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This phenomenological qualitative study explored counselor education doctoral students’ co-teaching experiences with faculty members during the pre-candidacy phases of their program training. Nine participants from Ohio counselor education doctoral programs were purposefully sampled and interviewed to ascertain their lived experiences of co-teaching.

Data were analyzed using a five-step process and revealed three overall themes: (a) co-teaching experiences are built on relationships, (b) co-teaching experiences have a structure, and (c) co-teaching experiences impact students’ development as teachers. Participants’ collective co-teaching experiences were mirrored in the identified themes and used as a basis for understanding co-teaching practices within counselor education doctoral programs.

The findings of this study revealed the need for a working definition and the intentional implementation of co-teaching practices in counselor education doctoral programs. Additional research extending the study to include a new sample, investigating faculty members’ perspectives on co-teaching, the deliberate use of mechanisms for reflective conversations, the use of different methodologies (e.g.,
ethnography, case study, Q-methodology, etc.), and the distinguishing features of teaching supervision in counselor education is warranted.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The importance of graduate students obtaining teaching experience to meet the demands of the professoriate has received considerable attention in the higher education literature (Austin, 2002; Berelson, 1960; Meacham, 2002; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). For Berelson (1960), universities’ emphasis on research over teacher preparation began with the inception of graduate training. The first graduate school was Johns Hopkins, established in 1876. Johns Hopkins operated under the German model of graduate education, where primacy was given to the research enterprise over other professional roles (like teaching) in the college setting (Gardner, 2005).

However, new faculty members entering the workforce face increasing demands in the teaching, research, and service roles (Austin, 2002). While establishing the balance between these faculty roles varies by the institution and individual (Ward, 2003), faculty preparation during doctoral training typically emphasizes the role of research over others (Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). Several authors point to the increasing need for future faculty members to have competencies in research, teaching, and professional service (Austin, 2002; Boyer, 1990; Meacham, 2002). With regard to the teaching role, many university doctoral programs still do not emphasize the importance of preparing doctoral students to teach (Austin, 2002, 2003; Utecht & Tullous, 2009).

The sole emphasis on research productivity is not sufficient to meet institutional criteria, which also stresses the importance of teaching and service productivity
(Meacham, 2002). The current study is concerned with students’ experiences of learning “how to” teach during their doctoral programs. Counselor education students who have teaching experiences during their doctoral training are better prepared to participate in the counselor education profession (Orr, Hall, & Hulse-Killacky, 2008). Further, doctoral students with teaching experiences are perceived as more marketable in securing counselor education faculty positions (Warnke, Bethany, & Hedstrom, 1999).

Nelson and Neufeldt (1998) described counselor education as the transmission of a legacy of knowledge and skills intended to foster student expertise during their graduate training. Knowledge and skills are imparted from instructors to students through the practice of teaching. But, how does one develop their teaching practice in order to fully participate in the counselor education process? The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) has recently given attention to standards impacting counselor education doctoral programs promotion of the knowledge, skills, and practices relevant to teaching (CACREP, n.d.). Knowledge areas include awareness of the major roles, responsibilities, activities, ethics, legalities, and multicultural issues relevant to teaching (CACREP, n.d., p. 56). The CACREP standards also suggest teaching skills and practices that need addressed during doctoral students’ training: (a) the development and implementation of a personal teaching philosophy; (b) competencies in course design, delivery, and evaluation; and (c) the ability to assess counseling students’ training needs in an effort to steer their skill development towards competence (p. 56).
The CACREP (n.d.) standards are intended to provide doctoral programs with a degree of structure for addressing how students will develop and advance their teaching competencies. Some programs have chosen to add a course in college teaching to the core curriculum to address the CACREP teaching standard. Counselor educators are expected to have knowledge in content areas and skill sets essential to the task of preparing counselors. Knowledge and skills are transmitted to students through the counselor education pedagogy, defined as the practice of the art and science of teaching (Nelson & Neufeldt 1998). Above and beyond taking a single course, what else is done in doctoral programs to prepare future counselor educators to promote knowledge, skills, through the practice of teaching?

This researcher reviewed the literature (e.g., Academic Search Complete, PsychINFO [EBSCO Interface], psycARTICLES [psycNET Interface], Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, ERIC, MEDLINE Complete, etc.) to ascertain how doctoral programs may use co-teaching (among other approaches) to prepare their students to meet the teaching demands of the professoriate. A review of the counselor education literature revealed one study on a collaborative teaching model that paired doctoral students with faculty members to develop teaching skills (Orr et al., 2008). Further review of the literature search failed to reveal any additional peer-reviewed studies of co-teaching as a way to prepare counselor education doctoral students for future teaching roles. To date, there are no working definitions of co-teaching or data to support how it is used to train future counselor educators in the area of teaching. This study seeks to fill that gap in the literature.
The current study examined counselor education students’ experiences of co-teaching with faculty members during their doctoral studies. To be more precise, the researcher investigated how shared meanings of co-teaching experiences among doctoral students emerged in the data and contributed to an overall structural explanation (i.e., the “what” and the “how”) of co-teaching. The purpose of this study, a description of the guiding research questions, and a review of the literature are illustrated in the remainder of this chapter.

**Purpose of the Study**

It is this researcher’s belief that improving our understanding of the experience and practice of co-teaching in counselor education programs will significantly inform its use to develop doctoral students’ teaching competencies. Put another way, how do we use “it” (viz., the practice of co-teaching) as a deliberate strategy to improve teaching competencies if we are not clear on what “it” is in our field? The goal of this study is a description of the “essence of co-teaching” that will serve as a pragmatic, credible, and transferable depiction of counselor education doctoral students’ co-teaching experiences.

The purpose of this study was to investigate counselor education doctoral students’ experiences of co-teaching with faculty members in order to establish: (a) the essential elements that comprise a co-teaching experience, (b) those co-teaching events deemed to be quality, and (c) the perceived value of co-teaching relevant to students’ post-degree aspirations. This study was guided by the question: “How do counselor education students experience co-teaching with faculty during their doctoral training?”
To explore the essence and meaning of co-teaching experiences guided by the research question, a qualitative phenomenological design was employed.

**Research Questions**

The research question used to guide this phenomenological qualitative study was:

How do counselor education students experience co-teaching with faculty during their doctoral training?

The sub questions of interest included:

1. What are the elements that comprise a quality co-teaching experience for counselor education students?
2. How do counselor education students perceive the value of co-teaching relevant to their post-degree aspirations?

**Review of the Literature**

A summary of the professional literature relevant to this study follows. The literature review highlights issues related to the preparation and demands of future faculty members with an emphasis on the teaching role. Co-teaching is examined and discussed in relation to the rationale for this study. Finally, teaching and aspects of teacher preparation in counselor education are presented.

**Preparation of Graduate Students as Future Faculty**

Faculty members of today and tomorrow do not have the luxury of focusing on one role above others (e.g., teaching more than research or service). Thus, future faculty members need to develop competencies in multiple areas including teaching, research,
and service. In this section, the development of knowledge and skills for future faculty members is presented prior to expanding on the role of teacher preparation.

Austin (2002, 2003) argued that the development of future faculty begins during the graduate school preparation process. Graduate preparation can be viewed as a process where students become part of a larger community’s (e.g., university, department, program, etc.) culture, values, attitudes, and expectations (Van Mannen, 1976). Graduate preparation can be viewed as a time where students are exposed to the tasks and expectations they will likely confront as future faculty members. As graduate students are socialized during their training, they may assume the values and attitudes of the group they wish to join (Austin, 2003). Austin (2002) suggested that graduate students’ exposure to the graduate training experience may lead to the adoption of attitudes and values relevant to their future faculty roles. In other words, graduate training can be a crucial preparatory experience that gives way to students’ development for future faculty roles (Austin, 2002, 2003; Van Mannen, 1976). The following study elaborates on this idea in more detail.

In a qualitative longitudinal study, Austin (2002) conducted multiple interviews with a multidisciplinary sample of graduate students who aspired to the professoriate. Participants represented a variety of disciplines including humanities (e.g., English and music), sciences (e.g., chemistry, engineering, and mathematics), social sciences (e.g., psychology and history), and other professional areas (e.g., education, business, journalism, and food science). During the interviews, participants were asked to reflect on their: (a) experiences as graduate students and teaching assistants, (b) disciplinary
interests, (c) career aspirations, (d) perceptions of the faculty career, (e) observations about faculty roles and responsibilities, and (f) suggestions about appropriate preparation of aspiring faculty members.

Austin (2002) noted the emphasis on graduate student perspectives on their training experiences over an extended period of time as a major contribution of the study. Data were reviewed, coded, and interpreted by Austin and her research team over a four-year period and organized according to four themes. The first theme describes factors influencing graduate students’ development during their programs. The second theme describes graduate students’ socialization and preparation for the faculty. The third theme describes graduate students’ perceptions of the careers and work of faculty members. Finally, the fourth theme discusses doctoral students’ recommendations to improve the graduate socialization and preparation experience. Each of the four themes from Austin’s (2002) study is described in more detail below.

Austin’s data (2002) suggest that graduate student development is complex, non-linear and shaped by a number of factors. Influencing factors include age, students’ educational backgrounds, family situations, previous employment (especially prior teaching experience), students’ perceptions of control or ability to manage the demands of programs, students’ sense of self-efficacy (i.e., belief in the ability to do what is expected), and students’ ability to make connections with people and seize opportunities. Disciplinary (i.e., field of study) and institutional contexts also influenced graduate student development. Specifically, the nature of student-faculty relationships varied by discipline. For example, students in the sciences were more likely to work with faculty
on research teams, and students in humanities and social sciences were more likely to work one-on-one with faculty members. Graduate students reported experiencing a variety of faculty perspectives regarding their preferred balances between teaching and research roles. Finally, graduate students had different teaching experiences by discipline. Teaching assistants in the sciences were more likely to work in collaboration with faculty teaching labs, whereas teaching assistants in the social sciences and humanities and other professional areas (e.g., education) were more likely to have taught courses on their own.

Austin (2002) noted that graduate students learn from observing and interacting with their faculty. Formal and informal conversations and observations of departmental policies, faculty behaviors, interactions with students, and faculty members’ willingness or hesitation to take on particular tasks are viewed as valuable sources of feedback by graduate students during their program training. Opportunities for faculty led mentoring and guided reflection were reported as desirable experiences by students during their training (Austin, 2002).

Austin (2002) suggested that graduate students want meaning in their work as future faculty members meaning: (a) a desire to pursue disciplinary interests, (b) to engage in creative work, (c) to interact with diverse and interesting people, (d) to contribute to the development of future generations of professionals, and (e) the desire to conduct research and to teach.

Respondents in Austin’s study offered observations on the research and teaching aspects of the faculty role. Some students were encouraged to value teaching, but their
faculty advisors did not directly model the behavior. In other words, they did not practice what they preached. Other students were encouraged to get involved in training programs to help their teaching and to regularly engage in discussions with their faculty advisors about teaching approaches and experiences. Still other students noted that they were discouraged from spending too much time on their teaching in favor of gaining research experiences. Overall, Austin (2002) surmised that graduate students received mixed messages about the importance of teaching compared to research and other duties, which stands in direct contrast to the larger argument regarding the importance of competence in research, teaching, and service roles for future faculty members (Austin, 2002; Gardner, 2005; Silverman, 2003).

Respondents in Austin’s (2002) study identified five recommendations for improving the experience of graduate school in preparation for future faculty roles. Graduate students’ recommendations included (a) faculty members’ attention to the regular mentoring, advising and provision of feedback to students; (b) structured opportunities to observe, meet, and talk with peers including observing and discussing teaching-related issues; (c) diverse, developmentally-oriented teaching opportunities including taking on increasingly complex and autonomous responsibilities in the teaching role; (d) information and guidance about a full range of faculty responsibilities balancing teaching, research, administrative and even grant-writing opportunities; and (e) regular and guided reflection between graduate students and faculty members or advanced colleagues.
In addition to the participants’ perspectives, Austin (2002) offered several recommendations. Austin affirmed the continued practice of developing students’ research skills with ample opportunities to teach and “think deeply” about teaching. In other words, students who aspire to be faculty members need to have organized and systematic opportunities to develop the philosophical assumptions that will guide their teaching, learn diverse teaching strategies, increase their knowledge about the characteristics of learners, be involved in curriculum development with faculty members, and be able to incorporate technology into their teaching. While there is variability in departmental approaches to help graduate student become teachers (Austin, 2003), some departments are implementing strategies to assist with the preparation of future faculty (Silverman, 2003). Strategies for preparing future faculty for teaching roles are discussed in the following section.

**Preparing Future Faculty for Teaching Roles**

Silverman (2003) suggested that if new faculty are to be successful they need to be able to manage all aspects of the job including teaching. Teaching responsibilities take up a great deal of faculty members’ time. Davis, Levitt, McGlothlin, and Hill (2006) surveyed faculty members across rank (i.e., assistant, associate, and full professors) who served as CACREP program liaisons. Among their findings, participants reported spending a greater amount of time in teaching-related activities versus scholarship and service. Research suggests that graduate students are concerned about pedagogical training and being able to handle their first faculty positions (Golde & Dore, 2001; Nyquist & Woodford, 2000). Furthermore, graduate students report that teaching
assistantships do not adequately prepare them to teach their own classes (Golde & Dore, 2001).

Silverman (2003) also suggested that adequate preparation for teaching roles may help future faculty members meet other demands (e.g., research and service) by not spending inordinate amounts of time in planning for teaching. Lack of teacher training could lead to frustration and a sense of incompetence on the new faculty member’s part. As Silverman (2003) put it: pedagogical training may help new faculty be more successful as teachers and as scholars.

**Collaborative Practices and Teacher Preparation**

Benjamin (2000) described core collaborative practices relevant to the scholarship of teaching noting that the co-teaching milieu is a likely place for collaborative practices to develop and unfold. Collaborative team (i.e., co-teaching) processes include: (a) sharing new or untried ideas, (b) critiquing ideas in order to improve practice, and (c) being comfortable with collaboration and confrontation when conclusions about teaching practice are addressed in the vein of deepening understanding (Benjamin, 2000). The goal for future faculty members is the engagement in what Boyer (1990) described as the scholarship of teaching: a concept that reflects the commitment of future teachers to continuous improvement of practice, critical appraisal, and production of scholarship relevant to teaching practices.

Benjamin (2000) operationalized the scholarship of teaching along the following four dimensions. Teaching scholars: (a) contribute to the literature of teaching and learning in general and within their discipline (e.g., counselor education), (b) focus on
reflectiveness related to their own teaching and students’ learning within their disciplines, (c) communicate and disseminate theoretical and practical ideas about teaching and learning within their disciplines, and (d) maintain a focus on student learning and teaching practice to guide their pedagogical activities and scholarly endeavors.

Pedagogical training can occur through a variety of mechanisms, some more useful in promoting reflective practice than others (Crow & Smith, 2005; Harris & Harvey, 2000; Orlander, Gupta, Fincke, Manning, & Hershman, 2000). Reflective conversations with peers or faculty members can encourage opportunities for deep thinking about one’s teaching (Crow & Smith, 2005). Future faculty development approaches that are closely linked to actual teaching contexts are most likely to be effective (Orlander et al., 2000). Pairing future faculty members with experienced faculty to develop teaching skills provides a supportive, gradual, and collaborative approach to training that may assist graduate students in future teaching situations. Teachers working together can maximize their gains by being purposeful in planning, teaching, and debriefing. A systematic approach can help collaborators to analyze their teaching encounters and to evaluate the process to developing teaching skills (Orlander et al., 2000). The next section explores co-teaching, an approach to teaching that involves more than one teacher working together in a classroom with the same set of students (see Cook & Friend, 1995).

**Co-Teaching**

It has been said it takes a village to raise a child. The same can be said of education: It takes a school to educate a student. To that end, it is important for teachers
to collaborate with each other to meet the educational, social, cultural, and emotional needs of diverse learners (Duchardt, Marlow, Inman, Christensen, & Reeves, 1999) and to satisfy institutional demands for quality teaching (Austin, 2002, 2003; Gardner, 2005; Silverman, 2003). Collaborative versus individualized approaches to teaching socializes the responsibility for educating students as shared among professionals (see Palmer, 1998).

