5-20-2005

Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision in Counselor Education: Faculty Members' Ratings of Importance

Jonathan Orr
University of New Orleans

SCHOLARSHIP, TEACHING, SERVICE, AND SUPERVISION IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION: FACULTY MEMBERS' RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE

A Dissertation

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

Doctor of Philosophy
in
The Counselor Education Program

by

Jonathan J. Orr

B.A., Tulane University, 1994
M.Ed., University of New Orleans, 2002

May 2005

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my wife, Daphne, with boundless love, incredible gratitude, and joyous celebration. I will forever be thankful and admire you for the incredible sacrifices you have made and your unfailing support, tenacity, perseverance, and patience for me during this journey. At every turn you reminded me of who I am and more importantly helped me define who I can become. You have allowed me to dream and encouraged me to shine my light brightly even in times of darkness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

With joy in my heart and humility in my soul, I express great regard and boundless appreciation to all who helped me in my doctoral journey. Those to whom I owe gratitude exceed the limits of this document, but there are some who bear mentioning for their special and unyielding support of me.

Thank you, Dr. Diana Hulse-Killacky, for your constant guidance throughout the dissertation process and my doctoral journey as my advisor and major professor. You ushered me through the dissertation process and have been a great advocate for me even as I doubted myself. With great patience and compassion you have challenged me, encouraged me, accepted me, and stretched me, all the while reminding me that life is an opportunity. To Dr. Jim Killacky, you have helped me create a professional identity that ensures I am grounded in principals most important to me. Diana and Jim, you have opened your home and hearts to me and my girls and offered refuge from the turmoil encountered along our journey. You both are great mentors and friends and I will forever be grateful for you.

To Dr. Louis V. Paradise, my mentor and methodologist, thank you for all of the great opportunities that you have provided for me. You have given me great courage and confidence to enter the world of higher education and challenged me to make my mark in counselor education. The added support to me and my family provided by you and Peggy throughout these last years has made many of our challenges fade into celebration. As a mentor, I thank you for believing in me and sharing your humor, your wealth of knowledge, and your experiences in counselor education and beyond.

Dr. Ted Remley, thank you for your commitment to quality in me. As a mentor and committee member for my dissertation study, you provided equal doses of challenge and encouragement. You held me to high standards and I have relied on you to be honest and direct and you have never disappointed me, all the while maintaining your unfailing support for me.

Thank you to my friends and colleagues who have supported me through my journey with laughter, compassion, empathy, and celebration. Special thanks to Lea, Walter, Danica, Nick, Dee, Ashley, and Josh for your "spirited" support. To my friends supporting me from afar, Rita Joe, Brad, Daru, Andy, and Jenny, you ground me and remind me that life is much greater than the confines of the temporary. In you I see my spirit and the vision of what life can be.

Thank you to my family. Steff and Chris, my siblings, you cheer my successes and support me in my times of need. To my father, Fred, you are my greatest role model and I walk this path in your footsteps. You embody a thirst for knowledge and compassion for humanity that extends light to all. To my mother, Stephanie, you have instilled in me the importance of following my heart and making my dreams into reality. You demonstrate selflessness and tenacity that have inspired me to persevere and reach my goals. To my grandmother, Yvonne, thank you for all of your prayers and the rosaries said on my behalf. To my in-law, Vivian Hodge, you reinforced for me the great value of education and demonstrated that there is no greater journey in life than the pursuit of learning. To my mother-in-law, Tina, you taught me the magic of the moment and you model resilience and grace even in the face of great challenge.

Finally, to Simone and Ella, my daughters, thank you for the constant reminders of that which is truly important in life. Your absolute joy, boundless enthusiasm, and confident encouragement, allowed me to grow into the person I want to be. You have always seen the best

in me and your individual and collective zest for life provided constant reminders of my priorities. I am forever grateful for all that you are and I love you with all that I am.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ..... **x**

ABSTRACT ..... **xii**

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION **1**
- The Problem in Perspective 2
- Conceptual Framework 4
- Purpose of the Study 6
- Importance of the Study 7
- Research Question 8
- Assumptions of the Study 8
- Limitations and Delimitations 9
- Definition of Terms 10
  - Ideal Importance 11
  - Perceived Importance/Perceived Institutional Importance 11
  - Scholarship 11
  - Teaching 11
  - Service 12
  - Supervision 12
- Organization of Remaining Chapters 12

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE **14**
- Faculty Responsibilities in Higher Education 14
- Boyer's Redefinition of Faculty Members' Job Responsibilities 15
  - Scholarship of Discovery 16
  - Scholarship of Integration 16
  - Scholarship of Application 17
  - Scholarship of Teaching 17
  - Citizenship 18
- Challenges in Applying Boyer's Model 18
- Faculty Responsibilities in Counselor Education 20

Related Studies in Counselor Education....21
Relevant Studies in Counselor Education....23
Determining Counselor Educators' Ideal Task Ratings....27
Scholarship as a Faculty Responsibility....28
Teaching as a Faculty Responsibility....28
Service as a Faculty Responsibility....29
Supervision as a Faculty Responsibility....30
Chapter Summary....31

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY....33
Purpose of the Study....33
Research Question....33
Hypotheses....34
Participants....34
Instrumentation....35
Counselor Educators Task Importance Instrument....37
CETII Section 1: Scholarship....37
CETII Section 2: Teaching....38
CETII Section 3: Service....38
CETII Section 4: Supervision....39
Pilot Study Using Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument....39
Pilot Study Participants....40
Pilot Study Results for Hypothesis 1....40
Pilot Study Results for Hypothesis 2....44
Pilot Study Results for Hypothesis 3....45
Data Collection....46
Data Analysis....47

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS....52
Characteristics of the Sample....52
Tests of Hypotheses....58
Research Question....58
Instrumentation....58
Test of Hypothesis 1....59
Test of Hypothesis 2....63
Test of Hypothesis 3....64
Test of Hypothesis 4....65
Test of Hypothesis 5....67
Test of Hypothesis 6....73
Test of Hypothesis 7....74
Summary....77

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION....80
Purpose of the Study....80
Discussion of Findings....80
Discussion of Findings for Hypothesis 1....82

Discussion of Items Demonstrating Most Incongruence 83
Discussion of Items Demonstrating Most Congruence 86
Discussions of Findings for Hypotheses 2-7 89
Discussion of Differences Based on Gender 90
Discussion of Differences Based on Academic Environment 91
Limitations 93
Implications for Counselor Education 94
Implications for Future Research 96
Conclusions 99

REFERENCES 102

APPENDICES 106
Appendix A: Letter to Human Subjects Committee 106
Appendix B: Electronic Messages to Participants 109
Appendix C: Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument 113

VITA 119

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item and Results of the Paired *t*-Test in Pilot Study 41

Table 2 Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Congruence in Pilot Study 43

Table 3 Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Incongruence in Pilot Study 44

Table 4 MANOVA Results for Master's Versus Doctoral Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets in Pilot Study 45

Table 5 MANOVA Results for Pre-Tenure Versus Tenured Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets in Pilot Study 46

Table 6 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Gender 53

Table 7 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Ethnicity 54

Table 8 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Academic Rank 54

Table 9 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Tenure Status 55

Table 10 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Number of Years as a Faculty Member 56

Table 11 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of Institution 56

Table 12 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of Program 57

Table 13 Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of College or University 58

Table 14 Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item and Statistical Results 59

Table 15 Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Incongruence 62

Table 16 Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Congruence 62

Table 17 MANOVA Results for Master's And Doctoral Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets.....63

Table 18 ANOVA Results for Master's And Doctoral Program Faculty for Supervision 64

Table 19 MANOVA Results for Pre-Tenure Versus Tenured Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets 65

Table 20 MANOVA Results for Type of Institution for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets 66

Table 21 ANOVA Results for Type of Institution for Supervision 66

Table 22 MANOVA Results for Type of College/University for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets 68

Table 23 ANOVA Results for College/University Type for Scholarship 68

Table 24 ANOVA Results for College/University Type for Supervision 72

Table 25 MANOVA Results for Ethnicity for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets.....74

Table 26 MANOVA Results for Gender for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets.....74

Table 27 ANOVA Results for Gender for Teaching.....75

Table 28 ANOVA Results for Gender for Supervision 76

ABSTRACT

The goals of this exploratory study were to: (a) compare counselor educators' ideal ratings of importance with their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings on tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision and (b) expand the understanding of the importance that counselor education faculty members assign to those same tasks. Group differences based on characteristics of gender, ethnicity, tenure status, program type, type of institution, and type of college or university in ideal importance ratings for scholarship, teaching, service and supervision tasks were also examined in this study.

Participants in this study were counselor education faculty members working in CACREP-accredited counseling graduate programs (N=169). All participants completed the Counselor Education Task Importance Instrument (CETII) that was designed for this study to assess participant's ideal and perceived institutional importance of tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. Paired *t*-tests on all CETII items resulted in statistically significant differences between participants' ideal importance ratings and their perceived institutional importance ratings in scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision tasks. Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) resulted in statistically significant differences for participants' ideal importance ratings for variables gender, type of program, type of institution, and type of college or university. Results for the MANOVA demonstrated non-significant statistical differences between ideal ratings for variations in the ethnicity and tenure status of participants.

Faculty members in counselor education can use the findings from this study to establish priorities for their work in higher education and advocate for a professional counseling identity that is distinct from other disciplines in the social sciences. Administrators in higher education who have responsibility for establishing and maintaining tenure and promotion criteria for counselor education can utilize the same findings to create benchmarks that encourage equity for the advancement of counseling faculty members. Results from comparing ideal and perceived institutional importance ratings suggest that counselor educators have conflicting priorities for their professional counseling and their academic careers. Future research can compare actual institutional ratings to participants' ideal and perceived institutional ratings on the CETII in order to clarify counselor educators' multiple identities as practitioner, researcher, and educator.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In order for faculty members in any discipline including counselor education to be successful they must master responsibilities related to the core tasks of teaching, scholarship, and service (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002a; Boyer, 1990; Ramsey, Cavallaro, Kiselica, & Zila, 2002). Supervision of counseling and advanced counseling practice are additional responsibilities for counseling faculty members added to the triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service (Lanning, 1990). Counseling faculty members strike a balance between being an educator and an advanced practitioner.

In addition to the expanded responsibilities expected of counselor educators in the educator/practitioner model, new faculty members are expected to perform different tasks than those of their predecessors (Austin, 2002b; Warnke, Bethany & Hedstrom, 1999). The use of technology such as PowerPoint in the classroom, online classroom aids such as Blackboard, and virtual classrooms either via the Internet or compressed video are just some of the additional competencies expected of newly hired counselor educators.

This study examined how counselor educators rated the importance of their responsibilities as faculty members in programs accredited by the Council for the

Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Specifically, this study compared the ideal ratings and the perceived institutional ratings of importance that counselor educators assign to tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

The Problem in Perspective

Faculty roles have been traditionally divided into three areas centered on activities related to scholarship, teaching, and service (Boyer, 1990; Lucas, 1996; Rice, 1996). While these three areas ostensibly represent equally the basis for faculty advancement, overwhelmingly, promotion and tenure decisions and by extension most hiring decisions are based almost exclusively on scholarly productivity (Boyer; Rice). Responding to this narrow focus on scholarship Boyer offered an expanded definition of scholarship in higher education to include tasks of service and teaching along with the traditional elements of research and publication of findings.

In his 1990 report, Boyer provided a redefinition of scholarship that incorporated teaching and service activities with traditional research productivity. Boyer's new conceptualization of scholarly productivity in higher education was seen as a turning point in how higher education might reward faculty members. A new set of criteria for rewarding faculty emerged as a result of his work and his model for scholarly productivity valued the diverse activities in which faculty members participate across their careers. While not yet universally applied, Boyer's model for scholarly productivity has been utilized across many disciplines including counselor education (Ramsey et al., 2002).

The reticence in applying Boyer's (1990) model can be partially accounted for by the combination of institutional assumptions regarding the absolute importance of research productivity and the intense emphasis on research during doctoral preparation. The institutional

assumption about research taking precedence over all other faculty responsibilities began during a time when higher education expanded and has been perpetuated by senior faculty members hired during that expansionist time in higher education who have moved into decision making positions within institutions (Rice, 1996). Tenured faculty members hold new faculty to the assumption that research dominates academe based on their own experiences and apply that assumption as the foremost criteria for tenure and promotion decisions.

Faculty at research institutions are primarily engaged in research and therefore tend to emphasize research over all other faculty tasks in their preparation of doctoral students for the professoriate while institutions may be moving towards a more student focused orientation that emphasizes teaching over research as a priority task for faculty members (Austin, 2002a; Meacham, 2002). The overemphasis of research in doctoral preparation leads to a lack of connection between the qualities being taught and those being sought in new faculty members (Adams, 2002). Caught between two worlds, pre-tenure faculty members often find themselves balancing conflicting priorities, and they are often required to choose between advancing the mission of their employing institution related to teaching and service and advancing their own careers through a faculty reward system based primarily on research productivity (Rice, 1996).

The dilemma faced by current faculty members in balancing institutional and personal career priorities is found across disciplines including counselor education. New counselor educators described frustration over the conflicting expectations to devote priority time to both teaching and researching and expressed confusion over the lack of information about requirements for receiving tenure and promotion (Magnuson, 2002). The lack of information about requirements of receiving tenure is an unfortunately common occurrence throughout academe. The tenure and promotion system at a given institution is both the most important and

often the least understood system for new faculty members (Lucas, 1996; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

Rice (1996) attributed the obscurity related to tenure and promotion to senior faculty members who were granted tenure without review or criteria as a means for recruitment and retention during the 1950s and 1960s. Those faculty members then created faculty reward criteria based on their own work rather than criteria generated by the institution. With the promotion and tenure process being basically a peer review, the criteria set by senior faculty for promotion and tenure have been passed through the generations despite changing priorities in the institution of higher education.

The establishment of faculty reward criteria based on tradition can be particularly restrictive on new and emerging professions. Existing standards of scholarship are applied to new professions in much the same way senior faculty apply promotion and tenure criteria to new faculty. The new is defined in terms of the old and therefore emerging professions rarely have the opportunity to assign importance to various tasks related to scholarship in the new profession. Counselor education faces this challenge of redefining scholarship for itself as it seeks to differentiate from other established mental health professions. Ramsey et al. (2002) initiated a discussion about the importance of defining scholarly work for counseling as an emerging profession and provided an important first step in the redefinition of scholarship in counselor education by asking counseling faculty members to rate the amount of time they devote to various forms of scholarship.

Conceptual Framework

Boyer (1990) divided scholarship into four elements: scholarship of discovery, scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching. Scholarship of

discovery refers to the investigative nature or research and the publication of findings based on that research. Scholarship of teaching relates to the interaction of research with classroom instruction; this type of research either informs activities in the classroom or flows from activities in the classroom. Scholarship of integration relates to the synthesis of research across multiple disciplines. Faculty members involved in scholarship of integration use their knowledge in conjunction with the knowledge of other disciplines to create interdisciplinary programs, projects, and lines of research.

The final area of scholarship defined by Boyer (1990) is the scholarship of application. This type of scholarship corresponds to notions of service in academe related to the application of specialized knowledge within a given field for the betterment of society at large. Faculty members participating in this type of scholarship apply their research to issues involving values and the larger social world. Boyer differentiated the scholarship of application from common ideas about service being the performance of social and civic duties. He assigned the term *citizenship* to social and civic duties performed by faculty members that include such activities as departmental committee membership, student organization advising, leadership in a professional organization, community volunteer work, etc. While he did not assign citizenship to a particular form of scholarship, Boyer emphasized the importance of citizenship activities to the roles of faculty members.

Building on Boyer's (1990) definition of scholarship, Lanning (1990) offered an educator/practitioner model for faculty in counselor education. The educator/practitioner model adds supervision of counseling and advanced counseling practice to the traditional responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service. Lanning noted that counselor educators differ from faculty members in other disciplines (including those in other mental health fields) in

their need to be able to demonstrate advanced clinical skills as well as the ability to provide supervision to a large group of emerging clinicians.

While Boyer's definition of scholarship has been examined (Andresen, 2000; Diamantes, 2002; Rice, 2002; Sorcinelli, 2002), with the exception of Ramsey et al. (2002), attention has not been given in the literature to the unique responsibilities expected of counselor educators in addition to scholarship. Furthermore, the responses in past studies of scholarly productivity have focused on where a profession is currently in regards to productivity and not where it would like to be. In this sense, professions are being defined by the status quo instead of offering a view of how they would like to be different from others. This study offers a more holistic view of counselor educators by including tasks related service and supervision in addition to those related to scholarship and teaching. Additionally this study compared the perceived institutional importance and the ideal importance of tasks related to faculty productivity. This comparison offers a view of how the profession would like to define faculty productivity on its own.

Purpose of the Study

This study built on the work of Ramsey et al. (2002) by offering a comparison between CACREP-accredited program faculty members' ideal ratings of job related task importance and their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings of those same job related tasks. The goals of this study were (a) to expand the understanding of the importance that counselor education faculty members assign to tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision and (b) to compare faculty's ideal ratings of importance with their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings. Clear identification of the importance that counselor educators assign to their job related tasks assists in the definition and growth of counseling as a new profession (Ramsey et al.). Additionally, this study extended the work of others who have investigated the

responsibilities of faculty members in counselor education (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Lanning, 1990; Magnuson, 2002; Niles, Akos, & Cutler, 2001; Warnke et al., 1999).

Importance of the Study

This study is important in its ability to fill the absence in the existing counselor education literature regarding the comparison between the ideal importance and the perceived institutions' importance assigned to counselor educators' tasks as faculty members. By including tasks related to supervision this study offered a more holistic view of counselor education faculty members' tasks and reflected the Lanning (1990) model of an educator/practitioner for counselor educators.

Investigations into the importance that counselor educators assign to the range of job responsibilities expected of them at the institutional level are important for those who are new counselor educators as well as those who are considering a future in counselor education. Across all disciplines including counselor education, the tenure and promotion system at a given institution is both the most important and often the least understood system for new faculty members (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). At the specific discipline level, findings from this study provide counselor education faculty members with an understanding of how others in their profession assign importance to job responsibilities and various types of scholarly activity. With an understanding of how other counselor educators assign importance to academic job tasks, new counseling faculty members can develop a guide for their own work as counselor educators.

