselor education programs, and the practice of preparing future counselor educators.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Historically, the doctoral degree has been the prerequisite educational credential for an academic career, particularly for professors holding graduate faculty status in research universities. Accreditation standards for counselor education programs, developed by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) (Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, 2001) require an earned doctorate for full-time faculty. The purpose of this degree is to prepare graduates who will advance the knowledge base of their specific disciplines; often through academic careers in research, teaching, and service to their profession and the public at large. In particular, counselor-education doctoral programs prepare graduates for careers as advanced mental-health clinicians, administrators, and counselor educators (CACREP, 2001).

A review of the literature reveals a lack of coherent objectives, curricular experiences, and structures that specifically address the preparation of doctoral students who are competent to perform work behaviors expected of counselor educators (Adams, 2002). One new counselor educator reported, "better preparation in the nuts and bolts of professors at the graduate student level would be most helpful. It seems there are well-kept secrets which are only revealed after you start work" (Magnuson, 2002).

These review findings are consistent across the nation and across disciplines (Golde & Dore, 2001; Nerad & Cerney, 1999; Smith & Pedersen-Gallegos, 2001). While doctoral programs are tasked with preparing future faculty, there appears to be a gap in

the manner in which that preparation occurs (Golde & Dore, 2001). Recently, academic programs, disciplines, professional organizations, and national initiatives have responded to the problem of insufficient training of future faculty (e.g., Preparing Future Faculty, Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, and Re-Envisioning the Ph.D.).

In addition to a lack of clarity in structuring preparation programs, the literature showed significant contextual changes in faculty, departmental and institutional settings, and the delivery of curricular experiences (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). Faculty retirements, the demand placed on independent funding sources, and the immersion of technology in program delivery are influencing the expectations and functions of counselor educators entering the profession in the new millennium. Related to this, little research has been conducted on counselor-educator work behaviors, particularly research attending to technology work behaviors (Loesch & Vacc, 1993; MohdZain, 1995).

The purpose of my study was to identify counselor-educator work behaviors that comprise the various duties expected of this position. I sought to discover differences in importance or frequency of work behaviors engaged within diverse academic units and institutional settings. This information has direct implications for doctoral students, faculty, academic programs, and the counselor-education profession. In particular, work behaviors can form the structural foundation for developing curricular experiences designed to prepare future counselor educators. I conducted an Internet-based work-behavior analysis to address questions based on the following areas: (1) work behaviors, (2) counselor educator demographics, and (3) program and institutional demographics.

Need for the Study

National initiatives and research studies have identified six issues critical to faculty preparation. First, doctoral students are not sufficiently socialized into the academic profession (Austin, 2002; Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, & Weibl, 2000; Gaff, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Nerad & Cerney, 1999) Second, students lack awareness of the multiple duties and responsibilities expected of a faculty member (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Magnuson, 2002; National Association of Graduate and Professional Students, 2001; Nerad & Cerney, 1999; Smith & Pedersen-Gallegos, 2001; Sorcinelli, 1992). Doctoral-program faculty are encouraged to ". . .help their students develop the skills and capacities they need to survive the first few years of an academic appointment and to meet the expectations and tenure requirements of different types of institutions" (Adams, 2002). However, results of research with new counselor educators reveal inconsistent faculty preparation (Magnuson, 2002).

A slow-dying myth assumes content knowledge is sufficient preparation for higher education teaching. A third issue is the inadequate preparation to teach (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; Boice, 1992; Gaff, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson, Norem, Haberstroh-Burke, Zirkle, & Henderson, 2001; National Association of Graduate and Professional Students, 2001; Nerad & Cerney, 1999; Seidel, Benassi, & Richards, 1999). Doctoral students are immersed in discipline-specific curricular experiences, complemented by preparation in conducting research. However, their programs of study do not adequately address such areas as learning theory, curriculum design, departmental service responsibilities, and understanding university systems and policies (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Magnuson, 2002).

Fourth, across disciplines, apparently no structured faculty-preparation programs are seamlessly integrated with courses and curricular experiences (Austin, 2002; Gaff, 2002). A fifth issue concerns implications for graduates in the job market. There is a mismatch among graduate training, faculty responsibilities, and career expectations of doctoral students pursuing faculty positions (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; Boice, 1992; Gaff, 2002; Golde & Dore, 2001; Magnuson et al., 2001; Maples, 1989; Maples, Altekruse, & Testa, 1993; Maples & Macari, 1998). Many doctoral graduates expect to continue in their mentors' footsteps, pursuing careers at research-extensive institutions. However, these positions are few compared to the number of clinician-focused masters-granting institutions emphasizing teaching and service.

Finally, there is a need for research and empirical evidence of best practices in faculty preparation, particularly within the Counselor Education discipline (Gaff, 2002). Details of work behaviors of counselor educators are unknown. One occupational analysis of counselor educators was conducted almost 10 years ago (MohdZain, 1995). The purpose of that study was to investigate perceptions of relative time spent performing common counselor educator roles. MohdZain's study contributed to understanding common domains of responsibility (i.e., administration, advising, consultation, counseling, scholarship, service, supervision, and teaching). However, it did not explore specific components and elements of these domains. It also did not reflect the growing trend toward faculty infusing technology into counselor-education curricula and program delivery.

Purposes and Significance of the Study

Students are not receiving comprehensive training preparing them to perform work behaviors common to counselor educators. To design such programs, it is important to identify common work behaviors.

My study was based on the assumption that within CACREP-accredited doctoral programs, it is the Counselor Education department's responsibility to prepare doctoral students to "master the knowledge and skills to practice effectively" as counselor educators (CACREP, 2001). According to CACREP standards (2001), this includes curricular and mentoring experiences in instructional theory and methods, teaching, supervision, professional writing, professional development, and service.

The purpose of my study was to identify critical work behaviors relevant to counselor educators working in masters' and doctoral-granting institutions. Faculty can use these results to help focus comprehensive curricular experiences that more effectively prepare doctoral students pursuing counselor educator careers. Students can use these results as a guide to shape their professional development, gaining and demonstrating competencies relevant to behaviors critical to faculty careers. Such a guide could strengthen their marketability in the job-search process. The counselor-education profession (i.e., the American Counseling Association, the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision, the Counsel for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, and the National Board of Certified Counselors) can foster the development and enhancement of academic standards and best practices in preparing counselor educators.

Central Theoretical Frameworks

Socialization and competency-based education were the two central theoretical frameworks shaping my conceptual understanding of the problem and influencing the research design and methods. Within a graduate school context, professional socialization is the developmental process in which students are introduced to and immersed in their chosen discipline and professional setting. Using observation, role practicing, and mentorship, graduate students seek to learn about and eventually internalize the professional roles they wish to assume. Within the setting of my study, the doctoral program is an appropriate time for students to be socialized into the academic profession (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). Critical to effective socialization is a clear understanding of the expectations and behaviors common to faculty members, and of the opportunities to witness and engage in those behaviors during the doctoral experience.

Competency-based education models provide a framework for structuring experiences and curricula so that students are introduced to faculty careers and gain competence and proficiency with the behaviors and with the unique contextual issues influencing decision-making (Whitty & Willmott, 1991). It is not enough for a student to be able to mirror the behaviors of a faculty member. Students need to understand how and why faculty behaviors are engaged; and gain exposure to the values and judgments that help determine the course of action in individual situations.

Both socialization and competency-based education models are grounded in a clear understanding of work behaviors. Work behaviors common to counselor educators are not clearly identified. These frameworks support the rationale for pursuing this line of inquiry.

Guiding Research Questions

My study was guided by research questions addressing counselor educator work behaviors, the demographic variables of the people performing them, the settings in which these behaviors occur, and finally the influence of tenure status and Carnegie classification on these work behaviors. Combined, my study sought to shed light on the behaviors, characteristics, and settings of counselor educators in the early twenty-first century.

Identifying core work behaviors performed by counselor-education faculty establishes the performance goals for preparing counselor educators. My study sought to answer questions related to what doctoral students need to be prepared to do, in order to become counselor educators. My study was organized around gaining information on the following research questions:

- **RQ 1.** What are the demographic characteristics of counselor educators working in CACREP-accredited programs?
- **RQ2.** What are the profiles of CACREP-accredited counselor education programs?
- **RQ 3.** What are the most important categories of work behaviors performed by counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs?
- **RQ 4.** What are the most frequently engaged categories of work behaviors performed by counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs?
- **RQ 5.** Is there a significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of categories of work behaviors?
- **RQ 6.** Is there a significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification based on frequency of engaging in categories of work behaviors?
- **RQ 7.** Is there a significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of categories of work behaviors?
- **RQ 8.** Is there a significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on frequency of engaging in categories of work behaviors?

To address these questions, a work behavior analysis was conducted. Work behavior analyses (also known as job analysis, occupational analysis, or task analysis) have been used widely by governmental and private agencies seeking to identify work behaviors specific to a particular job or occupation (U. S. Office of Personnel Management, 2003). Across disciplines and vocations, it has been used in training program development, curriculum, and syllabus design (DeCotiis & Morano, 1977; Doron & Marco, 1999; Fine & Cronshaw, 1999). The method has been used in counseling research to clarify tasks, assess the need for specialized training, and to inform the structure of the National Counselor Examination (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986; Loesch & Vacc, 1993; Vacc, 1989). A description of the method, rationale for use, and application in this study are further explored in Chapters 2 and 3.

Definition of Terms

Competencies

Competencies are defined as knowledge, skill, abilities, and related performance guidelines (Engels, 2004; Paulson, 2001).

Counselor Education

The CACREP (2001) defines counselor education as "a process that prepares counselors in both didactic and clinical aspects of counseling. Doctoral programs also prepare counselors to serve as counselor educators." Dr. Larry Loesch offered a similar definition; counselor education is the education and/or professional preparation, knowledge attainment, and skill development of individuals who intend to assume the professional identity of a counselor, as defined by the American Counseling Association (ACA), the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC), the Association for

Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), and other relevant professional associations" (Loesch, 2004, personal correspondence).

Counselor Educator

A literature review revealed no formal definition of "Counselor Educator." The CACREP Standards (2001) do not provide a definition in their glossary. Associate Director of CACREP, Jenny Gunderman, confirmed there is no formal definition of counselor educator in the 2001 standards. She offered the following criteria based on her experience with the CACREP Board:

- The person should have a terminal degree in counselor education and identify with the field of counseling.
- If the terminal degree is not in counselor education, the person must have a track record of activity in the field of counseling. This would mean a history of publication, presentations, and leadership activity in ACA, its divisions and branches. Long-standing licensure and/or certification is another way of showing professional identity to counseling (Gunderman, 2004).

Inferences can be drawn from the CACREP 2001 Standards, particularly Section IV (Faculty and Staff), that can assist in formulating a definition. Based on Section IVA, a Counselor Educator is someone who meets the following criteria:

- Primary academic appointment is to the unit in counselor education (IV.A.2)
- Possesses an earned doctoral degree in counselor education, preferably from a CACREP accredited program (IVA)
- Has relevant preparation and experience in the assigned area of teaching (IVA4)
- Identifies with the counseling profession through memberships and involvement in appropriate professional organizations and appropriate certifications and/or licenses pertinent to the profession (IVA5)
- Has the authority to determine program curricula within the structure of the institution's policy (IVA6).

The standards offer guidance in defining affiliate and adjunct counselor education faculty. Criteria are similar to the above, while including subtle differences. For example, they specify that affiliate or adjunct faculty must hold graduate degrees, but do not require an earned doctorate. Otherwise, they are similar in requiring relevant preparation and experience in the assigned area of teaching; professional identification; and an understanding of the mission, goals, and program curriculum (Section IV.C.1-4).

For the purposes of my study, counselor educator is defined as someone who

- Has part- or full-time academic appointment within a counselor education department in a CACREP-accredited program
- Possesses an earned graduate degree (preferably a doctorate) in counselor education or a related counseling degree
- Maintains identification with the counseling profession through membership and involvement in professional organization, certifications, and/or licenses appropriate to the profession
- Has relevant preparation and/or experience in the duties assigned (i.e., teaching, research, service, supervision, consultation, etc)
- Participates in ongoing program and curriculum evaluation and development
- Çontributes to the ongoing scholarly conversations within the counseling profession.

Work Behavior

According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council's Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (EEOCC, 2002), a work behavior is "an activity performed to achieve the objectives of the job. Work behaviors involve

observable (physical) components and unobservable (mental) components. A work behavior consists of the performance of one or more tasks."

Work Behavior Analysis

In their work behavior-analysis of professional counselors, Loesch and Vacc (1993, p. 4) defined work-behavior analysis (also called work-oriented job analysis) as "a systematic examination of the nature and/or elements of a relatively broadly defined (employment) 'position,' 'occupation,' or 'job'".

Organization of the Study

The following chapters introduce the reader to the relevant contexts, theoretical frameworks, and details of the study. Chapter 2 reviews the relevant literature, theoretical frameworks, research questions, and the study method. Chapter 3 describes the instrument-development process, provides an outline of the instrument, describes the sample and procedure, identifies hypotheses, and discusses data-analysis methods. Results are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 links these findings to the ongoing conversation of preparing future counselor educators, discussing limitations of the study, and presenting implications for further research and application.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of my study was to identify critical work behaviors common to counselor educators. It is situated in a broader context relevant to preparing the professoriate within higher-education settings. This chapter gives an overview of faculty preparation in higher education and counselor education. It identifies current trends, problems, and needs. Using socialization theory and competency-based conceptual frameworks, problems and needs are linked with potential interventions; yielding a framework for counselor-educator preparation based on work behaviors. The work- behavior analysis is introduced as a foundational step toward linking academic preparation more seamlessly with faculty role expectations.

The Professoriate: An Overview

In the 2001-2002 academic year, 413 universities in the United States conferred 39,955 doctoral degrees. The average doctoral student was a white male and a citizen of the United States. Of the 62.4% of graduates with planned employment after graduation, 36.3% sought employment in educational institutions, which included 2-year, 4-year, and foreign colleges and universities, medical schools, and elementary and secondary schools. Of the 17,984 graduates with employment commitments after graduation, 39.6% identified teaching as their primary activity, and 19.8% identified teaching as their secondary activity (Hoffer et al., 2003).

The same summary report provided a breakdown of counselor education versus counseling and guidance doctoral recipients. The average counselor education doctoral

graduate was a white female and a U.S. citizen. In the 2001-2002 academic year, 256 counselor education doctorates were awarded (Hoffer et al., 2003). Their report provided no information on the career direction of counselor education doctoral graduates.

Based on Hoffer's survey of doctoral recipients, it appears that between 35 and 60% of doctoral graduates pursue some form of faculty work, whether it is their primary or secondary activity. Trends within higher education indicate that the academy is in the midst of significant employment transition (Kezar, 2000; Magner, 1999; Mcguire & Price, 1989). There is a simultaneous increase in the number of higher education faculty and wide-scale retirements of a faculty cohort group hired in the 1960s and 1970s.

Retirements and increased enrollments are two major factors influencing the projected increase of 36% or more in employment of college and university faculty through 2012 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). ". . . [A] significant number of openings also is expected to arise due to the need to replace the large numbers of postsecondary teachers who are likely to retire over the next decade. Many postsecondary teachers were hired in the late 1960s and 1970s to teach the baby boomers, and they are expected to retire in growing numbers in the years ahead" (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004)

Comparisons between the 1990 and 2000 census identified a 22.4% increase in the number of postsecondary teachers (from 921,428 in 1990; to 1,127,597 in 2000) (Bureau, Date Unknown). Meanwhile, many faculty members are aging and nearing retirement. In a survey of 33,785 faculty members in 378 colleges and universities, approximately 33% were over 55 years old. The proportion of faculty under 45 years old has decreased from 41 to 34% (Magner, 1999).

The counselor education discipline is experiencing similar employment trends. The number of counselors, social workers, and community social service specialists rose 43% between 1990 and 2000 (Bureau, Date Unknown). This increase demonstrates a consistent need for counselor educators to respond to the demand for clinicians.

The counselor educator population reflects the history of modern higher education and the broader trend of aging in the professoriate. The modern counselor education profession grew out of the vocational education movement. Originally focused on training secondary-school educators in guidance counseling, two key post-World War Two initiatives shifted counselor education to graduate schools. The George-Barden Act of 1946, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, provided financial support for counselor preparation programs in universities (Sweeney, 2003). The number of counselor education programs rose from 175 to 475, between 1958 and 1961 (Sweeney, 2003). Between 1964 and 1967, the number of counselor educators grew from 706 to 1,119; while the number of institutions preparing counselors increased from 327 to 372 (p. 29). In the 10th Edition of *Counselor Preparation* (Hollis & Dodson, 2000), the authors identified 542 academic departments having a counselor education program. Of the 428 departments that responded to the authors' survey, 2,808 counselor educators were identified.

A cohort group of counselor educators graduated during this era, and shortly after this surge. A significant number of them are at (or approaching) retirement age. For example, the University of Nevada at Reno was established after the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Of the seven-member department, five were hired after the NDEA. Seventy-one percent of the department faculty were approaching retirement in

the late 1980s (Maples, 1989). Using my department as a second example, three faculty members retired in 2003, and two are expected to retire within the next 2 years with at least one additional faculty member retiring in 5 years. With 12 full-time faculty, this amounts to a turnover of 50% within 5 years.

Ten years ago, in MohdZain's (1995) role analysis of counselor educators, 55.5% of the 353 respondents surveyed were over age 50. At the time of the study, an additional 33.1% were between ages 40 and 49. Adjusting for the decade since the study, 88.6% of these respondents would be over age 50. Two programs at the 2004 ACA conference addressed the "retirement of a significant number of counselor educators" (Association, 2004), p. 73) and its impact on the preparation of the next generation of counselor educators (Alessandria & May, 2004; Bradley, Morris, & Brinson, 2004).

An aging counselor-educator population appears consistent with the counseling profession. The National Board for Certified Counselors (Counselors, 2000) examined the demographics of National Certified Counselors. Counselors over age 50 comprise 50% of National Certified Counselors. An additional 30% are between ages 40 and 50.

Although undergoing a transition with significant numbers of retirements, faculty careers remain a viable professional option. Stakeholder expectations impacting the higher-education context include quality of teaching, learning outcomes, traditional-subject expertise and technological fluency, applying knowledge to social problems, linking university research with community economic development, and overall fiscal constraints (Austin, 2002). The job market is growing increasingly competitive; with candidates expected to demonstrate awareness of differing emphases, and proficiency with faculty roles of teaching, research, service, and citizenship (Brinkley et al., 1999).

The next section explores current methods of preparation, reported problems and needs, and interventions designed to enhance faculty preparation.