There are many ways teachers can collaborate to support each other and students. One collaborative approach to meet these multiple demands is co-teaching. This study seeks to understand the experience of co-teaching from the perspective of counselor education doctoral students in training. Co-teaching is a process used in other branches of education (e.g., teacher training, special education, higher education, etc.) to prepare teachers. Co-teaching is defined and discussed in the following section including its relevance to higher education and preparing counselor educators.

**Co-Teaching Defined**

Co-teaching, a shortened term for cooperative teaching, refers to the delivery of substantive instruction by two or more instructors to a diverse or blended group of students (Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989; Cook & Friend, 1995). Co-teaching has its origins in special education representing a merger between general and special education professionals’ efforts to provide instruction to students with and without disabilities (Murawski & Swanson, 2001). The practice of co-teaching involves two teachers (i.e., co-teachers) working side-by-side to enhance students’ learning opportunities while sharing insights into the teaching process (Badiali & Titus, 2010).
Co-teachers share the responsibility for utilizing teaching insights to enhance their practice and improve the learning conditions for students (Bauwens et al., 1989). Co-teaching can also be conceptualized as the collaboration between two teachers from diverse fields that join together to teach concepts bridging two or more fields of study (Crow & Smith, 2003; Gillespie & Istraetal, 2008). Teachers and students are thought to benefit from their mutual knowledge and skills as they present the concepts in a more collaborative and integrated manner (Conderman & McCarty, 2003).

Collaboration between teachers requires the sharing of expertise and power when delivering instruction, solving problems, and so forth (Duchardt et al., 1999). Co-teachers do not need to be from different disciplines to benefit from the collaborative process of co-teaching. In fact, it is the process itself that may provide the essential elements that make co-teaching work as an instructional tool to benefit student learning (Duchardt et al., 1999; Gillespie & Istraetal, 2008) and as a vehicle for preparing teacher candidates (Bacharach, Heck, & Dahlberg, 2008; Conderman & McCarty, 2003). It is the latter point that is explored in more detail in this chapter: specifically, co-teaching as a viable process for preparing teachers in higher education positions (e.g., counselor educators).

Crow and Smith (2005) credited co-teaching as a vehicle to enhance reflective practice; a key mechanism for learning teaching skills in the higher education setting. The authors subscribed to Brody’s (1994) definition of co-teaching as two or more teachers collaboratively planning, teaching, and assessing the same students in the interest of creating a learning community. Crow and Smith (2005) added that the
“essence of co-teaching is the interaction of teachers in the whole process including co-planning, classroom interaction, and evaluation” (p. 495).

**Approaches to Co-Teaching**

Co-teaching is a vehicle for enhancing collaboration between professionals, moving the profession of teaching beyond the viewpoint of: “one teacher responsible for one group of students” (Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). Professionals seeking to incorporate co-teaching into their educational practice are often unsure of how to take advantage of the arrangement due to lack of experience with the practice as either students or teachers (Bauwens & Hourcade, 1995; Hourcade & Bauwens, 2001). Generally, teacher education programs do not train teachers to develop the collaborative mind-set associated with co-teaching practice (Duchardt et al., 1999). Thus, teacher educators experience challenges when expected to model and teach collaborative approaches they have not experienced during their training (Duchardt et al., 1999).

Co-teaching often occurs in the context of new or novice teachers learning while teaching alongside experienced or ‘expert’ teachers (Crow & Smith, 2005). However, this has been challenged as less than ideal if novice teachers do not receive opportunities for actual practice (e.g., teaching and not just observing) and reflective conversations with experienced teachers (see Smith, 2004). Crow and Smith (2005) concluded that co-teaching is a time-consuming process involving reflective conversations between instructors, which is the key to making co-teaching work for both students and instructors. The authors also suggested fostering reflective practice among students, which they believe is modeled by the co-teachers and built into class experiences. For
Crow and Smith, it is the reciprocity between instructors that served as the most helpful vehicle for “enabling empathic and constructive dialogue” about the shared experiences of teaching (p. 504). Reciprocity for these authors suggests an ongoing dialogue both in and out of the classroom, each informing the other.

**Co-Teaching Models**

Badiali and Titus (2010) argued that using models of co-teaching may be an effective approach for preparing teacher candidates. Several models of co-teaching have been identified as instrumental for the professional growth of all teachers (Friend & Bursuck, 2011; Friend & Cook, 2000; Roth & Tobin, 2002) and adapted as vehicles for facilitating the relationships between experienced and novice teachers (Badiali & Titus, 2010). Cook and Friend (1995) described six models of co-teaching used for teacher preparation and described by others (see Badiali & Titus, 2010; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012): (a) mentor modeling; (b) one teach, one guide; (c) station teaching; (d) parallel teaching; (e) alternative teaching; and (f) synchronous teaching. Graziano and Navarrete (2012) recommended that co-teachers consider the stage of relationship development between co-teachers, the teaching context, and the rationale for employing a particular model.

Mentor modeling pairs a novice teacher with an experienced teacher. This model is intended to provide novice teachers with an orientation to an experienced teacher’s approach to instruction in two ways (Badiali & Titus, 2010; Friend & Bursuck, 2011; Friend & Cook, 2000). First, novice teachers observe experienced teachers to pick up on obvious and subtle aspects of instruction in order to facilitate a reflective conversation on
the effects of the teaching strategies. The authors recommended the use of a systematic (i.e., agreed upon and consistent) approach to observation for novice teachers. Second, the experienced teacher can observe the novice teacher’s work to evaluate effective and developing teaching behaviors. Experienced teachers provide the novice teacher with feedback intended to enhance their thinking about teaching performance, not to only judge performance (Badiali & Titus, 2010). Two-way reflective conversations about teaching between the experienced and novice teachers are of primary importance to this model.

In the one teach-one guide approach to co-teaching, the primary responsibility for delivering instruction falls on one teacher (i.e., one teach), while the other teacher (i.e., one guide) circulates among the students to provide individual assistance (Badiali & Titus, 2010). Implementing this model necessitates some planning so that both teachers understand the nature of the lesson. The guide monitors and intervenes throughout the lesson while collecting data on students’ understanding of the material (e.g., verbal feedback, observations, etc.). Following the lesson, reflective conversations ensue between teachers to determine the impact of the lesson based on their observations and student feedback. The co-teachers decide in advance what types of specific information to gather and the system for gathering data, and then both analyze the data together after the lesson (Graziano & Navarrete, 2012).

Station teaching involves the use of focal points of instruction that center on a common theme. For example, focal points can be targeted knowledge or skills acquisition (Badiali & Titus, 2010). The authors noted that station teaching can attend to
students’ group dynamics and accommodate a variety of learning styles by focusing on skills development during small group instruction. In the case of counseling students, stations (i.e., small groups attended by a teacher with a specific role) could be created to assist students with developing active listening skills (e.g., one station each for developing skills in paraphrasing and reflecting feelings). Stations can incorporate non-guided instruction such as watching videos of skills demonstration prior to attending one of the practice (i.e., skills development) stations. Co-teachers plan their roles prior to conducting the sessions and debrief afterwards to discuss the impact of the stations on students’ learning. Each teacher focuses on a specific responsibility (e.g., demonstrating skills, leading role-plays, processing students’ experiences, etc.).

Teachers who implement a parallel co-teaching model split a large class into two smaller groups. Co-teachers teach the same content. Parallel teaching accommodates student learning styles, student pace, and may help students who are hesitant to participate in large group discussions (Badiali & Titus, 2010). The authors noted that parallel teaching can help co-teachers increase their awareness of how to differentiate their instruction in small group settings to meet student needs.

The alternative teaching model is similar to the parallel model except that teachers deliver different content to need students’ needs. For example, co-teachers in a counseling techniques class could provide skills-training on reflection of feeling to one group and lead a discussion group about Carl Rogers to the other group. This approach accommodates short attention spans and allows for a variety of teaching strategies (Badiali & Titus, 2010).
Badiali and Titus (2010) described the synchronous teaching model as most applicable in later stages of co-teachers’ relationships (e.g., mentor/novice). Co-teachers’ relationships and familiarity with teaching style develops over time, which leads to increased trust according to the authors. This model requires the greatest amount of responsibility (compared to the other five models) and careful co-planning as teachers deliver instruction at the same time, often building upon one another’s statements and ideas (Badiali & Titus, 2010). Applications of this model may include one teacher demonstrating while the other teacher explains or models, co-teachers role playing, and co-teachers taking turns delivering instruction (Graziano & Navarrete, 2012).

**An Iterative Co-Teaching Model**

Orlander et al. (2000) developed an iterative co-teaching approach that pairs junior and senior faculty members with a focus on developing teaching skills and sharing responsibility for supervising students’ progress. Their model involves four phases: (a) orientation, (b) the teaching encounter, (c) debriefing, and (d) planning. The four-phase co-teaching model is expanded on in the following section.

During the orientation phase, the co-teachers (one faculty member and one doctoral student) identify goals to assist with focusing the teaching encounter (i.e., encounters between teachers-students) and the interactions between co-teachers. Establishing goals for teaching encounters helps to steer the less experienced teacher’s skill development in an intentional way. Establishing goals for co-teacher interactions sets the tone for reflective practice on classroom performance, skills development, and the intentional use of the debriefing and planning phases. According to Orlander et al.
co-teachers are responsible for articulating their own goals (viz., teaching encounters and co-teacher interactions) and then negotiating a shared agenda.

Teaching encounters refer to the interactions between co-teachers and students in clinical and classroom settings. Two roles are identified for teaching encounters: one teacher and one observer. The model emphasizes the use of alternating roles and not synchronous teaching (see Graziano & Navarrete, 2012). However, in most of the teaching encounters, the less experienced teacher takes the lead while the senior member observes the teaching process and group dynamics (Orlander et al., 2000).

The debriefing session provides the forum for systematic interaction and reflection on the teaching encounter. The model suggests that conversations be led by the teacher with the observer facilitating the guided reflection and analysis of the teaching encounter once the teaching event has concluded. Orlander et al. (2000) noted that debriefing practices that have the biggest impact on “learning about one’s teaching” include (a) maintaining a focused discussion; (b) the acknowledgement and discussion of anxiety; (c) the self-assessment of one’s teaching; (d) the analysis of teaching through the use of observer probes, clarification of goals and strategies, validating observations, and reframing issues; and (e) the continued development of a trusting relationship between co-teachers (p. 259). Observers are prompted to offer feedback on improving practices and making observations outside of the teacher’s awareness as the relationship strengthens.

Orlander et al. (2000) described the planning phase as useful for identifying specific teaching goals and developing an implementation plan based on the previous
teaching encounter. Future teaching encounters are directly informed by past teaching encounters and thus constitute an iterative process. The co-teachers collaboratively develop goals for improving teaching practices and meeting the needs of learners. The latter is based on an increased understanding of their idiosyncrasies, strengths, specific learning needs, and personalities (Orlander et al., 2000). The former is based on an increased sense of trust within the co-teaching relationship.

Orlander et al. (2000) acknowledged that co-teaching is labor intensive (e.g., debriefing and planning occur outside the classroom setting) and is affected by the characteristics of the environment where co-teaching is implemented (e.g., the type of classroom setting, the number of class sessions, learners’ needs, teachers’ skill levels, the amount of time available to implement the four phases of the model, etc.). For these authors, the benefits of co-teaching outweigh the costs. The intent of co-teaching is to engender the perspective that teaching is an ever-evolving process. Thus co-teaching events set the stage for a “lifelong process of systematic reflection on one’s teaching” (Orlander et al., 2000, p. 264).

**Phenomenological Experiences of Co-Teaching**

Lester and Evans (2009) conducted a phenomenological analysis of collaborative teaching experiences. In this study, faculty members were not co-instructors with doctoral students. Faculty members served on the research team that spearheaded the phenomenological inquiry. Thus, the Lester and Evans study reflects co-teaching experiences between two educational psychology doctoral students. The current study provided information relevant to the experiences of doctoral students who taught with
faculty members as part of their counselor education doctoral training. Several themes reflected in their study are discussed below.

Time spent outside the classroom is an important part of the co-teaching process. Lester and Evans (2009) recognized that time spent in planning and critical reflection allowed them to deepen their understanding of the course material; reflected in the theme: “You can’t just shoot from the hip” (p. 380; italics in original). Interactions between co-teachers and their students improved over time guided by critical reflection and the authors’ respective capacities to embrace their differences as instructors.

Sharing power is deemed an important part of the learning process for the co-instructors, and included the ability to relinquish individual control captured in the theme: “Not my classroom, but our classroom” (Lester & Evans, 2009, p. 380; italics in original). Co-teaching is a demanding and time-consuming process increasing the potential for disagreement between instructors; reflected in the theme: “If we walk away disagreeing, is it okay?” (Lester & Evans, 2009, p. 378; italics in original).

Finally, Lester and Evans (2009) acknowledged the experience of co-teaching as being mutually inspiring and motivating to continuously improve their teaching practice. The theme relevant to this phenomenon was described as: “The presence of another pushed us to go deeper” (Lester & Evans, 2009, p. 378; italics in original). The presence of another instructor provides a real reminder that the tension between comfort and discomfort— inherent in reflective practice—is part of growing as a teacher (Palmer, 1998). How better to engage in reflective practice than through collaboration with another living person. Social interactions with others (e.g., co-instructors, students, etc.)
lead to thoughts, which are internalized and serve to inform future teaching ventures (see Vygotsky, 1978).

**Counselor Education and Teaching**

Following in the footsteps of Nelson & Neufeldt (1998), this researcher searched the literature (e.g., Academic Search Complete, PsychINFO [EBSCO Interface], psycARTICLES [psycNET Interface], Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection, ERIC, MEDLINE Complete, etc.) using the search terms: **pedagogy** and **counselor education** and again using the terms **counselor education** and **teaching**. Less than 40 articles (published from 1986 to 2012) were found to reflect what the authors described as “the art of science of teaching” as it applies to counselor education (p. 71).

The counselor education teaching literature emphasizes: (a) the application of approaches to assist students in developing counseling skills (Hanna & Giordano, 1996; Juhnke, 1994; Seligman, 1993; Schmidt, 2012; Wheeler & D’Andrea, 2004), (b) the use of strategies for teaching counseling content courses (Cheston, 2000; Dollarhide, Smith, & Lemberger, 2007; Ingersoll, 1997, 2000; Murray, Lampinen, & Kelley-Soderholm, 2006; Shepard & Brew, 2005; Stickle & Onedera, 2006; Ziff & Beamish, 2004), (c) approaches to teaching diversity and multicultural issues (Carroll & Gilroy, 2001; Evans & Larrabee, 2002; Frank & Cannon, 2010; Locke & Kiselica, 1999; Moore, Madison-Colmore, & Collins, 2005), (d) pedagogy and the counselor education curriculum (Fong, 1998; Granello, 2000; Granello & Hazler, 1998; Guiffrida, 2005; Nelson & Neufeldt, 1998; Odegard & Vereeri, 2010), and (e) ethical considerations (Downs, 2003; Fier & Ramsey, 2005; Kitchener, 1986; Morrissette & Gadbois, 2006).
In spite of this research, very little is known about the process of teacher preparation within the field of counselor education (Orr et al., 2008). Morrissette and Gadbois (2006) suggested that the application of existing teaching strategies can be used to articulate (counseling) theory, increase student competencies, and enhance student self-awareness. These are all important aims of quality teaching within counselor education. Yet, one might ask: how does one implement a particular teaching strategy before learning how to teach?