The understanding of job related task importance also informs the work of department chairs, deans, and other administrators involved in tenure and promotion decisions. Findings resulting from the comparison between the ideal ratings of participants and the perceived

institutional ratings provide information about the extent to which counselor educators are incorporating the institutional goals with their own professional goals. Administrators can also use these findings about job related task importance to develop benchmarks by which to determine tenure and promotion for counselor educators.

The new definition of criteria for the promotion and tenure of counselor educators is important in the continuing effort to differentiate counseling from other mental health professions. Defining scholarly productivity for counselor education is particularly important as counseling continues to seek differentiation from counseling psychology (Ramsey et al., 2002). Counselor education benefits from findings related to the comparison between the ideal and the perceived institutional importance ratings in much the same way as university administrators. The comparison of ideal and perceived institutional ratings information resulted in findings that provide the counseling profession an opportunity to adjust the priorities of the profession to match the changing priorities of the higher education.

Research Question

Do the ideal ratings of faculty members differ from their perceptions about the ratings assigned by the institution regarding the importance of tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision in CACREP accredited counselor education programs?

Assumptions of the Study

A primary assumption of this research concerned the Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument (CETII) that was designed for this exploratory study. While there may be variations among the job responsibilities for faculty members in counselor education, the CETII was assumed to reflect the major job tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. The CETII's ability to accurately reflect the actual job responsibilities of counselor

educators was also assumed. A final assumption related to the CETII was that the instrument is valid and measures the importance that counselor education faculty members assign to tasks related to teaching, scholarship, service, and supervision.

An assumption of this study concerning the participants completing the CETII was that counselor education faculty members were assumed to display honest and willing participation in completing the survey. Following data collection, an additional assumption was that data from the surveys were accurately recorded, analyzed, and interpreted.

Limitations and Delimitations

A limitation is generally defined as a natural condition that restricts the scope of a study and potentially affects the validity of the results (McMillan & Schumacher, 2000). The first potential limitation of this study was the sample that chose to complete the CETII. Participants were not required to complete the CETII and therefore those that did complete the survey might not have been representative of the entire sample of counselor educators. A second limitation was that the CETII might not have accurately reflected the importance of tasks related to particular faculty responsibilities. Finally, the importance that participants assign to particular tasks was related specifically to time at which they complete the CETII. The CETII asks for responses based on current belief and may not have accounted for changes in those beliefs over time. A final limitation involved the use of an Internet based survey collection system. Participants were solicited via email and directed to a secure website to complete the survey instrument. This data collection method narrowed the participants to those who have both email and Internet access.

Unlike a limitation, a delimitation is typically determined at the beginning of a study prior to data collection and represents an intentional boundary to which a study is confined

(McMillan & Schumacher, 2000). This study had several delimitations that may have affected data collection as well as the findings. The first delimitation of this study involved the inclusion of counselor educators at CACREP accredited universities only. No participation in this study was solicited from faculty in non-CACREP accredited counseling programs; therefore, the findings can only be applied to CACREP accredited programs in counselor education. Faculty in cognate disciplines (e.g., counseling psychology) were not included in the study. This was a sampling decision that is discussed further in chapter three, but is included here as a delimitation for the generalizability of the findings.

The chosen tasks related to teaching, research, service, and supervision also delimited the study. The tasks chosen for this study were intended to be representative of general responsibilities expected of most faculty members and might not represent the only significant tasks in which faculty participate. A related delimitation involved the tasks that institutions consider important for counselor educators; institutions may require other tasks as more important that were not included in this study.

A final delimitation of this study involved the CETII itself. Participants were asked to rate the importance of tasks to their particular institutions. Those ratings were based on the participants' perceptions of their institution and therefore may not have accurately reflected the institutions' values.

Definition of Terms

The definitions that follow specify how terms that were most often used in this research study were conceptualized. The terms are clarified to facilitate understanding of concepts for readers of this study.

Ideal Importance

Ideal importance refers to the preferences that faculty members have for job-related responsibilities based on their on beliefs about what is important to their work as counselor educators. Ideal importance may be influenced by professional and collegial expectations as well as personal preferences for one type of task over another. Ideal importance in this study was meant to represent how counselor educators would most like to spend their time while working in higher education.

Perceived Importance/Perceived Institutional Importance

These phrases refer to the perceptions that counseling faculty members have concerning how their institutions prioritize job-related tasks in counselor education. The perceived institutional importance is based on faculty members' understandings of institutional expectations and may be influenced by program and institutional missions, prior preparation for the professoriate, knowledge of promotion and tenure systems, values of the profession, and values of their direct administrative supervisor.

Scholarship

Primarily refers to the scholarship of discovery described by Boyer (1990) that involves the investigation, discovery, and dissemination through publication or presentation of new information that expands thought, knowledge, and/or practice in a particular field of study. Scholarship was also used here to refer to the consumption of research through activities such as reading professional journals, attending professional conferences, attending workshops, etc.

Teaching

Corresponds to the scholarship of teaching described by Boyer (1990). This task involves the design and delivery of curricula in the field of counselor education. Additional tasks included in

the teaching category included academic advising, using technology in the classroom, self-reflecting on teaching strategies, etc.

Service

Used to refer to the tasks related to citizenship as described by Boyer (1990). These service tasks are those that, unrelated to scholarship and teaching, benefit institutions, academic departments, and professional and community organizations. Examples of service activities include departmental committee membership, participation in college or university governance, leadership in professional organizations such as the American Counseling Association, and faculty adviser for student groups such as the counseling honor society Chi Sigma Iota International.

Supervision

The management of or overseeing the clinical or academic activities of students and those seeking state licensure. Supervision also refers to activities related to maintaining licensure or certification such as attending or hosting a continuing education workshop. This category incorporated both the scholarship of application and the scholarship of integration introduced by Boyer (1990). Examples of supervision activities include counseling clients, supervising students working as graduate assistants, supervising clinical interns, attending a CEU workshop etc.

Organization of Remaining Chapters

This chapter has introduced the research problem and created a context for this research by providing a conceptual framework. The second chapter will review existing literature on scholarly productivity, promotion and tenure, and the responsibilities of faculty members in higher education and more specifically in the discipline of counselor education. The third chapter will outline research methodology used in this study. This third chapter will include the research

hypotheses, descriptions of the participants and sampling procedures, instrumentation, method of data collection, and a general overview of how data were analyzed. Chapter three will also report the results of a pilot study. The fourth chapter will present the results of the data collection and the statistical analyses of the data. The fifth chapter will offer an interpretation of the findings and discuss implications for faculty responsibilities in counselor education, for scholarly productivity in counselor education, and for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the research and literature related to job responsibilities performed by faculty members in higher education in general and specifically in counselor education. This chapter is organized into four sections that build a context for examination of faculty job responsibilities and frame the unfolding dilemma facing faculty members with consideration to promotion and tenure decisions across disciplines and specifically in counselor education. The first section provides an overview of faculty responsibilities in higher education and describes how Boyer's (1990) redefinition of scholarship has shaped faculty responsibilities in higher education. Faculty responsibilities in counselor education are the discussed in section two and the major research literature that has shaped this proposed study is reviewed. This study's purpose is stated and the job responsibilities of counselor educators are offered in section three. The fourth section provides a summary of the chapter.

Faculty Responsibilities in Higher Education

The job responsibilities of faculty members have been steadily changing since World War II (Austin, 2002b; Boyer, 1990; Ramsey et al., 2002; Rice, 1996). Teaching increasingly has become more important for faculty members at research as well as liberal arts

institutions (Meacham, 2002). Changes in notions about how scholarship is considered for faculty members in higher education accompanied changes in teaching responsibilities (Boyer; Lucas, 1996; Rice). Specifically, the mission of institutions and the criteria used to determine promotion and tenure have seen the greatest shifts in emphasis from a sole focus on research productivity to an increased focus on teaching and an incorporated conceptualization of service activities (Finkelstein, 2003; Meacham).

Boyer (1990) observed that faculty reward systems in higher education rarely match the range of responsibilities expected of professors and often faculty members are caught between competing expectations. Faculty members at research institutions are expected to demonstrate mastery in teaching while advancing their lines of research with little additional time or resources dedicated to developing teaching competencies. Likewise, faculty members at institutions where teaching is emphasized face similar dilemmas with research productivity playing a major role in promotion and tenure decisions. In those teaching institutions faculty members are allowed no reduction in teaching and advising loads and no additional dedicated time for pursuing their lines of research (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Overall in most institutions, research occupies the first and most important role for faculty members and the other two responsibilities of teaching and service receive less merit (Boyer; Rice, 1996).

Boyer's Redefinition of Faculty Members' Job Responsibilities

In 1990, Boyer published a report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in which he sought to expand the definition of scholarship beyond a strict focus on research. Responding to this narrow view of scholarship as consisting of research only, Boyer offered an expanded definition of scholarship in higher education to include tasks of service and teaching along with the traditional elements of research and publication of findings. His goal in

redefining scholarship in higher education was to reflect the diversity of faculty activities and provide a new paradigm for determining the job responsibilities for higher education faculty. Boyer organized the specific responsibilities of faculty members into four categories of scholarship that incorporate traditional responsibilities of research, teaching, and service. His four categories for scholarship include the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching.

Scholarship of Discovery. This type of scholarship involves the investigation and dissemination of new knowledge linked to a specific field of study or discipline (Boyer, 1990). The term "research" is often used in place of the scholarship of discovery to represent the gathering, analyzing, interpreting, and reporting of data that is typically involved in this type of scholarship (Boyer, 1990; Ramsey et al., 2002). A concerted effort towards the discovery of new information particular to a chosen discipline is one of the defining characteristics of this type of scholarship. This type of scholarship can offer recognition and benefit to the individual investigators, the investigators' profession or discipline, and lastly the institution. While others may benefit, it is clearly the individual investigators' overall careers that benefit the most from this type of scholarship (Rice, 1996).

Scholarship of Integration. Faculty members who are engaged in this type of scholarship seek to synthesize their own research with the research across other disciplines (Boyer, 1990). Through this synthesizing, faculty members connect disciplines and often form collaborative programs or projects. Bringing multiple perspectives together on a particular issue or discovery is a characteristic of this type of scholarship. Like the scholarship of discovery, individual investigators, the investigators' profession or discipline, and the institution all stand to benefit from this type of scholarship. While the investigators' professions outside of the institution may

benefit from integrative activities, the investigators and their institution are the greatest beneficiaries of this type of scholarship. For example if a counselor educator integrates research about counseling children with research generated by faculty members in a business department, the researchers and their programs potentially benefit directly from the research. In that same scenario, the individual professions of business administration and counseling benefit only indirectly from the collaborative research. Increased programs and special projects bring increased funding into an institution through the principle investigators (Rice, 1996).

Scholarship of Application. A defining characteristic of this type of scholarship is the connection of the investigators' special fields of knowledge to larger social issues (Boyer, 1990). This type of scholarship characterizes the service responsibilities of faculty members as applying to the larger community served by the faculty members' institutions and professions or disciplines. Faculty members engaging in the scholarship of application seek to use their specialized knowledge to achieve the social mission of their institution and their profession. Similar to other forms of scholarship, institutions, the investigators, and the investigators' professions all profit from the scholarship of application; however, larger social systems also benefit from this form of scholarship.

Scholarship of Teaching. Scholarly material that is produced for use in the classroom or that is produced as a direct result of activities in the classroom is considered scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990). This type of scholarship can include activities such as the development of curricula, student or program handbooks, and new courses. The scholarship of teaching primarily fulfills faculty members' responsibilities to their employing institution; therefore, the primary beneficiary of this type of scholarship tends to be the institution (Rice, 1996). Some institutions and disciplines value teaching more than others and in those situations, faculty

members who participate in the scholarship of teaching would receive more direct benefit in their career advancement.

Citizenship. Absent from the four types of scholarship introduced by Boyer (1990) is the traditional view of service that includes service to the community and the institution. That traditional view of service includes professional, civic, and social duties performed by faculty members that are expected but rarely rewarded in promotion and tenure decisions. Rice (1996) characterized those service responsibilities as part of the institutional career that often competes with faculty members' disciplinary career. In an attempt to differentiate the social service activities that are linked to the scholarship of application, Boyer used the term citizenship to refer to civic and institutional service. In Boyer's definition, citizenship encompasses social functions (e.g., youth club leader, social organization leader, etc.), institutional functions (e.g., student organization advisor, faculty committee membership, etc.), and civic functions (town council member, taskforce leader, etc.).

Challenges in Applying Boyer's Model

In many ways, Boyer's (1990) model has proven to be an idealistic framework for considering faculty responsibilities in higher education (Lucas, 1996, Rice, 1996), and higher education administrators and institutions have been slow to adopt his recommendations as basis for tenure and promotion decisions. Universities continue to favor research, assign less value to teaching, and all but eliminate service in their determination of tenure and promotion (Lucas). Institutions and individual disciplines in higher education continue to rely on research related funding to support many faculty positions and entire programs thereby strengthening the position of research as the primary faculty responsibility (Finkelstein, 2003; Rice, Finkelstein, Hall, & Schuster, 2004). The institutional focus on research and external funding for research is

particularly challenging for new faculty members who are held to the same job expectations as their predecessors even though the funding for research has decreased considerably in the meantime (Rice).

In addition to greater competition for external funding for research, changes in academe have brought a greater emphasis on teaching and student performance in the classroom even within research institutions (Meacham, 2002). Despite the shift in focus on teaching most institutions are not willing to exchange research productivity for increased teaching effectiveness (Schuttenberg, Patterson, & Sutton, 2001; Tierney, 2001). Faculty members at research institutions are expected to demonstrate mastery in teaching while advancing their lines of research with little additional time or resources dedicated to developing teaching competency (Schuttenberg et al.). Faculty members at institutions where teaching is emphasized face similar dilemmas with research productivity playing a major role in promotion and tenure decisions while faculty members are allowed no reduction in teaching and advising loads and no additional time is dedicated to pursuing their lines of research (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

The scholarship of teaching outlined in the Boyer (1990) model offers a means for combining research and teaching effectiveness but institutions have had difficulty applying this model. Increasingly, institutions are applying the Boyer model as a division of labor rather than a division of individual faculty members' responsibilities (Rice, 1996; Rice, Finkelstein, Hall, & Schuster, 2004). This means that, for example, faculty members are being hired into teaching only or research only positions where they are expected to perform one primary job responsibility (Austin, 2002a; Brand, 2000; Finkelstein, 2003). These specialized faculty members take the place of traditional faculty members who divide their job responsibilities among research, teaching, and service.

The confusion that results from the application of Boyer's (1990) model for faculty responsibilities related to tenure and promotion decisions is not uncommon in academe. Tenure and promotion systems across disciplines are often the least understood systems for new faculty members (Lucas, 1996; Magnuson, 2002; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). Inconsistencies between institutions regarding tenure and promotion systems further contribute to the misinterpretation and misapplication of Boyer's model (Tierney, 2001).

Counselor education shares the confusion and inconsistency in tenure and promotion systems that exists across higher education (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001; Niles et al., 2001). New faculty members in counselor education often struggle with balancing multiple responsibilities expected of them in addition to scholarship (Magnuson). By self-defining the importance of tasks related to scholarship, teaching, and service, counselor educators strengthen the link between the activities in which they participate and the activities that their institution will reward through tenure and promotion decisions. Findings from this research study provide counselor education faculty members with an understanding of how others in their profession assign importance to job responsibilities and various types of scholarly activity. New counseling faculty members can use findings from this study to develop a guide for their own work as counselor educators.

Faculty Responsibilities in Counselor Education

The research literature discussing faculty responsibilities in counselor education is consistent with other disciplines in suggesting that in order for faculty members to be successful they must master responsibilities related to the traditional core tasks of teaching, scholarship, and service (Magnuson, 2002; Niles et al., 2001; Ramsey et al., 2002). In addition to those traditional core tasks, counselor educators are expected to engage in supervision activities (Lanning, 1990).

In this current exploratory study of job responsibilities for counselor educators, supervision was defined as the management of an academic or specially funded program combined with act of overseeing the clinical or academic activities of students and those seeking state licensure. This definition framed academic supervision in terms of both the scholarship of application and the scholarship of integration introduced by Boyer (1990). In terms of clinical supervision this definition incorporated the clinical responsibilities of counselor educators to monitor the quality of counseling that novice counselors deliver and serve as gatekeepers for the counseling profession (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004).

Studies situated in counselor education have examined the job related activities of African American counselor educators (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004), female counselor educators (Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996), new assistant professors in counselor education (Magnuson, 2002), and counselor educators with 15 or more years experience as faculty members (Niles et al., 2001). Ramsey et al. (2002) provided the only study to date that examined the job related activities of counselor educators across type of institution, gender, academic rank, and tenure status. While each of these studies contributed to the development of this exploratory study, the level of their contributions varied from related studies that provided background for studying faculty activities to relevant studies that directly shaped this study.

Related Studies in Counselor Education

Studies conducted by Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy (2004) and Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996) focused on the job activities of two specific groups of counselor educators. Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy applied three primary research questions to guide their creation of a survey questionnaire to examine the roles of African American counselor educators. The survey questionnaire generated information that (a) provided a descriptive profile of African

American counselor educators; (b) identified potential sources of stress for participants; and (c) illuminated sources of challenge that the participants perceived as barriers to their attainment of promotion and tenure. In terms of the descriptive profile for African American counselor educators, the authors provided only a brief mention about participants' publication frequency.

In their presentation of the findings, Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy (2004) focused primarily on their second and third research questions. They suggested that mentoring in the responsibilities of faculty members was a primary tool for decreasing stress and removing barriers for African American counselor educators; however, the authors gave no discussion of counselor educators' profile in other scholarship activities outside of publishing frequency. Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy offered no comments on the other faculty responsibilities of teaching, service, and supervision thus providing a very narrow view of the often complex roles of counselor educators as described by Lanning (1990). Information about the importance of job-related tasks in counselor education can provide the first step in mentoring, yet, without foundational information about what tasks counselor educators consider important, faculty members cannot build effective mentoring relationships. Bradley and Holocmb-McCoy do not provide a clear portrait of counselor educators' responsibilities on which mentoring relationships can be established.