Preparing the Professoriate – Problems, Needs, and Interventions

Purpose and Objectives of Doctoral Education

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching gave this purpose of doctoral education: "to educate and prepare those to whom we can entrust the vigor, quality, and integrity of the field. We call such a person [so educated] a 'steward of the discipline" (Teaching, 2003). A steward demonstrates proficiency in three critical areas: generation of new knowledge; conservation of the history and foundational development of the profession; and transformation of this knowledge through teaching, scholarship, practice, and service (Teaching, 2003). More discipline-specific, the mission and objectives of doctoral degree programs in counselor education are "to prepare students to work as counselor educators, supervisors, and advanced practitioners in academic and clinical settings . . . [P]rogram objectives address the professional leadership roles of counselor education, supervision, advanced counseling practice, and research competencies of doctoral graduates" (CACREP, 2001). Both the Carnegie Foundation and the accreditation standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) identified academic careers and their related activities (i.e., counselor educator, teaching, scholarship, service, etc.) as an appropriate professional context for doctoral graduates.

Key Problems and Needs

Six themes emerged from the literature related to problems with doctoral education and faculty preparation. First, graduate students receive insufficient socialization into the academic profession (Austin, 2002; J. Gaff, Pruitt-Logan, & Weibl, 2000; J. G. Gaff,

2002; C. Golde & T. Dore, 2001). Second, students lack awareness of the multiple roles expected of a faculty member (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; C. M. Golde & T. M. Dore, 2001; Magnuson, 2002; Nerad & Cerney, 1999; Smith & Pedersen-Gallegos, 2001; Sorcinelli, 1992; National Association of Graduate and Professional Students, 2001). Third, while students may gain experience in some roles, the preparation may be inadequate (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; J. G. Gaff, 2002; C. Golde & T. Dore, 2001; Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson, Norem, Haberstroh-Burke, Zirkle, & Henderson, 2001; Nerad & Cerney, 1999; Seidel, Benassi, & Richards, 1999; Sorcinelli, 1992; National Asssociation of Graduate and Professional Students, 2001; Zimpfer, Cox, West, Bubenzer, & Brooks, 1997). Related to the previous two problems, the fourth concern is a lack of structured faculty preparation programs (Austin, 2002; J. G. Gaff, 2002). Fifth, doctoral graduates experience a mismatch between their career expectations and the realities of the job market (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002; Boice, 1992; J. G. Gaff, 2002; C. Golde & T. Dore, 2001; Henderson, Clarke, & Reynolds, 1996; Henderson, Clarke, & Woods, 1998; Hollis & Dodson, 2000; Magnuson et al., 2001; Maples, 1989; Maples, Altekruse, & Testa, 1993; Maples & Macari, 1998; Olsen, 1993; Olsen & Crawford, 1998; Rice, 1996; Sanderson & Dugoni, 1999; Smith & Pedersen-Gallegos, 2001; Sorcinelli, 1992; Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996; Whitt, 1991; Zimpfer, 1993, 1996). Finally, there remains a need for further research and empirical evidence about the doctoral experience (Gaff, 2002)

To what degree are these concerns an issue within counselor education? The *2000 National Doctoral Program Survey* (NAGPS, 2001) was the only study I located in which counselor-education doctoral students evaluated their programs. Participants (n=97

counselor education doctoral students or graduates) were self-selected, and only 9 doctoral counselor-education programs were represented. Thus, the results may not be representative of the experiences of all counselor-education doctoral students or all counselor-education programs. Yet, the results are worth noting.

The web-based survey included 10 sections: (1) Information for prospective students, (2) Preparation for a broad range of careers, (3) Teaching and TA preparation, (4) Professional development, (5) Career guidance & placement services, (6) Controlling time to degree, (7) Mentoring, (8) Program climate, (9) Overall satisfaction, and (10) Background information. Likert-scale items assessing the degree of agreement with statements relevant to the section comprised the first nine sections. The tenth section asked for participant background information. Items were based on best practices in graduate education (identified by the Association of American Universities; the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation; the Modern Language Association; and the National Research Council's Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy). Points were assigned to each rank along the Likert-scale; results were calculated; and a letter grade was assigned to each section.

The next sections and items were relevant to my study. Under Preparation for a Broad Range of Careers, "My program does a good job of preparing students for academic careers" received a B+ rating, with 90% of respondents (87 of 96) agreeing or strongly agreeing with that statement.

Teaching and TA Preparation got a C rating. Four items were included in this section. First, respondents were asked about TA preparation and training before entering the classroom. Respondents gave preparation and training a C rating. Only 32% of

respondents agreed or strongly agreed they were appropriately prepared and trained before entering the classroom. The second item asked about appropriate supervision to help teaching assistants improve their teaching skills. The item received a C+ rating, with 41% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with that statement. The third item about considering doctoral student needs and interests in determining which courses students teach. Respondents gave a C+ rating, with 50% agreeing or strongly agreeing with that practice. Of the respondents, 43% agreed or strongly agreed with the final item in the section asking whether the teaching experience available through their programs is adequate preparation for an academic/teaching career. This item got a C rating.

Other selected items related to aspects of faculty careers or the academic job search. Respondents gave a C rating to the statement about training in professional skills such as public speaking, grant writing, and working in teams. Effective career guidance and planning services for careers in academia got a B- rating. For positions in academia, respondents got a B- rating for effective placement assistance and job-search support. Respondents positively rated (B+) their comfort in talking to their advisors about a career in academia.

The survey's direct link to promising practices in graduate education is a strength. The items and responses provide feedback on specific strategies designed to enhance doctoral education. These results offer a glimpse, although limited, into some of the strengths and challenges of doctoral education with regard to preparation for academic careers.

Prior Interventions

Four national initiatives addressing faculty preparation provide insight into the needs and strategies of intervention with doctoral education. This section provides an

overview of each initiative, key elements, major research and programs, and relates them to this study and the research design. The four national initiatives are (1) Preparing Future Faculty, (2) Re-envisioning the Ph.D., (3) The Responsive Ph.D., and (4) and The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate.

Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) (http://www.preparing-faculty.org) is an ongoing collaboration, now including more than 295 partner institutions representing higher education institutions ranging from community colleges to research-extensive doctoral granting universities. The initiative is sponsored by the Council of Graduate Schools, the Association of American Colleges and Universities and with financial support from the National Science Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and the Atlantic Philanthropies. The purpose is to prepare doctoral students for the spectrum of roles and responsibilities fulfilled by faculty in diverse institutional settings. Three key elements form the structure of a PFF program. First, there is a cluster of institutions or departments, anchored by a doctoral granting university or department. Partner institutions may include community colleges, liberal arts colleges, master's granting colleges or universities. Second, within the cluster framework, doctoral students participate in experiences typical of the spectrum of work behaviors common to faculty members in these diverse settings. Students are able to see how different settings value shifting emphases among the multiple faculty roles (e.g., teaching, service, and research). Third, students work with multiple mentors and receive direct feedback on their performance (Faculty, 2003). Within such programs, students are able to learn about diverse academic settings, gain experience that can inform their career decision making process, and develop awareness and competency with a broader range of faculty work behaviors and responsibilities. The current phase of

the PFF program emphasizes multidisciplinary collaboration and partnering with disciplinary societies and professional associations. For example, PFF is focusing attention on preparing faculty in the social sciences. Coordinators have partnered with the American Psychological Association that has identified academic departments in which to address preparation of future psychology professors.

The Preparing Future Faculty programs related to this study along two dimensions. First, it addresses the limitation of doctoral students being prepared for academic positions in research-intensive and research-extensive institutions. Rather, it broadens a student's experience by encouraging participation in the daily routines and work behaviors of faculty in diverse settings. Within this dimension is the link with work behaviors common to counselor educators, whether they are located in clinician-focused master's programs or advanced clinician and research-focused doctoral programs. A second dimension is the close partnership with disciplinary and professional associations. Addressing doctoral education and preparing future counselor educators is a valuable issues for the American Counseling Association (ACA), the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP), and related divisions of ACA. Faculty preparation is a multidisciplinary concern, yet the experience of faculty members varies depending on the discipline. This study addressed faculty work expectations from the unique perspective of counselor educators. While the behaviors are likely similar to other disciplines, they may be carried out in subtly different ways. For example, supervision may be different for a counselor educator than for an engineering educator.

Re-envisioning the Ph.D. was a project funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts to answer the foundational question, how can we re-envision the Ph.D. to meet the needs of the society of the 21st Century (Re-envisioning the Ph.D.., 2002). The project had four main objectives. In the first two objectives, they sought to pull together the multidisciplinary efforts to research and address concerns with doctoral education, analyzing major themes and patterns among the interventions, programmatic changes, and concerns of major stakeholders of doctoral education. Once this information was gathered and key stakeholders were identified, the Re-envisioning staff convened a national conversation in 2000 about the doctoral education process, including such stakeholders as students, faculty, industry, K-12 educators, legislators, representatives of the spectrum of higher education settings, accrediting agencies, and disciplinary agencies. The goal of the gathering was to identify frameworks and strategies for enhancing doctoral education. Their fourth objective was to provide an ongoing clearinghouse for resources on doctoral research and emerging best practices.

Several concerns of major stakeholders were relevant to this study (Nyquist & Woodford, 2000). Members of research-focused doctoral institutions identified the conflict between the need for graduate teaching assistants to meet the demand for undergraduate teaching and the need for doctoral student development as educators. Often situations arise where doctoral students end up meeting the university, yet lacking a structured environment in which solid grounding in pedagogy and teaching is provided (Nyquist & Woodford, 2000). Members of master's, liberal arts, and community colleges raised concerns that doctoral graduates are insufficiently prepared for positions in their institutions. They lack awareness of differences in institutional missions, shared

governance responsibilities, tenure and promotion processes, and expectations for faculty performance, such as service and outreach. Graduates also lack the foundation in pedagogy needed to effectively teach students and design curricula based on multiple learning styles (Nyquist & Woodford, 2000) Doctoral students present at the national meeting were aware of their lack of sufficient preparation. They identified the need for better understanding of the workings of faculty life, including work behavior expectations and life-work balance strategies (Nyquist & Woodford, 2000). Exposure to "the wide range of faculty members' roles and responsibilities – committee work, service, teaching across disciplinary lines, faculty governance and institutional policies – often remains very much unaddressed in traditional TA and RA experiences" (Nyquist & Woodford, 2000). Finally, disciplinary societies advocated for their role in attending to the disciplinary differences in faculty experiences. They supported using disciplinary communication structures, such as conferences, web pages, and newsletters as means of fostering further conversations about doctoral education.

This study addressed the need for information about faculty roles and work behaviors. Results could provide doctoral students with a clearer picture of faculty expectations and demands. Again, addressing this question in a counselor education context recognized disciplinary uniqueness.

The Responsive Ph.D. is sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. The goal is to diversify both the knowledge base and the population of doctoral graduates in this country. It is a four-pillar model, focusing on new paradigms, new practices, new people, and new partnerships. Some of the key elements are relevant to this study. They support professional development and pedagogical training that better prepares doctoral students

for the multiple roles faculty members fulfill. Much like the concerns expressed by other initiatives, project members recognized graduate students

> "get little help in learning to be educations – not only learning effective classroom teaching, but putting together course curriculum, thinking strategically about introducing a discipline or making connections among disciplines, or teaching to varied audiences. In many disciplines, doctoral students teach what the faculty does not want to teach" (The Responsive Ph.D., 2004)

This initiative supported identifying core competencies for doctoral students. Results of the present study could assist in developing core competencies for counselor educators, clarifying expectations and helping to shape preparation programs specific to the counselor education discipline.

The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate is unique for its focus on academic departments' attempts to structure doctoral programs. This initiative partners with departments and disciplinary societies. Currently, they are working with in chemistry, educational psychology and curriculum and instruction within colleges of education, English, history, mathematics, and neuroscience. During a conference in 2003, faculty and students identified concerns and strategies. Consistent with the literature and with other initiatives, students reported inadequate preparation for faculty roles other than research (Golde & Bueschel, 2003). One strategy relevant to this study is a socialization process for first-year doctoral students, conceptualized as "pedagogy of induction" (p. 33).

Socialization and Competency-Based Frameworks as Interventions

As the key problems and prior interventions described, doctoral students lack concrete information about the spectrum of faculty roles and work behaviors. Additionally, experiences within their programs do not adequately prepare them for fulfilling those roles. This section describes how socialization and competency-based

frameworks can inform intervening with these concerns. Finally, to address this gap in knowledge within counselor education, the chapter concludes with an introduction to the work behavior analysis method.

Socialization is the process in which an individual is introduced to the knowledge, skills, and values required for successful entry into a discipline or specific career (Weidman, Twale, & Stein, 2001). For graduate students, this is a developmental process leading towards commitment to a particular role (e.g., faculty member) that involves specific stages. Stages of graduate student socialization include anticipatory, formal, informal, and personal (Weidman et al., 2001). The anticipatory stage is the period during which an individual learns of the behavioral, attitudinal, and cognitive expectations of a particular role (Weidman et al., 2001). A graduate student is in the anticipatory stage during their search for an appropriate graduate program. They have developed expectations about careers based on popular media sources and personal knowledge of others who have held the role. For example, an individual pursuing a faculty career may have been developed perceptions of an academic career based on undergraduate faculty members, family who are faculty, or movies and literature. It is important that at this stage, the information about work behaviors is accurate and closely relates to the expectations of those actually working in the field.

Students in the formal stage have entered into their academic programs and are determining the goodness of fit (Weidman et al., 2001). From instructors and more advanced student colleagues and through didactic and experiential opportunities, students are learning disciplinary knowledge and the business of how work gets done. Role rehearsal is a key element in this stage. Task issues are critical, and preparation is

dependent on the spectrum of activities in which students participate, the clarity of standards and expectations, and sufficient time for role-playing opportunities (Weidman et al., 2001).

Mentoring is critical to students in the informal stage. As they begin to try out behaviors and meet expectations of professional roles, they need direct feedback and support. Support may come from faculty or student colleagues. In previous stages, they may have been more comfortable imitating others while developing competence in work behaviors common to a role. In this stage, they develop their own style for carrying out role behaviors (Weidman et al., 2001).

In the personal stage, students internalize a professional identity. In counselor education, this stage may be experienced during clinical and counselor education internships, during which time students fulfill roles and behaviors common to clinicians and faculty. As with each stage, observation, participation, and role taking are critical to socialization (Weidman et al., 2001)

Several aspects of these stages are relevant to the current study. Using the faculty role as an example, students in the anticipatory stage are introduced to behaviors and professional expectations held by a faculty member. Students gain awareness of both concrete and affective dimensions of faculty life. Students at this stage are able to clarify their previously held expectations about faculty members by learning what they need to know and be able to do as counselor educators (Weidman et al., 2001). Accurate behavioral information is very important. Also, related to concerns identified in the literature, often students lack awareness of the full spectrum of faculty roles and work behaviors (Austin, 2002; J. Gaff et al., 2000; C. Golde & T. Dore, 2001). They may be

more familiar of the activities involved in research, but do not know they will be expected to sit on committees, perform outreach and service, and secure external funding. The next section will demonstrate how this research design will address specific issues about work behaviors performed by counselor educators in diverse educational settings.

Socialization provides a framework for conceptualizing doctoral education, particularly faculty preparation, so that students are introduced to the knowledge requirements, the behavioral expectations, and the culture of faculty careers. In such a framework, the reality of faculty life within diverse settings informs and seamlessly infuses program design, clinical and professional experiential opportunities, mentorship and professional development. The goal is for doctoral graduates pursuing an academic career to be as prepared as possible, and as competitive as possible, to secure their first counselor educator positions.

If socialization provides a framework for conceptualizing doctoral education, competency-based education theory provides a structure for designing such an educational experience. Competency-based education (CBE) models had their origins in K-12 education (Houston & Howsam, 1972; Spady, 1978). More recently, it has been utilized in designing preparation programs for educators (Hyland, 1993; Reynolds & Salters, 1995; Whitty & Willmott, 1991). Grounded in providing academic and experiential opportunities to gain demonstrable proficiencies in competencies related to professional duties, benefits of CBE include demystifying professional expectations, providing students with clear goals of achievement and evidence of progress, and providing employers with a clearer understanding of the abilities of job applicants (Whitty & Willmott, 1991).

Competencies are defined as knowledge, skill, abilities and related performance guidelines (Engels, 2004; Paulson, 2001). Competencies must be meaningful and relevant to the professional context; competency statements must be derived from occupational analysis of roles within the related profession; and competency statements must include knowledge and understanding required for effective performance in employment (Whitty & Willmott, 1991).

The latest edition of *The Professional Counselor: Portfolio, Competencies, Performance Guidelines, and Assessment* demonstrated the role competencies play in counselor education (Engels, 2004). The authors supported using a competency-based approach in program design and student evaluation as a means of holding students and programs accountable for developing skills required of counselors and counselor educators. The counselor education and supervision competencies and performance guidelines compliment an analysis of work behaviors common to counselor educators. While the competencies and guidelines allude to many of the behaviors of faculty members (e.g., counselor, teacher, scholarship, etc.), the relative importance and frequency of engaging in these behaviors depending on academic setting is unclear.

Competency-based education can influence program design, accreditation self-studies, course design, student evaluation and self-assessments (Engels, 2004; Mager, 1997; Whitty & Willmott, 1991). Competencies can form the framework for instructional objectives within curriculum design (Mager, 1997). In counselor education, a competency-based approach was used in selecting faculty members (Weitz, Anchor, & Percy, 1976)

While vocational education, community colleges, and professional education have recognized the value of linking curriculum design with work-place abilities, the doctoral experience has not utilized such a model. Yet, the concerns raised in the literature build a powerful argument towards conceptualizing the doctoral experience from this framework.

Work-Behavior Analysis: A Foundational Step toward Change

The socialization process includes introducing doctoral students to the specific behavioral expectations held by faculty members – what they need to know and be able to do to fulfill the professional requirements of a counselor educator. A work behavioral analysis is tool to identify that information. It provides information about not only the broad role domains but also the specific work behaviors related to those domains. The work behavior analysis (a.k.a. job analysis or occupational analysis) is often used in identify work behaviors, foundational to competency-based education models (Browning, Bugbee, & Mullins, 1996).

In their work behavior analysis of professional counselors, Loesch and Vacc (1993) defined a work behavior analysis (also referred to as a work-oriented job analysis) as "a systematic examination of the nature and/or elements of a relatively broadly defined (employment) 'position,' 'occupation,' or 'job'" (p. 4). The method is employed when a professional identity has not been clearly defined. Such analyses are also utilized for training purposes (Council, 2002).