Lanning (1990) described the role of counselor educators as those skilled counselors who are also systematically prepared to perform the tasks of an educator including “systematic preparation to teach” (p. 171). For Lanning, the key area of preparation to be an effective counselor educator is the ability to teach graduate classes. To meet this need, doctoral students are directed to have at least one semester of a teaching practicum in order to develop skills necessary for teaching. Counselor education doctoral programs often contain specific courses in pedagogy to assist with students’ skill development related to teaching (CACREP, n.d.; Carte et al., 1994; Lanning, 1990; Orr et al., 2008). Lanning (1990) observed that programs and practices that promote teaching before learning how to teach have no place in counselor education. It is the desire to understand doctoral students’ experiences of learning how to teach through the phenomenon of co-teaching that drives the current study.
Teacher Preparation in Counselor Education: The Collaborative Teaching Teams Model (CTT)

Teaching experience helps to prepare doctoral students to participate in the counselor education profession (Lanning, 1990). Specifically, an increased emphasis on teaching responsibilities for future faculty means a greater need for teaching experience for job candidates (Orr et al., 2008). Within the counselor education literature, only one article describes the intentional preparation of doctoral students for future teaching roles. Towards that end, Orr et al. developed the collaborative teaching teams (CTT) model.

The CTT model was initially developed in order to meet the CACREP doctoral standards for fostering collaborative student-faculty relationships through teaching. The CTT model emphasizes the development of teaching competencies guided by: (a) faculty supervision of teaching, (b) ample opportunities for guided reflection on one’s teaching practice, (c) graduated real-world teaching experiences, (d) peer support of teaching, and (e) the eventual role as a lead instructor (i.e., sole instructor or instructor of record for master’s-level counseling courses).

The CTT entails a progression of collaborative teaching (i.e., co-teaching) experiences. The first step begins with a doctoral student approaching a faculty member with an interest in teaching a course. In the CTT model, doctoral students are asked to wait until they have finished one year of coursework in their programs before becoming a lead instructor. The one-year waiting period allows doctoral students to become familiar with their program requirements and faculty members.
During the one-year waiting period, doctoral students serve as coaches for at least one semester prior to leading a course. A coach observes lead instructors and takes an active role in some class sessions (e.g., preparing and delivering instruction on a specific topic, reviewing assignments, etc.). The authors noted that operating in the coaching role before leading a class exposes the doctoral student to the course material and the processes of teaching (e.g., micro processes, or “teaching within a class session,” and macro processes, or “teaching a session within the context of the entire course”), and provides opportunities for the student to develop a working relationship with the faculty member (Orr et al., 2008).

Doctoral students’ promotion from the role of coach to lead instructor is determined by the supervising faculty member. If a student is not deemed “ready” to lead a course, they will remain in the coach role until ready. Student readiness is determined on an individual basis through the supervision process between the doctoral students and supervising faculty members, deemed critical to the CTT model. Once promoted to lead instructor, doctoral students and supervising faculty members meet to discuss and plan the course including: (a) identifying the particular counseling course for the co-teaching experience; (b) reviewing the materials and resources for designing the course; (c) discussing the rationale, goals, and objectives for the course; (d) discuss teaching philosophy starting with the faculty member’s approach; and (e) discussing the context of the selected course within the overall counseling curriculum.

For Orr et al. (2008), the key to making CTT work is the ongoing and regularly scheduled supervision between the faculty member and doctoral student. The faculty
member is viewed as a supervisor who provides “live supervision” to doctoral students engaged in classroom teaching experiences. According to the model, the faculty member remains in the role as instructor of record ultimately assuming liability for the course and responsibility for students’ final evaluations. However, student lead instructors are involved in all aspects of the course, from course design to implementation to grading and evaluation.

**Doctoral Students’ Experiences of the CTT Model**

The CTT model was implemented in a CACREP-accredited counseling program. Nine master’s-level courses (e.g., counseling techniques, career counseling, group counseling, etc.) taught over a 14-week semesters, 8-week summers, and 1-week intensives served as the source for doctoral students’ coaching and lead teaching experiences. Doctoral students who participated in the CTT model between 2003 and 2008 provided feedback to the model developers in the form of semi-structured questionnaire responses and reflection papers. This qualitative data was gathered from 5 respondents, compiled and coded for themes including: (a) developing a personal style of teaching, (b) using supervision to shift roles from student to instructor, and (c) increasing confidence and competence as a teacher (Orr et al., 2008).

Lead instructors (i.e., counselor education doctoral students) reported increased clarity into their developing teaching philosophies, which is directly encouraged and supported in the student-faculty supervision relationship. Lead instructors reported that developing personal teaching styles was helpful, particularly for those doctoral students who indicated intent to pursue careers as counselor educators (Orr et al., 2008). Lead
instructors reported that supervision with faculty members helped them shift their thinking from student roles to teacher roles. The authors suggested this is a process similar to clinical supervision in that students shift from “learners in the classroom to facilitators in a counseling session” (p. 158). Finally, lead instructors reported greater self-awareness relevant to their teaching experiences, greater depth of knowledge relevant to the counseling curriculum, a greater understanding of how to use resources to build a course, and increased confidence when interviewing for counselor educator positions; due to greater insight and articulation of their teaching philosophies. Future counselor education faculty members face multiple responsibilities in teaching, research, and service roles. Wouldn’t it be nice if doctoral students’ program experiences prepared them to “hit the ground running” as competent teachers as they acclimate to their new faculty roles.

**Summary of Chapter 1**

This chapter introduced the current study, which examined counselor education students’ experiences of co-teaching with faculty members during their doctoral studies. Definitions and models of co-teaching from the teacher preparation, special education, and higher education literature were explored. Counselor education doctoral preparation for future teaching roles is supported by the 2009 CACREP standards. The majority of the counseling literature focuses on approaches to teaching specific counseling skills, delivering content or topic specific content, and managing ethics. A paucity of research in the counselor education literature relevant to preparing counselor educators for future
teaching roles is noted with the exception of the Orr et al. (2008) article on the collaborative teaching teams (CTT) model.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The previous chapter reviewed and summarized the importance of doctoral students’ preparation for future teaching roles during their doctoral training. Overall, the literature points to the use of co-teaching in K-12 environments, a variety of co-teaching models, and its infiltration into the higher education setting. Co-teaching and its application within counselor education is discussed in one study emphasizing the progressive nature of teaching experiences under supervision leading to solo teaching roles (Orr et al., 2008).

The purpose of this study was to investigate counselor education doctoral students’ experiences of co-teaching with faculty members in order to establish (a) the essential elements that comprise a quality co-teaching experience and (b) the students’ perceived value of co-teaching relevant to their post-degree aspirations. This study was guided by the following research question: How do counselor education students experience co-teaching with faculty during their doctoral training? To explore the essence and meaning of co-teaching experiences guided by the research question, a qualitative phenomenological design was employed.

Phenomenological Research

Qualitative research seeks to understand the world from the perspectives of those living in it (Hatch, 2002). The practice of qualitative research is both reflexive and process driven producing richly descriptive knowledge in order to more fully understand a particular issue or phenomenon (Creswell, 2007; Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006).
The perspectives of participants and the meaning they ascribe to events are prominent in qualitative studies and this is especially true for phenomenological qualitative research (Creswell, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Jacob, 1988; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2002). Phenomenological qualitative research exists as a distinct approach among the various qualitative research traditions (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, etc.). A brief account of phenomenological research, goals, and the rationale for this study follows.

Rooted in philosophy, phenomenology was formally conceived as a research “method” by philosopher Edmund Husserl (Wertz, 2005). Husserl emphasized the unbiased description of subject matter in an effort to mediate the explanatory aspects of positivism (i.e., objective facts) and purely philosophical (i.e., armchair) interpretations of events (Colaizzi, 1973). Husserl’s work (1962, 1970) promoted the description of the “what” of a particular phenomenon in an effort to delineate the characteristics and clarify the meaning of a particular subject matter and has been referred to as “descriptive phenomenology” (Lopez & Willis, 2004, p. 727; Wertz, 2005). Giorgi (1989), building on the work of Husserl, described the core characteristics phenomenological research including the use of descriptive phenomenological reductions, the investigation of the intentional relationship between persons and situations, and the delineation of the structures of meaning inherent in human experience. In essence, realities are treated as pure ‘phenomena’ and the “only absolute data from where to begin” (Groenewald, 2004, p. 4).
Proponents of the existential-phenomenological tradition (e.g., Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty) would argue Husserl and Giorgi’s descriptive approach presupposes a “sharp distinction between facts and essences,” when in fact, either one implies the other (Colaizzi, 1973, p. 3). Instead, the distinction between the researcher and the phenomenon of inquiry is blurred in favor of viewing researchers as relating to the world through intentional experiences with phenomena (Colaizzi, 1973). Lopez and Willis (2004) referred to this tradition as interpretive phenomenology. Central to the goal of interpretive phenomenological research is the attainment of a deeper understanding of the nature and meaning of everyday experiences in a pre-reflective, non-classifying, non-theoretical manner (Van Manen, 1990; Wertz, 2005).

Phenomenological research assumes shared and distinguishing experiences exist among the persons involved in the phenomenon of inquiry (Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2002; Van Manen, 1990), in this case the experience of counselor education doctoral students co-teaching with faculty members. Researchers engaged in this process commit to capturing all aspects of a phenomenon favoring participants’ explanations of meanings over their own explanations of events (Moustakas, 1994). Interpretive aspects of research process center on themes related to the experience, thus avoiding theory generation, describing participants’ characteristics, or confirming facts (Hycner, 1999).

The phenomenological paradigm used for this study is grounded in the work of Max van Manen (1990, 2007) and reflects a combination of descriptive and interpretive approaches to phenomenological research (e.g., bracketing while acknowledging that the researcher cannot be fully removed from the lived worlds of participants). Van Manen
(1990) is known for his use of phenomenological inquiry into the meanings of teaching, parenting, and “related pedagogic vocations” (p. 1). For Van Manen (1990), the aim of phenomenological research is the development of a critical pedagogical competence through thoughtful inquiry and careful attention to the details of practice many often take for granted. Pedagogical competence is derived through conscious acts and practices and captured in the lived experience of teaching, parenting, educating, and so forth (van Manen, 1990, 2007). That said, if the clues to teaching competence are embedded in conscious everyday acts of teaching, it stands to reason that the phenomenon of teaching (or more specifically, co-teaching) be investigated more fully to bring those competencies to light.

Thus, the framework for this study reflects Van Manen’s (1990) approach in that its aim is fundamental to the process of pedagogy. The goal of this study is to capture the essence and meanings behind the practice of co-teaching, a form of pedagogy, acknowledging all aspects of the phenomena. Second, an exploratory design that actively acknowledges and incorporates a process (e.g., bracketing) to mediate researcher biases towards the experience of co-teaching was essential (Groenewald, 2004). Third, a design was needed that provides for a deeper understanding of the act of co-teaching and its relative meanings from the perspectives of those engaged in practice—that is, an inside view. Finally, a data analysis process that does justice to the integrity of the phenomenon by providing guidance without too much specificity is warranted. The data relevant to the phenomena’s meaning and unique perspectives is emergent and thematic and is

A review of the literature examined counselor education students’ experiences of co-teaching with faculty members during their doctoral studies. Definitions and models of co-teaching from the teacher preparation, special education, and higher education literature were explored. The research reviewed on teaching in counselor education focused on teaching specific counseling skills, delivering topic specific content, the curriculum in counselor education, and ethical considerations. A paucity of research in the counselor education literature relevant to preparing counselor educators for future teaching roles is noted with the exception of the Orr et al. (2008) article on the collaborative teaching teams (CTT) model.

This research study sought to fill a gap in the literature by providing information on counselor education doctoral students’ experiences with co-teaching, and their perspectives on quality co-teaching experiences including those perspectives relevant to their post-degree teaching aspirations. The researcher assumed that participants would have experiences and perspectives that would contribute to a shared meaning of co-teaching in counselor education doctoral programs. The current study is congruent with the goals of phenomenological research. Thus, a phenomenological research design was deemed appropriate to study doctoral students’ co-teaching experiences in counselor education.
Bracketing Beliefs and Description of the Researcher

Van Manen (1990) cautioned that our pre-understandings, beliefs, suppositions, or assumptions may predispose us to interpretation before one can “come to grips” with the significance of a particular phenomenon (p. 46). This begs the question: How does one best suspend these beliefs? The concept of *epoché* was introduced by Husserl (1962, 1970) and revisited by other phenomenological researchers (Giorgi, 1989; Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 2007; Wertz, 2005). *Epoché* refers to the act of refraining from bias by setting aside our scientific assumptions in an effort to gain access, in Husserl’s famous words, to “the things themselves” (Wertz, 2005). Husserl (1970) was the first to introduce the term *bracketing*, which refers to the process of explicating our assumptions, reflecting and revisiting them, and holding them “deliberately at bay” in an effort to place them outside the realm of the phenomenon of inquiry (p. 33). *Epoché* and the process of bracketing are essential to the phenomenological research process (Groenewald, 2004; Husserl, 1962, 1970; Moustakas, 1994; Van Manen, 1990; Wertz, 2005).

Lopez and Willis (2004) aptly illustrated that the notion of bracketing is a point of contention between descriptive (e.g., proponents of Husserl) and interpretive (e.g., proponents of Heidegger) phenomenologists. Interpretive phenomenologists argue that there can be no true separation of researcher and phenomenon. In other words, researchers are not detached from the phenomenon of inquiry and should not pretend otherwise (Hammersley, 2000). The approach to bracketing used by the researcher in this study is described by LeVasseur (2003) as an attempt to move beyond everyday assumptions and remain persistently curious about new horizons and meanings associated
with the experience of co-teaching. This approach is more congruent with the interpretive phenomenological approach and provides a process to rigorously manage personal bias that may impact the results.

The goal of bracketing in this study was to raise awareness and reflect on any preferences and assumptions toward the practice of co-teaching. This allows the researcher to be aware of any biases that may influence the research process (Creswell, 2007; Hatch, 2002). What follows is a description of the researcher, his experience with co-teaching, and a list of assumptions about the practice of co-teaching. Researcher assumptions are grounded in first-hand experiences and a review of the education teaching literature prior to conducting this study.

**Researcher**

The researcher for this study is a middle-aged Caucasian male who lives in a suburban community in Northeast Ohio. He grew up in a family of teachers with many of his immediate family members teaching in local schools to date. However, none of his family members, save one, teach at the university level. Currently, none of his family members are university faculty members. At the time of the study, the researcher was a doctoral candidate in a Counseling and Human Development Services at Kent State University. The researcher was an independently licensed clinical counselor with a supervision endorsement in Ohio. The researcher’s scholarly interests are in the areas of teaching and the supervision of counseling students. After many years as a clinician and supervisor, the researcher returned to obtain his Ph.D. with the goal of acquiring a faculty position in Counselor Education. The researcher’s experience with teaching prior to
doctoral studies was providing workshop trainings to licensed counselors seeking continuing education credits. The researcher co-facilitated a graduate internship course on home-based intervention. Additionally, the researcher provided seminars to psychiatric residents in a hospital setting.

The researcher assumed prior to entering his doctoral studies that training counselors was achieved solely through the process of supervision. Given the career aspiration of becoming a counselor educator, it became increasingly evident that teaching played a critical role in preparing counselors. This led the researcher to seek out teaching experiences during the first year of his doctoral studies. The researcher’s inquiry led to an opportunity to co-teach two graduate courses with faculty members.

Co-Teaching Experience

The researcher experienced co-teaching in two different graduate courses. The first course was a content-oriented classroom that averaged 25–30 master’s level graduate students. The co-teaching experience included facilitating role-plays, presenting course material to the large group, participating and facilitating class discussion, preparing course materials, and participating in supervision with the faculty instructor.

The second course was a small-group (5–6 students) practicum course, where counseling students practice their skills with clients for the first time. The co-teaching experience included the weekly individual and group supervision of students, teaching counseling skills, reviewing DVD work samples, and participating in supervision with the faculty instructor. The opportunity to co-teach in both content and applied courses provided the researcher with a “dress-rehearsal” experience that influenced his drive to
seek out instructor of record opportunities. At the time of the study and subsequent to the
co-teaching experiences, the researcher has been instructor of record for two graduate
courses at Kent State University.