Similar to Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy (2004), Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996) focused on a specific group of counselor educators. They examined the publishing activities of women faculty in counseling doctoral or master's programs. Their findings and subsequent discussion focused primarily on the following three areas (a) participants' rate of publication across their careers, (b) participants' most recent publication experiences, and (c) the journals in which participants most frequently published.

The authors' sole focus on the publishing activities of women counselor educators provided only a one-dimensional profile of counseling program faculty members. Furthermore, their sole focus on publication activities contradicted their findings regarding the importance of professional activities. When asked to rate the activity in which they were most often engaged, 87% of the participants in the Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996) study indicated that they were engaged primarily in teaching as their primary work activity. An examination of the importance of job-related tasks as offered by this current study expanded the profile of professional activities performed by counselor education faculty members.

Relevant Studies in Counselor Education

Moving from related studies to research that is more relevant to this study, Magnuson (2002) provided profiles of new counselor educators and the challenges they face in adjusting to their new roles. Magnuson built on an earlier study (Magnuson et al., 2001) of new counselor educators and studied the levels of stress, satisfaction, and connectedness that new assistant professors in counselor education experienced in their first year as faculty members. Using a survey questionnaire designed for her study that combined both narrative responses and Likert-type items she asked participants to rate their levels of stress and anxiety (1=*minimal*, 10=*exorbitant*), their satisfaction in their new jobs (1=*totally dissatisfied*, 10=*totally satisfied*), and their levels of perceived connectedness to their programs and other faculty members (1=*extremely lonely and isolated*, 10=*well connected and satisfied*). Narrative prompts focused on factors contributing to the participants' ratings on the Likert-type items.

Thirty-eight new professors of counselor education participated at both the mid-year and end-of-year administration of the questionnaire. Magnuson (2002) found that support from program faculty; teaching, supervising, and relationships with students; and the overall academic

environments (e.g., campus resources, deans, etc.) contributed to satisfaction among the participants in her study. Sources of stress and challenge for participants were attributed to course design and preparation, requirements for tenure and promotion, and overall time management. Additionally, Magnuson noted a trend towards less satisfaction from midyear to the end of the year among her participants.

In her discussion of the findings, Magnuson (2002) highlighted activities that senior faculty members could use to assist new faculty members in adjusting to their new positions in academe. Among her recommendations is a call for senior faculty members to provide information about prioritizing tasks and assisting with time management. However, without any discussion about how faculty members in counselor education assign importance to their job responsibilities, new counselor educators cannot even begin to understand what tasks they need to prioritize. Information about task importance will provide a guide to other counselor educators entering the profession and facilitate time management and task prioritization.

Moving to the opposite side of the counselor educator career continuum, Niles et al. (2001) conducted a qualitative study using structured interviews with 14 senior counselor educators. Their goal was similar to that of Magnuson (2002) in that they offered a guide to assist counselor educators in managing their work-related tasks. All participants in his study had at least 15 years experience as counselor educators and the rank of full professor. Structured interviews were used to collect data and all questions focused on the performance of tasks related to research, teaching, and service. Interview questions included information about strategies for success, time management, and obstacles related to research, teaching, and service responsibilities.

While Niles et al. (2001) studied the three faculty member responsibilities of research, teaching, and service, their research questions and methodology focused on how counselor educators can be successful in their three primary role responsibilities. In contrast, the researchers did not explore how important the individual tasks of research, teaching, and scholarship are in faculty evaluations and promotion decisions. Furthermore, the Niles et al. study, discussed neither the collective nor the relative importance that research, teaching, and service are assigned in counselor education; instead, the authors assumed the importance of all three.

Information regarding the importance assigned to particular faculty activities expands the discussion about the job expectations for both new and senior counselor educators. This type of discussion enhances conversations about role expectations and promotion criteria for counselor education faculty started by Niles et al. (2001). In addition, by comparing the importance assigned by senior faculty members to the importance assigned by new or more junior faculty members, new conversations can be built on the ones offered by Niles et al. about how new faculty members can prioritize their new roles as counselor educators.

Taking the conversation about faculty responsibilities in counselor education from specific groups of faculty members, Ramsey et al. (2002) provided the most comprehensive discussion to date about faculty responsibilities in counselor education. The authors divided scholarship in counselor education into seven activities and organized those activities into the four categories of discovery, integration, application, and teaching described by Boyer (1990). Ramsey et al. were interested in determining (a) the extent to which counselor educators were involved in seven scholarly activities; (b) the mean and median for the productivity rate for each category; (c) the most frequently cited of the seven scholarly categories; (d) the relative

importance of the seven scholarly activities in tenure and promotion decisions; and (e) the scholarly productivity activities of counselor educators by type of institution, gender, tenure status, and academic rank. Results of their study provided a broader view of scholarship in counselor education and identified some differences in the activities of counselor educators based on their rank and tenure status.

A total of 113 counselor educators from varying types of CACREP-accredited institutions (i.e. research university, doctorate-granting university, comprehensive college or university, or liberal arts college) who were of diverse gender, academic rank, and tenure status completed two questionnaires created for use in the study. The first was a demographic questionnaire that asked participants about their gender, racial/ethnic identification, highest degree earned, academic rank, number of years in rank, tenure status, and type of institution based on the Carnegie classification system for higher education. The second survey required participants to indicate the number of scholarly activities that they completed in the three years prior to the study in the following seven activities: journal article publication; conference presentations; other publications (books, monographs, book chapters); other written works (grants, training manuals, book reviews); scholarly work related to teaching (new courses, new programs, student/program handbooks); other professional activities (workshop/in-service presentations, and consultations); and professional leadership roles (editorial board memberships, executive officer of a national, regional, state, or local professional organization). Additionally, participants utilized a 5-point scale to rate the relative importance of the already listed scholarly activities in counselor education to tenure and promotion decisions.

In their findings Ramsey et al. (2002) calculated the means and medians for the scholarly activities and the mean ratings for the relative importance of the scholarly activities and reported

that counselor educators perceived traditional forms of scholarship (research) to be more important for tenure and promotion decision, while also valuing other types of scholarship (grant writing, book reviews, training manuals, etc). The authors concluded from these findings that counselor educators use a more inclusive definition of scholarship than their institutions to determine promotion and tenure decisions. Additional findings indicated differences in scholarship related to teaching, published work, and professional leadership as academic rank varied.

The view of counselor educators' scholarship activities provided by Ramsey et al. (2002) began to identify tasks in which counselor educators participate; however, similar to the Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996) study, taken by itself, the study presented a one-dimensional portrait of counselor education faculty. The authors suggested further research is needed in the area of scholarly activities particularly regarding the ideal importance ratings that faculty members assign to scholarship activities. While scholarship in academe constitutes a major responsibility of faculty members and is often the primary criterion for tenure and promotion, counselor educators have other responsibilities that they are expected to manage such as teaching, service, and supervision. Inclusion of those additional tasks that are expected of faculty members provides a more holistic portrait of counselor educators' responsibilities in academe.

Determining Counselor Educators' Ideal Task Ratings

This research study built on the work of Ramsey et al. (2002) by offering a comparison between CACREP-accredited program faculty members' ideal ratings and their perceptions of their institutions' ratings of job related task importance. The goals of this study were to (a) compare faculty's ideal ratings of importance with their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings and (b) expand the understanding of the importance that counselor education

faculty members assign to tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. Clear identification of the importance that counselor educators assign to their job related tasks assists in the definition and growth of counseling as a new profession (Ramsey et al.).

Faculty roles have been traditionally divided into three areas centered on activities related to scholarship, teaching, and service (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1996; Lucas, 1996). While these three tasks are necessary across disciplines, the constituent responsibilities of each task vary slightly from one discipline to another. For example, tasks related to supervision are additional responsibilities expected of counselor educators and other faculty members in service delivery professions such as nursing, medicine, and education. Inclusion of the additional tasks related to supervision that are expected of counseling faculty members provides a more holistic portrait of counselor educators' responsibilities in academe.

Scholarship as a Faculty Responsibility

Overall in most institutions scholarship occupies the first and most important role for faculty members and the other two responsibilities of teaching and service receive less merit (Boyer, 1990; Lucas 1996; Rice, 1996). In this study, scholarship as a faculty responsibility primarily referred to the scholarship of discovery described by Boyer that involves the investigation, discovery, and dissemination through publication or presentation of new information that expands thought, knowledge, or practice in a particular field of study. Many of the same activities described in the Ramsey et al. (2002) study were used in this study to define activities related to the responsibility of scholarship.

Teaching as a Faculty Responsibility

Faculty members at research institutions are expected to demonstrate mastery in teaching while advancing their lines of research with little additional time or resources dedicated to

developing teaching competency. Faculty members at institutions where teaching is emphasized face similar dilemmas with research productivity playing a major role in promotion and tenure decisions while faculty members are allowed no reduction in teaching and advising loads and no additional time is dedicated to pursuing their lines of research (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). As higher education institutions are attending more to the outcomes of instruction (learner focused), rather than how that instruction is being delivered (teacher focused), faculty members increasingly are expected to demonstrate competency as teachers (Meacham, 2002).

In this study, teaching corresponded to the scholarship of teaching described by Boyer (1990). The tasks related to this responsibility were similar to those used by Ramsey et al. (2002) to identify the scholarship of teaching. These tasks involved the design and delivery of curricula in the field of counselor education as well as academic advising, using technology in the classroom, and self-reflecting on teaching strategies.

Service as a Faculty Responsibility

The faculty tasks that relate to service are typically the most broadly defined of all faculty responsibilities with activities ranging from service on higher educations committees within an institution to service as a leader in a community or faith based organization (Lucas, 1996). The broad definition of service leaves many educational administrators with confusion about how to evaluate service in promotion and tenure decisions and as a consequence, most administrators devalue or ignore altogether the service activities of faculty members (Boyer, 1990).

Boyer (1990) used to the term *citizenship* to refer to service tasks that are those, unrelated to scholarship and teaching, that benefit institutions, academic departments, and professional and community organizations. Examples of typical citizenship activities include departmental committee membership, participation in college or university governance, leadership in

professional organizations, and faculty adviser for student groups such as the counseling honor society Chi Sigma Iota International. While Boyer's conceptualization of citizenship may be more precise in its definition of tasks, the term *service* continues to be used widely to refer to those same citizenship activities (Lucas, 1996). In this study, the more common term *service* was used to refer to activities that reflect Boyer's notion of citizenship.

Supervision as a Faculty Responsibility

Counselor educators' responsibility to act as supervisors has been well documented in the literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Haynes, Corey, & Moulton, 2003: Henderson, 1994; Hess, 1980; Osborne & Purkey, 1995; Schwitzer, Gonzalez, & Curl, 2001). Despite the importance of supervision to the role of a counselor educator, prior studies concerning counselor educators' job responsibilities have focused only on the traditional triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service in academe.

Lanning (1990) offered an educator/practitioner model for faculty in counselor education. The educator/practitioner model adds supervision of counseling and advanced counseling practice to the traditional responsibilities of teaching, scholarship, and service. His model is based on the American Psychological Association's conceptualization of psychologists as scientist/practitioners, accentuating the equal roles of psychologists as both researchers and clinicians. Lanning noted that counselor educators differ from faculty members in other disciplines (including those in other mental health fields) in their need to be able to demonstrate advanced clinical skills as well as the ability to provide supervision to a large group of emerging clinicians. Those supervision activities are added to the traditional responsibilities related to research, teaching, and service and they provide the opportunity for counselor educators to remain current in their field of practice.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided a review of the research literature that informed this study on job-related faculty activities in counselor education. Boyer's (1990) redefinition of scholarship extends faculty activities beyond the traditionally narrow focus on research and provides a conceptual framework for the discussions of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision in counselor education. Applying Boyer's model to tenure and promotion decisions can be problematic and has led to some confusion about how to divide faculty responsibilities among research, teaching, and service. This confusion with dividing faculty responsibilities among research, teaching, and service is found in the counseling literature as reflected in the research of Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy (2004), Magnuson (2002), and Roland and Fontanesi-Seime (1996).

In addition to the counseling research literature reporting confusion about the faculty member responsibilities of research, teaching, and service, it also provided possible solutions. Increased mentoring was most often recommended by researchers (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Magnuson, 2002; and Niles et al., 2001, Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996). Despite the call for mentorship, no study to date has provided information about the task importance of specific counselor educator activities. Ramsey et al. (2002) provided a first step towards offering information, but they focused only on one dimension, faculty scholarship activities in counselor education.

A more complete portrait of counselor educators' task importance including teaching, service, and supervision activities is needed to provide a foundation for mentoring relationships in counselor education. Investigations into the importance that counselor educators faculty assign to the range of job responsibilities expected of them at the institutional level are important for

those who are new counselor educators as well as those who are considering a future in counselor education. With an understanding of how other counselor educators assign importance to academic job tasks, new counseling faculty members can develop a guide for their own work as counselor educators. Additionally, the comparison of ideal and perceived institutional ratings resulted in findings that provide the counseling profession an opportunity to adjust the priorities of the profession to match the changing priorities of the higher education.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into seven sections and the methodology employed in this study is presented. The first section presents the purpose of the study and the second section presents the research question and associated hypotheses. Participants and instrumentation are described in the third and fourth sections respectively. A pilot study that employed the instrument developed for this study is described in section six and results of the pilot study data analysis are reported to demonstrate trends in data. The last sections present plans for data collection and data analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research study was to compare CACREP-accredited program faculty members' ideal ratings of job-related task importance to their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings of those same job-related tasks.

Research Question

Do faculty members' ideal ratings differ from their perceived institutions' ratings regarding the importance of tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision in CACREP accredited counselor education programs?

Hypotheses

The hypotheses in this study included the following:

1. There is a difference between counselor educators' ideal ratings and their perceptions of the institutional ratings of task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
2. There is a difference between master's program and doctoral program counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
3. There is a difference between tenured and non-tenured counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
4. There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of institution.
5. There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of college or university.
6. There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on ethnicity.
7. There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on gender.

Participants

Participants in this study were counselor educators who work in counseling programs that are accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Participating programs were identified using a list of CACREP-accredited counseling programs obtained from the Internet. Once a program was identified as being

CACREP-accredited, faculty members' electronic mail addresses were gathered from the individual programs' websites and entered into a generic electronic mailing list titled *CETII Study 04*. This electronic mailing list only contained the electronic mail addresses of program faculty and no other identifying information was collected. Participants were contacted directly through email using a mass email message.

Participant information was gathered in order to provide descriptions of the participants as well as to aid future researchers conducting investigations related to this study. Personal information such as gender, ethnicity, and tenure status were expected to contribute to differences in the ratings of participants. Appendix C provides a complete list of the characteristics that were collected in a copy of the study's personal information sheet.

Instrumentation

No previous study has examined the ideal and perceived ratings of importance that counselor education faculty members assign to tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. Other researchers have studied the responsibilities of counselor educators (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Magnuson, 2002; Niles et al., 2001; Ramsey et al., 2002; Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996); however, their instruments were not appropriate for this study. For example, Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy studied the scholarship activities of African American counselor educators exclusively. In their study they used a survey instrument that focused solely on the time devoted to particular activities related to scholarship. Roland and Fontanesi-Seime also used a survey instrument in their study, but like Bradley and Holcomb-McCoy, their instrument was specific in its focus. The authors surveyed only female counselor educators and only asked question related to the participants' publishing activities.

Magnuson (2002) used both surveys and qualitative interviews to gather data related to the affective experiences of new counselor education faculty members. Data for Magnuson's study were collected using a survey that asked respondents to rate their job stress levels, their job satisfaction levels, and their relationships with senior faculty members. Responses to the survey were supported by qualitative interviews. Similar to Magnuson, Niles et al. (2001) focused on the experiences of counselor educators in completing their work. Niles et al. used structured interviews to ask counselor educators with at least 15 years experience in academe to identify their strategies for research, teaching, and service activities.

While none of the aforementioned studies had appropriate instruments for use in this study, Ramsey et al. (2002) provided useful concepts related to the types of scholarship activities that counselor educators perform. They conducted the most comprehensive study of faculty members' responsibilities in counselor education based on the four categories of scholarship (i.e., discovery, integration, application, and teaching) devised by Boyer (1990). Ramsey et al. divided scholarship in counselor education into seven activities and organized under Boyer's four categories of scholarship. The seven scholarship activities included (a) journal article publication; (b) conference presentations; (c) other publications (books, monographs, book chapters), (d) other written works (grants, training manuals, book reviews); (e) scholarly work related to teaching (new courses, new programs, student/program handbooks), (f) other professional activities (workshop/in-service presentations, and consultations), and (g) professional leadership roles (editorial board memberships, executive officer of a national, regional, state, or local professional organization). While the Ramsey et al. (2002) instrument focused extensively on scholarship activities, non-scholarship activities, such as teaching courses or committee membership, related to teaching and service were not included in the instrument.

Activities were included only as they related to scholarship and therefore provided only a one-dimensional portrait of counselor educators' job responsibilities.

Counselor Educators Task Importance Instrument

The Counselor Educators Task Importance Instrument (CETII) was created specifically for this study with the purposes of (a) determining the ideal importance that counselor educators assign to tasks related to their job responsibilities and (b) determining counselor educators' perceptions of the importance that institutions assign to those same tasks. The CETII is a 48 item survey that utilizes a Likert-type 7 point scale with anchored responses on either end of the continuum. Possible responses ranged from *very important* to *not important at all*. A demographic sheet accompanied the CETII and asked participants to identify some general personal information (e.g., gender, ethnicity, rank, tenure status, etc.) as well as some characteristics of their employing institution (e.g., type of institution, doctoral or master's program, etc.).

The CETII was divided into two main parts. Part one asked participants to rate items according to the level of importance that they would personally assign to a particular job related task. Part two asked participants to rate the same items reported in part one according to the importance that they perceive their institutions assign to those job related tasks. Within both parts one and two there were four sections with six task items in each that correspond to counselor educators' job responsibilities in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. A description of the four sections and the rationale for the types of tasks included in each section follows and a complete print copy of the CETII can be found in Appendix C.