Occupational and work behavior analyses have been conducted in counseling and related professional contexts. An occupational analysis of counseling psychologists was performed in order to determine the actual work behaviors engaged in by members of that profession (Fitzgerald & Osipow, 1986). The method used by Fitzgerald and Osipow informed a later study of counselors (Loesch & Vacc, 1993). In the design, a list of work

behaviors was generated, based on a review of the literature, professional materials, and related job analyses (Loesch & Vacc, 1993). Following a review by subject matter experts, the list informed the development of a survey instrument in which respondents were asked to rate perceptions of importance and the frequency in which they engaged in the work behaviors.

Work analyses conducted for counseling and related disciplines have informed this study, and the present study seeks to contribute to the developing database of work behaviors. The most recent study was a role analysis conducted with counselor educators (MohdZain, 1995). Per MohdZain's recommendation, an analysis of job announcements was performed to ensure congruence between the instrument and work expectations. MohdZain's study identified the major domains comprising the counselor educator role (e.g., supervision, teaching and advising, counseling and consultation, etc.). However the specific work behaviors encompassing those domains was not investigated. Fitzgerald and Osipow and Loesch and Vacc's studies were conducted for related but distinct purposes. Their goals were not to identify work behaviors of counselor educators. While they were useful in developing the items for this study's instrument, they did not answer this study's research questions.

A review of the relevant research revealed concerns falling under the broad umbrella of insufficient socialization of doctoral students pursuing faculty careers. If it is assumed that the doctorate program is an appropriate time to introduce students to the behavioral, attitudinal, and performance expectations of faculty members, then current concerns identify a need to clarify role and behavioral expectations of faculty, increase awareness of and exposure to opportunities to participate in diverse behaviors common to

faculty, and ultimately better prepare students to enter their first academic position. Approaching these concerns using a competency-based education framework, an appropriate first step was an analysis of work behaviors common to counselor educators. While work behavior and occupational analyses have been conducted with counselors and counseling psychologists, and a role analysis was conducted with counselor educators; there was a gap in the research related to counselor educator work behaviors. As a first step towards attending to preparation of future faculty, this study used a work behavior analysis method to identify work behaviors common to counselor educators. The next chapter will describe the method, including sampling and instrument development.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Sampling Procedures

Counselor education faculty members provide, oversee, and facilitate curricular and clinical experiences (Hollis & Dodson, 2000). The doctorate is the common highest academic degree earned by university faculty. They may hold additional credentials, such as clinical licensure and national certification, and may be affiliated with professional counseling associations, such as the American Counseling Association (ACA) and the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (CACREP) (Hollis & Dodson, 2000).

According to the Occupational Outlook Handbook (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004), academic positions will continue to increase. However, part-time and non-tenure track opportunities will increase faster than traditional full-time tenure-track positions. Neither Hollis and Dodson nor the Occupational Outlook Handbook provides demographic breakdowns of current counselor educators by gender, age, race, or ethnicity. My study gathered demographic information from participants to better describe current counselor educators.

Common tasks and functions include teaching large and small undergraduate and graduate classes, supervising students, preparing lectures, securing outside funding, administering grants, conducting research, analyzing data, writing for publication, presenting at professional conferences, advising and mentoring students, and supervising student research and student teaching. Increasingly, faculty members are expected to

incorporate technology within each aspect of their jobs, including demonstrated competency with presentation software, the Internet, distance learning technology, and course management applications. In addition to work centered on teaching and research, faculty members participate in department and university service and governance. Also, they are involved in community, state, and national service as well as service to professional organizations. Clinical work compliments more traditional academic work for counselor educators. This may include individual and group supervision, outside clinical practice, and managing clinics associated with academic departments.

Thus, the counselor educator population assume diverse responsibilities and balance numerous expectations within varied professional settings, ranging from clinician-focused entry-level programs to research extensive universities emphasizing research, publication, service, and teaching.

Population

The counselor educator population was obtained from the 2004 Directory of CACREP Accredited Programs, updated May 2003 (CACREP, 2003). The directory includes information on the name of the academic unit, institution name, address, web site, program liaison, telephone number, and email address. The directory contained 182 academic units housed within 180 institutions. Each academic unit included at least an email address of the program coordinator, and most included a program website, indicating the degree to which technology and Internet use have become a mainstream medium of communication. For this study, every individual was contacted who met the following criteria: (1) identified as a faculty member on a department website of a CACREP-accredited program and (2) has an email address.

An Internet search of each academic unit's web site was conducted. Faculty members were identified, and e-mail addresses was copied and pasted into a "Counselor Educator Population" list within SurveyMonkey.com. No faculty members' names were maintained in this study.

In addition to surveys being sent to individual email addresses, an email inviting participation was sent to the CESNET Listserv, the listserv for counselor educators. Based on the comprehensive method used to identify potential participants, it is assumed the sample invited to participate was representative of counselor educators working in CACREP-accredited programs.

Instrument Development

The Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument developed for this study was based on a review of relevant literature, previous work behavior analyses, and an analysis of current assistant professor job announcements.

MohdZain (1995) conducted a role analysis of the counselor education professoriate. In his role analysis survey, MohdZain organized his items by six functional domains: teaching and advising, supervision, counseling and consultation, administration, scholarship, and service. These roles were based on a review of literature pertaining to general work expectations of higher education faculty (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Labor, 1991; Loesch & Vacc, 1993; Mintz, 1992). Loesch and Vacc (1993) conducted a work behavior analysis of professional counselors. The results were a prioritized list of work behaviors organized into five clusters: fundamental counseling practices, counseling for career development, counseling groups, counseling families, and professional practice. This study did not differentiate counseling work behaviors conducted by counselor educators. However, a selection of work behaviors could be applicable to counselor

educators as they related to the functional domains identified by MohdZain (i.e., supervise counselor trainees, conduct community outreach, provide consultation services).

Using MohdZain's domains as a foundational structure, an analysis was conducted on assistant professor counselor education positions posted in January 2004. To identify the duties, responsibilities, and job expectations of counselor educators, a search of current job postings was conducted using three Internet-based job databases advertising either or both counselor education and academic jobs. On January 13, 2004, a search for posted faculty positions was conducted on the ACA Career Center (http://www.counseling.org/site/PageServer?pagename=career), the Chronicle of Higher Education (http://chronicle.com), and on HigherEdJobs.com (http://www.higheredjobs.com).

The purpose of the search was to identify work behaviors of academic positions for which new counselor education doctoral graduates would be competitive. Thus, criteria for selection included counselor education and related positions at the Assistant Professor rank. The ACA Career Center had 13 postings meeting the search criteria, with posting dates ranging from December 18, 2003, to January 12, 2004. The Chronicle of Higher Education listed a total of 5 postings, with posting dates ranging from December 17, 2003, to January 2, 2004. HigherEdJobs.com identified 46 postings meeting the search criteria, with posting dates ranging from September 10, 2003, to January 12, 2004.

A total of 64 postings were identified. These positions were diverse in geographic location and institutional structure. Programs included masters-only, clinician-focused training programs as well as research-intensive doctoral granting programs. Thus,

institutions were represented that varied in the values placed on research, teaching, and service. Many programs were CACREP-accredited; others were either not accredited or currently seeking CACREP accreditation. A fewer number were accredited by related organizations, including the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT) and the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE). Virtually all positions advertised a Fall 2004 start date.

Of note, in late 2003, the Chronicle of Higher Education removed "Counselor Education" as a unique category, integrating these positions within the "Teacher Education" category. Searches within the Chronicle were conducted in the following categories: teacher education, human development/family sciences, other education, other social/behavioral sciences, and psychology. HigherEdJobs.com maintains "Counselor Education" as a unique search category, and it is assumed that positions advertised by the American Counseling Association's Career Center are relevant to counselor education. Because the Chronicle may have counselor education positions listed that were not identified, this search was not exhaustive. However, given the diversity of positions identified, it is assumed they are representative of the scope of counselor education positions currently available within the United States for which new counselor education doctoral graduates might apply.

Each position was given a Position Number for reference, ranging from 01 to 64. The positions were reviewed, and a table was generated with rows representing each position and columns containing the following information: Position No., Track, Type of Program, Accreditation, Geographic Region, Duties, Required Qualifications, and Preferred Qualifications. This data was sought within each position. If the information

was not available within the posting, “Not Available” was placed in the corresponding cell. A list of 281 duties was isolated and organized according to the six functional domains. Duplicates and similar items were eliminated. The resulting list, along with MohdZain’s domains, and work behaviors identified by Loesch & Vacc were used to develop the Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument.

Instrument

The Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument consisted of a cover page detailing the informed consent process and two sections with a total of 32 items: Section I – Importance and Frequency of Work Behaviors and Section II – Demographic Information. Refer to Appendix A for a Microsoft Word-formatted version of the online survey, Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument.

In Section I (Items 1 though 6), work behaviors were organized according to six functional domains: (1) Administration, (2) Scholarship, (3) Service, (4) Supervision, (5) Teaching and Advising, and (6) Your Practice of Counseling & Consultation. Seventy three (73) work behaviors were examined: Administration (15), Scholarship (16), Service (8), Supervision (7), Teaching and Advising (15), and Your Practice of Counseling & Consultation (12). For each work behavior, participants were asked to rate the importance and the frequency with which they engage in the work behavior. Participants were asked to consider importance of work behaviors performed within an average academic term. Importance of work behaviors was ranked along a 6-point Likert scale: Not performed, Not important, Somewhat important, Important, Very important, and Extremely important. Participants were asked to consider frequency as the number of hours a week a work behavior is performed within an average academic term. Frequency was ranked along a 6-point Likert scale: Not performed, <1 hour, 1-2 hours, 2-5 hours, 5-8 hours, 8+

hours. The importance and frequency Likert scales appeared as radio buttons. The participant clicked the radio button, and the corresponding scale appears. The participant clicked on the appropriate option.

In Section II (Items 7 through 32), participants were asked to provide demographic information related to the individual respondent, her or his institution and academic unit. Items relevant to the respondent included: gender, ethnicity, age, highest degree earned related to current position, area(s) of professional specialization, number of years working as a faculty member, academic rank, tenure status, full- or part-time counselor educator status, hours spent on professional, university-related work activities in a typical week, hours spent on professional, private work activities in a typical week, percent of total work time in a typical month spent on all professional work activities, professional affiliation(s), and licensure(s) and certification(s). Items related to the institution and academic unit included: geographic location, Carnegie classification, approximate total number of faculty members in academic unit, approximate total number of students in academic unit, degree(s) offered in program, program specialization(s), program accreditation(s), general program type, and curriculum delivery mode. The final three items related to a participant's opinion about a professional credential for counselor educators and whether or not the participant wanted a global summary of the study's findings.

Data Collection

The Internet-based survey was created using SurveyMonkey.com LLC services (http://www.surveymonkey.com/home.asp). Account holders with SurveyMonkey.com LLC are able to design surveys, collect responses, and analyze results within a secure and confidential environment.

Access is password protected to the following areas: survey design, data collected, and participant email list. Access is limited to the researcher, who is the sole account holder. This survey host does not allow spamming. SurveyMonkey.com LLC states in their privacy policy that data collected are kept private and confidential.

SurveyMonkey.com LLC provides the following overview of their security structure and procedures. Servers are kept at Berbee Networks (www.berbee.com) and owned and maintained by SurveyMonkey staff. Servers are kept in a locket cage. Entry requires a passcard and biometric recognition. Digital surveillance equipment monitors the servers. Controls are provided for temperature, humidity, and smoke/fire detection, and professional staff are on the premises on a 24/7 basis. Network security is maintained by: multiple independent connections to Tier 1 Internet access providers; fully redundant OC-48 SONET Rings; uptime monitored every 5 minutes; and firewall restricts access to all ports except 80 (http) and 443 (https). Hardware security is maintained through the following procedures: servers have redundant internal power supplies; data is on RIAD 10, operating system on RAID 1; and servers are mirrored and can failover in less than one hour. Finally, software security is maintained through the following procedures: code in ASP, running on SQL Server 2000 and Windows 2000 Server; latest patches applied to all operating system and application files; SSL encryption of all billing data; data are backed up every hour internally; and data are backed up every night to centralized backup system, with offsite backups in event of catastrophe.

The Instrument was created using a Yellow Metal color theme for ease of reading and clear item distinction. All questions were optional. A cover page introducing the study provided the following information: researcher and supervisor introductions;

overview, rationale, and purpose of the study; overview of survey and directions; disclosure of potential risks, benefits, and description of voluntary nature of participation; instructions on removing oneself from the study; contact information; and an informed consent statement.

Section I consisted of matrix-multiple answers per row (rating scale) questions for each work behavior. Work behaviors were organized alphabetically within functional domains. Along each work behavior within each item, participants will click on a radio button for importance and frequency, using the mouse to select the appropriate option. The importance and frequency radio buttons refered to the corresponding Likert scales. The participant could change any response at any point of the survey.

Section II consisted of multiple item types, depending on the information sought. SurveyMonkey.com provided options for item types and guided the researcher in selecting the most appropriate type to generate the information sought. To maintain consistency, when multiple options appeared, all options appeared in a vertical format. The section began with items focused on individual characteristics (Items 13 through 20). Gender identity was a choice – one answer item. Broadening the traditional dualistic male or female options, a third transgender option was included. Ethnicity was a choice – one answer item. Multiracial and international choices were provided to broaden options beyond traditional ethnic categories. The international option was appropriate for a participant who was a citizen of a country other than the United States. Age was an open-ended/one line item with prompt, requesting the response be given in years. Highest degree earned was a choice – one answer item providing options of masters, advanced graduate studies, and doctoral degree in counseling or related fields. Area(s) of

professional specialization was a choice – multiple answers item. Specialization options corresponded to specializations identified by CACREP. An “other” field was provided, so a participant could enter a different answer than the choices provided. Number of years working as a faculty member was an open-ended – one line item with prompt. Current academic rank was a choice – one answer item. Options include the traditional academic ranks of assistant, associate, and full professor along with professor emeritus, adjunct and affiliate professor, visiting scholar, and instructor. Tenure status was a choice – one answer item. The literature reported a shift in some institutions away from granting tenure towards annual contracts. The options reflected that shift. Full or part-time status was a choice – one answer item. Two items asked for hours spent on activities in a typical week, in open-ended with prompt format. One item asked for professional, university-related work and the second asked for professional, private work. Next, respondents were asked to calculate the approximate percent of total work time in a typical month spent on all professional work activities. Written in an open-ended constant sum format, respondents supply percentages for each domain referenced in Section I. Professional affiliation(s) and licensure and certification(s) were choice – multiple answer items.

Items 21 through 32 sought information on academic unit, program, and institutional characteristics. The two-letter state abbreviation was an open-ended – one line with prompt item. Respondents were asked to provide information on the institution’s Carnegie classification, with defining descriptors of each classification. Two items were asked in open-ended one-line with prompt format asking about the size of the faculty and students. Items 25, 26, and 27 were choice – multiple answer items that inquire about the degree(s) offered, program specialization(s), and program

accreditation(s). Items 28 and 29 were choice – single answer items seeking information on the program type and curriculum delivery mode. Item 30 was a choice – one answer request for the participant's opinion about whether there should be a professional credential specifically for counselor educators. Likert-scale options included: No interest, Minimal interest, Neutral, Moderate interest, and Strong interest. Items 31 and 32 asked participants if they would like a global summary of the results. If yes, they were asked to provide their email address.

Potential participant email addresses were obtained from a search of websites of programs included in the 2004 CACREP accreditation directory, last updated in May 2003. Email addresses were copied and pasted into a "Counselor Educator Population" list created in List Management in SurveyMonkey.com. This list, along with the CESNET counselor educator Listserv, received an introductory email inviting them to participate. Respondents who declined to participate and requested to be removed from the mailing list received no further contact. Incorrect or undeliverable email addresses were tracked to adjust the total number of participants surveyed.

The email subject line read "Invitation to Participate in a Work Behavior Analysis of Counselor Educators." Following the salutation, the body of the email read, "I invite you to participate in a study that will help prepare future generations of counselor educators. This study is in response to previous research identifying concerns surrounding the degree to which graduate programs prepare doctoral students for academic careers. The purpose is to identify work behaviors common to counselor educators in diverse academic units and institutions. If you would like to participate in

this study, please click on the hyperlink “I Accept,” which will link you to the survey.” A link is provided for individuals to click who do not want to receive further emails.

Doctoral committee members reviewed the Instrument for consistency, ease of completion, and the time required for completion. Revisions were made based on feedback received. Reviewer respondents took between 10 and 25 minutes to complete the Instrument, with an average of 15 minutes required to complete the survey.

Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to identify work behaviors common to counselor educators in CACREP-accredited academic units within diverse. Broad demographic questions included: (1) Who are counselor educators and (2) What do they do? Also of interest were potential differences in importance and frequency of engaging in work behaviors depending on academic rank, tenure status, and Carnegie classification.

The following research questions and hypotheses are based on the purpose of this study. Research Questions 1 through 4 centered on descriptive information and included no hypotheses. Research Questions 5 through 8 are listed with corresponding hypotheses. This section concludes with an overview of the data analysis process that tested hypotheses related to Questions 5 through 8. Data were analyzed using the Statistica application.

Research Question 1. What are the demographic characteristics of counselor educators working in CACREP-accredited programs? To address this question, descriptive statistics were calculated on the following relevant items: gender identity, ethnicity, age, highest degree earned related to current position, area(s) of professional specialization, number of years working as a faculty member, current academic rank, tenure status, full- or part-time counselor educator status, professional affiliation(s), and

licensure(s) and certification(s). Descriptive statistics included: frequencies and percent of respondents that performed each work.

Research Question 2. What are the profiles of CACREP-accredited counselor education programs? To address this question, descriptive statistics were calculated on the following relevant items: two-letter state abbreviation, Carnegie classification, total number of faculty members, total number of students, degree(s) offered, program specialization(s), program type, and curriculum delivery mode. Descriptive statistics include: frequencies and percent of respondents that performed each work behavior.

A factor analysis was conducted on the data from Section I of the Counselor Educator Work Behavior Inventory. Tbe reliability of the factor structure was confirmed with a reliability analysis using Chronbach's Alpha, Inter-item Correlations, and Item/Total Correlation comparisons. Based on the results of the reliability tests, Summed Score Scales were created for each of the factors, which because the Dependent Variables for data analysis for Research Questions 5 through 6.

Research Question 3. What are the most important work behaviors performed by counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs? Most important work behaviors performed were identified as those work behaviors that loaded greater than .40 on the factor analysis. Mean scores, confidence intervals, and standard deviations were calculated for the items within each of the 12 factors.