Assumptions

A phenomenological attitude regarding the daily practice of an occupation
compels the question: “What is it like to be a teacher?” (Van Manen, 1990, p. 45). The
investment of the researcher is reflected in this question with the added bias that one must
experience the essence or practice of teaching in order to know what it is like. The
primary assumption of the researcher is that co-teaching with an already experienced
teacher is a good starting point.

Co-teaching was, in fact, the researcher’s introduction to the experience of
teaching and the impetus for pursuing this study based on two assumptions. The first
assumption is that in order to be better prepared for teaching (e.g., as an Instructor of
Record), one must first experience co-teaching, the phenomenon of inquiry. The
researcher’s co-teaching experiences shaped his beliefs that a quality experience has
certain characteristics (e.g., relationship with faculty, learning experiences, increased
confidence while teaching, and helpful feedback). The second assumption is that co-
teaching experiences prior to solo teaching better prepare counselor educators in training
for their future teaching roles. Yet, it is clear in the literature that very little is known
about the phenomenon of co-teaching, particularly in counselor education. This study
seeks to fill that knowledge gap.
Upon reflection, the following list of assumptions are bracketed herein and are the result of the researcher’s experiences with co-teaching, his personal beliefs, and a review of the teaching literature in preparation for this study:

1. There are shared meanings, descriptions, and experiences among Counselor Education doctoral students who have engaged in the practice of co-teaching with program faculty.

2. All full-time counselor education doctoral students have the opportunity to engage in the practice of co-teaching with program faculty as part of their doctoral experience.

3. Counselor education doctoral programs have at least one faculty member who has interest and experience with the scholarship of teaching and regularly co-teaches with doctoral students.

4. Quality co-teaching experiences contain certain shared meanings, experiences, and practices.

5. Co-teaching experiences will be incorporated into doctoral students’ perceptions of future teaching, scholarship and practice of teaching and career aspirations.

6. Co-teaching is essentially a precursor experience the quality of which critically impacts subsequent teaching practice as an instructor of record.

**Sampling Procedures**

It is critical to find participants who have had experience with the phenomenon of inquiry (Creswell, 2007; Groenewald, 2004)—in other words, doctoral students with
co-teaching experiences with faculty members. Patton (1990) referred to this as “purposeful sampling” and that participants who share common experiences for in-depth study comprise a relatively “homogenous group” (pp. 169-86). Nevertheless, participants are selected with the intention of representing a balanced view related to the phenomenon of inquiry, which serves to enhance the credibility of the study (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). Rubin and Rubin suggested that participants can provide useful information when they have knowledge, have experience, and represent a variety of perspectives relevant to the phenomenon of inquiry. Although the number of participants varies from study to study, conducting interviews until no new themes emerge with at least six participants is recommended (Morse, 1995). Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006) supported Morse’s findings suggesting that broad themes with surface within six interviews with data saturation occurring within twelve interviews. Purposeful sampling was used to identify participants for this study. Twelve participants were recruited for this study. Of those 12 participants, two did not meet inclusion criteria and one was unable to participate in the interviews and member checks within the study’s timeframe, leaving nine participants who contributed to this study.

**Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Participant Selection**

The researcher identified CACREP-Accredited Counselor Education (CE) doctoral programs in Ohio that include faculty members who regularly co-teach with doctoral students. CE doctoral program coordinators were solicited to obtain contact information for identified faculty members. The identified faculty members were contacted via phone and e-mail to obtain contact information for students who have
participated in co-teaching. Doctoral students were subsequently solicited via e-mail or by phone and selected for this study based on the following inclusion criteria:

- Students were enrolled and engaged in a CE doctoral program
- Students have completed at least one semester of coursework
- Students have co-taught at least one content-oriented course with a program faculty member within the past year (e.g., multicultural, theories, diagnosis, career, etc.)
- Students were in the pre-candidacy phase of their programs
- Students were recognized as having an interest in co-teaching versus being recruited by program faculty
- Students were willing to participate in at least two interviews over a the course of three months
- Students were willing to participate in member checks, that is, follow-up interviews to discuss the quality and content of interview data

Exclusionary criteria for doctoral students included:

- Students with extensive graduate-level teaching experience prior to program attendance
- Co-teaching experiences limited to post candidacy
- Students whose co-teaching experience is limited to clinical courses (e.g., procedures, practicum, internship, etc.)

Exclusionary criteria were based on two assumptions. First, students who have extensive teaching experience may have a considerable set of experiences that could
impact findings. Second, clinical courses have a prominent supervision component and in many ways are intended to simulate the real-world practice of individual and group supervision that may occur in community agencies. In short, the distinction between the teaching and supervision aspects of clinical courses is difficult to define and make a phenomenological inquiry into the underlying structure of co-teaching challenging at best (Moustakas, 1994).

**Procedures and Ethical Considerations for Participant Selection**

After receiving an approval from the Kent State University Institutional Review Board (Appendix A), the researcher identified CACREP-Accredited Counselor Education (CE) doctoral programs in Ohio that included faculty members who regularly co-teach with doctoral students. CE programs were identified with the consultation of dissertation co-chairs and program advisors. A list of four CE programs was identified.

Four CE doctoral program coordinators were solicited to obtain contact information for identified faculty members via e-mail or phone asked the following: “Which faculty members in your program regularly co-teach content-oriented courses with doctoral students?” CE program coordinators identified seven faculty members from three different CE programs as likely candidates for regular co-teaching practice.

Seven identified faculty members were contacted via phone or e-mail to obtain contact information for students who have participated in co-teaching and asked the following: “Could you please identify one or two doctoral students who have recently co-taught a content-oriented course with you and are able to aptly reflect on the co-teaching experience?”
Once doctoral students were identified, the researcher sent e-mails to 12 doctoral students who were asked to participate in the study prompted by the following question: “Would you be willing to participate in a study that seeks to understand doctoral students’ experiences of co-teaching with program faculty?” Inclusion and exclusion criteria were also presented to doctoral students as part of the correspondence. The researcher made follow-up phone calls to doctoral students who did not respond by e-mail within 10 days of the initial contact. Of the 12 doctoral students contacted, 12 responded and nine were in agreement and met criteria to participate in the study.

Participants were not coerced into the study. The researcher sent the doctoral students a consent form via e-mail (Appendix B: Consent Form and Recording Release) and asked participants to review the consent form, sign it, and keep it for their records. The researcher also requested scanned and e-mailed copies for his records, which were kept in a locked storage facility at Kent State University. All e-mail correspondence between the researcher and participants occurred through a security-encrypted server at Kent State University assuring a high degree of confidential communication.

The researcher asked participants to be available for at least 2 one-hour interviews within a three month time period. Participants were also asked to be involved in at least two member checks, a process described by Merriam (2002) as reviewing the data and tentative interpretations with the interviewees in an effort to reach consensus before further analysis are conducted.

Confidentiality was discussed with participants as it would be implemented throughout the course of the study: (a) The researcher assured the participants that their
interview transcripts would be de-identified; (b) the researcher assured participants that their interview transcripts would be kept in a locked storage facility; (c) the researcher assured participants that pseudonyms would be used in place of their real names during data analysis and in the final text; and (d) the researcher assured the participants of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without recourse or penalty.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Creswell (2007) described data collection as a series of interrelated activities aimed at gathering quality information in response to research questions. Adapted from Creswell, the researcher used a process for data collection illustrated in Figure 1: The Data Collection Cycle. The five-step data collection procedure used by the researcher included: (a) obtaining consent and background information, (b) conducting initial interviews, (c) conducting member check interviews, (d) conducting final member check interviews, and (e) determining data saturation before proceeding to formal analysis.

![Figure 1. The data collection process](image-url)
Obtaining Consent and Background Information

The researcher contacted by email or phone (Appendix C: Recruitment Script) the 12 participants identified by CE program faculty. The researcher introduced self and the nature of the study to prospective participants discussing: (a) the inclusion and exclusion criteria, (b) the goals of the study, (c) the issues related to confidentiality and data storage, (d) the interview and member check procedures, and (e) the consent procedures. Interested participants who met the inclusion criteria were sent an electronic copy of the consent, which was reviewed by the researcher in advance in order to clarify points or answer any questions. Consent forms were signed by participants, scanned and e-mailed back to the researcher along with demographic information (Appendix D: Background Information Form) in advance of scheduling the interviews. Each participant retained the original consent form for his or her records. Ten of the 12 participants met criteria for the study, with nine engaging in initial interviews and member checks within the study’s time frame.

Conducting Initial Interviews

Interviews were scheduled in accordance with participants’ availability for at least one hour and were conducted in person. Interviews were recorded digitally for the purpose of transcription (discussed in Data Analysis Procedures, later in this chapter). Participants were e-mailed a release of information form (see Appendix B: Consent Form and Recording Release) in advance of the interview. A signed, scanned copy of the recording release was requested by the researcher and securely stored with consent forms.
and background information (see Procedures and Ethical Considerations for Participant Selection earlier in this chapter).

All interviews were conducted in the conversational style described by Rubin and Rubin (2005). Interviews were conducted in an effort to make participants feel at ease and to resemble a conversational exchange. To that end, participant interviews were structured using a combination of main questions (e.g., those intended to explore the broad range of topics related to co-teaching), follow-up questions (e.g., those prompted by participants responses and intended to explore particular themes arising in the conversation), and probes (e.g., those responses intended to keep the conversation moving, obtain specific examples, and to provide clarification).

The overall intent of the interviews was to gather information about the experience of co-teaching (i.e., what was the co-teaching experience like, what stood out, and how did the experience impact students’ perspectives on teaching?). The nature of the interviews was to capture experiences that increased the researcher’s ability to understand co-teaching through the eyes of the participant. Research questions and probes were employed to facilitate a conversation and not a question-answer exchange (see Rubin & Rubin, 2005; suggestions for structuring interviews). Interview questions were translated into more concrete and conversationally facilitating terms in order to make the topic easier to discuss (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The initial interview for each participant was guided by the research questions listed in Appendix E (Interview Questions).
The researcher transcribed digitally recorded videos of initial interviews. The interview transcripts were reviewed on multiple occasions by the researcher. It is recommended that researchers listen to recordings of each interview repeatedly in order to become familiar with the interviewees’ perspectives (Groenewald, 2004; Holloway, 1997; Hycner, 1999).

**Member Check Interviews**

Member checks are a strategy for enhancing the “validity” (Merriam, 2002) or “trustworthiness” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) of a qualitative study. Polkinghorne (1989) referred to a “valid” qualitative study as one that is well grounded and well supported. In other words, does the interview data reflect the experiences of the participants? Participants were approached for a member check interview after the researcher had identified and summarized meaning units from the initial interview transcript (see data analysis procedures later in this chapter). Member check interviews serve to “fine-tune” participants’ perspectives and facilitate any additional recollections of their co-teaching experiences as they interact with the data (Merriam, 2002; Van Manen, 1990). Lincoln and Guba (1985) considered member checks to be the most “critical technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314).

All member check interviews were conducted by the researcher by e-mail and phone if desired by participants. Participants were asked to dedicate up to one hour to the member check in a non-distracting environment. The researcher notified participants by e-mail to determine a convenient time for member checks. Participants were e-mailed a summary of the meaning units (e.g., short phrases or sentences that represent the salient
themes related to participants’ co-teaching experiences) derived from their initial
interviews. Full transcripts of the initial interviews were made available to participants to
provide context and encourage additional reflection as participants interacted with
meaning unit summaries. In the event participants needed to discuss responses in more
detail, to address questions, concerns, or desire a forum for expanding on their written
responses, a short interview was conducted via phone and recorded for additional
transcription. Member checks, like the initial interviews, were conducted in a
conversational style if participants needed to discuss thoughts, concerns, or issues by
phone (see Moustakas, 1994). The researcher asked each of the participants to respond to
the following questions:

1. What are your thoughts, feelings, comments as you read the summary of your
   first interview? Please describe them and use examples.
2. Does the summary represent your experience of co-teaching? What should be
   added, or removed?
3. There are underlined statements in the summary. How well do the underlined
   statements (meaning units) fit with your experience of co-teaching?

In the event a follow-up interview was conducted and recorded, the researcher
transcribed and analyzed the member check interviews to see if additional information
was revealed. Data saturation was determined in the event no new themes or participant
perspectives emerged after the member check (Groenewald, 2004). In the event that
participants added new information, themes, or suggested changes, a second member
check was conducted. Seven out of nine participants reached data saturation after
member check one. Two participants required a second member check, which was conducted via e-mail at the participants’ request (see below). Participants (P) indicated data saturation after the first member check as illustrated by the following responses:

- “I would not add or remove anything” (P1).
- “I believe it is an accurate account of my experience” (P2).
- “Yes, I think that it is truly representative of my lived experience with co-teaching” (P4).
- “Yes, it does represent my experience in co-teaching. I am quite amazed at how the researcher was able to distill my interview down to these salient themes and stay faithful to the spirit, or essence, of my responses. I don’t feel anything needs to be added or taken away from the summary” (P5).
- “At this time, I believe that the summary fully represents my experience of co-teaching. I can think of nothing that should either be added or removed” (P6).
- “Yes, the summary represents my experience of co-teaching quite well” (P7).
- “The summary accurately represents my experience of co-teaching. I don’t think anything needs to be added or removed” (P8).

Second Member Check Interviews

If needed, the researcher incorporated new themes, details, or changes suggested by a participant during the second member check. This information was integrated into a revised summary of a participant’s meaning units (see data analysis). The summary was
e-mailed to participants one week in advance of the second member check. In the e-mail, the researcher asked the participants the following:

1. Does the revised summary accurately represent your experience of co-teaching?
2. Does anything need to be changed or added to this description?
3. Does anything need to be removed from this description?

Two of the nine participants required a second member check prior to reaching data saturation. Data saturation was determined when no new ideas were added to the content of the interview transcript or meaning unit summaries. Participants three and nine responded to the researcher’s prompt questions indicating that the corrected summaries were representative of their respective experiences. Data saturation was determined due to no new themes or ideas being added at the time of member check two.

**Determining Data Saturation**

Data saturation was determined jointly between the researcher and each individual participant (see description of member check interviews above). Interview data were determined to be saturated when the researcher and participants agreed that no new information needed to be added or deleted regarding co-teaching experiences. For example, data saturation was determined for participant one as illustrated by the response: “I think the summary of themes is spot on.” Data analysis procedures (discussed later in this chapter) were conducted by the researcher concurrent to data collection. The researcher reviewed the individual participants’ data and compared data across participants in order to determine that no new ideas had emerged before
proceeding to the final steps of data analysis. Upon comparison, all participants reached
the conclusion that the interview and summaries reflected their lived experiences of
co-teaching. At that point, the researcher stopped conducting member checks and moved
into data analysis (see data analysis steps 3 through 5).

**Data Analysis Procedures**

The term *analysis* has dangerous connotations for phenomenology (Groenewald,
2004; Hycner, 1999) in that breaking data into parts may contribute to the loss of
meaning. Creswell (2007) warned researchers to avoid positivist-influenced dichotomies
inherent in the term *analysis*. The goal of phenomenological data analysis is to depict the
essence or meaning of an experience that can only be perceived within the lived
experience of those within a particular phenomenon (Van Manen, 1990). The end product
of this data analysis is a detailed description of the essence of co-teaching experiences that
represents the collective perspectives of all participants, that is, the underlying structure of
the phenomenon of co-teaching. Phenomenological methods do not seek to explicate
meanings specific to particular taxonomies, theories, or pre-conceived notions of any type
(Van Manen, 1990). Hycner (1999) supported this notion by suggesting that data be
viewed as aspects of a phenomenon with continuous reference to the context as a whole.
Hycner’s notion is reflected in the data analysis process selected for this study.

The approach to data analysis for this study follows a pattern of transcript analysis
originally posed by Giorgi (1989). Giorgi’s (1985, 1989) approach was modified by
Worthen and McNeill (1996) as a means to organize and “break down” transcribed
interviews into meaning units that “can be more easily analyzed” (p. 123). It is the
participants’ spoken words rather than observed behaviors that constitute the data for analysis in phenomenological studies (Christofi & Thompson, 2007), and for this study as well.