CETII Section 1: Scholarship. The items contained in this section corresponded to the traditional notion of scholarship being based solely in the production of research (Austin, 2002a;

Rice, 1996; Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). In terms of Boyer's (1990) redefinition of scholarship the items in this section corresponded to the scholarship of discovery. Boyer defined the scholarship of discovery as the investigation, generation, and dissemination of knowledge within a specific discipline. Items 1, 2, 5, and 7 related to the dissemination of knowledge while items 3 and 4 related to the investigation and generation of knowledge. Item 6 incorporated the element of funding with the investigation, generation, and dissemination of knowledge. The scholarly activities described in each item in this section reflect the same activities that Ramsey et al. (2002) categorized as the scholarship of discovery in their study of scholarship in counselor education.

CETII Section 2: Teaching. Item numbers 8, 9, 10, 11, and 13 in this section corresponded to the definition used by Ramsey et al. (2002) of Boyer's (1990) conceptualization of the scholarship of teaching. According to Boyer, the scholarship of teaching refers to activities that either directly inform the work done in a classroom or that generate knowledge and research based on the work done in a classroom. Item number 12 corresponded to a supervisory or admnistrative function of counselor education that is directly related to teaching activities.

CETII Section 3: Service. Items number 14, 15, and 19 addressed service to the institution while items number 16, 17, and 18 related more to service performed outside of the institution for the benefit of professional or community organizations. Boyer differentiated service activities by using the term citizenship to refer to activities that support the functioning of an institution or profession (e.g., committee membership, leadership position in an organization, etc). While Boyer's distinction of service activities is helpful, it finds little application in professional literature concerning faculty members' responsibilities (Austin, 2002a; Adams, 2002; Fairweather, 2002). Within counselor education literature, service continues to refer to

broad activities that support the functioning of both organizations and institutions (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Magnuson, 2002; Niles et al., 2001).

CETII Section 4: Supervision. Counselor educators' responsibility to act as supervisors has been well documented in the literature (Bernard & Goodyear, 2004; Haynes et al., 2003: Henderson, 1994; Hess, 1980; Osborne & Purkey, 1995; Schwitzer et al., 2001). Despite the importance of supervision to the role of a counselor educator, prior studies concerning counselor educators' job responsibilities have focused only on the traditional triumvirate of scholarship, teaching, and service in academe. Lanning (1990) acknowledged supervision as a key characteristic in his educator/practitioner model for counselor educators. Ramsey et al. (2002) incorporated supervision type activities across various categories in their examination of scholarship in counselor education; however, supervision was not explicitly included as a category of faculty activity. Supervision was included in the CETII to address the absence in prior research of supervision as a responsibility for counselor educators. Items number 20, 21, 22, and 23 related to clinical work and supervision while item number 24 related to supervision within the institution.

Pilot Study Using the Counselor Educators Task Importance Instrument

A pilot study was conducted to aid in the creation of the CETII and to test the potential for hypotheses 1-3. Hypotheses 4-7 that anticipated differences in ideal scores for type of institution (i.e., public vs. private), type of college or university (i.e., Carnegie classification), ethnicity, and gender were added following the pilot study. Decisions to add hypotheses were made based on feedback from participants and trends in the data from the pilot study. Ten counselor educators were contacted via electronic mail with a note requesting their participation in the pilot study of the CETII. Participants were given a brief background on the study and

instructions were provided about accessing the on-line version of the CETII. Participants' feedback was solicited regarding the clarity of items on the survey and the ease of survey access and completion.

Pilot Study Participants

Nine of the 10 counselor educators who were contacted chose to participate in the pilot study. Participants consisted of 8 females and 1 male with 6 classifying themselves as Caucasian/European American, two as African American, and one participant identified as Asian American. In terms of rank, eight respondents were assistant professors, and one was a full professor; likewise in terms of tenure status, eight were pre-tenure and one had been tenured for seven years. Participants were employed at both non-CACREP and CACREP-accredited counselor education programs and seven were employed at public institutions and two were in private institutions. Five participants identified their type of programs as granting masters degrees only; two identified their programs as granting both master's and doctoral degrees; and one did not respond to this item on the survey. Five participants identified their type of college or university as undergraduate and master's degree granting; three identified their college or university as undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degree granting; and two chose research university as their college or university description.

Pilot Study Results for Hypothesis 1

Given the small sample size data analysis was conducted on the pilot study to identify trends in the data and not to determine statistical significance. A paired *t*-test was used to compare the means of counselor educators' ideal importance ratings and the means of their perceived ratings of institutional importance regarding tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. Five of the 24 pair mean comparisons (pairs 12, 15, 17, 21, and 22)

were significantly different at the $p<.05$ level. An additional two pairs (11 and 20) were significantly different at the $p<.10$ level. Table 1 lists all pair comparisons, specific item numbers from the CETII, and the corresponding statistical results for each item.

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item and Results of the Paired *t*-Test in Pilot Study

Item	Ideal		Institutional		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
Scholarship					
1. Write for publication in refereed journals	1.33	.441	1.56	1.130	1.512
2. Write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)	2.67	1.333	2.11	1.054	-1.250
3. Conduct outcome research in counseling	2.00	.972	2.22	1.093	.686
4. Conduct process research in counseling	2.22	.882	2.67	1.000	1.512
5. Present at professional conferences	1.33	.882	1.78	1.093	1.512
6. Serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer	2.56	1.130	3.11	1.269	1.474
Teaching					
7. Design new courses for a counselor education program	1.89	1.225	2.22	1.202	.816
8. Teach graduate level courses	1.22	.500	1.22	.441	.000
9. Develop lectures, syllabi, assignments and other course documents	1.44	1.269	1.56	.726	.263
10. Attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness.	1.78	1.236	2.22	.972	1.079
11. Train and supervise teaching assistants	2.44	1.000	3.11	1.764	2.000
12. Critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques.	1.33	1.054	2.22	.972	2.530*

(table 1 continued)

Item	Ideal *M*	Ideal *SD*	Institutional *M*	Institutional *SD*	*t*
Service					
13. Serve on a departmental committee at a particular academic institution	1.78	1.118	1.44	.527	-.894
14. Service on a campus-wide committee at a particular academic institution	1.89	1.414	1.56	.726	-.707
15. Serve as a volunteer, committee member, or officer in a national, regional, or local counseling organization	1.67	.928	2.56	1.014	2.874*
16. Serve as a volunteer or officer in a community organization	2.44	.833	2.67	1.323	.800
17. Provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations	2.56	1.500	4.22	1.481	3.333*
18. Participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)	2.67	1.716	2.89	1.616	.389
Supervision					
19. Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	1.33	1.130	1.78	.972	1.180
20. Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	1.78	1.936	3.11	1.900	2.066
21. Counsel clients	2.44	1.667	4.00	1.936	2.800*
22. Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	2.00	.866	3.00	1.414	3.464*
23. Administer a grant.	3.22	2.892	2.11	1.764	-1.153
24. Manage a budget.	4.00	2.693	2.67	1.732	-1.486

Note. *df* for all items were 8. * $p<.05$. Values of $t>0$ indicate that the participants rated items higher in importance to themselves (ideal) than they rated items in perceived importance to the institution (institutional).

In addition to the findings of significant differences between participants' ideal and institutional ratings, the occurrence of small differences between ideal and institutional ratings was also noteworthy. A small difference between the ideal and the institutional ratings indicated that participants perceived similarity between their own preferences for job-related tasks and the importance that they perceived their institutions assign to job related tasks. The mean ideal ratings and the mean institutional ratings were most congruent for items 8, 9, 3, 16 and 18. Table 2 displays the top five items that demonstrated congruence.

Table 2: Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Congruence in Pilot Study

	Ideal		Institutional		
Item	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
8. Teach graduate level courses	1.22	.500	1.22	.441	.000
9. Develop lectures, syllabi, assignments and other course documents	1.44	1.269	1.56	.726	.263
3. Conduct outcome research in counseling	2.00	.972	2.22	1.093	.686
16. Serve as a volunteer or officer in a community organization	2.44	.833	2.67	1.323	.800
18. Participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)	2.67	1.716	2.89	1.616	.389

Note. *df* for all items were 8. Values of $t > 0$ indicate that the participants rated items higher in importance to themselves (ideal) than they rated items in perceived importance to the institution (institutional).

The means for items 17, 21, 20, 24, and 23 were most incongruent between ideal and institutional ratings. Table 3 displays the top five items demonstrating incongruence between participants' ideal and institutional importance ratings.

Table 3: Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Incongruence in Pilot Study

Item	Ideal		Institutional		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
17. Provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations	2.56	1.500	4.22	1.481	3.333*
21. Counsel clients	2.44	1.667	4.00	1.936	2.800*
20. Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	1.78	1.936	3.11	1.900	2.066
24. Manage a budget.	4.00	2.693	2.67	1.732	-1.486
23. Administer a grant.	3.22	2.892	2.11	1.764	-1.153

Note. *df* for all items were 8. * $p<.05$. Values of $t>0$ indicate that the participants rated items higher in importance to themselves (ideal) than they rated items in perceived importance to the institution (institutional).

Pilot Study Results for Hypothesis 2

Four separate one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings on question subsets related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on program type (i.e., master's versus doctoral program). The results for all four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 4 and revealed no significant differences for master's or doctoral program faculty in each of the subsets of questions related to scholarship, teaching, and supervision. MANOVA results revealed significant differences between master's and doctoral counselor educators on the dependent variables in the service subset, Wilks' $\Lambda=.000$, $F(1,6)=729.83$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2=1.000$.

Table 4: MANOVA Results for Master's Versus Doctoral Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets in Pilot Study

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-6)	.023	7.17	1, 6	.278	.977
Teaching (Items 7-12)	.026	6.15	1, 6	.299	.974
Service (Items 13-18)	.000	729.83	1, 6	.028	1.00
Supervision (Items 19-24)	.065	2.38	1, 6	.459	.935

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA using the dependent variables related to service an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on each service dependent variable as a follow-up test. The ANOVA resulted in no significant differences in the dependent variables at the $p<.05$ level. The lack of significant differences in the ANOVA tests was most likely due to the small sample size, which resulted in inadequate power and a Type II error.

Pilot Study Results for Hypothesis 3

Four separate one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service, supervision based on tenure status of participants (i.e., pre-tenure versus tenured). The results for the four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 5 and revealed no significant differences in scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision for tenure status.. The non-significance of the findings in this pilot study is in large measure due to the small sample size used for this test that most likely caused a Type II error.

Table 5: MANOVA Results for Pre-Tenure Versus Tenured Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets in Pilot Study

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-6)	.766	.10	2, 6	.978	.234
Teaching (Items 7-12)	.763	.10	2, 6	.987	.237
Service (Items 13-18)	.164	1.69	2, 6	.417	.836
Supervision (Items 19-24)	.130	2.23	2, 6	.341	.870

Data Collection Plan

All procedures and protocols related to data collection were reviewed and approved by the University of New Orleans Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB). A copy of the letter submitted to the IRB and their subsequent approval of this study appear in Appendix A. Following the approved research guidelines, data were collected from counselor educators working fulltime in CACREP-accredited programs. A volunteer sample was drawn from the total population of faculty members at CACREP-accredited schools. According to a directory of accredited programs listed on CACREP's web page (http://www.cacrep.org), there are approximately 47 total CACREP-accredited doctoral programs and approximately 137 accredited programs that grant only master's degrees. Of the 184 listed programs, 149 had valid websites and yielded an initial sample of 1026 potential participants. Through three rounds of participant solicitation, that initial sample of potential participants was reduced by 127 due to invalid email address. The final total sample pool consisted of 899 participants and 184 chose to participate.

Data were collected anonymously via SurveyMonkey.com (http://www.surveymonkey.com), an on-line survey and data collection service. The Counselor

Educator Task Importance Instrument (CETII) was created as an on-line survey using the SurveyMonkey.com survey creation tools and a secure electronic link was created through which participants could access the survey. While the total population of potential participants was identifiable via their electronic mail addresses prior to data collection, the CETII did not contain questions that could have revealed the identity of individual participants and the data collection tool, SurveyMonkey.com, did not provide any method for identifying participants.

The total population of potential participants was identified using a public list of CACREP-accredited programs listed on the CACREP website. Once a program was identified as being CACREP-accredited, faculty members' electronic mail addresses were gathered from the individual programs' websites and entered into a generic electronic mailing list titled *CETII Study 04*. This electronic mailing list only contained the electronic mail addresses of program faculty and no other identifying information was collected.

Potential participants were contacted via a generic mass electronic message requesting participation using the list titled *CETII Study 04*. The electronic message contained a brief description of the study, a statement about participant anonymity and consent to participate in the study, and directions for accessing the CETII via the secure electronic link generated by SurveyMonkey.com. Participation in the study was completely voluntary and anonymous. No identifying data were collected from participants and responses were not assigned identifying characteristics.

Once participants accessed the on-line version of the CETII, they were asked to complete a demographic information sheet and the 40 item CETII. A copy of the instructions for completing the CETII appears in Appendix C along with a copy of the instrument. Two generic mass electronic messages were sent to all potential participants using the *CETII Study 04* list to

thank those who had participated and remind those who had not yet completed the CETII. These mass electronic messages were sent in weeks 3, and 6 of the study. A final generic mass message announcing the end of the data collection phase and thanking all participants was sent at the conclusion of the data collection process using the *CETII Study 04* list. Samples of the introductory electronic message and the subsequent reminder messages that participants received appear in Appendix B.

Data Analysis

Data analysis for this proposed study included descriptive statistics, a paired *t*-test to compare the difference between paired observations in the same sample, and analyses of variance between two groups using the Fisherian technique for mean comparison for measuring differences between one or more groups. Where differences existed between ideal and perceived importance ratings, an *ex post facto* analysis was conducted to identify the variables that possibly contributed to the differences. Listed below are the primary and secondary hypotheses and the corresponding data analyses methods that were used to test those hypotheses.

Hypothesis #1 (primary): There is a difference between counselor educators' ideal ratings and their perceptions of the institutional ratings of task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

Data Analysis: Paired *t*-tests were used to test the differences between the ideal importance ratings of counselor educators and their perceptions of institutional ratings of importance. In this analysis all items 1-48 on the CETII were used in paired t-tests. The error rate was controlled by using Bonferroni approach.

Hypothesis #2 (secondary):	There is a difference between master's program and doctoral program counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
Data Analysis:	Four separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used to test for differences in ideal ratings on each item (dependent variables) based on program type, master's or doctoral programs (independent variable). The four procedures corresponded to the four faculty job-task categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
Hypothesis #3 (secondary):	There is a difference based on tenure status among the ideal task importance ratings of counselor educators in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
Data Analysis:	Four separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used to test for differences in ideal ratings on each item (dependent variables) based on tenure status (independent variable). The four procedures corresponded to the four faculty job-task categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.
Hypothesis #4 (secondary):	There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of institution (i.e., public or private).
Data Analysis:	Four separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used to test for differences in ideal ratings on each item (dependent variables) based on type of institution (independent variable). The

four procedures corresponded to the four faculty job-task categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

Hypothesis #5 (secondary): There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of college or university (i.e., Carnegie classification).

Data Analysis: Four separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used to test for differences in ideal ratings on each item (dependent variables) based on type of college or university (independent variable). The four procedures corresponded to the four faculty job-task categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

Hypothesis #6 (secondary): There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on ethnicity.

Data Analysis: Four separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used to test for differences in ideal ratings on each item (dependent variables) based on ethnicity (independent variable). The four procedures corresponded to the four faculty job-task categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

Hypothesis #7 (secondary): There is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on gender.

Data Analysis: Four separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were used to test for differences in ideal ratings on each item (dependent variables) based on gender (independent variable). The four procedures corresponded to the four faculty job-task categories of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

Ex post facto analysis: The pilot study indicated trends towards difference between ideal and perceived importance ratings on the following item pairs: (a) critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques; (b) provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations; (c) supervise counseling students in practicum or internship; (d) supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials. *Ex post facto* analyses of these items and others that resulted in differences between ideal and perceived ratings were conducted in an attempt to determine possible antecedents of the differences. Variations in program type, academic rank, tenure status, and institution classification were all considered in the *ex post facto* analyses.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to compare CACREP-accredited program faculty members' preferred ratings of job-related task importance to their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings of those same job-related tasks. Additionally, this study sought to determine whether there were differences among counselor educators' ideal ratings of task importance based on characteristics of gender, rank, ethnicity, tenure status, program type, and type of institution. The goals of this study were (a) to compare faculty members' ideal ratings of importance with their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings; and (b) to expand the understanding of the importance that counselor education faculty members assign to tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. This chapter provides characteristics of the sample and results of the data analyses.

Characteristics of the Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from the population of all faculty members working in the 184 CACREP-accredited counseling graduate programs. Criteria for participation included full-time status as a faculty member in a CACREP-accredited program and a functioning email address. The CACREP list includes program websites and those websites were used to gather participants' professional email addresses. Thirty five of the program websites included on the CACREP list of accredited programs were invalid and these programs with invalid websites

were excluded from the sample. Of the184 programs on the CACREP list, 149 had functioning websites and yielded an initial sample of 1,026 potential participants. Through three rounds of emails, the potential participant pool was reduced by 127 due to invalid email addresses. This yielded a final sample of 899 potential participants. One-hundred eighty-four surveys were completed and returned by the participants representing a return rate of 21%. Fifteen of the surveys were incomplete; therefore, the number of usable returned surveys was 169.

Participants were asked to indicate their gender and descriptive data for participants responses appear in Table 6.

Table 6: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Gender

Gender	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Women	93	55.0
Men	75	44.4
No Response	1	.6
Total	169	100

The majority of the respondents were women (55%) reflecting a sample that is consistent with the population being hired in counselor education programs (Magnuson et al., 2001; Maples & Macari, 1998).

Participants were asked to identify their ethnicity and their responses appear in Table 7.

Table 7: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
African American	6	3.6
Asian American	3	1.8
Caucasian/European American	148	87.6
Hispanic	8	4.7
Native American	1	.6
Pacific Islander	0	0
Other	3	1.8
Total	169	100

Most of the respondents identified themselves a Caucasian/European American (87.6%). Of those who responded as *other*, one identified as Middle Eastern/European, one as South American, and one as multiracial.