Research Question 4. What are the most frequently engaged work behaviors performed by counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs? Using the most important work behaviors as calculated by factor analysis mentioned in the previous section, mean scores, confidence intervals, and standard deviations were calculated for

the parallel survey items asking for the frequency of engaging in the work behaviors identified within each of the 12 factors.

Research Question 5. Is there a significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of work behaviors? Relevant instrument items included: academic rank, Carnegie classification, and responses to importance for each work behavior in Items 1 through 6. Null Hypothesis – With regard to importance of work behaviors, there is no significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification.

Research Question 6. Is there a significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification based on frequency of engaging in work behaviors? Relevant instrument items included: academic rank, Carnegie classification, and responses to frequency for each work behavior in Items 1 through 6. Null Hypothesis – With regard to frequency of work behaviors, there is no significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification.

Research Question 7. Is there a significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of work behaviors? Relevant survey items included: tenure status, Carnegie classification, and responses to importance for each work behavior in Items 1 through 6. Null Hypothesis – With regard to importance of work behaviors, there is no significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification.

Research Question 8. Is there a significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on frequency of engaging in work behaviors? Relevant survey items included: tenure status, Carnegie classification, and responses to frequency

for each work behavior in Items 1 through 6. Null Hypothesis – With regard to frequency of work behaviors, there is no significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification.

Research Questions 3 and 4 were analyzed by calculating the average responses for most important and most frequently engaged work behaviors for items within each factor. The factor analysis process is explained in the following paragraphs.

Data for Research Questions 5 through 8 were analyzed using the following process. Responses to Items 1 through 6 were reviewed, and missing data cells were substituted using the following assumptions: If a response to Importance or Frequency was 0, then the corresponding response to Frequency or Importance was 0. In other words, if a participant responded to an item's importance or frequency by reporting s/he did not engage in that behavior, and if s/he left the Importance or Frequency item related to that behavior blank, then the missing data point was replaced by a 0.

An item analysis was conducted. Items were dropped if mean responses had an average value of less than 1 or greater than 4 or the standard deviation was less than 1.0. Based on this criteria, no items were eliminated.

A factor analysis was conducted using a Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis and a Varimax (or Orthogonal) rotation in order to maximize the independence of factors and minimize the likelihood of shared variance between factors. Factors were kept with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Items were assigned to factors with factor loadings greater than .40. Items with factor loadings greater than .40 on multiple factors were assigned to the factor in which they loaded the highest or were determined to be more conceptually consistent with other items within the factor.

The reliability of the factor structure was confirmed by implementing a reliability analysis using Chronbach's Alpha, Inter-item Correlations, and Item/Total Correlation comparisons. Items showing poor reliability (items that significantly decreased the Chronbach Alpha, Inter-item Correlations, or Item/Total Correlation comparisons) were not kept in the scale for the factor.

Based on the results of the Reliability tests, Summed Score Scales were created for each of the factors. The Summed Score Scales became the Dependent Variables for the data analysis. Respondents with three or fewer data points missing, either within importance or frequency, had the data points substituted by their Carnegie Mode Score. The Carnegie Mode Score was used because the Carnegie rank was the common independent variable in the analysis for Research Questions 5 through 8. This Mode Substitution was utilized in order to maximize the number of respondents able to be included in the multivariate analyses. The substitution was determined to have minimal impact on the analysis, given the overall variance of the sample was minimally changed by these few data points.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to identify work behaviors common to counselor educators in CACREP-accredited academic units within diverse institutional settings. Additionally, this study sought to capture a snapshot of the current counselor educator population, based on the responses of survey participants. Research questions focused on identifying the current counselor educator population, critically important and frequently engaged work behaviors, and potentially significant interactions between Carnegie classification, tenure status, and academic rank based on perceived importance or frequency of engaging in common work behaviors. This chapter describes the results of this study, organized by research question. Results for the first two research questions provide information on characteristics specific to both counselor educators and the specific academic units in which they work. Results are presented under the distinct headings: Demographic Characteristics of Counselor Educators in CACREP-accredited Programs and Profiles of CACREP-accredited Counselor Education Programs. Next, results are presented for the factor analysis that conceptually categorized critical work behaviors performed by respondents. Finally, the chapter continues with a discussion of the results related to the remaining seven research questions. Sections are organized according to the main topic addressed by each research question. A discussion based on the results presented in this chapter follows in Chapter Five.

Demographic Characteristics of Counselor Educators in CACREP-accredited Programs

What are the demographic characteristics of counselor educators working in CACREP-accredited programs? The Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument was distributed online, via email, to 1738 potential participants. Participant inclusion criteria were: (1) name appeared as a faculty member on a web page of an academic department housing one or more CACREP-accredited counselor education program and (2) faculty member had an email address. The original participant pool decreased by 230 due to nonfunctioning email addresses (123), persons who declined to participate (93), and technical difficulties (14). Reasons for declining to participate included: retirement, person did not identify as a counselor educator; the person was a former member of a now defunct counselor education program, and time constraints. The revised participant pool included 1508 counselor educators, of which 162 responded to the survey, comprising a 10.74% response rate. The response rate is consistent with response rates for mail, online, and email surveys, which can range from 5 to 68% (Alreck & Settle, 1995; Schonlau, Fricker, & Elliott, 2001). Chapter Five will discuss the degree to which the sample was representative of the counselor educator population.

Sample Demographics

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the following variables: (1) gender identity, (2) ethnicity, (3) age, (4) highest degree earned related to current position, (5) area(s) of professional specialization, (6) number of years working as a faculty member, (7) current academic rank, (8) tenure status, (9) full- or part-time counselor educator status, (10) professional affiliation(s), and (11) licensure(s) and certification(s).

Table 4-1 summarizes the frequencies and percentage of total participants who responded to each of the 11 variables. Table 4-2 provides summary statistics for gender identity and ethnicity. Table 4-3 provides summary statistics for age, including average age, age ranges, and age in relation to gender. Table 4-4 provides summary statistics for age in relation to ethnicity. Table 4-5 provides summary statistics for professional characteristics, including Variables 4 through 11.

Table 4-1 Item Response Rates for Participant Demographic Variables (Total N=162)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Gender Identity	147	90.7
Ethnicity	146	90.1
Age	147	90.7
Highest Degree Earned	146	90.1
Area(s) of Specialization	149	91.9
Number of Years as Faculty	148	91.3
Current Academic Rank	147	90.7
Tenure Status	145	89.5
Full- or Part-Time	148	91.3
Professional Affiliations	143	88.2
Licensure(s) and Certifications	140	86.4

Table 4-2 Participant Demographics – Gender Identity and Ethnicity

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Gender Identity		
Female	82	50.6
Male	65	40.1
Transgender	0	0.0
Not Reported	15	9.2
Ethnicity		
African American	3	1.8
Asian American	2	1.2
European American	122	75.3
Hispanic American	5	3.0
Native American	2	1.2
Pacific Islander American	0	0.0
Multiracial	3	1.8
International	4	2.4
Other	6	3.7
Not Reported	15	9.2

Table 4-3 Participant Demographics – Age, Age & Gender Identity

Variables – Age and Gender Identity	Years
Age Distribution	
Total Respondents	29 to 75
Female	29 to 63
Male	34 to 75
Average Age	
Total Respondents	50.95
Female	45.79
Male	57.19
Age Ranges	
29 to 39	N=24
Female	16
Male	8
40 to 49	N=37
Female	23
Male	14
50 to 59	N=55
Female	35
Male	20
60+	N=31
Female	8
Male	23

Table 4-4 Participant Demographics –Age & Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Average Age	Age Distribution
African American	35.0	31 to 40
Asian American	46.0	38 to 54
European American	41.8	29 to 75
Hispanic American	45.2	36 to 60
Native American	42.0	39 to 45
Pacific Islander American	n/a	n/a
Multiracial	47	34 to 56
International	46.25	36 to 55
Other	53.5	60 to 62

Table 4-5 presents demographic data relevant to participant's professional qualifications and characteristics. Information within each variable is sorted by frequency and presented in descending order, beginning with the variable levels with highest frequency.

Table 4-5 Participant Demographics – Professional Characteristics

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Highest Degree Earned		
Doctoral degree in counselor education	99	67.8
Doctoral degree in closely related field	42	28.8
Masters Degree in counseling	5	3.4
Advanced Graduate Study degree in counselor education (i.e., Ed.S., CAGS)	0	0
Advanced Graduate Study degree in closely related field (i.e., Ed.S., CAGS)	0	0
Masters Degree in closely related field	0	0
Area(s) of Specialization		
Counselor education and supervision	84	56.4
School counseling	58	38.9
Mental health counseling	54	36.2
Community counseling	52	34.9
Marital, couple, and family counseling/therapy	41	27.5
Counseling psychology	33	22.1
Other	30	20.1
Career counseling	24	16.1
College counseling	21	14.1
Student personnel in higher education	18	12.1
Rehabilitation counseling	15	10.1
Gerontological counseling	4	2.7
Number of Years as Faculty (Range <1 to 40)		
0 to 7 years	59	39.8
8 to 14 years	30	20.2
15 to 22 years	22	14.8
23 to 30 years	22	14.8
31+ years	15	10.1
Current Academic Rank		
Full Professor	54	36.7
Assistant Professor	42	28.6
Associate Professor	42	28.6
Adjunct Professor	4	2.7
Instructor	4	2.7
Visiting Scholar	1	0.7
Professor Emeritus	0	0
Affiliate Professor	0	0
Tenure Status		
Earned tenure	89	61.4
Seeking tenure	42	29
Annual contract	8	5.5
Not applicable	6	4.1
Full- or Part-Time		

Table 4-5. Continued

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Full-time	139	93.9
Part-time	9	6.1
Professional Affiliations		
American Counseling Association (ACA)	131	91.6
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)	93	65.0
Chi Sigma Iota (CSI)	62	43.4
American Psychological Association (APA)	44	30.8
American School Counseling Association (ASCA)	39	27.3
American Mental Health Counseling Association (AMHCA)	23	16.1
International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (IAMFC)	23	16.1
American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT)	16	11.2
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association (ARCA)	9	6.3
Licensure(s) and Certifications		
Licensed	116	82.9
Nationally Certified Counselor (NCC)	92	65.7
NBCC Approved Clinical Supervisor	22	15.7
License eligible – Actively seeking state licensure	13	9.3

Profiles of CACREP-accredited Counselor Education Departments

What are the profiles of CACREP-accredited counselor education departments represented in this sample? To address this question, descriptive statistics were calculated on the following relevant items. To assess geographic representation, participants were asked to provide the state in which their institution was located. For the sake of interpretation, locations were organized according to geographic regions, as identified by the American Counseling Association. The American Counseling Association has four geographic regions: North Atlantic Region (CT, DE, MA, ME, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT, and NH); Western Region (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MO, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, and WY); Midwest Region (ND, SD, NE, KS, OK, MN, IA, MO, WI, IL, IN, OH, and MI);

and Southern Region (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, SC, TN, TX, VA, and WV). All states were not represented in the responses, and there were no respondents who identified locations outside the United States. For the purposes of this analysis, respondents from the District of Columbia were placed in the Southern Region. Other variables included: Carnegie classification, total number of faculty members within each department, total number of students, degree(s) offered, program specialization(s), program type, and curriculum delivery mode. Table 4-6 provides a summary of response rates for the relevant department variables. Table 4-7 provides a summary of descriptive statistics for variables related to the departments in which participants were employed.

Table 4-6 Item Response Rates for Department Demographic Variables (N=162)

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Geographic region	146	90.1
Carnegie classification	147	90.7
Total number of faculty members	146	90.1
Total number of students	145	89.5
Degree(s) offered	148	91.3
Program specialization(s)	146	90.1
Program type	144	88.8
Curriculum delivery mode	146	90.1

The levels within the following variables are presented in descending order, sorted by frequency, with the most frequent level appearing first.

Table 4-7 Department Demographic Variables

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Geographic region		
Southern Region	71	48.6
Midwest Region	34	23.2
Western Region	22	15.0
North Atlantic Region	18	12.3
Carnegie classification		
Doctoral/Research University-Extensive	63	42.9
Master’s College and University I	40	27.2
Doctoral/Research University-Intensive	32	21.8

Table 4-7. Continued

Variable	Frequency	Percent
Master's College and University II	12	8.2
Degree(s) offered		
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)	81	54.7
Master of Arts (MA)	68	45.9
Master of Education (M.Ed.)	64	43.2
Master of Science (MS)	59	39.9
Advanced Graduate Study (e.g., CAGS, Ed.S.)	45	30.4
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)	22	14.9
Other	19	12.8
Program specialization(s)		
School counseling	142	96.6
Community counseling	100	68.0
Counselor education and supervision	60	40.8
Mental health counseling	43	29.3
Student personnel in higher education	43	29.3
Marital, couple, and family counseling/therapy	41	27.5
College counseling	37	25.2
Rehabilitation counseling	34	23.1
Counseling psychology	26	17.7
Other	26	17.7
Career counseling	16	10.9
Gerontological counseling	0	0
Program type		
Full-time, Weekday, Day Program	36	25
Part-time, Evening, Weekend Program	27	18.8
Both Full-time, Weekday, Day Program and Part-time, Evening, Weekend Program	81	56.2
Curriculum delivery mode		
Campus-based	146	100.0
Distance-learning	46	31.5
Satellite campus-based	39	26.7

Table 4-8 Department Demographic Variables – Number of Faculty and Students

Faculty and Students	Range or Average
Range of number of faculty members	3 to 81
Average number of faculty members	15.14
Range of number of students	14 to 1000
Average number of students	193.15

Factor Analysis

To identify and conceptually organize critical work behaviors common to counselor educators, a factor analysis was conducted. The analysis was conducted using a Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis and Varimax (or Orthogonal) rotation in order to maximize the independence of factors and minimize the likelihood of shared variance between factors. Factors were kept with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Items were assigned to factors with factor loadings greater than .40. Items with factor loadings greater than .40 on multiple factors were assigned to the factor in which they loaded the highest or were determined to be more conceptually consistent with other items within the factor.

The reliability of the factor structure was confirmed by implementing a reliability analysis using Chronbach's Alpha, Inter-item Correlations, and Item/Total Correlation comparisons. Items showing poor reliability (items that either significantly decreased the Chronbach Alpha, Inter-item Correlations, or Item/Total Correlation comparisons) were not kept in the scale for the factor.

Based on the results of the Reliability tests, Summed Score Scales were created for each of the factors. The Summed Score Scales became the Dependent Variables for the data analysis run for Research Questions Five through Eight. Respondents with three or fewer data points missing, either within importance or frequency, had the data points substituted for the Carnegie Mode Score. The Carnegie Mode Score was used because the Carnegie rank was the common independent variable in the analysis for Research Questions Five through Eight. This Mode Substitution was utilized in order to maximize the number of respondents able to be included in the multivariate analyses. The

substitution was determined to have minimal impact on the analysis, given the overall variance of the sample was minimally changed by these few data points.

Based on an analysis of items loaded within each factor, the factor was assigned a name and conceptual description. Table 4-9 provides a list of each factor name, the conceptual description of the factor, items loaded greater than .40, and their corresponding factor loadings. On the table, items within each factor are identified by the item name and the abbreviation of the survey section and item number, each referring to importance (e.g., Admin 1-I refers to Item No. 1-Importance from the Administra section). Refer to Appendix A for a copy of the Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument. Note that items included within a factor may have been drawn from multiple sections of the survey. For example, the Community Building factor loaded items from both Service and Teaching and Advising sections of the instrument. Items are sorted in descending order by factor loadings, beginning with the item that loaded heaviest.

Table 4-9 Results of Factor Analysis

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
Program Administration	These activities describe how counselor educators develop, administer, and manage programs within an academic department		
		Admin. 6-I: Coordinate advising programs	0.761063
		Admin. 1-I: Administer counseling program	0.613342
		Admin. 8-I: Coordinate specialization (e.g. School Counseling) program	0.588513

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
		Admin. 7-I: Coordinate practicum and internship activities	0.529693
		Admin. 9-I: Develop program related reports	0.422723
Clinical Counseling Practice	These activities form the core elements of clinical counseling practice, including assessment, treatment planning, evaluation, and case management.		
		Prac. 5-I: Establish counseling goals	0.963830
		Prac. 6-I: Evaluate client's movement toward counseling goals	0.963488
		Prac. 7-I: Evaluate client's need for referral	0.948984
		Prac. 4-I: Develop comprehensive treatment plans	0.919675
		Prac. 8-I: Maintain case notes, records, and/or files	0.919247
		Prac. 3-I: Counsel clients	0.891819
		Prac. 9-I: Participate in case conferences	0.823655
		Prac. 1-I: Assess potential for client to harm self/others	0.783380
Scholarship	These activities describe the practice of scholarly research from project design, implementation, analysis, and result dissemination. It describes a recursive process involving collaboration and sharing results with the professional community.		

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
		Schol. 2-I: Collect and analyze data	0.893752
		Schol. 5-I: Engage in data analysis	0.837328
		Schol. 1-I: Collaborate in research with other professionals	0.667209
		Schol. 16-I: Write for publication in scholarly journals, books, and electronic media	0.631397
		Schol. 3-I: Engage in counseling outcome research	0.488832
		Serv. 5-I: Peer review articles	0.462029
		Schol. 13-I: Secure external funding (e.g., grants)	0.430306
Teaching and Mentoring	These activities describe the process in which academic courses are developed, designed, facilitated, and student work evaluated within counselor education programs. Included in this process is the mentoring element around students' personal and professional development.		
		T&A 13-I: Prepare lectures, exercises, and experiential activities	0.720678
		T&A 7-I: Evaluate and/or grade exams and papers	0.667195
		T&A 5-I: Develop and revise syllabi	0.522992
		T&A 15-I: Teach core counseling classes	0.511396

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
		T&A 11-I: Mentor students in professional development	0.508108
Clinical Supervision	These activities describe the ways in which counselor educators provide clinical supervision, training, and assessment to counseling students.		
		Sup. 4-I: Provide individual and group supervision	0.839647
		Sup. 2-I: Evaluate practicum and internship counselor trainee's performance	0.823176
		Sup. 3-I: Provide counselor skill development training	0.703980
		Sup. 1-I: Complete written progress and evaluation reports	0.447517
		Sup. 1-I: Complete written progress and evaluation reports	0.447517
Shared Governance	These activities describe the ways in which counselor educators participate as citizens in the governance of departments and institutions.		
		Serv. 6-I: Serve on academic or administrative committees	0.807743
		Serv. 4-I: Participate in university governance	0.787072
Infusing Technology	These activities describe the process by which technology is infused into curriculum design and delivery.		