Worthen and McNeill (1996) noted that interviews do not typically proceed along a “linear thought process” stressing the importance of organizing interview data within a “logical and contextual relationship” (p. 124). Groenewald (2004) used a focused version of Hycner’s (1999) data analysis process. Following in the footsteps of both Groenewald (2004) and Worthen and McNeill (1996), the researcher used an adapted (e.g., adapted from Hycner and Giorgi) approach to data analysis culminating in a five-step process.

The five-step process for the analysis of co-teaching experiences is illustrated in Figure 2: Data Analysis Procedures. Data analysis procedures included: (a) multiple reviews of audio and written transcripts to obtain a sense of the whole, (b) identifying individual meaning units, (c) articulating and integrating meaning units across participants, (d) clustering meaning units into a contextual meaning structure, and (e) creating a summary of the essence of interview data. The data analysis followed the process of bracketing, which is addressed earlier in the chapter (see Bracketing Bias and Description of the Researcher) with steps one and two occurring concurrent to data collection procedures (see member checks addressed earlier in this chapter).
Figure 2. Data analysis procedures

Step 1: Transcript Review to Obtain a Sense of the Whole

As soon as possible after the interviews, the researcher listened to the recordings and made notes in advance of the transcription. The researcher transcribed all interviews. The researcher reviewed interview transcripts and audio recordings on three separate occasions. This process was done to assist the researcher with obtaining a contextual feel for the interview, or sense of the whole (Groenewald, 2004; Worthen & McNeill, 1996), which served as the researcher’s first glimpse into the participants’ experiences of co-teaching (see Giorgi, 2008; Van Manen, 1990). Following the listening and note-taking process, the researcher transcribed the interviews verbatim and checked each transcription for accuracy.
Step 2: Identify Meaning Units

Following the accurate transcription of each interview, the researcher reviewed the transcripts to break up the transcript text into manageable parts called meaning units (i.e., short phrases or sentences that represent the salient themes related to participants’ co-teaching experiences; see Giorgi, 2008). Each meaning unit was underlined and slashes were used to separate experienced shifts in textual meaning (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). Meaning units are not identified by the frequency of their occurrence within an interview transcript. What matters is whether the meaning is distinct and present or not (Giorgi, 1994). This process is unique to the phenomenon of inquiry, the participants, and the researcher with no single way to achieve this analytic task (Giorgi, 2008).

Each of the participant’s meaning units were extracted from the original interview transcripts, summarized, and re-organized by assigned pseudonym. Summaries of individual meaning units served as the basis for the first member checks discussed earlier in this chapter. An example of meaning unit summaries identified within the interview transcript is shown in Appendix F. As data were collected via the member check process, the researcher reviewed each individual participant’s responses in preparation for the next step. Reviewing participants’ responses involved cross-checking meaning unit summaries with the original transcript to assure none of the original meaning was diluted as data was extracted and re-organized.

Step 3: Integrating and Articulating Meaning Units Across Participants

Following the member check, participants’ meaning units were revised or refined in accordance with their feedback and compared to the original interview transcripts as
needed for contextual cues. Then, the meaning units were integrated into a first-person narrative depicting a temporal sequence of events (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). The integrated narrative depicted the sequential telling of each participant’s co-teaching experiences. An example of an integrated narrative constructed from the meaning units identified from an interview transcript is found in Appendix G.

After the second member check (if needed), each participant’s integrated narrative was refined to incorporate any new or revised ideas and then carefully reviewed by the researcher in order to articulate the central themes of each participant’s experience of co-teaching. The central themes or articulated meaning units were examined with the intention of expressing the underlying structure or meaning of co-teaching experiences for each individual participant (Moustakas, 1994). Articulated meaning units were continuously evaluated in the context of the raw interview data to assure contextual relevance (Giorgi, 1985; Worthen & McNeill, 1996).

Following the identification of central themes for each participant, the narratives were re-organized and written as brief third-person sequential narratives. The intention of this step is to organize the data into a heuristic description of co-teaching experiences that served as the basis for the researcher to compare participants’ experiences with one another. In Moustakas’ (1990) terms, the researcher is “creating a story that portrays the qualities, meanings, and essences of universally unique experiences” (p. 13).

**Step 4: Clustering Meaning Units into a Contextual Structure**

After each of the individual interviews was analyzed (i.e., broken into meaning units, integrated into a first-person summary, and then articulated in a thematic
third-person narrative), a comparative analysis of similarities and differences between each of the thematic narratives was conducted by the researcher (Worthen & McNeill, 1996). This is done to allow the underlying meanings or essence of co-teaching to emerge (Van Manen, 1990). Three steps were used by the researcher to cluster themes into a contextual structure: (a) each individual participant’s articulated meaning units (themes) from their respective thematic narratives were extracted and then integrated into one inclusive list of co-teaching experiences, (b) the integrated list completed in step a was reviewed to identify meaning units shared by two or more participants, which were then extracted and compiled into a refined list, and (c) a review of the list in step b was conducted to identify those articulated meaning units shared by 6 or more participants, which were extracted and complied in a final collated list of articulated meaning units relevant to the experience of co-teaching. This final collated list was used as the basis for creating a summary of the essence of co-teaching.

**Step 5: Creating a Summary of the Essence (Narrative)**

The final list of consensus themes (articulated meaning units) derived from the clustering process described in Step 4 above, served as the basis for generating the full narrative description of each counselor education doctoral students’ experiences of co-teaching with program faculty during their training. Themes were consolidated into a single narrative to illustrate “what happened” and “how the phenomenon was experienced” by the participants (Creswell, 2007). In other words, the final product of this data analysis process is a description of the essence of co-teaching for counselor education doctoral students (see Chapter 3, Results).
Credibility and Trustworthiness of the Data

Improving the trustworthiness and credibility of a qualitative study can come from a variety of processes including triangulation, which involves the use of multiple sources, methods, investigators, or theories to provide support for the results obtained in qualitative studies in an effort to increase the trustworthiness of a study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). If two or more methods result in similar findings, then it serves to enhance the validity of the findings (Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2006). Denzin (1989) indicated that triangulation procedures serve to increase rigor and trustworthiness in the research process so that one can “broaden, thicken, and deepen” the interpretive base of the study, meaning the study’s transferability (p. 247).

However, in this phenomenological study, interview transcripts and refined narratives served as the primary sources of data. Thus, triangulation procedures as described above need to be re-conceptualized (absent multiple data sources) as procedures intended to increase credibility, trustworthiness, and transferability by making the process of data collection and analysis transparent to readers. The procedures used for this study included: (a) bracketing in order to minimize the potential intrusion of researcher experiences, (b) the use of multiple member checks, and (c) detailed descriptions to inform transferability.

Bracketing

Schram (2006) suggested that researchers need to monitor the subjectivity that influences their research in an effort to increase the trustworthiness of their results. A tradition that has become a standard in phenomenological practice is that of making one’s
own implicit biases and assumptions explicit to self and others (Morrow, 2005). This process, termed bracketing (Husserl, 1913/1931), was discussed previously in this chapter. LeVasseur (2003) described bracketing as an attempt to move beyond everyday assumptions and remain persistently curious about new horizons and meanings associated with the experience of co-teaching.

Bracketing was used at the outset of the study to capture the researcher’s biases towards co-teaching and then again during the data analysis process to continuously monitor any intrusion of researcher subjectivity. The goal of bracketing in this study is to raise awareness and reflect on any biases and assumptions toward the practice of co-teaching. This allows the researcher to be aware of any biases that may influence the data analysis process (Creswell, 2007; Hatch, 2002). Bracketed assumptions are listed earlier in this section (see Bracketing Bias and Description of the Researcher).

**Member Checks**

Member checks are a strategy for enhancing the “validity” of a qualitative study (Merriam, 2002). Polkinghorne (1989) referred to a “valid” qualitative study as one that is well grounded and well supported. In other words, does the interview data reflect the actual experiences of the participants? Member check interviews serve to “fine-tune” participants’ perspectives and facilitate any additional recollections of their co-teaching experiences as they interact with the data (Merriam, 2002; Van Manen, 1990). Lincoln and Guba (1985) considered member checks to be the most “critical technique for establishing credibility” (p. 314).
Member checks served to increase the credibility and trustworthiness of this study by keeping data analysis rooted in the perspectives of the participants, not the researcher. Participants were able to review, clarify, or add new meanings that were described in the interview transcripts. As the researcher integrated and articulated meaning units from the interview transcripts—a process of interpretation by the researcher—participants were able to view the data and shape the outcome. Put another way, the participants didn’t have to wait until the end to see how their experiences were incorporated into a final narrative of co-teaching experiences. While the researcher has similar lived experiences, member checks serve to assure the essence of co-teaching reflects participants’ lived worlds and not that of the researcher (Van Manen, 1990). The researcher’s lived experience with co-teaching is articulated through the bracketing process. The bracketed experiences of the researcher and the member check procedures are transparently displayed to the reader.

**Detailed Description of the Phenomenon to Inform Transferability**

Detailed descriptions with verbatim quotes were used in this study to allow the reader to decide if the study can transfer to other settings, because of shared characteristics with their respective settings (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 2002). Descriptions of articulated meaning units and the final narrative of co-teaching are grounded in the data analysis procedures, which can be transparently traced back to the interview transcripts and subsequent member checks.

Themes relevant to the essence of co-teaching are illustrated and enhanced by the use of verbatim quotes from participants throughout Chapter 3 (see Chapter 3, Results).
Creswell (2007) noted that detailed descriptions enable readers to transfer the findings to their settings. Polkinghorne (1989) described this as a feeling that “I understand better what it is like for someone to experience that” (p. 46). The researcher of this study believes that if a reader can grasp the essence of the experience of co-teaching and feel empathy, they are more likely to transfer findings to their particular setting.

Summary of Chapter 2

The goals of Chapter 2 were as follows: (a) to describe the traditions of phenomenological research and the van Manen framework that guided the design for this study, (b) to illustrate the data collection and data analysis procedures, and (c) to discuss the procedures to enhance the trustworthiness and credibility of this study. Examples of data analysis steps are illustrated in this chapter and documents are outlined in the appendices (e.g., Consent Form and Recording Release, Recruitment Script, Background Information From, Interview Questions, Summary of Meaning Units, and an Integrated Narrative). Chapter 3 presents the findings from this phenomenological qualitative investigation.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Chapter 3 presents the findings of this phenomenological study as shown through participants’ reported experiences of their own co-teaching with faculty members. In addition, the essential elements that comprise quality co-teaching experiences and students’ perceived value of co-teaching relevant to their post-degree aspirations were investigated and included among the results. The purpose of this chapter is to: (a) introduce each participant and establish a foundation for the credibility of their contributions, and (b) present the broad themes and corresponding sub themes that comprise the essence of counselor education students’ co-teaching experiences.

The phenomenon of co-teaching across participants was revealed thematically in two ways. First, participants shared similar experiences and meanings about aspects of co-teaching during their doctoral training. These underlying experiences contributed to the main themes of co-teaching experiences as reported by counselor education doctoral students. Data analysis revealed the following themes: (a) co-teaching experiences are built on relationships, (b) co-teaching experiences have a structure, and (c) co-teaching experiences impact students’ development as teachers. Second, participants disclosed beliefs about the various tasks, interactions, responsibilities, roles, and learning experiences while participating in the co-teaching process with program faculty. These shared experiences account for the sub themes as reported by counselor education doctoral students.
Participants

The purpose of this study was to investigate the co-teaching experiences of nine counselor education students during their doctoral training. Participants’ ages ranged from 25 to 43 years old. All participants were students in CACREP-Accredited Counselor Education doctoral programs. Participants were purposefully sampled based on their interest and motivation to discuss co-teaching experiences including quality co-teaching moments and the impact of co-teaching on their career aspirations. The sample included six female and three male participants; six identified as Caucasian, one identified as Southeast Asian American, and two identified as African American. Participants’ year in program ranged from second to fourth year status. Three participants described their program focus as school counseling, five participants identified clinical mental health, and one participant identified both clinical mental health and school counseling. Participants were selected by department faculty members and doctoral student peers. All participants met the inclusion criteria (e.g., Students were enrolled and engaged in a CE doctoral program, completed at least one semester of coursework, had co-taught at least one content-oriented course with a program faculty member within the past year, were in the pre-candidacy phase of their programs, were recognized as having an interest in co-teaching, and were willing to participate in at least two interviews over the course of three months, including member checks). Participant demographic information is outlined in Table 1.
The following section outlines participants’ reasons for seeking the doctoral degree and plans after graduation. The number of past and current co-teaching experiences is articulated as well as a brief description teaching experiences prior to engaging in doctoral studies. Participants are presented in the order in which they were interviewed in the data collection sequence. Tables 2 and 3 summarize the aforementioned demographic information. The confidentiality of participants was ensured through the use of pseudonyms and the de-identification of faculty co-teachers and course titles.
Table 2

Participants’ Reasons for Degree and Post-Graduation Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Reasons for Seeking Degree</th>
<th>Plans After Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Further career goals; discovered she enjoys teaching while in program</td>
<td>Clinical practice and adjunct teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>To become a counselor educator</td>
<td>Counselor education faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>To train school counselors</td>
<td>School counseling position, conduct research, and adjunct teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Counselor education faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>To become a leader in multicultural counseling</td>
<td>Clinical practice and adjunct teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Teaching and supervision of counselors in training</td>
<td>Counselor education faculty and clinical practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>To obtain training and qualifications</td>
<td>Counselor education faculty and clinical practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Advance knowledge and preparation for a faculty position</td>
<td>Counselor education faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>To improve within the profession of school counseling and obtain research experience</td>
<td>Counselor education faculty and school counselor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Participants’ Co-Teaching Experiences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Past Co-Teaching</th>
<th>Current Co-Teaching</th>
<th>Prior Teaching Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Preschool (6 yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Graduate teaching assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Teaching in religious organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Undergraduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Agency training and development; undergraduate teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High School English (3 yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>High School Social Studies (5 yrs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mary**

Mary is a 41-year-old Caucasian female. She is a third year counselor education doctoral student and the first participant to be interviewed for the study. The focus of her doctoral program is clinical mental health. Mary reported no previous teaching experience prior to co-teaching during her doctoral program. Her reasons for seeking the degree included furthering her career goals by assuming a leadership position within community mental health. While co-teaching, Mary discovered she enjoys teaching while engaged in her doctoral training, which was reportedly unexpected. She plans to continue in clinical practice, seek out leadership positions within the community mental
health community, and pursue part-time adjunct teaching in a counselor education master’s program.

At the time of the interview, Mary reported that she was actively involved as a clinician and supervisor and that those activities informed her co-teaching experiences. Specifically, the clinical experiences allowed her to provide real-world examples for students during lecture and small-group activities. She further described experiences relevant to co-teaching a counseling procedures course over the course of one semester. She explained that the faculty member encouraged her to co-teach as part of her doctoral training. Mary further explained that the established relationship with the faculty member (who was also her advisor) made her feel more comfortable with her first co-teaching venture. The applied nature of the course allowed Mary to participate readily in class discussion by citing recent clinical experiences. Mary felt that her clinical contributions were valued and encouraged by the faculty member throughout the co-teaching process.

Mary emphasized the collaborative nature of co-teaching and its role in her learning process. She articulated the importance of choosing a mentor as it relates to teaching, which emerged as a theme relevant to the co-teaching relationship. For example, Mary noted that “the professor I co-taught with knew me and my experiences, and understood what I needed to learn from the experience.” Finally, Mary reported that while she may not pursue a full-time teaching position, she feels more ready and able to participate in solo teaching as an instructor of record. In fact, the co-teaching experience prompted her to inquire about teaching the same course as an instructor of record.
**Megan**

Megan was the second counselor education doctoral student to be interviewed. She is a 25-year-old Caucasian female in her second year of the program. Megan had a self-reported interest in teaching. She reported that the focus of her doctoral program was both clinical mental health and school counseling expressing a desire to be able to teach across both program areas when she graduates. Megan was clear from the start of the interview that she was seeking the doctoral degree to assist her with the goal of becoming a counselor educator. She plans to pursue a full time counselor educator position at a university upon graduation. Megan expressed that she would like to be able to teach both clinical mental health and school counseling students, which impacted the choice of courses she elected to co-teach during her doctoral training. Prior to her co-teaching experiences during her doctoral training, Megan reported working in a teaching role in a preschool setting.