Assistant professors comprised the predominant group in the sample (42 %) and those identifying themselves as instructor were the least represented (3.6 %). Participants with the rank of full and associate professor were equivalent (27.2 % and 26.6 % respectively). Respondents by academic rank of participants appear in Table 8.

Table 8: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Academic Rank

Academic Rank	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Full Professor	46	27.2
Associate Professor	45	26.6
Assistant Professor	71	42.0

(table 8 continued)

Academic Rank	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Instructor	6	3.6
No Response	1	.6
Total	169	100

Tenure status was a characteristic for which participants were asked to respond. Their responses appear in Table 9.

Table 9: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Tenure Status

Tenure Status	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Pre-tenure	76	45.0
Tenured	90	53.3
No Response	3	1.8
Total	169	100

If tenured, participants were asked to indicate the number of years which they have been tenured. Responses ranged from a high of 33 years to a low of one year with a mean of 11 years with tenure.

Participants were asked to indicate the number of years they had been faculty members. Descriptive data for participants' responses appear in Table 10.

Table 10: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Number of Years as a Faculty Member

Years as a Faculty Member	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
< 1 year	11	6.5
1 – 3 years	20	11.8
3 – 7 years	46	27.2
7 – 12 years	27	16.0
12 – 17 years	26	15.4
> 17 years	39	23.1
Total	169	100

The largest group of respondents indicated that they had been faculty members for 3 – 7 years (27.2 %) followed by 23.1 %, who indicated that they had been faculty members for more than 17 years.

In terms of institutional characteristics for study participants, respondents were asked to indicate the type of institution, public or private, in which they worked. Participants in this study were primarily employed by public institutions (85.2 %) and descriptive information from their responses is found in Table 11.

Table 11: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Private	24	14.2
Public	144	85.2
No Response	1	.6
Total	168	100

Participants were asked to identify the type of program (master's only or master's and doctoral degree granting) in which they serve as faculty members. Their responses are displayed in Table 12.

Table 12: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of Program

Type of Program	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Master's Degree Only	65	38.5
Master's and Doctoral Degrees	102	60.4
No Response	2	1.2
Total	169	100

Although CACREP-accredited master's programs outnumber the accredited doctoral programs in America, by almost 3:1 (CACREP, 2001) the majority of respondents in this study (60.4 %) were employed in programs granting doctoral degrees.

Participants indicated their type of college or university following the Carnegie Institution's classification system. Descriptions of degrees offered were used to represent the specific titles of Carnegie Institution classifications. The largest group of participants (39.6%) indicated that they work at institutions granting doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees followed closely by those working in research universities (37.3%). Participants' responses appear in Table 13.

Table 13: Frequency Distribution of Respondents by Type of College or University

Type of College or University	Frequency of Respondents	% of Participants
Research University	63	37.3
Doctoral, Master's, and Undergraduate Degrees Granted	67	39.6
Undergraduate and Master's Degrees Granted	38	22.5
Primarily Undergraduate Degrees Granted	0	0
No Response	1	.6
Total	169	100

Tests of Hypotheses

Research Question

Do faculty members' ideal ratings differ from their perceived institutions' ratings regarding the importance of tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision in CACREP accredited counselor education programs?

Instrumentation

The Counselor Educators Task Importance Instrument (CETII) was created specifically for this study and is a 48 item survey that utilizes a Likert-type 7 point scale. On the CETII, a score of 1 indicated that a participant rated the task as extremely important, and a score of 7 indicated a that a participant rated the item as not important at all.

Test of Hypothesis 1

Research hypothesis 1 stated that there is a difference between counselor educators' ideal ratings and their perceptions of the institutional ratings of task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

The null hypothesis that anticipated no difference between participants' ideal importance ratings and their perceived institutional importance ratings was tested by comparing participants' responses on CETII items 1 through 24 with their responses on items 25 through 48. Paired *t*-tests were performed on each of the item pairs (e.g., 1 & 25, 2 & 26, 3 & 27, etc.) to compare the means of counselor educators' ideal importance ratings and the means of their perceived ratings of institutional importance regarding tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. With the large number of *t*-tests performed, Bonferroni's correction was used where α was divided by the number of tests. The Bonferroni correction resulted in a substantially more conservative alpha level of .002 that was used for each paired *t*-test. The results of the paired *t*-tests appear in Table 14.

Table 14: Means and Standard Deviations for Each Item and Statistical Results

Item	Ideal		Institutional			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	ES
Scholarship						
1. Write for publication in refereed journals	2.57	1.39	1.54	.98	-8.34**	1.29
2. Write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)	3.05	1.50	2.73	1.41	-2.26	.35
3. Conduct conceptual research in counseling	2.65	1.38	2.75	1.25	.71	.11
4. Conduct data driven research in counseling	2.74	1.44	2.01	1.26	-6.00**	.93

(table 14 continued)

Item	Ideal *M*	Ideal *SD*	Institutional *M*	Institutional *SD*	*t*	ES
5. Present at professional conferences	2.01	1.05	2.28	1.16	2.35	.36
6. Obtain external funding.	4.03	1.77	2.00	1.21	-13.47**	2.07
7. Serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer	3.08	1.45	3.17	1.40	.63	.10
Teaching						
8. Design new courses for a counselor education program	1.79	1.05	2.80	1.48	9.09**	1.40
9. Teach graduate level courses	1.23	.57	1.87	1.27	7.00**	1.08
10. Develop lectures, syllabi, assignments and other course documents	1.38	.76	2.21	1.36	8.36**	1.29
11. Attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness.	1.83	1.05	3.56	1.59	13.64**	2.10
12. Maintain office hours and provide academic advisement	1.88	1.16	2.14	1.17	2.46	.38
13. Critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques.	1.59	.82	3.07	1.56	11.87**	1.83
Service						
14. Serve on a departmental committee at a particular academic institution	2.96	1.52	2.04	1.04	-6.47**	1.00
15. Service on a campus-wide committee at a particular academic institution	3.38	1.63	2.09	1.09	-9.24**	1.43
16. Serve as a volunteer, committee member, or officer in a national, regional, or local counseling organization	2.49	1.23	3.28	1.53	6.04**	.93
17. Serve as a volunteer or officer in a community organization	3.37	1.43	4.23	1.63	6.77**	1.04

(table 14 continued)

Item	Ideal *M*	Ideal *SD*	Institutional *M*	Institutional *SD*	*t*	ES
18. Provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations	3.04	1.48	5.14	1.63	14.04**	2.17
19. Participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)	2.97	1.70	3.15	1.78	1.20	.19
Supervision						
20. Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	1.48	.89	2.44	1.53	8.30**	1.28
21. Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	2.51	1.59	4.18	2.05	11.21**	1.73
22. Counsel clients	2.80	1.56	5.56	1.53	19.03**	2.94
23. Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	2.65	1.36	4.47	1.72	12.55**	1.94
24. Train and supervise teaching assistants	2.91	1.62	3.88	1.91	7.26**	1.12

Note. *df* for all items were 168. ** $p<.001$. Values of $t>0$ indicate that the participants rated items higher in importance to themselves (ideal) than they rated items in perceived importance to the institution (institutional). The reverse is true for values $t<0$.

In addition to the findings of significant differences between participants' ideal and institutional ratings, the occurrence of small differences between ideal and institutional ratings was also noteworthy. A small difference between the ideal and the institutional ratings indicated that participants perceived similarity between their own preferences for job-related tasks and the importance that they perceived their institutions assign to job related tasks. Cohen's *d* was computed for each pair comparison to serve as the effect size. Effect sizes ranged from a high of 2.94 to a low of .10 (see Table 9). The means for items 22, 18, 6, 23, and 11 were most incongruent between ideal and institutional ratings. Table 15 displays the top five items demonstrating incongruence between participants' ideal and institutional importance ratings.

Table 15: Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Incongruence

Item	Ideal		Institutional			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	ES
22. Counsel clients	2.80	1.56	5.56	1.53	19.03**	2.94
18. Provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations	3.04	1.48	5.14	1.63	14.04**	2.17
6. Obtain external funding.	4.03	1.77	2.00	1.21	-13.47**	2.07
23. Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	2.65	1.36	4.47	1.72	12.55**	1.94
11. Attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness.	1.83	1.05	3.56	1.59	13.64**	2.10

Note. *df* for all items were 168. ** p<.001. Values of $t > 0$ indicate that the participants rated items higher in importance to themselves (ideal) than they rated items in perceived importance to the institution (institutional). The reverse is true for values $t < 0$.

The mean ideal ratings and the mean institutional ratings were most congruent for items 7, 3, 19, 12, and 5. Table 16 displays the top five items that demonstrated congruence.

Table 16: Top Five Item Pairs Demonstrating Congruence

Item	Ideal		Institutional			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	ES
7. Serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer	3.08	1.45	3.17	1.40	.63	.10
3. Conduct conceptual research in counseling	2.65	1.38	2.75	1.25	.71	.11
19. Participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)	2.97	1.70	3.15	1.78	1.20	.19
12. Maintain office hours and provide academic advisement	1.88	1.16	2.14	1.17	2.46	.38
5. Present at professional conferences	2.01	1.05	2.28	1.16	2.35	.36

Note. *df* for all items were 168. Values of $t > 0$ indicate that the participants rated items higher in importance to themselves (ideal) than they rated items in perceived importance to the institution (institutional). The reverse is true for values $t < 0$.

Test of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that there is a difference between master's program and doctoral program counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

To test Hypothesis 2, four separate, one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings on question subsets of items related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on program type i.e., master's versus doctoral level. The results for all four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 17. The findings revealed no significant differences for master's or doctoral program faculty in each of the subsets of questions related to scholarship, teaching, and service. MANOVA results revealed significant differences between master's and doctoral counselor educators on the dependent variables in the supervision subset, Wilks' Λ=.854, $F(5,161)=5.485$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=.146$.

Table 17: MANOVA Results for Master's And Doctoral Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-7)	.930	1.711	7, 159	.110	.070
Teaching (Items 8-13)	.934	1.884	6, 160	.087	.066
Service (Items 14-19)	.939	1.722	6, 160	.119	.061
Supervision (Items 20-24)	.854	5.485	5, 161	.000	.146

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA using the dependent variables related to supervision an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on each supervision dependent variable as a follow-up test. Five ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant

differences, F (1, 165) =18.102, p<.001, in the dependent variable "train and supervise teaching assistants" at the p<.05 level. On this item, participants from programs granting both mater's and doctoral degrees rated this item higher in importance (M=2.49) than participants from programs granting only mater's degrees (M=3.54). Table 18 displays the results of the ANOVA analyses on the supervision items.

Table 18: ANOVA Results for Master's And Doctoral Program Faculty for Supervision

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	Between Groups	1.93	1	2.49	.015	.116
	Within Groups	127.70	165			
Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	Between Groups	8.24	1	3.29	.020	.072
	Within Groups	413.50	165			
Counsel clients	Between Groups	5.66	1	2.37	.014	.126
	Within Groups	394.58	165			
Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	Between Groups	1.36	1	.732	.004	.394
	Within Groups	307.08	165			
Train and supervise teaching assistants	Between Groups	43.63	1	18.10	.099	.000
	Within Groups	397.64	165			

Test of Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that there is a difference between tenured and non-tenured counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

To test Hypothesis 3, four separate, one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service, supervision based on tenure status of participants, i.e., pre-tenure versus tenured. The

results for the four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 19 and revealed no significant differences in scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision for tenure status.

Table 19: MANOVA Results for Pre-Tenure Versus Tenured Program Faculty for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-7)	.977	.540	7, 158	.803	.023
Teaching (Items 8-13)	.964	.996	6, 159	.430	.036
Service (Items 14-19)	.976	.645	6, 159	.694	.024
Supervision (Items 20-24)	.975	.806	5, 160	.547	.025

Test of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 stated that there is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of institution, i.e. public or private.

To test Hypothesis 4, four separate, one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service, supervision based on type of institution, i.e. public or private. The results for the four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 20. They revealed no significant differences in scholarship, teaching, and service for type of institution. MANOVA results revealed significant differences between master's and doctoral counselor educators on the dependent variables in the supervision subset, Wilks' Λ=.930, $F(5,162)$=2.427, p<.05, η^2=.070

Table 20: MANOVA Results for Type of Institution for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-7)	.937	1.549	7, 160	.155	.063
Teaching (Items 8-13)	.980	.541	6, 161	.776	.20
Service (Items 14-19)	.970	.838	6, 161	.542	.030
Supervision (Items 20-24)	.930	2.427	5, 163	.038	.070

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA using the dependent variables related to supervision an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on each supervision dependent variable as a follow-up test. Five ANOVA procedures were conducted and resulted in significant differences, F (1, 166)= 8.036, p=.036, for the dependent variable "conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic settings" at the p<.05 level. On this item, participants from private institutions rated this item higher in importance (M=2.13) than participants from public institutions (M=2.75). Table 21 shows the results of the ANOVA analyses on the supervision variable.

Table 21: ANOVA Results for Type of Institution for Supervision

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	Between Groups	1.02	1	1.288	.088	.258
	Within Groups	130.93	166			
Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	Between Groups	3.45	1	1.38	.008	.242
	Within Groups	416.49	166			
Counsel clients	Between Groups	3.94	1	1.63	.010	.204
	Within Groups	401.77	166			

(table 21continued)

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	Between Groups	8.04	1	4.452	.026	.036
	Within Groups	299.63	166			
Train and supervise teaching assistants	Between Groups	9.53	1	3.68	.022	.057
	Within Groups	429.31	166			

Test of Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that there is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of college or university.

To test Hypothesis 5, four separate, one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on type of college or university. The results for the four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 22. They revealed no significant differences in teaching and service for type of institution. MANOVA results revealed significant differences between counselor educators in various types of colleges or universities on the dependent variables in the scholarship subset, Wilks' Λ=.840, $F(14,318)=2.075$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2=.084$, and the supervision subset, Wilks' Λ=.882, $F(10,322)=2.092$, $p<.05$, $\eta^2=.061$.

Table 22: MANOVA Results for Type of College/University for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-7)	.840	2.075	14, 318	.013	.084
Teaching (Items 8-13)	.885	1.685	12, 320	.069	.059
Service (Items 14-19)	.925	1.057	12, 320	.396	.038
Supervision (Items 20-24)	.882	2.092	10, 322	.025	.061

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA using the dependent variables related to scholarship and supervision, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on each scholarship and supervision dependent variable as a follow-up test. Five ANOVA procedures were conducted on the scholarship variable and resulted in significant differences in the following variables at the $p<.05$ level: "write for publication in refereed journals," F (2, 165)=7.692, p=.001, "write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)," F (2, 165)=7.938, p=.001, "conduct conceptual research in counseling," F (2, 165)=7.472, p=.001, "conduct data driven research in counseling," F (2, 165)=5.546, p=.005, "serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer," F (2,165)=4.764, p=.010. Table 23 displays the results of the ANOVA analyses on the supervision variable.

Table 23: ANOVA Results for College/University Type for Scholarship

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Write for publication in refereed journals	Between Groups	27.36	2	7.692	.085	.001
	Within Groups	293.47	165			
Write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)	Between Groups	32.05	2	7.938	.088	.001
	Within Groups	332.83	165			

(table 23 continued)

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Conduct conceptual research in counseling	Between Groups	26.22	2	7.472	.083	.001
	Within Groups	289.45	165			
Conduct data driven research in counseling	Between Groups	21.76	2	5.546	.063	.005
	Within Groups	323.74	165			
Present at professional conferences	Between Groups	2.72	2	1.244	.015	.291
	Within Groups	180.23	165			
Obtain external funding	Between Groups	7.82	2	1.248	.015	.290
	Within Groups	516.89	165			
Serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer	Between Groups	18.53	2	4.764	.055	.010
	Within Groups	320.88	165			

Given the significant results of the ANOVA on the variable "write for publication in refereed journals," a Bonferroni post-hoc analysis was conducted. Using an alpha level of .05, the pairs of means were found to be significantly different from one another for research universities and universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (p=.000). The findings showed non-significance for differences between research universities and universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (p=.181) and for differences between universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees and universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (p=.064). Participants from research universities rated the item "write for publication in refereed journals" higher in importance (M=2.13) than participants from universities granting primarily

doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (M=2.67) and those from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (M=3.18).

Bonferroni post-hoc analyses using an alpha level of .05 were conducted based on the significant results of the ANOVA for the variable "write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)." Means for respondents from research universities were found to be significantly different (p=.004) from means for respondents at universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees; likewise, means for respondents from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted were found to be significantly different (p=.002) from the means for respondents at research universities. Differences were non significant (p=1.000) between universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees and universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted. Participants from research universities rated the item "write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)" higher in importance (M=2.48) than participants from universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (M=3.28) and those from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (M=3.50).

Using an alpha level of .05, Bonferroni post-hoc analyses were conducted based on the significant results of the ANOVA for the variable "conduct conceptual research in counseling." Means for respondents from research universities were found to be significantly different (p=.005) from means for respondents at universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees; likewise, means for respondents from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted were found to be significantly different (p=.003) from the means of respondents at research universities. Differences were non significant (p=1.000) between universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees

and universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted. Participants from research universities rated the item "conduct conceptual research in counseling" higher in importance (M=2.16) than participants from universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (M=2.90) and those from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (M=3.08).

Bonferroni post-hoc analyses using an alpha level of .05 were conducted based on the significant results of the ANOVA for the variable "conduct data driven research in counseling." Differences were non significant (p=.990) between universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees and universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted. Means for respondents from research universities were found to be significantly different (p=.010) from means for respondents at universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees; likewise, means for respondents from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted were found to be significantly different (p=.025) from means for respondents at research universities. Participants from research universities rated the item "conduct data driven research in counseling" higher in importance (M=2.29) than participants from universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (M=3.02) and those from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (M=3.05).

Given the significant results of the ANOVA on variable "serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer," a Bonferroni post-hoc analysis was conducted. Using an alpha level of .05, means for respondents from research universities were found to be significantly different (p=.009) from those from respondents at universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees. The differences in means for respondents at universities granting primarily doctoral,

master's, and undergraduate were non-significantly different (p=.904) from the means for respondents from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted. The difference in means were also non-significant (p=.090) between respondents from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted and respondents at research universities. Participants from research universities rated the item "serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer" higher in importance (M=2.64) than participants from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (M=3.24) and those from universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (M=3.36).