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
		T&A 12-I: Post course content, class notes, class schedules, and other information on the Internet	0.617700
		T&A 8-I: Infuse technology into course design and management	0.603328
		T&A 3-I: Conduct distance education activities	0.464669
Community Building	These activities describe the ways in which counselor educator build community between students and external stakeholders utilizing mentorship, consultation, and outreach activities.		
		Serv. 1-I: Conduct community outreach	0.652032
		Serv. 2-I Engage in professional/community public relations	0.607341
		Serv. 8-I: Work with student and community organizations	0.494964
		T&A 10-I: Mentor students in personal development	0.434959
		Prac. 2-I: Consult with community organizations	0.412069
		T&A 11-I: Mentor students in professional development	0.404092
Consultation	These activities identify the various consultation practices that counselor educators provide.		

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
		Prac. 11-I: Provide consultation services for interpersonal skills training	0.583772
		Prac. 10-I: Provide consultation services for human relationships development	0.522933
		Prac. 12-I Provide consultation services for professional skill development	0.495631
Counselor Educator Professional Development	These activities identify the ways in which counselor educators participate in ongoing self-reflection and professional development.		
		Schol. 8-I: Participate in continuing education/skill enhancement	0.600563
		Schol. 12-I: Secure and maintain professional licensure and credentials	0.564444
		Schol. 11-I: Review ethical standards, legal statutes and regulations	0.562700
		Schol. 10-I: Read current professional literature	0.545889
		T&A 4-I: Conduct self-reflection activities on teaching and learning strategies	0.424735

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
Program Evaluation	These activities describe the methods by which counselor educators evaluate their programs and disseminate results to stakeholders in the profession.		
		Admin. 3-I: Conduct formative evaluation of counselor education program	0.725781
		Admin. 5-I: Conduct summative evaluation of counselor education program	0.701238
		Admin. 4-I: Conduct program accreditation activities	0.691000
		Serv. 7-I: Serve on committees in relevant local, state, regional, and national professional organizations	0.424036
		Admin. 9-I: Develop program related reports	0.400414
Research Oversight	These activities relate to the supervision and management of faculty and staff while engaged in counseling research.		
		Schol. 3-I: Engage in counseling outcome research	0.542752
		Admin. 15-I: Supervise faculty and staff members	0.514323
		Schol. 4-I: Engage in counseling process research	0.467052
		Admin. 10-I: Manage a budget	0.443439

Table 4-9. Continued

Factor Name	Conceptual Description	Items Loaded >.40	Factor Loadings (Varimax Raw)
		Admin. 14-I: Participate in staffing processes	0.415352

Importance of Work Behaviors

What are the most important work behaviors performed by counselor educators in CACREP-accredited work programs? Most important work behaviors performed were identified as those work behaviors that loaded greater than .40 on the factor analysis described in the above section. Mean scores, confidence intervals, and standard deviations were calculated for the items within each of the 12 factors. Table 4-10 reports the results in descending order, beginning with the factor with the highest mean item score. See Appendix B for a results summary of the importance of work behaviors for each item within the survey.

Table 4-10 Most Important Work Behaviors – Average Item Means by Factor

Factor	Valid N	Mean	Confidence -.95%	Confidence +95%	Std. Dev.	Standard
Teaching and Mentoring	145	4.029	3.913	4.145	0.704	0.058
Clinical Supervision	147	3.711	3.505	3.917	1.264	0.104
Counselor Educator Professional Development	147	3.631	3.492	3.770	0.852	0.070
Scholarship	147	3.213	3.065	3.360	0.905	0.075
Community Building	143	3.047	2.882	3.211	0.995	0.083
Program Evaluation	147	3.039	2.867	3.212	1.057	0.087

Table 4-10. Continued

Factor	Valid N	Mean	Confidence -.95%	Confidence +95%	Std. Dev.	Standard
Program Administration	148	2.830	2.626	3.033	1.254	0.103
Shared Governance	147	2.534	2.337	2.731	1.207	0.100
Clinical Counseling Practice	143	2.314	2.007	2.621	1.858	0.155
Research Oversight	148	2.205	2.009	2.402	1.210	0.099
Infusing Technology	145	2.179	1.998	2.361	1.104	0.092
Consultation	143	1.671	1.424	1.919	1.497	0.125

Frequency of Engaging in Work Behaviors

What are the most frequently engaged work behaviors performed by counselor educators in CACREP-accredited work programs? Using the most important work behaviors as calculated by factor analysis outlined in the previous section, mean scores, confidence intervals, and standard deviations were calculated for the parallel survey items asking for the frequency of engaging in the work behaviors identified within each of the 12 factors. Table 4-11 reports the results in descending order, beginning with the factor with the highest mean item score. See Appendix C for a results summary of the frequency of engaging in work behaviors for each item within the survey.

Table 4-11 Most Frequently Engaged Work Behaviors – Average Item Means by Factor

Factor	Valid N	Mean	Confidence -.95%	Confidence +95%	Std. Dev.	Standard
Teaching and Mentoring	144	2.721	2.586	2.855	0.816	0.068
Clinical Supervision	147	2.281	2.091	2.470	1.165	0.096
Program Administration	148	1.791	1.617	1.964	1.070	0.088

Table 4-11. Continued

Factor	Valid N	Mean	Confidence -.95%	Confidence +95%	Std. Dev.	Standard
Shared Governance	144	1.785	1.583	1.986	1.224	0.102
Counselor Educator Professional Development	146	1.771	1.632	1.910	0.849	0.070
Scholarship	142	1.764	1.591	1.936	1.040	0.087
Community Building	137	1.627	1.479	1.774	0.875	0.075
Program Evaluation	144	1.426	1.288	1.565	0.840	0.070
Infusing Technology	145	1.168	1.020	1.316	0.900	0.075
Clinical Counseling	142	1.033	0.840	1.225	1.159	0.097
Practice Research	148	0.973	0.848	1.098	0.768	0.063
Oversight	142	0.812	0.650	0.974	0.975	0.082
Consultation						

Interactions Among Academic Rank, Carnegie Classification, and Importance of Work Behaviors

Is there a significant interaction between Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification based on perceived importance of categories of work behaviors? The null hypothesis is that there is no significant interaction between academic rank and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of categories of work behaviors.

Participants included in this analysis met the following criteria: they indicated that (1) their current academic rank was at the Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor level; and (2) their institution's Carnegie classification was at the Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, Doctoral/Research-Intensive, Master's College and University I, or Master's College and University II. For the purposes of this analysis, Master's College

and University I and II were combined as one category (Masters Program). One hundred thirty one participants met the inclusion criteria for this analysis.

A 3 (Academic Rank) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Importance) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted utilizing Hotelling's T as the test statistic and setting the overall level of significance at $\alpha = .05$.

The results of the 3 (Academic Rank) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Importance) MANOVA indicated that Hotelling's T = 0.4376, F (48, 438) = 0.9984, $\underline{p} = 0.4799$. The conclusion is to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant interaction between Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification across the categories of Work Behaviors-Importance.

Given an insignificant interaction, main effects for both Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification were examined across the categories of Work Behaviors-Importance. Significant main effects were found on the MANOVA for Academic Rank; Hotelling's T = 0.5067, F (24, 220) = 2.3227, $\underline{p} < 0.0008$. Significant main effects were also found on the MANOVA for Carnegie Classification; Hotelling's T = 0.6437, F (24, 220) = 2.9505, $\underline{p} < 0.0001$.

Separate 3 x 3 ANOVAs were conducted on each of the factors of Work Behaviors-Importance and indicated that significant differences were found on the following Categories of Work Behaviors-Importance: Scholarship (Academic Rank, Carnegie Classification), Counselor Educator Professional Development (Carnegie Classification), Program Evaluation (Academic Rank), and Research Oversight (Academic Rank). The significant results are summarized on Table 4-12.

Table 4-12 Summary of Significant Main Effects for Importance of Work Behaviors on Academic Rank x Carnegie Classification

Category of Work Behaviors	Main Effect	df1	df2	F	p-value
Scholarship	Academic Rank	2	122	3.615	0.0298
Scholarship	Carnegie Classification	2	122	11.104	<.0001
Counselor Educator Professional Development	Carnegie Classification	2	122	7.196	0.0011
Program Evaluation	Academic Rank	2	122	5.647	0.0045
Research Oversight	Academic Rank	2	122	3.870	0.0234

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Academic Rank in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between the ranks of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor ($p = .0167$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .5714$, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-13.

Table 4-13 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Academic Rank on the Importance of Scholarship

Academic Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Assistant Professor	39	24.84	6.01	22.89	26.79
Associate Professor	42	21.30	4.97	19.75	22.86
Full Professor	50	22.32	6.89	20.36	24.27
Total	131	22.74	6.19	21.67	23.81

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between the classifications of Doctoral/Research University-Extensive and Masters Programs ($p < 0.0001$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .8594$, indicating a large effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-14.

Table 4-14 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Importance of Scholarship

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	61	24.98	6.16	23.40	26.56
Doctoral-Intensive	31	22.22	5.53	20.19	24.25
Masters Programs	39	19.66	5.37	17.92	21.40
Total	131	22.74	6.19	21.67	23.81

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Counselor Educator Professional Development category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between the classifications of Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive ($p = 0.0105$). Additionally, there was a significant difference between the classifications of Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs ($p = 0.0057$). Effect size for Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .6175$, indicating a moderate effect size. Effect size for Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .6199$, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-15.

Table 4-15 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Importance of Counselor Educator Professional Development

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	61	16.62	4.49	15.47	17.77
Doctoral-Intensive	31	19.22	3.23	18.04	20.41
Masters Programs	39	19.23	3.84	17.98	20.47
Total	131	18.01	4.21	17.28	18.74

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Academic Rank in the Program Evaluation category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between the ranks of Assistant Professor and Full Professor ($p < 0.0005$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .7568, indicating a large effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-16.

Table 4-16 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Academic Rank on the Importance of Program Evaluation

Academic Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Assistant Professor	39	12.84	6.38	10.77	14.91
Associate Professor	42	15.07	5.15	13.46	16.67
Full Professor	50	16.98	4.25	15.76	18.19
Total	131	15.13	5.47	14.19	16.08

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Academic Rank in the Research Oversight category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between the ranks of Assistant Professor and Full Professor ($p = .0074$). Additionally, there was a significant difference between the ranks of Associate Professor and Full Professor ($p = .0140$). Effect size for Assistant Professor and Full Professor was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .5692, indicating a moderate effect size. Effect size for Associate Professor and Full Professor was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .5501, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-17.

Table 4-17 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Academic Rank on the Importance of Research Oversight

Academic Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Assistant Professor	39	9.89	5.43	8.13	11.65
Associate Professor	42	10.00	5.29	8.35	11.64
Full Professor	50	13.18	6.00	11.47	14.88
Total	131	11.18	5.78	10.18	12.18

Interaction Among Academic Rank, Carnegie Classification, and Frequency of Engaging in Work Behaviors

Is there a significant interaction between Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification based on frequency of engaging in categories of work behaviors? The null hypothesis is that there is no significant interaction between Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification based on frequency of engaging in categories of work behaviors.

Participants included in this analysis met the following criteria: they indicated that (1) their current academic rank was at the Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor level; and (2) their institution's Carnegie Classification was at the Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, Doctoral/Research-Intensive, Master's College and University I, or Master's College and University II. For the purposes of this analysis, Master's College and University I and II were combined as one category (Masters Program). Due to participants not completing frequency items, only one hundred twenty one subjects had completed data sets that could be utilized in this analysis.

A 3 (Academic Rank) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Frequency) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted utilizing Hotelling's T as the test statistic and setting the overall level of significance at $\alpha = .05$.

The results of the 3 (Academic Rank) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Frequency) MANOVA indicated that Hotelling's T = 0.2761, F (48, 402) = 0.5781, p = 0.9893. The conclusion is to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant interaction between Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification across the categories of Work Behaviors-Frequency.

Given an insignificant interaction, main effects for both Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification were examined across the categories of Work Behaviors-Frequency. Significant main effects were found on the MANOVA for Academic Rank; Hotelling's T = 0.3765, F (24, 202) = 1.5844, p = 0.0469. Significant main effects were also found on the MANOVA for Carnegie Classification; Hotelling's T = 0.6548, F (24, 202) = 2.7557, p < 0.0001.

Separate 3 x 3 ANOVAs were conducted on each of the factors of Work Behaviors-Frequency and indicated that significant differences were found on the following Categories of Work Behaviors-Frequency: Program Administration (Carnegie Classification), Scholarship (Academic Rank, Carnegie Classification), and Counselor Educator Professional Development (Carnegie Classification). The significant results are summarized on Table 4-18.

Table 4-18 Summary of Significant Main Effects for Frequency of Engaging in Work Behaviors on Academic Rank x Carnegie Classification

Category of Work Behaviors	Main Effect	df1	df2	F	p-value
Program Administration	Carnegie Classification	2	113	5.0875	0.0076
Scholarship	Academic Rank	2	113	3.5286	0.0326
Scholarship	Carnegie Classification	2	113	8.4411	<.0004
Counselor Educator Professional Development	Carnegie Classification	2	113	3.2403	0.0428

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Program Administration category of work behaviors-frequency determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive ($p = .0035$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .7400$, indicating a large effect size (Table 4-19).

Table 4-19 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Frequency of Engaging in Program Administration

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	56	7.64	4.59	6.41	8.87
Doctoral-Intensive	30	11.30	5.24	9.34	13.25
Masters Programs	36	9.02	4.65	7.45	10.60
Total	122	8.95	4.95	8.06	9.83

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Academic Rank in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-frequency determined that there was a significant difference between the ranks of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor ($p = .0303$). Effect size for Assistant Professor and Associate Professor was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .4899$, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-20.

Table 4-20 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Academic Rank on the Frequency of Engaging in Scholarship

Academic Rank	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Assistant Professor	34	15.23	7.88	12.48	17.98
Associate Professor	39	11.58	6.86	9.36	13.81
Full Professor	49	11.22	7.23	9.14	13.30
Total	122	12.45	7.45	11.12	13.79

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-frequency determined that

there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs (p = .0006). Additionally, there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Intensive and Masters Programs (p = .0215). Effect size was calculated for Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .7731, indicating a large effect size. Effect size was calculated for Doctoral/Research-Intensive and Masters Programs using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .6268, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-21.

Table 4-21 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Frequency of Scholarship

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	56	14.42	7.87	12.31	16.53
Doctoral-Intensive	30	13.33	8.23	10.25	16.40
Masters Programs	36	8.66	4.08	7.28	10.04
Total	122	12.45	7.45	11.12	13.79

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Counselor Educator Professional Development category of work behaviors-frequency determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive (p = .0189). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .6109, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-22.

Table 4-22 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Frequency of Engaging in Counselor Educator Professional Development

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	56	7.85	3.27	6.97	8.73
Doctoral-Intensive	30	10.30	5.22	8.34	12.25
Masters Programs	36	8.33	3.58	7.12	9.54
Total	122	8.59	4.02	7.87	9.31

Interaction Between Tenure Status, Carnegie Classification, and Importance of Work Behaviors

Is there a significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of categories of work behaviors? The null hypothesis is that there is no significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on perceived importance of categories of work behaviors.

Participants included in this analysis met the following criteria: they indicated that (1) their tenure status was at the Earned Tenure or Seeking Tenure level; and (2) their institution's Carnegie classification was at the Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, Doctoral/Research-Intensive, Master's College and University I, or Master's College and University II. For the purposes of this analysis, Master's College and University I and II were combined as one category (Masters Program). One hundred twenty five participants met the inclusion criteria for this analysis.

A 2 (Tenure Status) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Importance) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted utilizing Hotelling's T as the test statistic and setting the overall level of significance at $\alpha = .05$.

The results of the 2 (Tenure Status) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Importance) MANOVA indicated that Hotelling's $T = 0.2372$, $F(24, 214) = 1.0577$, $\underline{p} = 0.3950$. The conclusion is to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant interaction between Tenure Status and Carnegie Classification across the categories of Work Behaviors-Importance.

Given an insignificant interaction, main effects for both Tenure Status and Carnegie Classification were examined across the categories of Work Behaviors-Importance. Significant main effects were found on the MANOVA for Tenure Status;

Hotelling's T = 0.3192, F (12, 108) = 2.8724, p =0.0018. Significant main effects were also found on the MANOVA for Carnegie Classification; Hotelling's T = 0.7166, F (24, 214) = 3.1949, p < 0.0001.

Separate 2 x 3 ANOVAs were conducted on each of the factors of Work Behaviors-Importance and indicated that significant differences were found on the following Categories of Work Behaviors-Importance: Clinical Counseling Practice (Carnegie Classification), Scholarship (Tenure Status, Carnegie Classification), Counselor Educator Professional Development (Carnegie Classification), and Program Evaluation (Tenure Status). The significant results are summarized on Table 4-23.

Table 4-23 Summary of Significant Main Effects for Importance of Work Behaviors on Tenure Status x Carnegie Classification

Category of Work Behaviors	Main Effect	df1	df2	F	p-value
Clinical Counseling Practice	Carnegie Classification	2	119	3.8223	0.0246
Scholarship	Tenure Status	1	119	4.811	0.0302
Scholarship	Carnegie Classification	2	119	13.849	<.0001
Counselor Educator Professional Development	Carnegie Classification	2	119	5.591	0.0047
Program Evaluation	Tenure Status	1	119	4.8577	0.0294

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Clinical Counseling Practice category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive (p = .0289). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .5665, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-24.

Table 4-24 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Importance of Clinical Counseling Practice

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	57	14.21	14.52	10.35	18.06
Doctoral-Intensive	30	22.43	14.49	17.02	27.84
Masters Programs	38	19.44	13.51	15.00	23.88
Total	125	17.77	14.51	15.20	20.34

The significant difference of Tenure Status in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-frequency was determined in the test for main effects ($\underline{p} = .0141$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .4336, indicating a small effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-25.

Table 4-25 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Tenure Status on the Importance of Scholarship

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Earned Tenure	86	21.88	5.98	20.60	23.16
Seeking Tenure	39	24.56	6.30	22.52	26.60
Total	125	22.72	6.18	21.62	23.81

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs ($\underline{p} = .0001$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .8932, indicating a large effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-26.

Table 4-26 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Importance of Scholarship

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	57	25.07	6.04	23.46	26.75
Doctoral-Intensive	30	22.26	5.62	20.16	24.36
Masters Programs	38	19.55	5.40	17.77	21.32
Total	125	22.72	6.18	21.62	23.81

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Counselor Educator Professional Development category of work behaviors-importance determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive ($\underline{p}$ = .0098). Additionally, there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs (p = .0066). Effect size for Doctor/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .6494, indicating a moderate effect size. Effect size for Doctor/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .6305, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-27.