Megan reported experiences from co-teaching two content courses relevant to counseling children and adolescents. At the time of the interview, Megan was actively involved in counseling children and adolescents at a local agency, experiences that informed her co-teaching endeavors. For Megan, the laid-back and approachable nature of the faculty members was reportedly helpful for relationship-building and facilitating her learning. In addition, Megan valued opportunities to present her clinical experiences and discuss information relevant to her interest areas (counseling children and adolescents, and school counseling) as she participated in the co-teaching experiences.
Megan emphasized the importance of gaining experiences in her doctoral program to prepare her for her future teaching endeavors; for example: “Well, I just wanted teaching experience. I felt like I hadn’t had any yet. I guess I thought that it would be easier to start with the class I’m interested in.” Megan articulated that she would like to co-teach one or two more times before she is given a course of her own as the instructor of record. She reports that additional co-teaching experiences with feedback from experienced faculty will help to steer her in that direction.

Lucy

Lucy is a 32-year-old Southeast Asian American female. She is a fourth year doctoral student in counselor education. She was the third participant to be interviewed. Lucy reported that the focus of her doctoral program was in school counseling. Lucy reported that she is seeking the doctoral degree to increase her capacity to train school counselors to work in urban school settings. At the time of the interview, Lucy reported intent to assume a position in a school setting with a focus on multicultural and social justice issues. She plans to remain involved in research and teach in an adjunct role. Prior to her co-teaching experiences during her doctoral training, Lucy reported one experience as a teaching assistant during her master’s program.

At the time of the interview, Lucy reported she had co-taught four courses. Lucy reported different levels of satisfaction with her co-teaching experiences suggesting that she works better when the co-teaching relationship is collaborative, and offers challenges and supports for risk-taking in the classroom. Supportive relationships that are inviting are reported as an “indicator of caring for me.”
Lucy stressed the importance that being recognized as a cultural being “adds to the strength of the relationship.” During the interview, she articulated and emphasized the importance of faculty members’ awareness of her cultural identity:

It helps to be invited to add a perspective acknowledging that I bring with me my experience as a Southeast Asian American woman, and it adds even more when the students and faculty member show interest in learning more about my background.

Overall, Lucy reported that her teaching experiences were important for her development while engaged in the doctoral program. As Lucy reflected on her co-teaching experiences, she recounted the importance of understanding that teaching is a “process and challenges will occur. However, the struggle is going to add to the experience and learning of how to teach.”

Susan

Susan is a 39-year old Caucasian female in the second year of her doctoral program. She was the fourth counselor education doctoral student to be interviewed. Susan identified that clinical mental health was the focus of her doctoral program. Susan reported that she was seeking the doctoral degree to assist her with the goal of pursuing a full time faculty position. Specifically, Susan expressed that she would like to teach full time in a counselor education program. During the interview, Susan clearly stated: “I came in knowing that I wanted to be a professor.” Susan reported that her co-teaching experiences, which occurred in an assessment in counseling course over two consecutive semesters, reinforced her desire to assume a full time teaching role in counselor
education. Prior to entering the doctoral program, Susan worked as a clinician in a community mental health agency. She developed an interest in providing trainings and workshops to fellow clinicians, a precursor to her interest in teaching. Prior to her co-teaching experiences, Susan reported that she taught undergraduate courses in a Women’s Studies program.

Susan described her co-teaching experiences as positive indicating that they will inform her future teaching practice as a lead instructor. She highlighted that learning techniques for evaluating students and feeling more comfortable relating to students while teaching were key lessons that she will build on throughout her teaching journey. Finally, Susan remarked that her co-teaching experience was so impactful that she plans to continue the practice of co-teaching in her future role as a faculty member.

**Anton**

Anton was the fifth participant interviewed for the study. Anton is a 43-year-old African American male in his third year as a counselor education doctoral student. The focus of Anton’s doctoral program is clinical mental health. During the interview, Anton mentioned that he has been working as a school-based mental health worker for the past couple of years. He further elaborated that he plans to pursue adjunct teaching and maintain a clinical practice. He pointed out that the doctoral degree will help him achieve that professional goal of becoming a leader in the field of multicultural counseling. Anton co-taught two content courses during his doctoral training including counseling techniques and diversity in counseling. Prior to his co-teaching experiences, Anton reported that his previous “teaching” experiences occurred in a non-secular setting.
Anton was an articulate and willing participant and expressed: “I felt like I had a very positive experience co-teaching, which I will not take for granted. I’ve heard of other students’ experiences that were not so good, so I appreciate my experience all the more.” For Anton, the collaborative nature of the co-teaching relationship and feeling valued for his clinical and real-world experiences, and personable moments were stand-out themes for his co-teaching experience. For example, Anton noted: “I think in all of my co-teaching experiences I was valued and allowed to let my skills shine in the classroom.”

Anton’s unique experiences emphasized the importance of personal relationships and personable moments in co-teaching aptly described in the following statement:

And, I guess what it all boils down to Eric, is that those things that stand out the most to me are the more personable experiences that meant a lot. I mean, outside of all the curriculum and the grades and everything. And, I think so often we can forget that and that’s the one thing we shouldn’t forget.

Overall, Anton reported a positive experience with co-teaching experiences and the interview process stating: “I feel good about the interview and I think it was a fair and representative of my experience.” Anton’s parting advice included suggesting that an end-of-the-semester debriefing between doctoral students and faculty members be adopted as a regular co-teaching practice. He plans to move forward and seek out opportunities to teach as an instructor of record in a counselor training program.
Kim

Kim is a 37-year-old Caucasian female in her second year as a counselor education doctoral student. Kim was the sixth participant to be interviewed for the study. She expressed genuine gratitude and willingness to discuss her co-teaching experiences. Kim reported that her focus of study in the doctoral program is clinical mental health. Kim explained that she is seeking the doctoral degree in order to train counselors. She reported that she will pursue a counselor education faculty position but wants to stay active in clinical practice. During the interview, Kim reported co-teaching one introduction to counseling course during her doctoral training. Prior to entering the doctoral program, Kim had taught human development at the undergraduate level.

Kim recalled fond memories of her co-teaching experience. Kim illustrated her feelings during the interview: “I have very fond memories of my experience and was thinking that I should allow my co-teacher to see my responses! Also, I was recalling my experience co-teaching and all of the positive emotions that accompanied that experience.”

Kim emphasized the importance of co-teaching as a means to develop teaching skills through a process that embodies collaboration and autonomy. The role of honest constructive feedback was reportedly important to Kim. She noted that while praise and “cheerleading” is helpful, it is the critical feedback from the faculty member that was most helpful for the development and refinement of her teaching skills. Kim reported that she would like to continue to gain teaching experiences as part of her internship.
Kim also noted that teaching demonstrations are frequently part of faculty interview process, and that co-teaching can be helpful toward that end.

**Darren**

Darren was the seventh participant to be interviewed for the study. He is a 39-year-old Caucasian male who is in his second year as a counselor education doctoral student. Darren reported that the focus of his program is clinical mental health. Darren was candid and used humor throughout the interview eagerly discussing his co-teaching experiences and their impact on his development. Darren discussed his desire to obtain the training and qualifications to assume a counselor educator faculty position. At the time of the interview, Darren was a practicing counselor with plans to continue clinical work after graduation. Darren reported one co-teaching experience (Assessment in Counseling) during his doctoral training emphasizing that the course content and the faculty member’s qualities prompted him to pursue the experience:

> I had taken it as a Master’s student [and] loved the material. I love doing those assessment things! I do assessments for the clients under clinical supervision and I really wanted to teach that class. The teaching experience came about because I went after it and because of the content itself. I got a lot out of it when I took the class myself.

Darren indicated that the co-teaching experience counted towards his doctoral internship hours. In addition to his love for the course content, Darren discussed his appreciation for the opportunity to work with a faculty mentor as a quality aspect of the co-teaching experience: “For me, it was also very much an opportunity to work with [my
faculty mentor] in a teaching capacity; as my advisor, as my mentor, I really wanted to work with him.”

Prior to co-teaching, Darren reported that he had taught undergraduates and had been providing trainings and workshops to the local mental health community for a number of years. These previous experiences contributed to Darren’s comfort level as he engaged in co-teaching responsibilities. Darren described his plans to use the co-teaching experience as a springboard to specializing in assessment, thus creating a niche within counselor education instruction. Finally, Darren suggested that his co-teaching experience will help him with future teaching endeavors. Put simply: “I think it really helps me down the road if I teach this course again at another university.”

Janet

Janet is a 27-year-old African American female and the eighth participant to be interviewed for the study. She is in the second year of her doctoral studies with a focus on school counseling. Janet reported that she is working as a school-based mental health worker while completing her doctoral program. She discussed the doctoral degree as (a) a training experience to advance her knowledge and a counselor, researcher, and educator; and (b) a means to assist her with obtaining a counselor educator faculty position. Additionally, Janet reported practicing as a school-based mental health worker, which allowed her to provide real-world examples to enhance the course content.

Janet was a high school English teacher for three years prior to engaging in her doctoral studies. Janet discussed two co-teaching experiences that occurred during her doctoral training including diversity and school counseling foundations. At the time of
the interview, she was co-teaching a content course, which she reported as a positive experience. For Janet, the ability to be collaborative (a co-leader vs. a teaching assistant), creative, and respectful of instructor differences made for a quality co-teaching experience.

According to some participants (e.g., Janet, Anton, & Mary), co-teaching experiences founded on respect for doctoral students’ experience base were reported as important for the relationship between instructors. Janet plans to continue gaining teaching experiences as she moves forward in her program. Overall, Janet viewed her co-teaching experiences as challenging and helpful for her future teaching endeavors.

**Brian**

Brian is a 34-year-old Caucasian male and the ninth participant to be interviewed for the study. Brian is a practicing school counselor in the fourth year of his counselor education doctoral program. The focus of Brian’s program is school counseling. He elaborated on his interests in developing as researcher emphasizing the interrelationship between research (e.g., student outcomes and evaluation of teaching practice) and developing teaching skills. Brian stated that his reasons for obtaining the doctoral degree centered on professional development as a school counselor and to gain research experience. He reported engaging in co-teaching at the suggestion of his advisor, who suggested that teaching experience may help with future teaching prospects. Brian co-taught one school counseling course during his doctoral training. Brian reported that the faculty member had given him a great deal of freedom in his co-teaching role. This sense
of freedom was reportedly founded on a relationship established during his master’s studies.

Brian spent five years as a high school social studies teacher prior to completing a master’s degree in school counseling. Brian highlighted differences between secondary and higher education settings including the frequency and time of classroom contact between teachers and students. Brian placed importance on the use of evidence-informed instructional strategies to guide his efforts in the classroom as his unique contribution to the co-teaching process. Finally, Brian suggested that counselor education doctoral students can change their minds about career goals (e.g., from desiring a faculty position to remaining a practitioner). However, he noted that his co-teaching experience had sparked his interest in teaching practices in the higher education setting.

Summary of Participants

Participants for this study had an investment and interest in the area of co-teaching. Each participant promptly responded to the researcher’s efforts to schedule interviews, thoughtfully participated in the interview process, candidly responded to member check inquiries, and maintained contact with the researcher throughout the process. It was evident in the data analysis that each participant contributed his or her unique voice. Further data analysis revealed similarities across the participants’ experiences of co-teaching captured in the themes of relationship, structure, and development. The rest of this chapter illustrates and discusses the themes relevant to the meaning of participants’ co-teaching experiences.
Doctoral Students’ Experiences of Co-Teaching

The phenomenological paradigm used for this study is grounded in the work of Max van Manen (1990, 2007). Van Manen (1990) is known for his use of phenomenological inquiry into the meanings of teaching, parenting, and “related pedagogic vocations” (p. 1). The phenomenon of co-teaching was investigated in this study to reveal the elements of competence embedded in conscious everyday acts of co-teaching among counselor education doctoral students during their program training. The goal of this study was to capture the essence and meanings behind the practice of co-teaching as a form of pedagogy, acknowledging all aspects of the phenomena.

The research question driving this study was: How do counselor education students experience co-teaching with faculty during their doctoral training? The sub questions of interest included: What are the essential elements that comprise a quality co-teaching experience? and How do counselor education students perceive the value of co-teaching relevant to their post-degree aspirations? The data analysis sequence for this study included (a) the transcription of interviews, (b) the identification and re-organization of verbatim excerpts of dialogue (i.e., meaning units), (c) the sequential telling of individuals’ respective co-teaching experiences (i.e., articulated/integrated meaning units), (d) comparing themes from articulated/integrated meaning units across participants (i.e., organizing meaning units into contextual themes), and (e) the summarization of shared themes into an essence of co-teaching narrative. Several themes emerged from the analysis sequence.
The phenomenon of co-teaching across participants was revealed thematically in two ways. First, participants shared similar beliefs about aspects of co-teaching during their doctoral training. These underlying beliefs contributed to the main themes of co-teaching experiences as reported by counselor education doctoral students. Data analysis revealed the following themes: (a) co-teaching experiences are built on relationships, (b) co-teaching experiences have a structure, and (c) co-teaching experiences impact students’ development as teachers. Second, participants disclosed shared experiences about the various interactions, responsibilities, roles, and learning experiences while participating in the co-teaching process with program faculty. These shared experiences account for the sub themes as reported by counselor education doctoral students. In the following section, data are organized and presented according to (a) the main themes or shared beliefs about co-teaching across participants, and (b) the supporting data sub themes for each of the main themes.

**Theme 1: Co-Teaching Experiences are Built on Relationships**

Evidence for the centrality and importance of relationships in co-teaching was present in the findings of this study. The theme of co-teaching being built on relationships represented the underlying experiences of all participants. Participants experienced feeling trusted and engaging in candid communication with faculty members as quality representations of a strong co-teaching relationship. For example, Mary, Megan, Susan, Kim, and Lucy experienced a strong sense of the relationship when faculty members trusted them to lead a class, solo teach when they were unavailable, provided candid feedback to improve their teaching practice, and communicated openly
about teaching anxieties. The findings around this theme also revealed that the co-teaching relationship helped to set the tone for how participants were perceived in the co-teaching roles. For example, faculty members who introduced doctoral students as co-teachers and defined their role were perceived by participants as more helpful and inviting. This served to foster a sense of collegiality in the co-teaching relationship, which in turn helped to increase participants’ comfort and confidence in the classroom.

As the researcher reviewed the data in more detail, three sub themes emerged relevant to the centrality of relationships in co-teaching: (a) students’ awareness of faculty members’ reputations as teachers, observations of faculty members’ teaching, and their advisor/advisee relationships influence the co-teaching relationship; (b) faculty members who are inviting and value students’ life experiences influence the co-teaching relationship; and (c) open communication and constructive feedback between faculty members and doctoral students is perceived as central to the co-teaching relationship. Table 4 summarizes the themes, sub themes, and shared experiences across participants.