Five ANOVA procedures were conducted on the supervision variable and resulted in significant differences in the following variable at the p<.05 level: "train and supervise teaching assistants," F (2, 165)= 6.862, p=.001). Table 24 displays the results of the ANOVA analyses on the supervision variable.

Table 24: ANOVA Results for College/University Type for Supervision

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	Between Groups	2.56	2	1.634	.019	.198
	Within Groups	129.39	165			
Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	Between Groups	5.15	2	1.024	.012	.361
	Within Groups	414.80	165			
Counsel clients	Between Groups	.64	2	.128	.002	.880
	Within Groups	409.27	165			
Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	Between Groups	3.65	2	.983	.012	.376
	Within Groups	306.33	165			

(table 24 continued)

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Train and supervise teaching assistants	Between Groups	33.70	2	6.862	.077	.001
	Within Groups	405.13	165			

Given the significant results of the ANOVA on variable "train and supervise teaching assistants," a Bonferroni post-hoc analysis was conducted. Using an alpha level of .05, the mean for universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted were found to be significantly different from means for participants from research universities (p=.001) and those from universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (p=.005). The findings showed non-significance (p=1.000) for differences between universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees and research universities. Participants from research universities rated the item "train and supervise teaching assistants" higher in importance (M=2.60) than participants from universities granting primarily doctoral, master's, and undergraduate degrees (M=2.75) and those from universities where primarily undergraduate and master's degrees are granted (M=3.74).

Test of Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 stated that there is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on ethnicity.

To test Hypothesis 6, four separate, one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service, supervision based on ethnicity. The results for the four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 25 and revealed no significant differences in scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision for ethnicity.

Table 25: MANOVA Results for Ethnicity for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-7)	.820	.915	85, 663	.602	.038
Teaching (Items 8-13)	.866	.652	30, 634	.924	.024
Service (Items 14-19)	.879	.694	30, 634	.894	.026
Supervision (Items 20-24)	.891	.750	25, 592	.806	.023

Test of Hypothesis 7

Hypothesis 7 stated that there is a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision based on gender.

To test Hypothesis 7, four separate, one-way multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were conducted to determine differences in ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service, supervision based on gender. The results for the four MANOVA procedures are reported in Table 26. They show no significant differences in scholarship and service for gender, and significance in teaching and supervision.

Table 26: MANOVA Results for Gender for Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision Subsets

Subsets	Wilks' Λ	*F*	*df*	*p*	η^2
Scholarship (Items 1-7)	.987	.300	7, 160	.953	.013
Teaching (Items 8-13)	.910	2.657	6, 161	.017	.090
Service (Items 14-19)	.955	1.260	6, 161	.279	.045
Supervision (Items 20-24)	.915	3.021	5, 162	.012	.085

Based on the significant results of the MANOVA using the dependent variables related to teaching and supervision, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted on each teaching and supervision dependent variable as a follow-up test. Five ANOVA procedures were conducted on the supervision variable and resulted in significant differences in the following variables at the $p<.05$ level: "attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness," F (1, 166)=10.568, p=.002, and "critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques," F (1, 166) = 5.096, p=.025). Female participants rated item "attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness" (M=1.60) higher than males (M=2.11). Likewise, female participants rated item "critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques" higher in importance (M=1.46) than males (M=1.75). Table 27 displays the results of the ANOVA analyses on the teaching variable.

Table 27: ANOVA Results for Gender for Teaching

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Design new courses for a counselor education program	Between Groups	2.67	1	2.510	.015	.115
	Within Groups	176.19	166			
Teach graduate level courses	Between Groups	.06	1	.187	.001	.666
	Within Groups	53.89	166			
Develop lectures, syllabi, assignments and other course documents	Between Groups	1.17	1	2.016	.012	.158
	Within Groups	96.68	166			
Attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness	Between Groups	10.57	1	10.000	.057	.002
	Within Groups	175.43	166			
Maintain office hours and provide academic advisement	Between Groups	2.27	1	1.761	.010	.186
	Within Groups	214.30	166			

(table 27 continued)

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques	Between Groups	3.36	1	5.096	.030	.025
	Within Groups	109.31	166			

Five ANOVA procedures were conducted on the supervision variable and resulted in significant differences in the following variables at the $p<.05$ level: "supervise counseling students in practicum or internship," F (1, 166)=11.500, p=.025, "supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials," F (1, 166)=4.740, p=.031, and "counsel clients," F (1, 166)=5.203, p=.024). Female participants rated item "supervise counseling students in practicum or internship" (M=1.28) higher than males (M=1.73). Likewise, female participants rated item "supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials" higher in importance (M=2.27) than males (M=2.80). Male participants rated item "counsel clients" (M=3.09) lower than females (M=2.55) in importance. Table 28 displays the results of the ANOVA analyses on the supervision variable.

Table 28: ANOVA Results for Gender for Supervision

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	Between Groups	8.55	1	11.500	.065	.001
	Within Groups	123.40	166			
Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	Between Groups	11.71	1	4.740	.028	.031
	Within Groups	410.28	166			
Counsel clients	Between Groups	12.33	1	5.203	.030	.024
	Within Groups	393.38	166			

(table 28 continued)

Item	Source	SS	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	Between Groups	3.16	1	1.720	.010	.191
	Within Groups	304.51	166			
Train and supervise teaching assistants	Between Groups	7.17	1	2.76	.016	.099
	Within Groups	431.67	166			

Summary

This chapter presented characteristics of the participants and the results of the study. The main research hypothesis that anticipated differences between ideal and institutional importance ratings on tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision in counselor education was supported in the findings of this study. Using the responses of all participants, 24 comparisons were conducted between the ideal importance ratings and the perceived institutional importance ratings on items in the scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision categories. Significant differences were noted between ideal and perceived institutional ratings for all participants on 18 of the 24 pair comparisons. The following items resulted in non-significant differences between ideal and perceived institutional importance ratings: "write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)," "conduct conceptual research in counseling," "present at professional conferences," "serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer," "maintain office hours and provide academic advisement," and "participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)."

The second research hypothesis that anticipated differences between master's program and doctoral program counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance was supported in this research study. Counselor educators at master's and doctoral programs were significantly

different in their ideal ratings of tasks related to supervision, but not significantly different in their ideal ratings in tasks related to scholarship, teaching, and service. Further analysis showed that within the area of supervision, counselor educators' responses were significantly different on the item describing training and supervising teaching assistants with participants from doctoral programs rating the item "train and supervise teaching assistants" as more important.

The third hypothesis that anticipated differences between tenured and non-tenured counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance failed to be supported in this study. No significant differences were found between the ideal ratings of tenured and non-tenured counselor educators.

The fourth hypothesis that anticipated differences between the ideal task importance ratings of counselor educators in private and public institutions was supported by this study. Counselor educators were significantly different in their ideal ratings of tasks related to supervision, but not significantly different in their ideal ratings in tasks related to scholarship, teaching, and service. Further analysis showed that within the area of supervision, counselor educators' responses were significantly different on the item "conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting" with participants from private institutions rating this item higher in importance.

The fifth hypothesis that anticipated differences between the ideal task importance ratings of counselor educators based on type of college or university was supported by this study. Counselor educators were significantly different in their ideal ratings of tasks related to scholarship and supervision, but not significantly different in their ideal ratings in tasks related to teaching and service. Further analysis showed that within the area of supervision, counselor educators' responses were significantly different on the item describing skill trainings conducted

outside of the academic setting. In terms of scholarship, counselor educators' responses were significantly different on the following items: "write for publication in refereed journals," "write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)," "conduct conceptual research in counseling," "conduct data driven research in counseling," and "serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer." On all items demonstrating significant differences, counselor educators from research universities rated those items higher in importance.

The sixth hypothesis that anticipated a difference in counselor educators' ratings of ideal task importance based on ethnicity was failed to be supported in this study. No significant differences based on ethnicity were found between the ideal ratings of counselor educators.

The seventh hypothesis that anticipated differences between the ideal task importance ratings of counselor educators based on gender was supported by this study. Counselor educators were significantly different in their ideal ratings of tasks related to teaching and supervision, but not significantly different in their ideal ratings in tasks related to scholarship and service. Further analysis showed that within the area of teaching, counselor educators' responses were significantly different on the items describing teaching effectiveness improvement trainings and critical reflection on teaching techniques and strategies. Within the area of supervision, men and women responses were significantly different on the items describing supervising practicum and internship students, supervising counseling interns for licensure, and counseling clients with women rating all of those items higher in importance.

Chapter 5 discusses the findings detailed in this chapter. The relationship between this study's findings and existing research will be presented. Information will be provided in Chapter 5 about limitations of this current study and implications for future research.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Chapter five includes a summary and a discussion of the findings of this study. The results of the study are discussed and linked to prior research. Limitations of the study are detailed and implications of the study for counselor educators and the counseling profession are provided. Recommendations for future research conclude the chapter.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory study was to compare CACREP-accredited program faculty members' ideal ratings of scholarship, teaching, service and supervision task importance to their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings of those same job-related tasks. Additionally, this study determined whether there were differences among counselor educators' ideal ratings of task importance based on characteristics of gender, ethnicity, tenure status, program type, type of institution, and type of college or university.

Discussion of Findings

The tenure and promotion systems in higher education are both the most important and the most often misunderstood systems in higher education (Lucas, 1996). Early career counselor educators have described confusion about the expectations for them in their first years

as faculty members (Magnuson, 2002). In addition to benefiting individuals through career advancement, tenure and promotion systems can shape a profession by providing emphasis and assigning value to specific professional activities (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 2002). Especially in situations where professions are in the process of establishing identities, decisions about promotion and tenure criteria can have particular influence over professional identity. Counseling, still considered an emerging profession relative to other mental health disciplines, has the opportunity to link tenure and promotion criteria to professional standards (Ramsey et al., 2002). As a discipline, counseling can bridge the expectations for counselor educations with the core values and expectations of practitioners in counseling. Creating such a bridge would further facilitate the educator/practitioner model for counselor educators (Lanning, 1990).

This current exploratory research study built on the work of Ramsey et al. (2002) by offering a comparison between CACREP-accredited program faculty members' ideal ratings and their perceptions of their institutions' ratings of importance on tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. This is the first study to compare the priorities of individual faculty members with their understanding of institutional priorities for the discipline of counselor education. Prior studies have examined the responsibilities of counselor educators in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Magnuson, 2002; Niles et al., 2001; Ramsey et al., 2002; Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996); however; this is the first study to add tasks related to supervision. As anticipated, the results of this study demonstrated a difference between the ideal ratings of counselor educators and their perceptions of their institutions' ratings of importance related to faculty responsibilities. Significant differences were found between the ideal and the perceived institutional ratings across items in all task categories (i.e., scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision). Findings of significant differences

between the ideal and the perceived institutional ratings reflect the findings of previous studies that a gap exists for counselor education faculty between the expectations of institutions and the expectations of specific disciplines (Rice, 1996; Lucas, 1996)

Discussion of Findings for Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that there is a difference between counselor educators' ideal ratings and their perceptions of the institutional ratings of task importance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. Overall examination of responses on the CETII revealed that participant ideal ratings were higher than the perceived institutional ratings across the CETII as a whole. The trends in overall response suggest that counselor educators have a broader definition for their responsibilities as faculty members. That broad definition includes the traditional tasks of scholarship, teaching, and service, but it also incorporates professional practice activities such as counseling clients and supervising individuals for licensure.

In terms of relative importance of task categories, counselor educators considered tasks related to teaching to be of greatest ideal importance (for all items M=1.62) and tasks related to scholarship (for all items M=2.35) to be of greatest perceived institutional importance. These findings regarding relative importance of task categories are not surprising and follow the distinctions made in literature about priorities for the professoriate. Institutions have traditionally considered the production of scholarship to be the primary role for higher education faculty members (Finkelstein, 2003; Meacham, 2002; Rice, 1996). Likewise, the valuing of teaching related tasks for counselor educators also results from traditional perspectives in counselor education. Counseling programs are typically housed in colleges of education and the counseling profession traces its roots through the field of education (Gladding, 2004). The connections of

counseling to the field of education are further strengthened in the core perspective that a positive link exists between psychoeducation and good mental health (Vaac & Loesch, 2000).

Discussion of Items Demonstrating Most Incongruence. Participants in this study responded most incongruently when rating the ideal and institutional task importance for items describing counseling practice outside of the academic setting with three of the top five item pairs demonstrating incongruence related to extracurricular counseling activities (see Table 15, p. 65). The most incongruence was on the item "counsel clients" on which counselor educators rated the item considerably more important to their ideal priorities (*M*=2.80, *SD*=1.56) than to their perceptions of the institutions' priorities (*M*=5.56, *SD*=1.53). The item "counsel clients" was followed by the item "provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations" that also demonstrated high incongruence between ideal importance (*M*= 3.04, *SD*= 1.48) and perceived institutional importance (*M*= 5.14, *SD*= 1.63). A third item, "conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting," also demonstrated the fourth highest levels of incongruence between ideal (*M*=2.65, *SD*= 1.36) and perceived institutional (*M*=4.47, *SD*=1.72) importance ratings. All three of those items relate directly to the professional practice of counseling and the discrepancies in item pairs related to counseling service delivery illustrate the balance that many faculty members in higher education try to establish between maintaining an identity as a professional practitioner and a professor (Rice, 1996).

Counselor educators encounter unique challenges to maintaining the balance between educator and practitioner since their professional practice and academic responsibilities are intentionally kept separate. Striking the balance between practitioner and educator can be particularly problematic for new counselor educators pursuing tenure and promotion (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001). As an applied discipline, counseling requires that a strong link

between research and application be maintained. In order to maintain that link, counselor educators must actively engage in the practice of counseling and supervision. However, unlike medical doctors, nurses, and psychiatrists who often teach while they practice in applied settings such as hospitals, counselor educators spend the majority of their academic time outside of practice settings. Furthermore, professional counseling ethics dictate that boundaries should be maintained between academic teaching and professional counseling practice (American Counseling Association, 1995). Combining classroom teaching with clinical experiences means that counselor educators must venture outside of the academic environment to gain professional experience.

The findings in this study indicate that counselor educators perceive their institutions to rate counseling practice tasks as the least important group of tasks relative to scholarship, teaching, and service. Overall, participants rated the task category of supervision lowest (M=4.11) in perceived institutional importance while rating scholarship highest (M=2.35) in perceived institutional importance. These findings suggest that the participants in this study perceive their institutions to be using traditional notions of scholarship as being research only in tenure and promotion decisions rather than a more incorporated view of scholarship like Boyer's (1990) model that includes applied research through professional practice. Adoption of criteria for scholarship that include research generated through professional practice and research applied in professional practice would close the gap between classroom and clinical settings in counselor education.

The third most incongruent pair of items and the only pair among the top five that demonstrated higher ratings for institutional task importance (M=2.00, SD=1.21) than for ideal task importance (M=4.03, SD=1.77) was "obtain external funding." The difference between the

importance scores indicates that the participants tend to know that external funding is a priority for institutions, but that priority is not shared by the greater number of participants. The reticence of participants in assigning greater importance to external funding may be due participants' lack of knowledge about finding external funding sources. Also external funding for counseling related research and projects is much less available than funding for many other disciplines such as engineering, biology, or chemistry.

The final item demonstrating the fifth most incongruent ratings between ideal and perceived institutional importance was "attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness." Participants rated this item higher in ideal importance (M=1.83, SD=1.05) than in perceived institutional importance (M=3.56, SD=1.59). The lower perceived institutional importance may reflect participants' understandings of faculty incentive systems such as tenure and promotion. Teaching, while an important task for higher education faculty members, tends to carry less weight as a criterion in tenure and promotion decisions (Boyer, 1990; Brand, 2000; Rice, 2002; Lucas, 1996). Furthermore, since teacher effectiveness is an individual characteristic rather than an institutional characteristic, higher ideal importance ratings were expected on the item "attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness." While an institution might value effective teaching and offer trainings and workshops to increase teaching effectiveness, it is up to individual counselor educators to take action to improve teaching.

Characteristics of the sample also offer insight into the incongruent importance ratings related to trainings in teaching effectiveness. The majority of study participants indicated working in doctoral granting programs (60.4%) at colleges or universities granting doctoral degrees (76.9%). Doctoral granting programs and schools tend to value scholarship over teaching

in faculty productivity (Finkelstein, 2003; Meacham, 2002; Rice, 1996). With the valuing of scholarship over teaching, the institutional emphasis would be placed on activities related to research rather than teaching in doctoral granting programs and institutions. Growth and development as an effective teacher might also be expected, but, similar to all items demonstrating incongruence between perceived institutional and ideal importance ratings, without institutional importance assigned to those tasks, counselor educators can find themselves balancing conflicting priorities in their roles as faculty members.

Discussion of Items Demonstrating Most Congruence. Participants' responses demonstrated greatest congruence in items related to scholarship with three of the top five most congruent item pairs describing scholarship tasks (see Table 16, p. 66). The item "serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer" demonstrated the greatest congruence between ideal ratings (M=3.08, SD=1.45) and perceived institutional ratings (M=3.17, SD= 1.40). Counselor educators rated those tasks only slightly more important than they perceived the institution to rate them.

The item "conduct conceptual research in counseling" demonstrated the second greatest congruence between ideal ratings (M=2.65, SD=1.38) and perceived institutional ratings (M=2.75, SD=1.25). This congruence reflects the importance that institutions assign to scholarly productivity; furthermore, the congruence indicates that counselor educators understand the importance that institutions place on scholarship. That understanding is contrasted by responses on the item "conduct data driven research in counseling" on which participants assigned greater perceived institutional importance (M=2.01, SD=1.26) than ideal importance (M=2.74, SD=1.44). While the ideal importance ratings for the two items describing research are only slightly different, the perceived institutional ratings were significantly different (t_{168}=7.23, p>.001) between the two items describing conceptual and data-driven research. This finding

illustrates a broader balance of ideal research type by counselor educators while maintaining a perception that institutions value data driven research more than conceptual research.