Table 4-27 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Importance of Counselor Educator Professional Development

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	57	16.50	4.52	15.30	17.70
Doctoral-Intensive	30	19.26	3.27	18.04	20.49
Masters Programs	38	19.18	3.88	17.90	20.46
Total	125	17.98	4.25	17.23	18.73

The significant difference of Tenure Status in the Program Evaluation category of work behaviors-frequency was determined in the test for main effects ($\underline{p}$ = .0158). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .4686, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-28.

Table 4-28 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Tenure Status on the Importance of Program Evaluation

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Earned Tenure	86	16.16	4.60	15.17	17.15
Seeking Tenure	39	13.69	6.24	11.66	15.71
Total	125	15.39	5.27	14.45	16.32

Interaction Between Tenure Status, Carnegie Classification, and Frequency of Engaging in Work Behaviors

Is there a significant interaction between tenure status and Carnegie classification based on frequency of engaging in categories of work behaviors? The null hypothesis is that there is no significant interaction between Tenure Status and Carnegie Classification based on frequency of engaging in categories of work behaviors.

Participants included in this analysis met the following criteria: they indicated that (1) their current tenure status was Earned Tenure or Seeking Tenure and (2) their institution's Carnegie classification was at the Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, Doctoral/Research-Intensive, Master's College and University I, or Master's College and University II. For the purposes of this analysis, Master's College and University I and II were combined as one category (Masters Program). One hundred seventeen subjects had completed data sets that could be utilized in this analysis.

A 2 (Tenure) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Frequency) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted utilizing Hotelling's T as the test statistic and setting the overall level of significance at $\alpha = .05$.

The results of the 2 (Tenure Status) x 3 (Carnegie Classification) x 12 (Work Behaviors-Frequency) MANOVA indicated that Hotelling's $T = 0.2110$, $F(24, 198) = 0.8707$, $\underline{p} = 0.6417$. The conclusion is to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant interaction between Tenure Status and Carnegie Classification across the categories of Work Behaviors-Frequency.

Given an insignificant interaction, main effects for both Tenure Status and Carnegie Classification were examined across the categories of Work Behaviors-Frequency. Significant main effects were found on the MANOVA for Tenure Status;

Hotelling's T = 0.2399, F (12, 100) = 1.9999, p = 0.0317. Significant main effects were also found on the MANOVA for Carnegie Classification; Hotelling's T = 0.7390, F (24, 198) = 3.0485, p < 0.0001.

Separate 2 x 3 ANOVAs were conducted on each of the factors of Work Behaviors-Frequency and indicated that significant differences were found on the following Categories of Work Behaviors-Frequency: Program Administration (Carnegie Classification), Scholarship (Tenure Status, Carnegie Classification), and Community Building (Tenure Status). The significant results are summarized on Table 4-29.

Table 4-29 Summary of Significant Main Effects for Frequency of Engaging in Work Behaviors on Tenure Status x Carnegie Classification

Category of Work Behaviors	Main Effect	df1	df2	F	p-value
Program Administration	Carnegie Classification	2	111	3.5444	0.0321
Scholarship	Tenure Status	1	111	6.5627	0.0117
Scholarship	Carnegie Classification	2	111	8.4504	<.0004
Community Building	Tenure Status	1	111	4.0822	0.0457

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Program Administration category of work behaviors-frequency determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive (p = .0086). Effect size for Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that d = .6815, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-30.

Table 4-30 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Frequency of Engaging in Program Administration

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	53	7.88	4.53	6.63	9.13
Doctoral-Intensive	29	11.24	5.32	9.21	13.26
Masters Programs	35	9.02	4.71	7.40	10.64
Total	117	9.05	4.93	8.15	9.96

The significant difference of Tenure Status in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-frequency was determined in the test for main effects ($p = .0117$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .5623$, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-31.

Table 4-31 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Tenure Status on the Frequency of Engaging in Scholarship

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Earned Tenure	82	11.30	6.98	9.76	12.84
Seeking Tenure	35	15.54	8.04	12.77	18.30
Total	117	12.57	7.54	11.19	13.95

A Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis examined the main effect of Carnegie Classification in the Scholarship category of work behaviors-frequency determined that there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs ($p < .0005$). Additionally, there was a significant difference between Doctoral/Research-Intensive and Masters Programs ($p = .0202$). Effect size Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .7970$, indicating a large effect size. Effect size Doctoral/Research-Intensive and Masters Programs was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .6220$, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-32.

Table 4-32 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Carnegie Classification on the Frequency of Engaging in Scholarship

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Doctoral-Extensive	53	14.69	7.91	12.51	16.88
Doctoral-Intensive	29	13.37	8.37	10.19	16.56
Masters Programs	35	8.68	4.14	7.26	10.10
Total	117	12.57	7.54	11.19	13.95

The significant difference of Tenure Status in the Community Building category of work behaviors-frequency was determined in the test for main effects ($\underline{p} = .0457$). Effect size was calculated using Cohen's d statistic and found that $d = .4891$, indicating a moderate effect size. A table of means and variance components is presented in Table 4-33.

Table 4-33 Summary of Means and Variance Components for Tenure Status on the Frequency of Engaging in Community Building

Carnegie Classification	N	Mean	STD Dev	-95% CI	+95% CI
Earned Tenure	82	8.64	3.89	7.79	9.50
Seeking Tenure	35	11.11	6.82	8.76	13.46
Total	117	9.38	5.05	8.45	10.30

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This study investigated important and frequently engaged work behaviors of counselor educators working in academic departments housing programs accredited by The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). This study was positioned within the broader context of preparing doctoral students for academic careers, specifically within the counselor education profession. A review of the literature revealed a lack of coherent objectives, curricular experiences, and structures addressing the preparation of counselor educators (Adams, 2002). Additionally, the literature demonstrated significant contextual changes in faculty, departmental, and institutional settings as well as changes in the delivery of curricular experiences (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004). Finally, little research had been conducted on counselor educator work behaviors, particularly research attending to work behaviors (Loesch & Vacc, 1993; MohdZain, 1995).

This study sought to address this issue by identifying work behaviors most important to and most frequently engaged by counselor educators. A list of work behaviors was developed based on a literature review and content analysis of assistant professor counselor educator positions. Based on this list, and organized according to main counselor educator roles previously identified (MohdZain, 1995), the Counselor Educator Work Behavior Instrument was developed for this study and administered via the Internet to 1508 counselor educators working in departments housing CACREP-

accredited programs. One hundred sixty two (162) participants responded, indicating a 10.74 % response rate.

Counselor Educators and CACREP-Accredited Programs

Findings indicated the average respondent was a European-American female, approximately 50 years old, employed full-time, having earned tenure and secured the rank of full professor. This average participant earned her doctorate in counselor education, and her most common area of specialization was counselor education and supervision. Her three most common professional affiliations were with the American Counseling Association (ACA), the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), and Chi Sigma Iota (CSI), and she was both licensed and credentialed as a Nationally Certified Counselor (NCC).

The literature and the content analysis of counselor education positions identified two issues relevant to counselor educator demographics: an aging faculty and a need for diversity (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2004, Maples, 1989, National Board for Certified Counselors, 2000). Participants ranged in age between 29 and 75 years, with the average age being 50.95 years. Females ranged between 29 and 63 years, and men ranged between 34 to 75 years. The average female was 45.79, and the average male was 57.19 years old. If a retirement age of 68 is assumed, and the average respondent was almost 51 years old, then the average respondent could have approximately 17 more years left in their career as a counselor educator. When comparing age with number of years as faculty, current academic rank, and tenure status, results indicated almost 40% of respondents been faculty for at least 15 years, 10% longer than 30 years. Over 61% of respondents had earned tenure, and over 65% were at the associate or full professor rank. These data indicated a significant minority of participants was in the middle to later

stages of their academic careers, consistent with the literature that supported the need for a continuing supply of higher education faculty. Yet, a majority of respondents (60%) were in the first half of their academic career, having been employed as faculty from less than 1 to 14 years. This suggests the counselor education profession may be experiencing the transition from large-scale retirements towards an insurgence of faculty members in the early stages of their careers.

If these findings are representative of the counselor educator population, they demonstrate the need for increased diversity. Over 75% of respondents were European American. Given that over 9% of respondents did not report their ethnicity, diverse and traditionally underrepresented ethnic groups comprised only 15% of the sample. Of the ethnic groups identified, Hispanic American (3%), International (2.4%), African American (1.8%), and Multiracial (1.8%) were the most represented. When compared with the overall sample, the average ages were younger for members of diverse ethnic backgrounds. Average ages ranged from 35 to 47 years old, perhaps suggesting an increase in the number of newer minority faculty entering the profession.

CACREP-Accredited Counselor Education Programs

Based on the most frequently represented levels of demographic program variables, the typical counselor education program was located in the southern region of the United States, within a Carnegie Doctoral/Research Extensive university, offering both masters and doctoral degrees. The typical program had 15 faculty members, 193 students, and offered specializations in school counseling, community counseling, and counselor education and supervision.

Certain program variables are worth noting and have implications for future counselor educators and current program faculty. Over 70% of respondents worked in

Carnegie Research-Extensive or Master's College and University I programs. Such types of institutions may have specific expectations for research, funding, and scholarly productivity. The ways in which programs are designed and curriculum delivered appears to be changing to meet the needs of student consumers. A more traditional, full-time, weekday, day program is in the minority. Rather, programs are being offered during the evenings, weekends and may be completed on either a full-time or part-time basis. Finally, 31% of respondents working in programs offering distance learning, and 26.7% working in programs housed in multiple satellite campuses. This has implications for doctoral students as they consider how their faculty career may be shaped in the years to come, as well as the pace and balance of carrying out the roles within the positions.

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis was conducted to identify categories of work behavior important to and frequently engaged in by counselor educators. A Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis and Varimax rotation was conducted, and factors were kept with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Items were assigned to factors with factor loadings greater than .40.

The analysis identified 12 factors with items demonstrating conceptual consistency. See Chapter 4, Table 4-9, for the results of the factor analysis. The following are the 12 categories of work behaviors:

- Program Administration
- Clinical Counseling Practice
- Scholarship
- Teaching and Mentoring
- Clinical Supervision
- Shared Governance
- Infusing Technology
- Community Building
- Consultation
- Counselor Educator Professional Development

- Program Evaluation
- Research Oversight

These categories are consistent with literature identifying work common to faculty members in higher education settings (Boice, 1992; Brinkley, Dessants, Flamm, Fleming, Forcey, & Rothschild, 1999). Additionally, they are consistent with the functions of faculty within counselor education programs (CACREP, 2001).

Average mean item scores for items within each factor were calculated and sorted to determine most important categories of work behaviors. The mean item scores for the corresponding items related to frequency were calculated to determine most frequently engaged categories of work behaviors. Table 5-1 provides a summary of most important and most frequently engaged categories of work behaviors.

Table 5-1 Summary of Most Important and Most Frequently Engaged Categories of Work Behaviors

Most Important Categories of Work Behaviors	Most Frequently Engaged Categories of Work Behaviors
Teaching and Mentoring	Teaching and Mentoring
Clinical Supervision	Clinical Supervision
Counselor Educator Professional Development	Program Administration
Scholarship	Shared Governance
Community Building	Counselor Educator Professional Development
Program Evaluation	Scholarship
Program Administration	Community Building
Shared Governance	Program Evaluation
Clinical Counseling Practice	Infusing Technology
Research Oversight	Clinical Counseling Practice
Infusing Technology	Research Oversight
Consultation	Consultation

Results indicated moderate consistency between the importance of a category of behaviors and the frequency with which it was engaged. It is important to note that

importance and frequency are separate constructs. An important behavior can be accomplished in little time, and a less important task may take significantly greater time to complete. It is unknown whether time spent on an activity was sufficient, too frequent, or not frequent enough. Thus, although scholarship was a very important category of work behaviors, it was engaged in less frequently than program administration and shared governance. More qualitative, follow-up analysis, could investigate the challenges of balancing these multiple categories within a given semester or over the course of a career.

Effects of Academic Rank, Tenure Status, and Carnegie Classification on Importance and Frequency of Engaging in Work Behaviors

Multiple, independent, Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) revealed no significant interactions between Carnegie Classification and Academic Rank or Tenure Status based on importance and frequency of engaging in work behaviors.

Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification

The results indicated significant differences in the importance of Scholarship, Program Evaluation, and Research Oversight. Assistant Professors tended to rank Scholarship as more important than Associate Professors. This finding is consistent with the role scholarship plays in the tenure process for Assistant Professors. A significant difference was identified between Assistant Professor and Full Professor for Program Evaluation. This is an interesting finding, raising the questions of how program evaluation is conducted and the role of all department faculty members in the process. Given the responsibilities involved in seeking tenure, the program evaluation process may be taken on more by faculty who have completed the tenure process. Significant differences were found between Assistant and Full Professors and Associate and Full Professors when ranking the importance of Research Oversight.

Results indicated significant differences in the importance of Scholarship and Counselor Educator Professional Development within the levels of Carnegie Classification. Not surprisingly, scholarship is rated as more important for Doctoral/Research University-Extensive faculty than by counselor educators in Masters Programs. Significant differences existed between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Doctoral/Research-Intensive and between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters Programs when rating Counselor Educator Professional Development.

Significant differences within levels of Academic Rank and Carnegie Classification were found in the frequency in which faculty members participated in Program Administration, Scholarship, and Counselor Educator Professional Development. Differences within frequency of engaging in scholarship were found between Assistant and Associate Professors and between Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Masters programs. This is consistent with the experiences of assistant professors seeking tenure as well as the differential expectations for scholarship within doctoral and masters institutions.

Tenure Status and Carnegie Classification

Significant differences were identified between levels of Tenure Status and Carnegie Classifications related to the importance of work behaviors in the following categories: Clinical Counseling Practice, Scholarship, Counselor Educator Professional Development, and Program Evaluation. Consistent with the literature and with findings in previous sections of this study, scholarship is ranked as more important by Assistant Professors than by Associate Professors, and by faculty in Research-Extensive institutions than by faculty in Masters programs.

Interestingly, one notable difference was in clinical counseling practice. Faculty in Doctoral-Intensive institutions tended to rate clinical counseling practice as more important than Doctoral-Extensive institutions. Given the balance of expectations within doctoral research-extensive and intensive programs, it is surprising faculty members balance those expectations while maintaining their clinical practice.

Significant differences were identified between levels of Tenure Status and Carnegie Classifications related to the frequency of engaging in the following categories of work behaviors: Program Administration, Scholarship, and Community Building. Most notably, faculty seeking tenure more frequently engage in community building activities than do faculty members who have earned tenure.

Implications

Counselor Educators

Given the findings, it is reasonable to infer the counselor education profession may be experiencing a shift following a significant number of retirements in which a majority of counselor educators are in the first stages of their academic careers (i.e., 31 respondents were over 60 years old). This has implications at the departmental, institutional, and professional levels in the areas of faculty development, support in all areas of faculty work life and scholarly productivity, and far reaching implications for the generation of new knowledge within the profession. The counseling profession may be entering an era of rebirth, with the potential for increased productivity and scholarship, impacting the next generation of counseling students and stakeholders throughout the professional community.

Given the findings, it is reasonable to infer the need for increased diversity and multicultural representation among the counselor education faculty. Only 15% of the

sample was diverse in ethnicity, well below their representation in the population at large (U. S. Census Bureau, 2003). This has implications for both departments and the profession. If this sample is consistent with the counselor educator population, counselor education students rarely experience the profession through the diverse perspectives that are growing more representative of the world outside the department. Additionally, this has implications on the counseling profession. As counselor educators become more diverse, this impacts the foci of research, publications, and the enhancement of theory and practice.

To recruit a more diverse faculty, it must begin at the doctoral level. These findings suggest program faculty recruit heavily among diverse communities, identifying future scholars representing the breadth of our global societies.

Counselor Education Programs

Counselor education program design and curriculum delivery modes are becoming more flexible, taking advantage of technological advancements. This researcher attends a program in which the majority of courses are offered during the day, during weekdays only. According to respondents in this study, such programs are in the minority. Rather, faculty members are challenged to design programs that balance accreditation and professional standards with the needs of students managing multiple professional and personal roles. An increasing number of programs are offered through distance learning, satellite campuses, with classes offered during the evenings and weekends. Doctoral students graduating from more traditional, weekday full-time programs, will need to adapt to more flexible models of curriculum delivery and program design.

Counselor Education Doctoral Students

This study has direct implications for doctoral students, potentially raising their awareness of the "nuts and bolts of professors at the graduate student level" and demystifying the "well-kept secrets" that are typically revealed after doctoral students have begun their academic careers (Magnuson, 2002).

Specifically, these findings can help doctoral students proactively organize their academic experience, empowering them to seek out curricular and experiential opportunities in which they can gain skill in these general categories of work behaviors. It would be important to introduce the factors and corresponding work behaviors early in a student's doctoral career. For example, students could seek out courses and trainings to prepare them to infuse technology into curriculum design and delivery. They could practice infusing technology during supervised teaching experiences. Demonstrated proficiency could be marketed through students' curriculum vitae and presentations during job interviews. In another example, students could seek out opportunities to engage in shared governance within their own departments, colleges and universities, and the broader profession, recognizing the place shared governance has in the career of a faculty member.

Even prior to initial enrollment, this study can help inform counseling students considering pursuing an academic career. It can raise awareness of professional expectations, the multiple roles and work behaviors engaged by counselor educators, and help them assess their level of interest in this career option. These findings could also assist candidates in identifying doctoral programs. Again utilizing the factor structure, candidates could identify doctoral programs that provide support for students interested in preparing for an academic career.

This study has implications for doctoral students engaging in an academic job search. Throughout the student's doctoral career, their experiences and personal preferences can help them identify the environment that best suits their career goals. They can use these findings to guide and inform their perceptions of expectations at institutions based on Carnegie status. Additionally, it will help them articulate differences in importance and frequency of work behaviors of faculty seeking tenure. In all, doctoral students may have a more clear picture of a counselor educator career.

Practice of Preparing Future Counselor Educators

This study identified work behaviors critical to counselor educators. Thus, findings may come as no surprise to faculty working in counselor education programs. However, they can help guide program evaluations, particularly evaluations of current doctoral programs.