**Reputation, observation, and advisor/advisee relationships.** Participants reported that relationships with prospective faculty co-teachers often began before stepping foot in the classroom. Participants believed that a doctoral student’s status influences the development of co-teaching relationships. A doctoral student’s status refers to having a graduate or teaching assistantship (creates more access to faculty), matriculating from master’s to doctoral work within the same institution (opportunities to observe and develop familiarity with faculty vs. coming to the doctoral program from another institution), and contact with faculty advisors (who most frequently
Table 4

Summary of Relationship Co-Teaching Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Sub Theme</th>
<th>Shared Co-Teaching Experiences Across Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching Experiences are built on Relationships</td>
<td>Faculty members’ reputation, students’ observation of faculty members’ teaching, and advisor/advisee relationships influence the co-teaching relationship.</td>
<td>Doctoral students had faculty member for class during master’s program and observed teaching style. Faculty member is an advisor/mentor and suggested co-teaching to doctoral student. Doctoral students are aware of faculty member’s reputation as a quality teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty members’ valuing and inviting students’ life experiences into the classroom influences the co-teaching relationship.</td>
<td>Faculty taught a course of interest to doctoral student. Doctoral student values life experiences as a strength and contribution to the co-teaching process. Faculty member invited student to teach based on observations of student performance in class. Faculty member invited doctoral student to discuss clinical/school experiences in class. Doctoral student viewed life experiences as complementary to faculty contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open communication and constructive feedback between the faculty member and the doctoral student influences the co-teaching relationship.</td>
<td>Doctoral students need clear and constructive feedback to help them develop their teaching skills. Doctoral students appreciate a safe space to acknowledge mistakes and process how to grow as a teacher. Faculty members acknowledge doctoral students’ role as a co-teacher with students in the class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

recommended co-teaching as part of the doctoral training experience). For example, doctoral students from outside programs may not experience the same relational advantages with program faculty as matriculating master’s students, who may be able to observe faculty members teach. Participants reported that having familiarity with faculty members’ demeanors and teaching styles was a helpful foundation for building co-teaching relationships. Janet offered her experiences of (co-teaching) relationship
building relevant to students who come to doctoral programs from different master’s degree granting universities (i.e., non-matriculating master’s students):

I went here for my Master’s [degree] so, I had a good idea of the faculty but if you’re coming from another program where you have no idea what the faculty is like in terms of how they’re going to be receptive to you. . . . I would say first, build those relationships. So kind of going to office hours more often, sitting down and meeting with them, talking to my advisor. I spent a whole lot of time talking to him my first semester just because it was a little overwhelming. So to sit down and teach it was just kind of like, I needed that.

Overall, the findings revealed evidence that participants’ awareness of faculty members’ reputations as teachers influenced their experience of the co-teaching relationship. Observations of faculty members’ teaching, and the advisor/advisee relationship as a forum for initiating the co-teaching relationship were experiences noted by participants as influencing the relationship as well. These points are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

**Faculty members’ reputations.** For some participants, it was the reputation of the faculty member that impacted their co-teaching relationship prior to beginning the experience. For Susan, a graduate assistant assigned to co-teach, the faculty member’s positive reputation helped to increase her comfort level and desire to co-teach:

So, I was really excited about that because he used to teach adjunct where I got my master’s. So I heard good things about him. I was pleased because everybody said: oh, you are going to love him, he’s like a teddy bear, you know,
it’s going to be a really good experience! I wanted to work with a faculty member who I had heard the students really respected.

Faculty members’ reputation as competent and knowledgeable teachers influenced participants’ approaches to the co-teaching relationship. In other words, students were concerned about doing a good job. For Darren, this meant “you don’t want to help teach a class that someone has done for twelve years and totally screw it up!” Kim added that her awareness of the faculty member’s reputation increased her desire to work hard in her co-teaching role. In addition to faculty members’ reputations, participants noted that their observations of faculty members’ demeanors and teaching styles influenced the co-teaching relationship.

_**Observations of faculty members’ teaching.**_ Participants related that experiencing faculty members while in their student roles led to a familiarity with their personalities and teaching styles and thus influenced their comfort level within the co-teaching relationship. Also, participants from outside programs (i.e., non-matriculating doctoral students) relayed that once they became more familiar with faculty members—through advising relationships, graduate assistantships, and observing them while in a student role—their trust level and confidence in the co-teaching relationship increased. Brian illustrated the latter point:

> You have to have a good trust that the person that you’re working with has confidence in you and you have confidence in them... and probably the number one [issue] that’s most important any time you co-teach is the ability to have a strong relationship and trust the person you’re co-teaching with.
Brian further elaborated on the implications of having previous experience with a faculty member as a master’s student on the co-teaching relationship:

I should add that I am not sure that I would have been given the independence and freedom with other faculty, as most of my collaboration has been with the faculty of whom I co-taught with. Having had several classes with him as the instructor of record in my Master’s program, and developing and demonstrating a work ethic and drive may have contributed to the independence I was given as a co-teacher.

Brian was able to connect his observations of the faculty member’s teaching to his comfort level and level of trust that he felt was established prior to beginning the co-teaching experience. Furthermore, Brian explained that the faculty member was familiar with his performance (i.e., observed) in the classroom and this led to Brian’s sense of independence and freedom within the co-teaching process.

Mary co-taught with a faculty member she had observed as a master’s student. Additionally, Mary had seen the faculty member work with other doctoral student co-teachers. Mary discussed her observations of the faculty member and the implications for the co-teaching relationship: “I guess what stands out for me with the experiences is having had the opportunity to see her co-teach with others and then feeling like my experience was different, and maybe richer.” Mary indicated that the co-teaching experiences strengthened the existing relationship with the faculty member. Mary felt like there was a goodness of fit between herself and the faculty co-teacher despite observing what she would describe as “concerning” examples of co-teaching:
I took the class as a master’s student. She had a doctoral student that was co-teaching with her. She also had a doctoral student when I took one of her classes that came in a few times when I observed them as a master’s student. And, I was a little concerned that I might not get a great experience because the doctoral students that did that seemed very quiet. But, I’m a talker, and I always offer information in class. So, I thought it’d be a good fit and I was right.

For Megan, having previous experience with a faculty member’s style and demeanor increased her comfort level to initiate the co-teaching relationship: “He tends to be a little bit more relaxed and personable. So, I was thinking that it would be a more stress-free one to start off with.” Megan was able to obtain a sense of what her own co-teaching experience may be while working with the faculty member:

I had him in classes before during my master’s program. And I mean even there he’s very much of a story teller in classes. He likes giving anecdotes and things like that. And, I like that because I think that brings content to life. And so, I liked that piece. He’s always been very open to doing things in classes; open to taking questions and things like that. So, I think just kind of what I saw from him in the classroom made me feel comfortable approaching him and asking him to co-teach.

Overall, participants agreed that previous observations, experience, and knowledge of a faculty member’s reputation increased their level of trust and confidence to initiate the co-teaching relationship. For some participants, the relationship pre-dates
the co-teaching experience having its origins in advisor/advisee interactions between doctoral students and faculty members.

**Advisor/advisee relationships.** For most participants, it was their faculty advisors who suggested that they engage in co-teaching. For some participants, co-teaching occurred with faculty advisors, who were viewed as trusted mentors. For example, Darren succinctly noted that “besides the fact that he’s my advisor, it was fun for me to work with him.” When referring to her faculty advisor and co-teaching, Mary relayed that “she has always been kind of a mentor to me. So, I did my one [co-teaching] class experience with her.”

Participants reported that faculty members engaged them in conversations about co-teaching as an important aspect of their doctoral training. Mary continued her account of this advisor/advisee relationship stating “we talked about that it might be a good idea to co-teach a whole semester and [eventually] a whole class at some point during my doctoral experience.”

Janet stressed the importance of the advisor/advisee relationship and its impact on the co-teaching process. For her, building relationships with faculty is her preferred strategy, particularly with building co-teaching relationships. Janet utilized both her master’s and doctoral-level advisors to obtain ideas and support:

So really kind of building that relationship is my go to. My Master level advisor was of course still one, and my current doctoral level advisor, which is different from my Master’s. So, still having my Master’s level advisor to still consult with because I had already built that relationship there. But then, sitting down and
meeting and saying: hey, I found this cool article. This is something I could write up because it could be a cool activity to do in the class, let me know your feedback if there’s something you think would be good to do, you know, all they could say was no, it’s not something I’m really interested in or it doesn’t really go align with something we’re trying to learn.

Most participants relayed that it was their advisors that suggested engaging in co-teaching as part of their doctoral training. Mary and Darren indicated that it was the relationship with their advisors that influenced their decisions to co-teach. For them, the co-teaching relationship started with advising, which led to a decision to co-teach with their advisors. Mary, Megan, Brian, and Darren described a higher level of comfort with the co-teaching relationship with faculty members who also served in an advisor role. In addition to reputation, observation, and the advisor/advisee relationship, participants described other experiences as central to the co-teaching relationship.

**Valuing and inviting life experiences to the classroom.** All participants acknowledged that they bring life experiences to the co-teaching experience. For some participants, the fit between life experience and the course content was a draw to engage in co-teaching (e.g., doctoral students with counseling children clinical experiences teaching a counseling children class, students interested in testing teaching an assessment n consoling course, etc.). Participants reported that faculty members who invited them to engage in co-teaching through the lens of their recent counseling experiences were helpful and thus increased their confidence in the classroom.
Further review of the data revealed that faculty members who acknowledged participants’ life experiences and intentionally invited them to class discussions were perceived as quality co-teaching moments. Mary illustrated this point as follows:

I think she was very inviting to the experience. I mean throughout all of the classes she would invite my input. I mean, I did feel like I was a participant. And, I felt like when she turned a lesson over to me she really turned a lesson over to me.

Participants suggested that faculty members who are aware of their life experiences (e.g., clinical skills) may view the co-teaching relationship as strengthened and mutually beneficial. Mary described this phenomenon in more detail:

She knew my clinical background that I already had and felt, not just would it be a good experience for me to teach, but it would be a good experience for her to have me co-teach with her. I think the best, probably the best moments in it were ones where I was using my clinical knowledge to enhance the learning in the classroom. I was in the field practicing still and had some very relevant information for to the class. And, she just thought it would be a good complimentary relationship.

For Anton, complementary life experiences (i.e., between faculty members and doctoral students) within the co-teaching relationship were reported as quality aspects of his co-teaching process. He suggested that valuing doctoral student co-teachers meant allowing them to use their “gifts, talents, and abilities in class.” Further exploration of this idea with the researcher led Anton to the following conclusion:
We played off of one another but he had limited experience in the field and, of course me being new in academia. But, have had years in the field. I mean is not a lot of experience in the field, I mean it’s just that I’ve been there. I don’t know if his field work has been during internship, but I was working at an agency before I got to the doctoral program. So, we talk about counseling procedures and he would talk about the procedure or the theory, or the background for why we do something. They’d talk about it in class and I would be able to share some where the “rubber meets the road,” practical, real-world examples of using that. I think that [co-teachers] should rely on each other.

Participants noted times that faculty members would defer to their life experiences inviting them to respond to prompts like “how have you found this to work in practice?” Overall, the process of incorporating life experiences in the classroom is viewed as complimentary. As Anton put it: “I think [faculty members] can do that kind of thing in a complementary kind of way. Not looking at one or the other as superior, but complementary.”

Lucy was clear on the role of the co-teaching relationship: “I think the relationship with the faculty member plays an important role with how co-teaching goes in the classroom.” Of significance was the acknowledgment of her life experiences by faculty members including her previous teaching and counseling experiences. Lucy elaborated on how valuing and inviting life experiences to the co-teaching process increased her comfort level:
When I feel more comfortable with a faculty member, I’m more willing to take risks in the classroom, to add more, to challenge, and to interject. If I didn’t have it as much, I would just be a lot quieter.

Most participants (e.g., Mary, Megan, Lucy, Susan, Anton, and Kim) agreed that co-teaching moments where they could contribute to classroom learning based on their life experiences increased their comfort and enhanced the overall experience. In addition to life experiences, participants emphasized the centrality of open communication and constructive feedback to the co-teaching relationship.

**Open communication and constructive feedback.** Participants agreed that their experiences of the co-teaching relationship were characterized by open communication and contained moments of constructive feedback. Specifically, participants articulated the importance of experiencing clear and constructive feedback to help them to improve as part of the co-teaching process. Furthermore, participants appreciated a safe space to acknowledge mistakes and process how to grow as a teacher. Participants felt more at ease with co-teaching when faculty members openly acknowledged their role as a co-teacher with students in the class.

Lucy is more willing to take risks when the co-teaching relationship is collaborative and faculty members are willing to keep an open dialogue about the struggles of teaching. Open communication also included the discussion of learning goals and the acknowledgement of relationships in and outside the classroom. For example:
I think at the beginning it was a very open conversation. I met with the instructor and he asked me like: what do you want to learn from this? So, he treated me like a colleague. And, we would just have those conversations and it really seemed collaborative. I think I was a lot more confident. I think it was really because our initial meeting was very collaborative. It was like—I want to learn from you.

Lucy advised that rapport with faculty members outside the classroom may not always transfer into the classroom. So, when faculty members acknowledged and asked, “What do you want to teach?”, this helped her with relationship building. Additionally, faculty members providing feedback to Lucy helped to strengthen the relationship despite her initial struggles. For example: “If I wanted feedback, he would give it and he was always so positive. He’s always so excited. So, I liked his energy. I always felt like I could do no wrong in that class.”

Susan was a confident person, but needed feedback and support from her faculty co-teacher to increase her comfort level and integrate her own voice into the teaching process over time. She was aware of the challenges of teaching and the critical role of a supportive faculty member:

You know this was hard! But, he was there and I knew he was there and I kept looking at him out of the corner of my eye like: am I doing this right? Did I say that right? And, I think that’s hard for me because I’m a very confident person in almost everything I do. So, when I didn’t feel confident sitting in a classroom of 24 students. He was very attentive to my need to understand.
The open communication between Susan and the faculty member was more important for her co-teaching experience than critical feedback. Initially, Susan expressed concerns about mistakes and receiving negative feedback. At the same time, she was continuously involved in a process of reflection guided by a drive to find her voice and self in the classroom:

I became more comfortable. And, at first you almost felt like you were going to be critiqued all the way through, like you almost afraid to say anything because you don’t know how much of your actual personality can come out. How much of your voice can come out. But, I was nervous. How much of myself can I be? Do you know?

Kim identified quality co-teaching moments as those that included constructive feedback from faculty members. She maintained that the best way to grow as a teacher is to receive direct feedback about what went well and what needs improvement with one’s teaching. In short, “it’s helpful to get feedback from another educator about how to educate.” Participants agreed that co-teaching provides a forum where faculty members can directly observe students’ teaching and provide constructive feedback. For Kim, this meant that faculty members approached feedback in ways that fostered a balance of autonomy and collaboration within the co-teaching relationship. This blend allowed Kim to overcome her initial discomfort in the classroom:

It seemed like there was a mix of autonomy and then collaboration. And so, although [initially] uncomfortable, I think that allowing me the autonomy on the front end and really stepping in with that collaboration on the back end was very
helpful. I think it would have been much less helpful much less helpful for him to say: I just don’t know if this is going to work out because I probably would’ve said: no, no, no it’s gonna be great! So, I think that blend was helpful.

Overall, participants agreed that faculty members’ approach to delivering feedback matters. Kim summarized this point: “the absence of constructive feedback is not helpful. It’s not helpful—I know it’s not helpful—when I only receive positive feedback and no critical feedback.”

All participants in this study deemed the relationship central to the co-teaching experience. The relational foundations of the co-teaching experience revealed themselves through students’ experiences of faculty members’ reputations, students’ observations of faculty members’ teaching, and the importance of the advisor/advisee relationship as a gateway to co-teaching. Above all, participants shared the experience of increased comfort within the co-teaching relationship as a result of experiencing the aforementioned relational themes. Next, the structural or organizational aspects of doctoral students’ co-teaching experiences are presented.

**Theme 2: Co-Teaching Experiences Have a Structure**

All participants identified common elements constitutive of a co-teaching structure. In other words, there is an organization and progression of the co-teaching experience that comprises the “what” and “how” of the process. All participants explained their involvement around teaching tasks and responsibilities with faculty members during the co-teaching process. Participants also spoke about their experiences
around the supervision of teaching including opportunities for guided reflection (e.g., from week to week, and at the end of the semester).