The incongruence between counselor educators' views and their perceptions of the institutional priorities may further reflect a difference between institutional and professional priorities. Similar to education and many other fields in the social sciences, counseling is considered an applied discipline that values a strong link between research and application (Vacc & Loesch, 2000). While that link is stronger at the doctoral level, the terminal degree for professional counselors and subsequently the majority of practicing counselors is at the master's level. Accredited master's programs are required to provide only one research course that covers the basics about how to apply rather than produce research through practice (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, 2001) and there are no uniform licensure requirements for continued education in research (National Board of Certified Counselors, 2001). This focus on application has implications for the types of manuscripts that professional counseling journals decide to publish and by extension the types of articles that counselor educators submit. Taking into consideration that their primary audiences often lack sophisticated training in research methodology, counselor educators face difficulty striking the balance between the expectations of their institutions and their profession.

Alternatively, the relative incongruence between responses on the items describing two different types of research reflects an additional hurdle that counselor educators potentially face when seeking tenure and promotion. Most tenure and promotion systems are constructed and maintained based on a peer review structure and for a relatively young discipline like counseling, tenure and promotion criteria are often established using cognate disciplines (Lucas, 1996). In counseling's circumstance, psychology as a cognate discipline informs many of the promotion

and tenure decisions for counselor educators. Unlike counseling, the terminal degree in psychology is typically at the doctoral level and research methodology occupies a central role in professional training (American Psychological Association, 2002). The advanced training of psychologists results in a profession that has greater experience with more traditional forms of data-driven research and values scientific inquiry to provide, "the empirical basis for all methods involved in psychological practice" (APA, p. 5, Section 3). With a different philosophical base for both academic training and professional practice, psychology does not serve as an appropriate equivalent for the counseling profession. Furthermore, counselor educators who are assessed for tenure and promotion based on the criteria established for psychologists are being expected to meet benchmarks that are not congruent with their professional identity and benchmarks for which they were not trained.

Two of the five items demonstrating greatest congruence did not relate directly to scholarship. The first of those was the item, "participate in accreditation process (e.g., CACREP reviewer)," was rated as slightly higher in ideal importance than in perceived institutional importance. The congruence between ideal and perceived institutional ratings on that item provides evidence that counselor educators and institutions consider accreditation important. The importance of program accreditation also represents a point at which the priorities of academe and the counseling profession overlap. Academic institutions benefit from the benchmarked standards offered through accreditation while the profession benefits from accreditation through consistent training of professionals across multiple settings.

The second non-scholarship item demonstrating congruence was the item "maintain office hours and provide academic advisement," and it too was rated slightly higher in ideal than perceived institutional importance. The congruent ratings on this item related to academic

advisement demonstrate a commitment to students that is shared by counselor educators and their institutions. This commitment to students in academe was expected to surface in this exploratory study since throughout the research literature in higher education and counselor education, a commitment to students has been supported (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002a; Austin 2002b; Brand, 2000; Magnuson, 2002; Niles et al., 2001).

Discussion of Hypotheses 2-7

An additional goal of this study was to compare the differences in ideal ratings among counselor educators based on characteristics of the participating sample. Non significant differences were found based on characteristics of ethnicity or tenure status between counselor educators' ideal ratings. The non-significant findings based on tenure status contradict previous findings that tenure status affects task prioritization in higher education (Ramsey et al., 2002). Previous literature in higher education has discussed problems caused by tenure and promotion systems that rely on peer review where tenured faculty members approve the applications of non-tenured members (Lucas, 1996; Rice, 1996). In those peer review systems, pre-tenure faculty members often rely on the institutional criteria for tenure and promotion while the tenured faculty members apply their own criteria based in tradition that often conflicts with institutional criteria (Rice, 1996). Those conflicting priorities often result in the failure of non-tenured faculty members to achieve tenure or be promoted.

The non-significant differences between pre-tenure and tenured counselor educator ratings suggest that pre-tenured and tenured faculty members in counselor education have a similar understanding of their task priorities despite the perceived institutional priorities. Furthermore, the congruence between task priority expectations for tenured and non-tenured counselor educators suggests that those faculty members reviewing tenure and promotion

applications have similar priorities as those applying. These findings support the use of tenure and promotion systems that are based on peer review where senior faculty members assess the tenure and promotion applications of junior faculty.

Discussion of Differences Based on Gender. Significant differences were found between men and women counselor educators' ideal ratings in tasks related to supervision and teaching. Overall, women counselor educators rated teaching and supervision higher than men in importance to their work as counselor educators. Ramsey et al. (2002) examined the scholarly activities of women compared to men counselor educators and found similar results. They noted that women counselor educators place greater emphasis on scholarly tasks involving exchanges with other people whereas men counselor educators may have a preference for more individualized activities. Likewise, researchers in feminist studies have supported the tendency for women to prefer activities that highlight relationships (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1996; Cook, 1993; Gilligan, 1982; Jordan, Kaplan, Miller, Stiver, & Surrey, 1991).

The findings that women counselor educators assign greater ideal importance to tasks related to teaching and supervision than those related to scholarship may also result from limitations placed on women in higher education. The power, prestige, and salary disparities that women in higher education face have been well documented (Asmar, 1999; Bronstein & Farnsworth, 1998; Creamer, 1998; Shultz & Easter, 1997). The reasons for those disparities have likewise been well documented and linked to institutional barriers such as unequal access for women to resources (Fouad & Carter, 1992), teaching or clinical assignments that take time away from scholarship (White & Hernandez, 1985), and insufficient mentoring and knowledge of tenure and promotion criteria (Buckley, Sanders, Margaret, Kallar, & Hampton, 2000).

Regardless of the motivation for the responses of women counselor educators to the ideal importance of tasks in this study, the findings suggest that changes to traditional systems of tenure and promotion that highly favor research based scholarship should be considered. If the women participants responded to task importance items based on their preferences for relational tasks, then greater accommodation should be made to include more diverse types of scholarship as suggested by Boyer (1990) in tenure and promotion criteria. Alternatively if women participants responded based on their experiences of institutional barriers, then counselor education as a profession should advocate for greater equality for all women in tenure and promotion decisions. Furthermore, institutions themselves should provide greater clarity about tenure and promotion expectations while simultaneously restructuring policies for distributing resources.

Discussion of Differences Based on Academic Environment. Characteristics of the academic work environment also accounted for significant differences in the ideal task importance ratings. Significant differences were found in counselor educators' ideal ratings of tasks related to supervision based on type of institution (i.e., private vs. public) with participants from private institutions rating supervision tasks as more important (M=2.30) than participants from public institutions (M=2.50). Significant differences were also found between participant ideal task importance ratings based on the type of program (i.e., master's vs. doctoral) The significant findings for type of institutions and type of program may be linked because further examination of data showed participants responding from private institutions tended to also indicate that their programs granted only master's degrees. Based on characteristics of type of college or university (i.e., Carnegie classification), significant differences were found between participant responses in the scholarship and supervision item subsets. Bonferroni *post hoc*

analyses demonstrated that participants from research universities assigned greater importance to scholarship and differed from all other participants in their responses to items in the scholarship subset.

The pattern of responses for participants based on type of program, institution, and college or university support prior research that characterizes research universities as being more focused on scholarship activities than other types of faculty responsibilities (Meacham, 2002). Furthermore, the findings of differences based on type of institution are supported by the findings of previous studies that an institution's Carnegie classification influences the task priorities of its faculty members (Miller, 2003). Likewise influence from the characteristics of the academic work environment is also supported in the literature (Meacham, 2002; Miller, 2003).

The influence of the academic work environment on ideal task importance ratings has implications for the training of doctoral students and the mentoring of new counselor educators. Austin (2002a) described the need for doctoral training programs to provide future faculty members in higher education with knowledge about different institutional types and culture. She argued that without that prior knowledge, new faculty members will be ill equipped to succeed in academe. Magnuson (2002) echoed Austin's call for better preparation at the doctoral level for future counselor educators. In her research with new counselor educators, Magnuson found that new faculty members were not adequately prepared for many institutional requirements and that better orientation to the differences among types of institution is needed in counselor education training programs.

Limitations

The limitations of this study touch three areas: (a) characteristics of the sample, (b) survey design, and (c) data collection procedures. The sample characteristics were a limitation of this study in that participants were in some ways exceptional to the larger population of counselor educators. The predominate profile for counselor educators tends to be a White man who has received tenure (Pack-Brown, 1999). Sample characteristics for this study matched that typical profile in terms of ethnicity, but was disproportionately representative of pre-tenure counselor educators who are typically female (Magnuson et al., 2001; Maples & Macari, 1998). The variation in gender and tenure status from the typical population for counselor educators indicates that the results of this study may not fully reflect the sentiment of the greatest number of counselor educators. If this is the case, the results of this study should be confirmed with a sample that is more representative of the larger population of counselor educators.

A second limitation of this study involves the design of the CETII. Several surveys submitted by participants were excluded from the data analysis due to their being incomplete. The incomplete surveys may have been due to participant error or the length of the instrument. Another limitation of the CETII was the use of the term *ideal*. Following feedback from the pilot study, definitions were added to the CETII in order to clarify the terms *ideal importance* and *institutional importance;* however, participants may have been confused about the differences between the two types of ratings. An additional limitation related to the CETII used in this study involves the items used to represent faculty tasks in counselor education. Inclusion of a comprehensive list of faculty tasks and institutional expectations would have made the CETII prohibitively long. With that in mind, a sample of tasks intended to represent activities related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision were used. That representative sample was

refined through the pilot study; however, the questions on the CETII could not equally represent the complex roles that counselor educators fill in diverse institutions across the country. With the representative task limitation in mind, readers should be cautious about generalizing the findings of this study to all counselor educators in all universities.

A final set of limitations for this study relate to the data collections procedures. A Web-based survey service was utilized to collect data for this study and the response rate was 21%. Participants were initially contacted via email and then directed to a hyperlink that took them to the CETII instrument. Over the course of data collection, several potential participants responded to the email solicitations for participation in the study and described difficulty with access to the CETII. Some participants cited an inability to activate the hyperlink that was included in the emailed requests for participation. Others described failure of the website hosting the survey to load the survey page. Additional limitations related to using an online data collection strategy included the need for participants to have access to the Internet and at least some familiarity with navigating through Web pages on the Internet.

Implications for Counselor Education

The results of this study were intended to bring greater clarity to the tasks that counselor educators believe are important to their work. Building on previous studies that profile the professional responsibilities for counselor educators (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson et al., 2001; Niles et al., 2001; Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996; Ramsey et al., 2001), the results of this study contribute to the knowledge base of faculty responsibilities in counselor education and suggest that counselor educators' task priorities conflict with their perceptions of their institutions' priorities. Findings of this exploratory study demonstrated that in terms of ideal importance counselor educators value activities related to teaching over tasks related to

scholarship, service, or supervision. Those findings were incongruent with the participants' perceptions of institutional task importance because participants rated tasks related to scholarship as being greatest in institutional importance. Incongruence between the two sets of priorities has direct implications for new faculty members entering the professoriate and for establishing a professional identity for counselor education that is independent of other disciplines such as psychology.

For new counselor education faculty entering the professoriate, better training and mentoring needs to be established that will provide a clear message about the criteria for tenure and promotion. Counselor education shares the confusion and inconsistency in tenure and promotion systems that exists across higher education (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001; Niles et al., 2001). New faculty members in counselor education often struggle with balancing multiple responsibilities expected of them in addition to scholarship (Magnuson). Findings from this research study provide counselor education faculty members with an understanding of how others in their profession assign importance to job responsibilities and various types of scholarly activity. New counseling faculty members can use findings from this study to develop a guide for their own work as counselor educators.

Counselor educator training programs can also use this information for preparing students for the professoriate. Proper training and mentoring of future faculty in counselor education will help ensure success for both the individual faculty member and the counseling profession as a whole (Adams, 2002; Austin, 2002b, Magnuson, 2002).

An additional application for the results of this study is advocacy for establishing a unique professional identity for counselor education in higher education systems. As the counseling profession continues to grow and the number of counselor educators increases, results

from this study can be useful to administrators for establishing tenure and promotion criteria. Individual counselor educators can also use the findings in this study as a guide for establishing professional priorities for themselves. Utilizing findings such as these provides a more accurate representation of priorities in the counseling profession than typical representations gained through the application of criteria established for other professions such as psychology. Furthermore, when the counseling profession has the opportunity to self-define tenure and promotion criteria, counselor educators strengthen the link between the activities in which they participate and the activities that their institution will reward through tenure and promotion decisions.

The view of faculty priorities offered through this exploratory research study provides a broader definition of scholarly production that includes conceptual research and promotes attention to professional practice and supervision. Broader definitions of scholarship like the one supported through this study's findings increases the inclusion of multiple groups of counselor educators such as women who encounter greater challenges in achieving tenure and promotion. Increasing access to resources and inclusion of diverse groups in all aspects of counseling are foundational tenets of the counseling profession. In order to reflect the profession's commitment to diversity, counselor educators can use findings from this current study to advocate for more inclusive definitions of faculty productivity. Increasing the profiles of counselor educators for potential and current faculty members opens the field of counselor education to value a wide range of perspectives and experiences.

Implications for Future Research

Future research should continue to build the profile of a counselor educator. As a relatively young mental health profession, counselor education needs to continue advocating for

itself and its unique philosophy. Advocacy for the profession of counseling begins in academe where practitioners and researchers are trained in the field of counseling. Future investigations that explore the responsibilities of counselor educators study will increase an advocate voice for counseling.

A starting point for future research involves the replication of this study using a greater and more representative sample of counselor educators. In order to execute such a study, paper and pencil surveys could be used in conjunction with electronic or Internet-based surveys. More research is necessary in counselor education that examines the diverse priorities of particular groups of counseling faculty. Current findings indicated that woman counselor educators had different priority ratings from men. Expanding the number and type of task items on the CETII in future research could provide additional information about faculty responsibilities for diverse groups of counseling faculty.

Future studies can extend the findings about ideal ratings of counselor educators by surveying program and department chairs, deans, and other administrators responsible for tenure and promotion decisions involving counselor educators. The change in focus related to task importance ratings from participants' perceptions to ratings by those responsible for institutional policy would provide a more accurate reflection of the institutional expectations for counselor educators. These types of investigations could yield insight into how the priorities of individual counselor educators fit with a more precise representation of programmatic and institutional priorities.

The importance ratings assigned to the two different types of research in counselor education, data-driven and conceptual, suggest that future studies can focus on the journal outlets for counselor educators. Questions answered by studies involving emphasis on data-driven

versus conceptual research might include: What types of articles do journals predominantly publish? What types of research methodology are most typically used? Do refereed articles in counseling journals tend to focus more on theory, practice, or an equal combination of both? What are the publishing criteria for counseling journals? The findings from a study that address those questions could be compared to others in cognate fields such as psychology. Additionally, an alternative study could also be conducted on the major conferences hosted by the American Counseling Association and its divisions. Studies that examine the scholarly outlets such as the ones suggested here would provide counselor education with information on the level of demand for data-driven and conceptual research in the profession of counseling. Counselor educators could then use that information in creating promotion and tenure criteria that reflect the level of research sophistication within the whole profession of counseling.

Finally, through the course of data analysis, the supervision subset of tasks emerged as a significantly important to participants. The supervision dimension of faculty responsibilities has not appeared before in other studies investigating counselor educators' roles and responsibilities in academe. Future studies into the responsibilities of counselor educators should include the supervision dimension and seek to expand the definition of tasks related to that academic and professional responsibility. Furthermore, the counseling profession as a whole would benefit from a greater investigation into the educator/practitioner model (Lanning, 1990) for counselor educators. If the counseling profession values educators who are simultaneously advanced practitioners, then greater advocacy needs to take place within higher education to establish faculty rewards for counselor educators who incorporate both academic and professional application of counseling knowledge.

Conclusions

This study compared counselor educators' ideal and perceived institutional importance ratings for tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. Additionally, this study identified group differences on the ideal importance ratings of counselor educators for personal characteristics of the sample such as ethnicity, gender, tenure status, and for characteristics of participants' employing institutions such as program type and college/university type. The goals of this study were to (a) compare faculty's ideal ratings of importance with their perceptions of the institutions' importance ratings; and (b) expand the understanding of the importance that counselor education faculty members assign to tasks related to scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

Findings from in this study present a portrait of faculty responsibilities in counselor education that supports an educator/practitioner model and is broader than the traditional considerations of scholarship, teaching, and service (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1996). The incorporation of supervision activities that support professional counseling identity was important to participants despite their perceptions that the institution considered supervision tasks as significantly less important than scholarship, teaching, and service. A similar pattern emerged for publication of data-driven versus conceptual research. In both cases related to research, participants considered the tasks high in both ideal and perceived institutional importance; however, participants perceived the institution to consider data-driven research to be significantly more important to tenure and promotion decisions.

The current state of faculty reward systems in counselor education is characterized by incongruence and the findings of this exploratory study support that state. The profession of counseling has worked hard to establish its independence and its uniqueness among other mental

heath professions. In order to maintain that unique identity it is important for counselor education to support the profession through maintaining academic task priorities that reflect priorities of the profession's identity. Conversely, the profession of counseling should provide journals, conferences, and professional meetings that more proactively promote opportunities for counselor educators that support the criteria for tenure and promotion established by institutions.

As large numbers of counselor educators continue to retire over the next several years, the counseling profession has opportunities to shape its future direction and professional identity. One of those opportunities is occurring in academe where counselor educators can widen the criteria for faculty rewards to include a more diverse representation of professional counseling identities. In order for counseling to be successful in creating an academic identity independent of cognate disciplines such as psychology and social work, change needs to occur either within the institutions that employ counselor educators or within the programs that train counselor educators, or both. Within employing institutions, counselor educators should advocate for more inclusive faculty reward systems that assign equivalent value to tasks across the responsibilities of scholarship, teaching, and service while also valuing the unique professional practice activities in which counselor educators engage.

Alternatively, if counselor educators wish to make changes within counseling training programs to reflect the traditional criteria used for tenure and promotion decisions, then the profession as a whole must be willing to make the paradigm shift. Master's level counseling programs would need to provide greater training in research methodology. Doctoral level programs would require greater focus on producing graduates whose primary identities are as researchers.