In what ways are doctoral students being socialized in program administration, teaching and mentoring, community building, shared governance, program evaluation, and research oversight? Are these experiences infused within the doctoral curriculum or are they a part of the hidden curriculum, maintained as well-kept secrets? Using the factor structure as a guide, departments could survey current students and doctoral graduates to assess the degree to which their program prepares students for faculty careers. Programs could follow up with their graduates and track them through the critical initial years of their career, specifically their tenure process. Based on this study's findings and any departmental program evaluations, faculty could partner with their own doctoral students, alumni, campus resources, and national initiatives to create programming to build competence in critical faculty work behaviors. Finally, these

findings could help clarify doctoral accreditation standards, helping identify core areas of counselor educator preparation.

Limitations

Limitations of this study exist and should be taken into account when interpreting the results. Particularly, limitations associated with survey design and response rate warrant caution being used when interpretations seek to generalize results to the counselor educator population.

Survey Design

The researcher received several email responses indicating participant confusion interpreting the purpose of the study and the appropriateness of their completing the survey. In the invitation to participate, the purpose of the study was situated within a broader context of doctoral preparation of future faculty. Multiple potential participants interpreted the study was only appropriate for faculty in departments housing doctoral programs. Several faculty members wrote explaining they did not have a doctoral program in their department and were not appropriate to participate.

The researcher attempted to minimize this confusion by clarifying the purpose of the study in the first and second reminder emails. The researcher emphasized the importance of counselor educators from all types of programs participating, regardless of degrees offered.

This confusion may have impacted negatively the response rate; however, it is unknown the significance of this limitation on the overall response rate. Any replications of this study should clearly differentiate the context of the issue of faculty preparation and the purpose of the specific study.

Response Rate

Invitations to participate in this online survey were distributed via email to 1738 potential participants. Faculty members in academic units housing CACREP-accredited programs were identified by visiting each program's website and copying and pasting the corresponding email addresses into a list contained within SurveyMonkey.com. Two hundred thirty (230) potential participants were eliminated from the pool due to nonfunctioning email addresses, individuals who declined to participate, and technical difficulties. Of the 1508 potential participants who received anywhere between one and three invitations to participate, 162 responded, constituting a 10.74% response rate. The response rate was consistent with response rates for both mail, online, and email surveys, which can range from 5 to 68% (Alreck & Settle, 1995; Schonlau, Fricker, & Elliott, 2001). Although this response rate falls within acceptable levels, a higher response rate is recommended.

Timing is one possible explanation for the low response rate. Assuming that faculty members have access to email throughout the year, regardless of whether they are on campus and attempting to control for the hectic pace of the academic year; the research chose to distribute the survey during the summer, with the initial invitation and first reminder distributed in May and June. Anticipating the low response rate may be due to the timing, the researcher distributed the second and final reminder within the first two weeks of the fall semester. Prior to conducting the study, the researcher posited potential participants may have had more time and fewer competing projects, thereby leading to a higher response rate. However, this theory may not be valid. Researchers including counselor educators may want to conduct studies during the academic year and compare response rates.

Recommendations for Future Research

While the response rate in this study fell within acceptable ranges established within the literature, it is recommended that future replications include a larger sample size. Possible strategies include multiple methods of survey distribution (e.g., paper-based and Internet-based), distributing surveys at professional conferences sponsored by such organizations as the American Counseling Association and the Association for Counselor Educators and Supervisors, and conducting the study during the traditional academic year when a greater number of counselor educators may respond.

This study could serve as the foundation of a research agenda addressing the preparation of future counselor educators. Based on the findings of this study, doctoral counselor education students could be surveyed to assess the degree to which they are prepared to engage in work behaviors critical to counselor educators. Such a study, or a parallel study, could investigate doctoral programs to assess the ways in which students receive training in these work behaviors in preparation for a faculty career. Program evaluations could be conducted at the departmental level as well as the professional level. The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs could use these findings to evaluate their accreditation requirements for doctoral programs.

While this study identified critical work behaviors, future studies could identify and evaluate effective strategies for developing competence in these work behaviors. Such research could draw from relevant fields, such as teaching and learning, educational psychology, educational administration.

Finally, should this study inform counselor educator preparation, follow-up, longitudinal, outcome-based research could be conducted with doctoral students.

Students in a program infusing training in these work behaviors could be followed during and after their doctorate. Follow-up surveys could be conducted with counselor educators employing these doctoral graduates, specifically faculty who serve on search committees. The goals could be to identify the merits of faculty preparation, the strengths and limitations of strategies of faculty preparation, the impact of such training on seeking tenure, the advancement of scholarship and securing funding, and productivity.

Summary

This study investigated important and frequently engaged work behaviors of counselor educators working in academic departments housing programs accredited by The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. An Internet-based survey was distributed to counselor educators. Findings indicated important and frequently engaged work behaviors within twelve conceptual categories: program administration, clinical counseling practice, scholarship, teaching and mentoring, clinical supervision, shared governance, infusing technology, community building, consultation, counselor educator professional development, program evaluation, and research oversight. This study has implications relevant to counselor educators, counselor education doctoral students, counselor education programs, and the practice of preparing future counselor educators.

APPENDIX A
COUNSELOR EDUCATOR WORK BEHAVIOR INSTRUMENT

I invite your to participate in a study that will help prepare future generations of counselor educators. This study is in response to previous research identifying concerns surrounding the degree to which graduate programs prepare doctoral students for academic careers. It compliments the work of national initiatives (e.g., Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, Preparing Future Faculty and Re-envisioning the Ph.D.) that support collaborative involvement between institutions, academic departments, professional associations, and accrediting bodies.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click “Next” at the bottom of the page, and proceed to the survey. Further information about the study is provided in the following paragraphs. Thank you for your consideration.

This is a self-administered Internet-based survey. The survey consists of two sections: (I) Importance and Frequency of Work Behaviors and (II) Demographic Information. Section I includes a list of work behaviors, organized alphabetically by major functional domains. You will be asked to rate the relative importance of each work behavior along a Likert-scale (from “Not performed” to “Extremely important”). Also, you will be asked to rate the relative frequency in wh ich you engage in each work behavior per week during an average academic term along a Likert-scale (from “Not performed” to “8+ hours per week”). Section II invites you to provide relevant demographic information about yourself, your institution, and your academic program.

This study should take approximately 15 minutes to complete, and you may complete it at your own convenience. You will be able to exit from and return to complete the survey at a later time. The study will be available between May 20th and August 20th.

There are no anticipated risks, discomforts, or direct benefits for participation. Participation is voluntary, and there is no compensation offered for involvement in this study. Participants have the right to withdraw consent at any time without consequence. Individuals wishing to withdraw consent may delete this email prior to participating in the survey or may close the web browser during the survey, thus ending their involvement with the study. A participant does not have to answer any survey item that s/he does not want to answer.

The identity of individuals involved in this study will be kept confidential to the extent provided by the law. The data collected are kept private and confidential.

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Kathleen Fallon (Principal Investigator) or Dr. Peter Sherrard (Faculty Advisor). Ms. Fallon may be reached via phone at (352) 392-0731, Ext. 224 or via email at kfallon@coe.ufl.edu. Dr. Sherrard may be reached via phone at (352) 392-0731, Ext. 234 or via email at psherrard@coe.ufl.edu. Additionally, questions or concerns about your rights as a participant may be directed to the University of Florida Institutional Review Board. Members of the UF-IRB may be reached via phone at (352) 392-0433 or via email at irb2@ufl.edu. Please use Protocol #2004-U-206 in reference to this study.

Thank you for your consideration. If you wish to participate, please click “Next” and proceed to the survey.

Kathleen M. Fallon, Doctoral Candidate, Principal Investigator
Dr. Peter A.D. Sherrard, Faculty Advisor

Department of Counselor Education
University of Florida
Protocol #2004-U-206

Section I – Importance and Frequency of Work Behaviors

For each of the following behaviors, please use the following response scales.

In an average academic term, how important is it for you to perform each of the behaviors effectively in your work as a counselor educator? The scale for **importance** is: (1) Not performed, (2) Not important, (3) Somewhat important, (4) Important, (5) Very important, and (6) Extremely important.

In an average academic term, how many hours a week do you perform each work behavior. The scale for **frequency** is: (1) Not performed), (2) <1 hour, (3) 1-2 hours, (4) 2-5 hours, (5) 5-8 hours, (6) 8+ hours.

[The online survey provided pull down menu items for importance and frequency with options corresponding to the scales listed in the above paragraph.]

1. Administration	**Importance**	**Frequency**
Administer counseling program		
Attend faculty meetings		
Conduct formative evaluation of counselor education program		
Conduct program accreditation activities		
Conduct summative evaluation of counselor education program		
Coordinate advising programs		
Coordinate practicum and internship activities		
Coordinate specialization (e.g., School Counseling) program		
Develop program-related reports		
Manage a budget		
Manage grants		
Participate in curriculum development and evaluation activities		
Participate in marketing, recruiting, and admissions activities		
Participate in staffing processes		

Supervise faculty and staff members		
2. Scholarship	**Importance**	**Frequency**
Collaborate in research with other professionals		
Collect and analyze data		
Engage in counseling outcome research		
Engage in counseling process research		
Engage in data analysis		
Engage in experimental/laboratory research		
Engage in field/observational research		
Participate in continuing education/skill enhancement		
Participate in professional conferences		
Read current professional literature		
Review ethical standards, legal statutes and regulations		
Secure and maintain professional licensure and credentials		
Secure external funding (e.g., grants)		
Write for non-counseling audiences		
Write to other professionals to maintain professional communications		
Write for publication in scholarly journals, books, and electronic media		
3. Service	**Importance**	**Frequency**
Conduct community outreach		
Engage in professional/community public relations		
Participate in professional organization activities		
Participate in university governance		
Peer review articles		
Serve on academic or administrative committees		
Serve on committees in relevant local, state, regional, and national professional organizations		
Work with student and community organizations		
4. Supervision	**Importance**	**Frequency**
Complete written progress and evaluation reports		
Evaluate practicum and internship counselor trainee's performance		
Provide counselor skill development training		
Provide individual and group supervision		
Review audio and videotapes		
Supervise graduate student teaching		
Supervise graduate student research (e.g., independent study, thesis, dissertation)		
5. Teaching and Advising	**Importance**	**Frequency**
Chair or serve on masters and doctoral committees		
Conduct career guidance for students		
Conduct distance education activities		
Conduct self-reflection activities on teaching and learning strategies		

Develop and revise syllabi
Develop elective courses
Evaluate and/or grade exams and papers
Infuse technology into course design and management
Maintain office hours
Mentor students in personal development
Mentor students in professional development
Post course content, class notes, class schedules, and other information on the Internet
Prepare lectures, exercises, and experiential activities
Review and select textbooks
Teach core counseling courses

6. Your Practice of Counseling and Consultation	**Importance**	**Frequency**
Assess potential for client to harm self/others		
Consult with community organizations		
Counsel clients		
Develop comprehensive treatment plans		
Establish counseling goals		
Evaluate client's movement toward counseling goals		
Evaluate client's need for referral		
Maintain case notes, records, and/or files		
Participate in case conferences		
Provide consultation services for human relationships development		
Provide consultation services for interpersonal skills training		
Provide consultation services for professional skill development		

Section II – Demographic Information

Please provide the requested information.

7. Gender Identity

- Female
- Male
- Transgender

8. Ethnicity

- African American
- Asian American
- European American
- Hispanic American

- Native American
- Pacific Islander American
- Multiracial (a descendent of more than one of the above)
- International
- Other (please specify)

9. Your age (years)

10. Highest degree earned related to your current position:

- Doctoral degree in counselor education
- Doctoral degree in closely related field
- Advanced Graduate Study degree in counselor education (e.g., CAGS, Ed.S.)
- Advanced Graduate Study degree in closely related field (e.g., CAGS, Ed.S.)
- Master's degree in counseling
- Master's degree in closely related field

11. Your area(s) of professional specialization (Check all that apply):

- Career Counseling (CRC)
- College Counseling (CLC)
- Community Counseling (CC)
- Counseling Psychology (CP)
- Counselor Education and Supervision (CES)
- Gerontological Counseling (GC)
- Marital, Couple, and Family Counseling/Therapy (MFT/C)
- Mental Health Counseling (MHC)
- Rehabilitation Counseling (RC)
- School Counseling (SC)
- Student Personnel in Higher Education (SPH)
- Other (Please specify)

12. Number of years working as a faculty member

13. Current academic rank

- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor
- Professor Emeritus
- Adjunct Professor
- Affiliate Professor
- Visiting Scholar
- Instructor

14. Tenure status

- Earned tenure
- Seeking tenure
- Contract
- Not applicable

15. Full or Part-Time counselor educator status

- Full-Time
- Part-Time

16. Hours spent on professional, university-related work activities in a typical week

17. Hours spent on professional private work activities (e.g., clinical practice) in a typical week

18. Percent of total work time in a typical month spent on all professional activities (total must equal 100%)

- Administration _____ %
- Counseling and Consultation _____ %
- Scholarship _____ %
- Service _____ %
- Supervision _____ %
- Teaching and Advising _____ %

19. Professional Affiliations (Check all that apply)

- American Counseling Association (ACA)
- American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT)
- American Mental Health Counseling Association (AMHCA)
- American Psychological Association (APA)
- American Rehabilitation Counseling Association (ARCA)
- American School Counseling Association (ASCA)
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES)
- Chi Sigma Iota (CSI)
- International Association of Marriage and Family Counselors (IAMFC)

20. Your Licensure(s) and Certification(s) (Check all that apply):

- Nationally Certified Counselor (NCC)
- NBCC Approved Clinical Supervisor

- Licensed
- License Eligible – Actively Seeking State License

21. Two-letter state abbreviation in which your institution is located (i.e., Florida = FL, British Columbia = BC)

22. Your institution's Carnegie classification

- Doctoral/Research University-Extensive (50+ doctoral degrees awarded per year across 15+ disciplines)
- Doctoral/Research-Intensive (10+ doctoral degrees awarded per year across 3+ disciplines or 20+ doctoral degrees overall)
- Master's College and University I (40+ master's degrees awarded per year across 3 disciplines)
- Master's College and University II (20+ master's degrees awarded per year)

23. Approximate total number of faculty members in your department (including part-time and full-time faculty)

24. Approximate total number of students in your department (including part-time and full-time students)

25. Degrees offered in your program (Check all that apply)

- Master of Arts (MA)
- Master of Science (MS)
- Master of Education (M.Ed.)
- Advanced Graduate Study (e.g., CAGS, Ed.S.)
- Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
- Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)
- Other (Please identify)

26. Program specializations (Check all that apply):

- Career Counseling (CRC)
- College Counseling (CLC)
- Community Counseling (CC)
- Counseling Psychology (CP)
- Counselor Education and Supervision (CES)
- Gerontological Counseling (GC)
- Marital, Couple, and Family Counseling/Therapy (MFT/C)
- Mental Health Counseling (MHC)

- Rehabilitation Counseling (RC)
- School Counseling (SC)
- Student Personnel in Higher Education (SPH)
- Other (Please identify)

27. Program accreditations (Check all that apply)

- American Psychological Association (APA)
- Commission on Accreditation of Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE)
- Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
- Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE)
- None/Not Applicable
- Other (Please identify)

28. General Program Type

- Full-time, Weekday, Day Program
- Part-time, Evening, Weekend Program
- Both Full-time, Weekday, Day Program & Part-time, Evening, Weekend Program

29. Curriculum delivery mode (check all that apply)

- Campus-based
- Distance-learning
- Satellite campus-based

30. To what extent do you think there should be a professional credential specifically for counselor educators, reflecting work behaviors such as those identified in this study?

- No Interest
- Minimal Interest
- Neutral
- Moderate Interest
- Strong Interest

Thank You!

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. If you would like to receive a global summary of the results, please check in the box and provide your email address.

To close the survey, please click “Done.”

31. Would you like to receive a global summary of the results?

- Yes
- No

32. If you would like to receive a global summary, please provide your email address.

Done

APPENDIX B
IMPORTANCE OF WORK BEHAVIORS

Listed below are the frequencies for each of the possible options per item. The Response Total refers to the number of participants who responded to each item.

Key: 1 = Not performed, 2 = Not important, 3 = Somewhat important, 4 = Important, 5 = Very important, 6 = Extremely important

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Response Total**
1. Administration							
Administer counseling program	47	1	14	27	35	31	155
Attend faculty meetings	2	6	29	53	42	22	154
Conduct formative evaluation of counselor education program	16	0	14	48	58	17	153
Conduct program accreditation activities	16	1	12	33	45	46	153
Conduct summative evaluation of counselor education program	22	2	12	45	54	14	149
Coordinate advising programs	39	2	14	43	37	18	153
Coordinate practicum and internship activities	26	1	3	18	54	51	153
Coordinate specialization (e.g., School Counseling) program	38	0	9	27	52	28	153
Develop program-related reports	30	6	37	48	22	11	153
Manage a budget	90	3	13	23	12	12	153
Manage grants	64	0	22	38	19	10	153
Participate in curriculum development and evaluation activities	3	0	15	50	60	24	152
Participate in marketing, recruiting, and admissions activities	18	1	14	38	44	37	152
Participate in staffing processes	45	2	16	37	27	24	151
Supervise faculty and staff members	79	1	8	25	23	15	151

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Response Total
2. Scholarship							
Collaborate in research with other professionals	4	0	14	40	60	34	152
Collect and analyze data	5	0	18	46	51	29	149
Engage in counseling outcome research	29	1	16	38	50	14	148
Engage in counseling process research	34	2	12	46	40	14	148
Engage in data analysis	12	1	24	46	44	21	148
Engage in experimental/laboratory research	83	12	20	20	7	6	148
Engage in field/observational research	39	2	21	49	29	8	148
Participate in continuing education/skill enhancement	5	0	12	52	49	31	149
Participate in professional conferences	1	1	11	32	67	37	149
Read current professional literature	0	1	8	38	58	44	149
Review ethical standards, legal statutes and regulations	5	2	19	46	36	41	149
Secure and maintain professional licensure and credentials	6	0	9	23	56	55	149
Secure external funding (e.g., grants)	33	3	32	41	29	11	149
Write for non-counseling audiences	49	13	44	31	10	2	149
Write to other professionals to maintain professional communications	7	4	44	44	38	12	149
Write for publication in scholarly journals, books, and electronic media	1	0	6	27	49	65	148
3. Service							
Conduct community outreach	10	4	35	47	37	16	149
Engage in professional/community public relations	18	3	35	50	36	6	148
Participate in professional organization activities	2	1	18	49	52	25	147
Participate in university governance	28	9	32	53	19	7	148

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Response Total
Peer review articles	22	1	25	59	27	15	149
Serve on academic or administrative committees	9	10	34	59	25	11	148
Serve on committees in relevant local, state, regional, and national professional organizations	11	1	22	59	36	19	148
Work with student and community organizations	18	5	37	50	28	10	148
4. Supervision							
Complete written progress and evaluation reports	21	2	10	42	43	28	146
Evaluate practicum and internship counselor trainee's performance	15	0	3	17	40	73	148
Provide counselor skill development training	12	1	5	25	46	58	147
Provide individual and group supervision	14	0	2	15	41	76	148
Review audio and videotapes	17	0	8	28	50	46	149
Supervise graduate student teaching	61	1	5	25	37	18	147
Supervise graduate student research (e.g., independent study, thesis, dissertation)	12	0	15	26	47	48	148
5. Teaching and Advising							
Chair or serve on masters and doctoral committees	27	1	8	26	42	44	148
Conduct career guidance for students	19	1	28	43	42	15	148
Conduct distance education activities	75	9	24	26	9	6	149
Conduct self-reflection activities on teaching and learning strategies	14	2	15	48	38	29	146
Develop and revise syllabi	0	2	7	45	56	38	148
Develop elective courses	36	11	37	34	23	7	148
Evaluate and/or grade exams and papers	0	1	11	37	57	41	147
Infuse technology into course design and management	9	3	36	57	26	15	146
Maintain office hours	3	2	19	38	46	38	146
Mentor students in personal development	9	4	20	42	30	42	147

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Response Total
Mentor students in professional development	2	2	5	27	54	56	146
Post course content, class notes, class schedules, and other information on the Internet	29	5	46	42	14	10	146
Prepare lectures, exercises, and experiential activities	0	1	1	22	60	62	146
Review and select textbooks	3	3	26	58	40	16	146
Teach core counseling courses	4	0	3	16	49	72	144
6. Your Practice of Counseling and Consultation							
Assess potential for client to harm self/others	44	0	5	7	22	64	142
Consult with community organizations	36	0	22	39	36	9	142
Counsel clients	56	1	10	16	28	30	141
Develop comprehensive treatment plans	59	3	10	24	34	11	141
Establish counseling goals	54	1	11	15	35	24	140
Evaluate client's movement toward counseling goals	54	1	8	13	41	23	140
Evaluate client's need for referral	54	0	15	19	29	23	140
Maintain case notes, records, and/or files	56	0	10	12	32	30	140
Participate in case conferences	56	1	16	36	25	7	141
Provide consultation services for human relationships development	71	2	25	26	9	7	140
Provide consultation services for interpersonal skills training	68	3	21	26	15	7	140
Provide consultation services for professional skill development	45	3	28	29	23	12	140

APPENDIX C
FREQUENCY OF ENGAGING IN WORK BEHAVIORS

Listed below are frequencies (n) for each of the possible options per item. The Response Total refers to the number of participants who responded to each item. The most frequently selected response is bolded for each item.