On the macro level, the profession of counseling continues to have opportunities to engage in creating its own unique identity as a mental health profession. Counselor education and subsequently the counseling profession should take the opportunity to examine expectations for counselor educators. Does the counseling profession expect counselor educators to be part educator and part practitioner? If so, how much of each is expected? How do counselor educators primarily identify themselves – counselor, educator, or researcher? Which of those identities is more important to the whole profession of counseling? Does the counseling profession expect counselor educators to primarily teach from a research or practice perspective? Answers to questions such as these will extend the findings of this exploratory study and continue the discussion of professional identity for counselor education. Ultimately, without first determining their own professional identity and definition of productivity, counselor educators are operating at a loss in advocating for their own unique place in higher education.

REFERENCES

Adams, K. A. (2002). What colleges and universities want in new faculty. (Preparing Future Faculty Occasional Paper No. 7). Retrieved May 23, 2004, from http://www.aacu-edu.org/pff/pdfs/PFF_Adams.PDF

American Counseling Association. (1995). *ACA Code of Ethics.* Retrieved January 20, 2005 from http://www.counseling.org/Content/NavigationMenu/RESOURCES/ETHICS/ACA_Code_of_Ethics.htm

American Psychological Association. (2002). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology.* Retrieved March 12, 2005, from http://www.apa.org/ed/G&P2.pdf

Andresen, L. W. (2000). A useable, trans-disciplinary conception of scholarship. *Higher Education Research & Development, 19,* 137-154.

Asmar, C. (1999). Is there a gendered agenda in academia? The research experience of female and male PhD graduates in Australian universities. *Higher Education, 38,* 255-273.

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

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

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1996). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2004). *Fundamentals of counseling supervision* (3rd ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

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

Bradley, C., & Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2004). African American counselor educators: Their experiences, challenges, and recommendations. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43*, 258-273.

Brand, M. (2000). Changing faculty roles in research universities. *Change, 32(6),* 42-46.

Bronstein, P., & Farnsworth, L. (1998). Gender differences in faculty experiences of interpersonal climate and processes for advancement. *Research in Higher Education, 39*, 557-586.

Buckley, L. M., Sanders, K., Shih, M., Kallar, S., & Hampton, C. (2000). Obstacles to promotion? Values of women faculty about career success and recognition. *Academic Medicine, 75,* 283-288.

Cook, E. P. (1993). *Women, relationships, and power: Implications for counseling.* Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2001). *CACREP 2001 Standards*. Retrieved January 20, 2005 from http://www.cacrep.org/2001Standards.html

Creamer, E. G. (1998). Assessing faculty publication productivity: Issues of equity. Washington, DC, ((ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED420242).

Diamantes, T. (2002). Promotion and tenure decisions using the Boyer model. *Education, 123,* 322-327.

Fairweather, J. S. (2002). The ultimate faculty evaluation: Promotion and tenure decisions. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 114,* 97-108.

Finkelstein, M. (2003). The morphing of the American academic. *Liberal Education, 89 (4)*, 6-15.

Fouad, N. A., & Carter, R. T. (1992). Gender and racal issues for new counseling psychologists in academia. *Counseling Psychologist, 20,* 123-140.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gladding, S. T. (2004). Counseling: A comprehensive profession (5th ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Haynes, R., Corey, G., & Moulton, P. (2003). *Clinical supervision in the helping professions: A practical guide.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Henderson, P. (1994). *Administrative skills in counseling supervision*. (Report No. EDO-CG-94-24). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED372356)

Hess, A. K. (Ed.). (1980). *Psychotherapy supervision: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Holcomb-McCoy, C.C., & Bradley, C. (2003). Recruitment and retention of ethnic minority counselor educators: An exploratory study of CACREP-accredited counseling programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 42*, 213-243.

Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A. G., Miller, J. B., Stiver, I. P., & Surrey, J. L. (1991). *Women's growth in connection.* New York: Guilford Press.

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

Lucas, C. J. (1996). *Crisis in the academy.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

McMillan J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2000). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction (5th ed).* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

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

Magnuson, S., Norem, K., & Haberstroh, S. (2001). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their preparation and their induction. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40,* 220-230.

Maples, M. F., & Macari, D. P. (1998). The counselor education crunch revisited: A status report. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 38,* 52-60.

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

National Board of Certified Counselors. (2001). *National Board of Certified Counselors Code of Ethics.* Retrieved January 20, 2005 from http://www.nbcc.org/pdfs/ethics/ NBCC-CodeofEthics.pdf

Niles, S. O., Akos, P., & Cutler, H. (2001). Counselor educators' strategies for success. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40*, 276-292.

Osborne, W. L., & Purkey, W. W. (1995). A model faculty peer review process for counselor education programs. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 654-659.

Pack-Brown, S. P. (1999). Racism and White counselor training: Influence of White racial identity theory and research. *Journal of Counseling & Development. 77,* 87-92.

Ramsey, M., Cavallaro, M., Kiselica, M., & Zila, L. (2002). Scholarly productivity redefined in counselor education. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 42,* 40-57.

Rice, R. E. (1996). Making a place for the new American scholar. New Pathways: Faculty Career and Employment for the 21st Century Working Paper Series. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED424812).

Rice, R. E. (2002). Beyond *Scholarship Reconsidered*: Toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 90*, 7-17.

Rice, R. E., Finkelstein, M. J., Hall, S., & Schuster, J. H. (2004). The future of the American faculty. *Change, 36(2)*, 26-36.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., & Austin, A. E. (2000). Heading new voices: Academic careers for a new generation. New Pathways: Faculty Career and Employment for the 21st Century Working Paper Series. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED451740).

Roland, C. B., & Fontanesi-Seime, M. (1996). Women counselor educators: A survey of publication activity. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 490-495.

Schuttenberg, E. M., Patterson, L. E., & Sutton, R. E. (2001). Self-perceptions of productivity of education faculty: Past, present and future. *Education, 107,* 161-172.

Schwitzer, A. M., & Gonzalez, T. (2001). Preparing students for professional roles by stimulating work settings in counselor education courses. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 40,* 308-320.

Shultz, E. L., & Easter, L. M. (1997). *A study of professional aspirations and perceived obstacles: A case for administrative change.* Pennsylvania, ((ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED417174).

Sorcinelli, M. D. (2002). New conceptions of scholarship for a new generation of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 90,* 41-48.

Tierney, W. G. (2001). Reforming tenure in schools of education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82* 550-555.

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

Vaac, N. A., & Loesch, L.C. (2000). Professional orientation to counseling (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge.

White, A., & Hernandez, N. (1985). *Perceptions of women and men in counselor education about writing for publication*. Wyoming (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED265445).

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

Appendix A

Letter to Human Subjects Committee

December 14, 2004

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

From: Jonathan J. Orr
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education

Re: IRB# 06dec04

Thank you for the quick feedback on my proposal that I submitted to the UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research. Your comments were most helpful to me as this is my first opportunity to apply for approval from the human subjects committee. I have enclosed two copies of my consent forms (i.e., emails to participants) with the changes that you requested. For your convenience, the first set of emails has the changes marked and labeled to correspond to your original suggestions while the second set of emails has the changes incorporated without the tracking comments.

Thank you again for the feedback and the opportunity to respond to your comments. I look forward to hearing from you again soon regarding the status of IRB approval for my project.

Sincerely,

Jonathan J. Orr, M.Ed.
Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education

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

Campus Correspondence

Jonathan Orr
Dr. Diana Hulse-Killacky
ED 348-O

December 19, 2004

RE: Scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision in counselor education: Faculty members' ratings of importance

IRB# 06deco4

I have reviewed the additional materials submitted about your proposal. Thank you for your thorough responses! Your project is now in compliance with the University of New Orleans and federal guidelines.

Please remember that approval is only valid for one year from the approval date. Any changes to the procedures or protocols must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Use the IRB number listed on this letter in all future correspondence regarding this proposal.

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

Best of luck with your project!
Sincerely,

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

Appendix B

Electronic Messages to Participants

Dear Counselor Educator,

I am writing today to request your assistance with my dissertation study titled *Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision in Counselor Education: Faculty Members' Ratings of Importance*. I have developed a survey (Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument or CETII) that asks counseling faculty members about job related tasks in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. I plan to use data from the survey to compare counselor educators' task ratings of ideal importance with their perceptions of institutional importance.

All information that you provide is anonymous; there is no way to identify you after you submit your answers. The approximate completion time for the total instrument ranges from 15-20 minutes.

If you are willing to help me out with this important step in my study please click on the following link to connect to the CETII:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=15716643612

If you are not connected automatically, then you can cut-and-paste the link into the address box on your web browser and then press enter.

Your answers on this survey and the comparison of task ratings in counselor education will provide important guidelines for future counselor educators and help shape the professional priorities for current counselor educators. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw consent and terminate participation at any time without consequence. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Some people may tire while answering these questions. If you would like more information about this study or if you wish to discuss any discomforts you may experience, please send your request to the principal investigator for this study, Jonathan Orr, at jjorr@uno.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Diana Hulse-Killacky, by email, dhulseki@uno.edu or by telephone, 504-280-6662, for more information about this study.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Jonathan J. Orr, M.Ed., NCC
Doctoral Candidate (ABD)
University of New Orleans
348 Bicentennial Education Building
University of New Orleans, Lakefront Campus
2000 Lakeshore Dr.
New Orleans, LA 70148
504-280-6662/jjorr@uno.edu

Dear Counselor Educator,

If you have already participated in this study by completing the Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument (CETII), thank you again for your participation!

If you have not had the opportunity to participate, please take approximately 15-20 minutes to read the information below and follow the hyperlink provided to complete the CETII.

I have developed a survey (Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument or CETII) that asks counseling faculty members about job related tasks in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. I plan to use data from the survey to compare counselor educators' task ratings of ideal importance with their perceptions of institutional importance in my dissertation study titled *Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision in Counselor Education: Faculty Members' Ratings of Importance*.

All information that you provide is anonymous; there is no way to identify you after you submit your answers. If you are willing to help me out with this important step in my study please click on the following link to connect to the CETII:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=15716643612

If you are not connected automatically, then you can cut-and-paste the link into the address box on your web browser and then press enter.

Your answers on this survey and the comparison of task ratings in counselor education will provide important guidelines for future counselor educators and help shape the professional priorities for current counselor educators. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw consent and terminate participation at any time without consequence. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Some people may tire while answering these questions. If you would like more information about this study or if you wish to discuss any discomforts you may experience, please send your request to the principal investigator for this study, Jonathan Orr, at jjorr@uno.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Diana Hulse-Killacky, by email, dhulseki@uno.edu or by telephone, 504-280-6662, for more information about this study.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Jonathan J. Orr, M.Ed., NCC
Doctoral Candidate (ABD)
University of New Orleans
348 Bicentennial Education Building
University of New Orleans, Lakefront Campus
2000 Lakeshore Dr.
New Orleans, LA 70148
504-280-6662/jjorr@uno.edu

Dear Counselor Educator,

This is one last reminder for those of you who have not had the opportunity to participate in my dissertation study titled *Scholarship, Teaching, Service, and Supervision in Counselor Education: Faculty Members' Ratings of Importance*. Please take approximately 15-20 minutes to read the information below and follow the hyperlink provided to complete the Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument (CETII). ***If you have already participated in this study by completing the CETII, thank you again for your participation!***

I have developed a survey (Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument or CETII) that asks counseling faculty members about job related tasks in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision. I plan to use data from the survey to compare counselor educators' task ratings of ideal importance with their perceptions of institutional importance

All information that you provide is anonymous; there is no way to identify you after you submit your answers. If you are willing to help me out with this important step in my study please click on the following link to connect to the CETII:

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=15716643612

If you are not connected automatically, then you can cut-and-paste the link into the address box on your web browser and then press enter.

Your answers on this survey and the comparison of task ratings in counselor education will provide important guidelines for future counselor educators and help shape the professional priorities for current counselor educators. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw consent and terminate participation at any time without consequence. The risks associated with this study are minimal. Some people may tire while answering these questions. If you would like more information about this study or if you wish to discuss any discomforts you may experience, please send your request to the principal investigator for this study, Jonathan Orr, at jjorr@uno.edu. You may also contact my faculty advisor, Dr. Diana Hulse-Killacky, by email, dhulseki@uno.edu or by telephone, 504-280-6662, for more information about this study.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Jonathan J. Orr, M.Ed., NCC
Doctoral Candidate (ABD)
University of New Orleans
348 Bicentennial Education Building
University of New Orleans, Lakefront Campus
2000 Lakeshore Dr.
New Orleans, LA 70148
504-280-6662/jjorr@uno.edu

Appendix C

Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument

WELCOME:

Thank you for agreeing to complete the Counselor Educator Task Importance Instrument (CETII). The purpose of this survey research is to learn about how counselor educators rate tasks related to their jobs in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service and supervision.

The survey consists of three sections. The first section asks you about your background and basic personal information. The second section is part one of the CETII that asks you to rate in ideal importance to you tasks related to your work as a counselor educator. In this study *ideal importance* is defined as the priority that you would assign to a task if you had no pressure to perform specific tasks for tenure or promotion. Your ideal importance ratings should reflect your own personal preference for performing a task independent of the expectations of your institution.

The third section consists of part two of the CETII that asks you to rate in importance to your institution tasks related to your work as a counselor educator. *Institutional importance* is defined in this study as the importance that you perceive your institution to assign to a task. Institutional importance can be based on such things as the mission of the institution or promotion and tenure criteria.

There are instructions preceding sections two and three to remind you of how you are being asked to rate your work tasks. Please answer all questions as frankly and honestly as possible.

All information that you provide is anonymous; there is no way to identify you after you submit your answers. Your responses on this instrument are extremely important to understanding how counselor educators assign importance to job related tasks in the areas of scholarship, teaching, service, and supervision.

The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. If you would like more information about this study, please send your request to jjorr@uno.edu.

Thank you again for your participation!

SECTION I: PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please provide the following personal information:

Gender:
☐ Male
☐ Female

Tenure Status:
☐ Tenured for _____ years
☐ Pre-tenure

Academic Rank:
☐ Full Professor
☐ Associate Professor
☐ Assistant Professor
☐ Instructor

Type of Program:
☐ Master's only
☐ Master's and Doctoral

Institution's Carnegie Classification:
☐ Doctoral/Research-Extensive
☐ Doctoral/Research-Intensive
☐ Master's College or University-I
☐ Master's College or University-II
☐ Specialized Institution

Ethnicity:
☐ African American
☐ Asian American
☐ Caucasian/European American
☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American
☐ Other_____

Number of Years as a Faculty Member:
☐ < 1 year
☐ 1-3 years
☐ 4-7 years
☐ 8-12 years
☐ 13-17 years
☐ > 17 years

Type of Institution;
☐ Private
☐ Public

SECTION II: IDEAL IMPORTANCE

Please read the descriptions of tasks related your job responsibilities as a counselor educator and indicate the level of *ideal importance* that you would assigns to each task.

Ideal importance is defined here as the priority that you would assign to a task if you had no pressure to perform specific tasks for tenure or promotion. Your ideal importance ratings should reflect your own personal preference for performing a task independent of the expectations of your institution.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Extremely Important **Not Important At All**

TASK

1.	Write for publication in refereed journals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Conduct conceptual research in counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Conduct data driven research in counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Present at professional conferences	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Obtain external funding.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Extremely Important							**Not Important At All**
	TASK							
8.	Design new courses for a counselor education program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Teach graduate level courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Develop lectures, syllabi, assignments and other course documents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Maintain office hours and provide academic advisement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Serve on a departmental committee at a particular academic institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Service on a campus-wide committee at a particular academic institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Serve as a volunteer, committee member, or officer in a national, regional, or local counseling organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Serve as a volunteer or officer in a community organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	Counsel clients	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	Train and supervise teaching assistants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

SECTION III: INSTITUTIONAL IMPORTANCE

Please read the descriptions of tasks related your job responsibilities as a counselor educator and indicate the level of *institutional importance* that you would assigns to each task.

Institutional importance is defined here as the importance that you perceive your institution to assign to a task. Institutional importance can be based on such things as the mission of the institution or promotion and tenure criteria.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Extremely Important							**Not Important At All**
	TASK							
1.	Write for publication in refereed journals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Write for publication in books (chapters or full texts)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Conduct conceptual research in counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Conduct data driven research in counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Present at professional conferences	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Obtain external funding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Serve as a journal or book editor or reviewer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Design new courses for a counselor education program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Teach graduate level courses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Develop lectures, syllabi, assignments and other course documents	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Attend trainings or workshops to learn new skills to improve teaching effectiveness.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Maintain office hours and provide academic advisement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Critically reflect on teaching and learning strategies and techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Serve on a departmental committee at a particular academic institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Service on a campus-wide committee at a particular academic institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Serve as a volunteer, committee member, or officer in a national, regional, or local counseling organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Serve as a volunteer or officer in a community organization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Important							**Not Important At All**
TASK							
18. Provide pro-bono counseling or consultation services to community agencies or organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Participate in accreditation process (e. g., CACREP reviewer)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Supervise counseling students in practicum or internship	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Supervise counseling interns for state counseling credentials	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Counsel clients	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Conduct counseling skill training outside of the academic setting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Train and supervise teaching assistants	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

VITA

Jonathan Joseph Orr was raised in Lake Charles, Louisiana. In 1994 he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and Classical Studies from Tulane University in New Orleans, Louisiana. He earned a Master's of Education degree in Counseling in 2002 from the University of New Orleans and completed the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Counselor Education at the University of New Orleans in May 2005.

Jonathan is a Licensed Professional Counselor in the state of Louisiana and he is also a National Certified Counselor. He has had experience counseling a wide range of clients in both community and college settings and has received counselor training at the University of New Orleans Counseling Services and through his work with individuals with disabilities at the Training, Resource, and Assistive-technology Center. Jonathan has presented at local, state, national, and international conferences on a wide range of counseling topics including counselor educator training, group work practice, vocational counseling for individuals with disabilities, pedagogy in counselor education, ethics, supervision of counselors, school counselor identity, professional counselor identity, social justice, and advocacy.

Jonathan has accepted a position as Assistant Professor in the Department of Counseling and Psychological Services at Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia beginning August 2005.