Key: 1 = Not performed, 2 = <1 hour, 3 = 1-2 hours, 4 = 2-5 hours, 5 = 5-8 hours, 6 = 8+ hours

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**Response Total**
1. Administration							
Administer counseling program	47	10	20	28	19	30	154
Attend faculty meetings	4	37	76	20	3	14	154
Conduct formative evaluation of counselor education program	25	66	42	13	3	3	152
Conduct program accreditation activities	23	57	49	11	6	6	152
Conduct summative evaluation of counselor education program	37	73	29	5	3	2	149
Coordinate advising programs	49	31	39	23	4	7	153
Coordinate practicum and internship activities	38	20	33	31	13	15	150
Coordinate specialization (e.g., School Counseling) program	47	22	37	21	9	14	150
Develop program-related reports	37	65	28	15	4	3	152
Manage a budget	101	29	10	5	0	3	148
Manage grants	73	31	23	10	2	8	147
Participate in curriculum development and evaluation activities	7	56	58	14	10	7	152
Participate in marketing, recruiting, and admissions activities	21	44	61	13	1	10	150
Participate in staffing processes	48	53	32	11	1	3	148

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Response Total
Supervise faculty and staff members	88	17	27	9	3	3	147
2. Scholarship							
Collaborate in research with other professionals	5	37	51	28	10	19	150
Collect and analyze data	11	62	39	14	9	14	149
Engage in counseling outcome research	46	48	32	10	2	7	145
Engage in counseling process research	55	45	26	12	2	5	145
Engage in data analysis	20	64	36	11	4	11	146
Engage in experimental/laboratory research	114	22	3	1	1	1	142
Engage in field/observational research	57	41	26	10	4	8	146
Participate in continuing education/skill enhancement	5	52	66	9	7	10	149
Participate in professional conferences	2	70	48	7	7	15	149
Read current professional literature	0	27	68	31	7	16	149
Review ethical standards, legal statutes and regulations	9	94	28	8	7	3	149
Secure and maintain professional licensure and credentials	10	94	28	7	2	7	148
Secure external funding (e.g., grants)	63	41	25	9	4	5	147
Write for non-counseling audiences	72	45	17	8	1	2	145
Write to other professionals to maintain professional communications	10	69	41	15	8	5	148
Write for publication in scholarly journals, books, and electronic media	4	16	52	27	21	27	147
3. Service							
Conduct community outreach	15	64	36	13	10	5	143
Engage in professional/community public relations	30	69	28	9	3	4	143
Participate in professional organization activities	5	53	52	18	8	9	145

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Response Total
Participate in university governance	43	36	31	19	8	7	144
Peer review articles	40	48	33	8	5	10	144
Serve on academic or administrative committees	13	34	55	26	5	12	145
Serve on committees in relevant local, state, regional, and national professional organizations	31	40	43	18	6	7	145
Work with student and community organizations	35	49	36	15	3	7	145
4. Supervision							
Complete written progress and evaluation reports	24	51	39	13	10	7	144
Evaluate practicum and internship counselor trainee's performance	20	14	50	37	9	16	146
Provide counselor skill development training	20	17	44	31	14	20	146
Provide individual and group supervision	17	3	39	38	22	27	146
Review audio and videotapes	21	11	41	49	9	16	147
Supervise graduate student teaching	73	24	27	15	2	3	144
Supervise graduate student research (e.g., independent study, thesis, dissertation)	18	21	43	33	17	16	148
5. Teaching and Advising							
Chair or serve on masters and doctoral committees	31	17	50	23	9	16	146
Conduct career guidance for students	25	62	40	10	6	5	148
Conduct distance education activities	100	11	20	7	3	3	144
Conduct self-reflection activities on teaching and learning strategies	16	60	44	16	6	3	145
Develop and revise syllabi	0	77	46	10	9	5	147
Develop elective courses	61	55	14	5	4	5	144
Evaluate and/or grade exams and papers	0	20	47	49	13	17	146
Infuse technology into course design and management	18	57	41	20	5	4	145
Maintain office hours	3	3	18	63	24	35	146

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Response Total
Mentor students in personal development	11	45	46	27	10	7	146
Mentor students in professional development	2	36	50	33	10	15	146
Post course content, class notes, class schedules, and other information on the Internet	45	53	26	14	3	3	144
Prepare lectures, exercises, and experiential activities	0	7	35	62	22	20	146
Review and select textbooks	3	94	36	8	2	2	145
Teach core counseling courses	8	1	4	42	46	43	144
6. Your Practice of Counseling and Consultation							
Assess potential for client to harm self/others	49	52	18	8	2	5	134
Consult with community organizations	42	57	23	10	3	1	136
Counsel clients	58	14	16	19	9	15	131
Develop comprehensive treatment plans	59	32	25	3	5	5	129
Establish counseling goals	54	39	26	2	1	6	128
Evaluate client's movement toward counseling goals	51	37	28	3	2	6	127
Evaluate client's need for referral	52	53	15	2	2	4	128
Maintain case notes, records, and/or files	53	26	32	7	5	5	128
Participate in case conferences	56	32	29	7	3	2	129
Provide consultation services for human relationships development	74	31	14	6	1	1	127
Provide consultation services for interpersonal skills training	67	36	16	4	4	2	129
Provide consultation services for professional skill development	47	41	30	7	3	4	132

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adams, K. A. (2002). *What colleges and universities want in new faculty* (PFF Occasional Paper Series, No. 7). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Alessandria, K. P., & May, K. M. (2004). *New faculty development: Preparing the new counselor education professoriate.* Paper presented at the 2004 ACA Convention, Kansas City, MO.

Alreck, P. L., & Settle, R. B. (1995). *The survey research handbook* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.

American Counseling Association. (2004). *ACA Annual Convention Program Guide*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

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

Boice, R. (1992). *The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American professors: A national resource imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bradley, C., Morris, J., & Brinson, J. (2004). *Preparing the next generation of counselor educators: Moving beyond the CACREP standards.* Paper presented at the 2004 ACA Convention, Kansas City, MO.

Brinkley, A., Dessants, B., Flamm, M., Fleming, C., Forcey, C., & Rothschild, E. (1999). *The Chicago handbook for teachers: A practical guide to the college classroom*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Browning, A. H., Bugbee, A. C., Jr., & Mullins, M. A. (Eds.). (1996). *Certification: A NOCA Handbook*. Washington, DC: National Organization for Competency Assurance.

Bureau of Labor Statistics U.S. Department of Labor. (2004). *Occupational outlook handbook, 2004-2005 Edition, Teachers-Postsecondary, on the Internet at* Retrieved 3/23/04, 2004, from http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos066.htm

DeCotiis, T. A., & Morano, R. A. (1977). Applying job analysis to training. *Training and Development Journal* (July), 20-24.

Dennis W. Engels and Associates. (2004). *The professional counselor: Portfolio, competencies, performance guidelines, and assessment* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Doron, R., & Marco, S. (1999). Syllabus evaluation by the job-analysis technique. *European Journal of Engineering Education, 24*(2), 163-172.

Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council. (2002, July 1, 2002). *Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures*. Retrieved 7/21/03, 2003, from http://www.uniformguidelines.com/uniformguidelines.html#top

Fine, S. A., & Cronshaw, S. F. (1999). *Functional job analysis: A foundation for human resourcces management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Osipow, S. H. (1986). An occupational analysis of counseling psychology: How special is the specialty? *American Psychologist, 41*(5), 535-544.

Gaff, J., Pruitt-Logan, A., & Weibl, R. (2000). *Building the faculty we need: Colleges and universities working together*.

Gaff, J. G. (2002). Preparing future faculty and doctoral education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 34*(6), 63-66.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7th ed. ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Golde, C., & Dore, T. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experience of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education* (Web Site. http://www.phd-survey.org. Retrieved December 8, 2003). Philadelphia, PA: A report prepared for The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Golde, C. M., & Bueschel, A. C. (2003). *Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate: Initial report of the Summer 2003 convenings, September 2003*: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Henderson, P. H., Clarke, J. E., & Reynolds, M. A. (1996). *Summary report 1995: Doctorate recipients from United States universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Henderson, P. H., Clarke, J. E., & Woods, C. (1998). *Summary report 1996: Doctorate recipients from United States universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Hoffer, T. B., Sederstrom, S., Selfa, L., Welch, V., Hess, M., Brown, S., et al. (2003). *Doctorate recipients from United States universities: Summary report 2002*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Hollis, J. W., & Dodson, T. A. (2000). *Counselor preparation: 1999-2001: Programs, faculty, trends* (10th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Accelerated Development (Taylor & Francis) and National Board for Certified Counselors.

Houston, W. R., & Howsam, R. B. (Eds.). (1972). *Competency-based teacher education: Progress, problems, and prospects*. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates, Inc.

Hyland, T. (1993). Professional development and competence-based education. *Educational Studies, 19*(1), 123-129.

Kezar, A. J.(2000). *Faculty: ERIC Trends, 1999-2000.* Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education and George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Loesch, L. C., & Vacc, N. A. (1993). *A work behavior analysis of professional counselors*. Greensboro, NC; Muncie, IN: National Board of Certified Counselors; Accelerated Development, Inc.

Mager, R. F. (1997). *Preparing instructional objectives: A critical tool in the development of effective instruction* (3rd ed.). Atlanta, GA: The Center for Effecive Performance.

Magner, D. K. (1999). The graying professoriate. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(2), A18-A19.

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

Magnuson, S., Norem, K., Haberstroh-Burke, S., Zirkle, D. S., & Henderson, N. J. (2001). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their preparation and their induction. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 40*(3), p. 220.

Maples, M. F. (1989). The counselor educator crunch: Anatomy of a faculty search. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 29*, 94-101.

Maples, M. F., Altekruse, M. K., & Testa, A. M. (1993). Counselor education 2000: Extinction or distinction? *Counselor Education & Supervision, 33*, 47-52.

Maples, M. F., & Macari, D. P. (1998). The counselor educator crunch revisited: A status report. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 38*(1), p. 52.

Mcguire, M. D., & Price, J. A. (1989, May 1989). *Faculty replacement needs for the next 15 years: A similated attrition model.* Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Baltimore, MD.

Mintz, L. B. (1992). Assistant professor: Paranoid or self-preserving? *The Counseling Psychologist, 20,* 39-46.

MohdZain, A. Z. (1995). *Counselor education professoriate in CACREP accredited counselor preparation programs: A role analysis.* Unpublished Dissertation, Kent State University.

National Association of Graduate and Professional Students. (2001a). *The 2000 national doctoral program survey*. Retrieved November 17, 2002, from http://survey.nagps.org

National Association of Graduate and Professional Students. (2001b). *Preliminary executive summary of the National Doctoral Program Survey*. Washington, DC: National Association of Graduate and Professional Students.

National Board for Certified Counselors. (2000). Gracefully aging at NBCC. *The National Certified Counselor, 17*(1), 1-2.

Nerad, M., & Cerney, J. (1999). From rumors to facts: Career outcomes of English Ph.D.s. *The Communicator*(Fall).

Nyquist, J., & Woodford, B. (2000). *Re-envisioning the Ph.D.: What concerns do we have?,* from http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/project_resources/concerns.html

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

Olsen, D., & Crawford, L. (1998). A five-year study of junior faculty expectations about their work. *Review of Higher Education, 22*, 39-54.

Paulson, K. (2001). An annotated bibliography on competencies. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 110*(Summer), 97-111.

Preparing Future Faculty. (2003). *Welcome to the website for the preparing future faculty program*. Retrieved 5/1/03, 2003, from http://www.preparing-faculty.org

Re-envisioning the Ph.D. (2002). *The Ph.D.: A tapestry of change for the 21st Century: Summary of initiatives*. Retrieved December 17, 2002, from http://www.grad.washington.edu/envision/resources/tapestry_init.html

Reynolds, M., & Salters, M. (1995). Models of competence and teacher training. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 25*(3), 349-360.

Rice, R. E. (1996). Rethinking faculty careers: Heeding new voices. *Educational Record, 76*(25-26).

Sanderson, A., & Dugoni, B. (1999). *Summary report 1997: Doctorate recipients from United States universities*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.

Schonlau, M., Fricker, R., D., & Elliott, M. N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the web*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Seidel, L. F., Benassi, V. A., & Richards, H. J. (1999). *College teaching as a professional field of study: The New Hampshire model*.Unpublished manuscript.

Smith, S. J., & Pedersen-Gallegos, L. (2001). *The careers and work of Ph.D. physical scientists: Not simply academic*. Unpublished manuscript.

Sorcinelli, M. D. (1992). New and junior faculty stress: Research and responses. In M. D. Sorcinelli & A. E. Austin (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 50, pp. 27-37). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Spady, W. G. (1978). The concept and implications of competency-based education. *Educational Leadership*(October), 16-22.

Sweeney, T. J. (2003). Counseling: Milestones and history makers. In J. D. West, C. J. Osborn & D. L. Bubenzer (Eds.), *Leaders and legacies: Contributions to the profession of counseling*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2003). *Preparing Stewards of the Discipline*. Retrieved December 8, 2003, from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/CID/stewards.htm

The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2001). *The 2001 Standards*, from http://www.counseling.org/CACREP/2001standards700.htm

The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2003). *Directory of Accredited Programs-Updated May 2003*. Retrieved 4/29/04, 2004, from http://www.counseling.org/site/PageServer?pagename=cacrep

The Responsive Ph.D. (2004). *Activities: The Responsive PhD: Sectors' forum*. Retrieved April 30, 2004, from http://www.woodrow.org/responsivephd/forum_synopsis.html

Tierney, W. G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*, 1-16.

Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

U. S. Census Bureau (2003). Annual Estimates of the Population by Race Alone and Hispanic or Latino Origin for the United States and States: July 1, 2003. Retrieved November 24, 2004, from http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/SC-EST2003-04.html.

U.S. Census Bureau. (Date Unknown). *Table 11. 1990 Census redistributed occupation data compared to Census 2000 occupation data, Using the categories found on Census 2000 summary files 3 and 4*. Retrieved April 8, 2004, 2004, from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/10index/pdf10/techtab11.pdf

U. S. Office of Personnel Management. (2003). *Delegated examining operations handbook*. Retrieved July 21, 2003, from http://www.opm.gov/deu/handbook_2003

U.S. Department of Labor. (1991). *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Vacc, N. A. (1989). An occupational analysis of counselors working with oncology patients. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 29*, 102-110.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Weitz, L. J., Anchor, K. N., & Percy, R. L. (1976). Competency-based evaluation for selecting a counselor educator. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 16*(1), 53-58.

Whitty, G., & Willmott, E. (1991). Competence-based teacher education: Approaches and issues. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 21*(3), 309-319.

Zimpfer, D. G. (1993). A comparison of doctoral graduates in counselor education and counseling psychology. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 32*, 227-240.

Zimpfer, D. G. (1996). Five-year follow-up of doctoral graduates in counseling. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 35*, 218-229.

Zimpfer, D. G., Cox, J. A., West, J. D., Bubenzer, D. L., & Brooks, D. K., Jr. (1997). An examination of counselor preparation doctoral program goals. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 36*(4), p. 318.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Kathleen McCann Fallon was born and raised in Rhode Island. She received her undergraduate education at Mount Holyoke College and Salve Regina University, graduating Magna Cum Laude from Salve with a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Religious Studies. She pursued graduate studies in counselor education at the University of Florida, completing Master of Education and Education Specialist degrees in Marriage and Family Therapy. For 3 years, she worked in community agency settings, specializing in crisis intervention and substance-abuse counseling. In 1999, she returned to the Department of Counselor Education at the University of Florida to pursue a doctorate in Counselor Education and Supervision, with a specialization in counselor education.

During her doctoral studies, she continued with clinical work, establishing a private practice, and completing a yearlong clinical internship in career counseling at the University of Florida Career Resource Center. She also worked as the Admissions Coordinator for the Department of Counselor Education. In July 2004, she joined the Counselor Education faculty at the University of Florida as an Assistant Scholar. Responsible for overseeing the admissions process and the practicum and internship program, this position integrates her passion for teaching, administration, supervision, advising, mentoring, and counseling.