Evidence for the structural aspects of doctoral students’ shared experiences of co-teaching is present in the findings. The basis for understanding the structural aspects of co-teaching are rooted in participants’ expressions of uncertainty early in the co-teaching process. It became more evident for participants that there was a “method to the madness” of co-teaching. For example, Mary, Susan, Kim, and others described a planning process that involved selecting topics for teaching, preparing materials (e.g., PowerPoints), and planning the delivery of course content. Preparing for co-teaching experiences began with planning and segued into moments of teaching in the classroom. Furthermore, the findings revealed that participants’ first teaching experiences consisted of observing faculty members’ teaching while contributing to class discussions by adding contextualizing anecdotes from their counseling experiences. Discussions of co-teaching experiences transpired in conversations between participants and faculty members with different degrees of focus. For example, Anton, Brian, Darren, and Janet’s conversational experiences focused on student issues and navigating the responsibilities associated with delivering content for a particular class session. Whereas, others noted the addition of guided reflection about one’s teaching practice including the invitation to provide feedback to the faculty member about his or her teaching moments (e.g., Mary, Megan, Kim, Lucy, and Susan).

A further examination of the data revealed three sub themes relevant to a co-teaching structure: (a) co-teaching involves identifiable responsibilities that occur in
and out of the classroom, (b) a doctoral student’s teaching responsibilities increase and evolve over time, and (c) co-teaching structure includes regular supervision with opportunities for guided reflection with a faculty member. Table 5 summarizes the themes, sub themes, and shared experiences across participants.

Table 5

*Summary of Structural Co-Teaching Themes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Sub Theme</th>
<th>Shared Co-Teaching Experiences Across Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching Experiences have a Structure</td>
<td>Co-teaching involves identifiable responsibilities that occur in and out of the classroom.</td>
<td>Syllabus development, adherence, and negotiation Planning with faculty member about roles and approaches in the classroom Preparing lectures and activities and facilitating discussion Assignments, classroom management, and grading Correspondence between faculty member and student Discussing and addressing student issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A doctoral student’s teaching responsibilities increase and evolve over time.</td>
<td>Observing faculty member as lead teacher Observing faculty member approach to teaching, grading, assignment selection, classroom management, and so forth Gradual increase of responsibilities including lecture time, presenting new or challenging topics, grading, discussion, and so forth Solo teaching moments for doctoral student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-teaching structure includes regular supervision with opportunities for guided reflection with a faculty member</td>
<td>Defining the co-teaching experience and roles Meeting in regular intervals and processing students’ feelings Providing candid constructive feedback about performance and providing a rational behind one’s teaching approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Co-teaching responsibilities in and out of the classroom. All participants discussed their involvement with a variety of co-teaching responsibilities. Participants reported that initial conversations with faculty members centered on the syllabus including syllabus review and development. All participants readily identified the selection of lecture topics and development of course materials as key co-teaching responsibilities. Participants were involved in course planning with their faculty members, often discussing teaching roles and approaches in the classroom. Additional responsibilities included discussing assignments, classroom management, and grading. Correspondence between participants and faculty members was reportedly important as was discussing and addressing student issues.

Mary recounted the times when her faculty co-teacher involved her in planning for her first co-teaching endeavors. Selecting topics for lectures began with a collaborative review of the syllabus: “Well, initially we went through the syllabus and decided on a couple of lessons that I would be in charge of.” Mary expressed feeling “really included in planning some of the lessons,” which included developing PowerPoints based on the faculty member’s previous lecture materials.

Mary said that the faculty member wanted certain things included in the lectures but there was some room for her contributions: “So there was certain material of hers that I had to make sure I got into the lessons. But, I could adjust the lesson, the PowerPoints, and bring in extra stuff that I might want to present.” Any changes to what was previously planned were discussed in advance of the class so Mary could adjust accordingly: “Every once in a while there’d be an e-mail or something. You know, like
maybe she needed me to do something extra that we hadn’t planned out. You know, ahead of time.” Mary explained that this correspondence was helpful and increased her comfort level in advance of having to deliver a lecture.

Megan and other participants noted that faculty members were concerned about students’ choices of teaching topics and asked prompt questions as part of the planning process. Megan illustrated this as follows: “Before the semester started we went over the syllabus and he asked: Which of these [topics] interests you? and Which ones do you want to teach?” Susan discussed a similar experience with her faculty member: “So, he and I sat down and we went through the syllabus that he designed and he said: Which of these topic areas do you love? What do you want to do?” At times, the faculty member would discuss his or her process of preparing for class. Some participants found this to be helpful. Susan elaborated: “We would go through what he was going to cover, his goals and objectives in talking about these things, which I thought was very, very helpful having no pedagogical experience or any classes.”

Participants would spend time alone preparing class materials for their teaching experiences after planning meetings with faculty members. Susan elaborated on this further:

So, we picked dates throughout the semester where I would cover the material.

And what I did was take the textbooks that we used for the class and touch up on all my knowledge of these specific areas. And then, I created PowerPoints.

Brian was given ample freedom when preparing materials after planning with his faculty co-teacher:
I was given a lot of freedom on how to construct the content and to present the lessons. We basically looked at the syllabi and he said: You know, these are the CACREP standards [and content areas] that we have to cover. Which ones do you have an interest in teaching?

Brian reflected on his planning sessions and correspondence with the faculty member:

So, we broke up the topics with standards. And, this was what I was going to cover. I emailed him always before every class. [And said] Hey, this is what I’m going to present. This is my speculation on the amount of time I’ll need to present it. So, basically the equivalent of a lesson plan, you know of how things were gonna go down.

All participants engaged in planning with faculty members and time alone preparing materials to deliver instruction. Faculty members were noted as providing participants a choice of topics to cover. Participants noted that planning lectures, discussion, and other responsibilities became easier over time. These collective experiences support the existence of a co-teaching structure. In other words, participants came to “know what to expect” from the co-teaching process including their responsibilities (e.g., planning, materials development, planning content delivery, etc.) and the guiding role of the faculty member (e.g., feedback through a co-teaching supervision conversation). Additionally, participants conveyed that there was an increase in teaching responsibilities over the course of the semester.

**Teaching responsibilities increase and evolve over time.** Some participants began their co-teaching experiences by observing faculty members’ teaching.
Participants would often contribute to class discussions at the request of faculty members while in their observer roles. Participants noted a gradual increase in their teaching responsibilities over the course of the semester including increased lecture time, opportunities to present new or more challenging topics, grading, leading class discussions, and so forth. Solo teaching moments for doctoral students occurred at different times throughout the semester; usually later in the semester for less experienced students.

Participants explained that being in an observer role was intentional for some faculty members including being able to observe students’ reactions to the instructor, the course material and to one another. Anton elaborated on this point to the researcher:

When I wasn’t leading, I was more of an observer. He told me: I want you to observe facial responses. I want you to look for the responses the students have towards comments I make and comments other students make. Don’t let anything slide. If you see a grimace or a grin or whatever based on what someone says, you know, explore that because you want to.

Finally, Anton and others noted that as the semester progressed for participants, more time was spent facilitating collaborative discussions or providing lectures while in lead teaching roles.

Megan discussed the progression of her co-teaching responsibilities: “[Initially], I only went in for a couple of classes and taught on areas that she [the faculty member] asked me to.” As she explained her other co-teaching experience, Megan noted that she was in the classroom during the “whole semester” contributing to discussions and
eventually assuming a lead teaching role as the semester progressed. Megan was given the opportunity to develop lectures (and later facilitate discussion) around topics of interest. She reiterated that being able to teach to her interest areas was a big draw for her and increased her excitement about co-teaching:

I guess the experiences were particularly exciting to me because they’re both topics that I’m really interested in. Those are the client populations I like to work with. For me, it made it exciting—the idea of teaching about it. I’m learning more about it myself through teaching.

Participants reported—as the semester progressed—that they knew ahead of time what they “would be standing up in front of the class and teaching.” This also included having a sense of “figuring out” and “putting together” the content that was going to be discussed in the classroom. Participants reported that when planning for co-teaching experiences, faculty members encouraged the use of anecdotes of their clinical or school counseling experiences. At times this was done through the planning process and at other times it was done “on the fly” during teaching moments in the classroom. For example, Lucy, Kim, Mary, and Megan’s experiences of “on the fly” moments included opportunities to add to the class discussion with clinical examples. Mary illustrates this phenomenon as she recounted her experience:

And, because of my history of working in a community behavioral health agency, she would often just kind of turn to me and ask for my input on what agencies are doing now. Or, you know, what do you see when you work with this diagnosis? She wanted more information to be added to her class.
As participants lectured and/or led the class in an activity or discussion, faculty members were reported as “jumping in” to add or expand on the discussion. Anton noted times during his co-teaching experience where he and the faculty member would connect course content to his agency work. It was during these moments that he felt his contributions to the class discussion became increasing more important.

Susan conveyed that the faculty member’s increased trust in her ability to lead a class (i.e., solo teaching without the faculty member present) represented progress and increased responsibility for her co-teaching experience. Susan reflected on her experience:

"What I loved—and this is the best moment for me—was that he couldn’t be there one night. He had something came up. It was my night to teach. In the beginning, if there was a night where something came up and he couldn’t be there, he would worry that I was going to be on my own. He would say: maybe we should just cancel class in the first semester. By the second semester—towards the end—he was like: Oh, you’re fine! I’m not gonna be there. You’ve got this!

Overall, participants reported experiencing an increase in the amount of time and level of involvement in teaching activities versus remaining in observer roles. This means that over the course of a co-taught semester, participants spent more time leading the class, more time preparing and delivering lectures and facilitating discussions, and more time grading and interacting with students’ assignments. Additionally, participants’ experiences reflect a structural awareness that as the semester progressed, they became
more actively involved in a lead role while under the guidance of a faculty member.

Participants all drew attention to a structural component of co-teaching that they reported as essential for a quality experience: Supervision and guided reflection.

**Supervision and guided reflection.** Participants stated that supervision with faculty members helped to define the co-teaching experience and their associated roles. Kim illustrated the participants’ concerns with defining co-teaching: “When all this started, I wasn’t sure what co-teaching meant. I wasn’t sure if co-teaching meant he would do all the teaching and I would kind of observe and get a chance for some lectures.” For Janet, supervision helped her to distinguish what the co-teaching experience would “look like.” It was important for Janet that faculty members distinguished between teaching assistant roles (i.e., no opportunities to lead and receive supervision to improve teaching skills) and co-teaching roles (i.e., opportunities for lead teaching with feedback about improving teaching skills).

All participants met to discuss the co-teaching experience in regular intervals throughout the semester including processing their feelings about their teaching. Faculty members were perceived as helpful when they provided candid constructive feedback about participants’ teaching performance (see co-teaching relationships above).

Participants found it helpful when faculty members could demonstrate and provide a rationale behind their teaching approach. Susan would pose questions in supervision to obtain the faculty member’s perspective:

It was very helpful for me to understand: So, why did you choose this? Why did you put this in the syllabus? [Is this] outside of what CACREP said to do? Why
did you put this here? Why are you going to cover that area? And then, get his perspective on it.

Kim recounted that a supervision “debriefing” would occur after every class: “We debriefed after every class regardless of who was teaching. It was very helpful.” Kim added that the faculty member would ask her for feedback on his teaching in the same manner he would prompt guided reflection about her teaching. Mutual feedback and guided reflection questions would occur during debriefing (i.e., during supervision of teaching sessions). For example, the faculty member would ask: What did you observe? What did you like about what you saw? What are some areas for improvement? The engagement in reflective dialogue about one’s teaching was a shared experience for Mary, Megan, Lucy, Susan, Kim, and reportedly an essential element of the co-teaching structure.

Some participants (e.g., Janet, Anton, Brian) did not engage in reflective dialogue about their teaching. Instead, supervision time favored class preparations, student issues, or administrative responsibilities. Anton recalled his co-teaching supervision experiences and offered this insight about the supervision of co-teaching:

All of our [supervision] meetings were class prep stuff. We did have post-class conversations as well. But, they weren’t as personable and they weren’t as reflective. We might’ve talked about a student with an attitude or somebody’s paperwork, or something like that. Now, if I would’ve pressed for it and said: Hey, I want to meet with you to talk about my experience in co-teaching. Maybe that could’ve been there. But, I think that even if that would be the case it needs
to be a part of the infrastructure of the co-teaching instead of making a separate appointment.

Anton’s experience of quality supervision moments in co-teaching incorporated reflective dialogue about his teaching. He elaborated that supervision experiences might offer a time to reflect on the entire experience of co-teaching. Anton elaborated on this point: “We would sit down [in supervision] and the professor would say: Ok. So what was that like for you? You had a whole semester—15 weeks with me—what was it like? What did you learn?”

Participants agreed that co-teaching takes a great deal of planning and time. For Brian, co-teaching involved more time planning outside of the classroom than for solo teaching. Brian emphasized the importance of weekly supervision to assist with the time-intensive nature of co-teaching. From his perspective, supervision is essential “to do co-teaching very successfully.” He expanded on his position saying, “You’re going to spend three times the amount of time outside the classroom with that teacher or instructor as you would inside.” Brian recalled his co-teaching experience suggesting that more supervision time may have been helpful. Specifically:

If I had to do it over, I probably should have been more reflective afterwards.

And, recommend some ideas afterwards. I would say that probably [at least] a half an hour every week. Just in office hours or something like that to go over the next week’s content and reflection on the previous week’s teaching.

Mary reported appreciation for her co-teaching supervision experiences. She identified feeling uncomfortable and, at times, overwhelmed as she initially struggled
with co-teaching. Supervision was a vehicle for her to “talk about” her teaching and talk about “how” she could integrate the faculty member’s feedback into subsequent teaching experiences. For Mary, the essence of co-teaching supervision entailed:

We would meet weekly just to talk about how my teaching experience was going. How things were going in the classroom in general, and it was an opportunity for me to ask her for feedback. But, she would also ask me for feedback as well. We would meet once a week for an hour.

Co-teaching experiences were described by all participants as having as a recognizable structure including: (a) identifiable teaching responsibilities such as planning, materials development, delivering instruction, facilitating class discussions, grading, discussing student issues; (b) a noticeable increase in participants’ teaching responsibilities as the semester progressed; and (c) supervision with a faculty member that included feedback about one’s teaching performance, navigating teaching responsibilities, and contained opportunities to reflect on the significance of the teaching experience for one’s practice. Co-teaching was also instrumental in participants’ development as teachers within counselor education.

**Theme 3: Co-Teaching Experiences Impact Students’ Development as Teachers**

Participants discussed the shared experience of the impact of co-teaching on their development as teachers. For some participants, it reinforced the desire to teach. For others, it strengthened a commitment to engage in solo teaching while in their program. Others relayed that co-teaching would help them in a future faculty role (e.g., adjunct or
tenure-track). Finally, for some participants, co-teaching provided an opportunity to learn “what to do” and “what not to do” while in a teaching role.

Data analysis revealed three sub themes relevant to co-teaching and doctoral students’ development as teachers: (a) co-teaching experiences help prepare doctoral students for future teaching roles, (b) co-teaching experiences provide opportunities for doctoral students to identify and overcome challenges, and (c) co-teaching experiences provide a forum for teaching skill development and refinement. Table 6 illustrates the themes, sub themes, and shared experiences across participants.

**Preparation for lead instructor roles.** Participants revealed that co-teaching experiences inform the responsibilities necessary to construct and lead a course as an instructor of record. For participants seeking teaching positions, experience with co-teaching during their doctoral training can assist with the faculty interview process. Participants may need to obtain faculty endorsement of their teaching competencies. Co-teaching provides an opportunity for faculty members to become familiar with doctoral students strengths, and capacities to fulfill future teaching roles.

Brian believed that co-teaching was helpful as a teacher preparation practice suggesting: “Co-teaching is a practical way to implement and learn effective instructional strategies. This is very important to teaching and learning.” He noted that experiences above and beyond a single course in pedagogy are warranted to prepare counselor education doctoral students for entry-level teaching:

I am not sure if taking one pedagogy class is enough to prepare someone for entry-level instruction. I would add more emphasis on the ability for doctoral
students to gain understanding of effective pedagogical practices through the co-teaching process, and ways to measure them.

Participants interested in pursuing future faculty positions (e.g., Megan, Susan, Kim, Darren, and Janet) had a desire to engage in co-teaching as often as possible prior to graduation. Megan viewed co-teaching as a precursor to assuming an instructor of record teaching role:
I would like to co-teach again at least one or two more times before being given a class. I think the challenging part of about being given a class is that there is not always so much feedback. And so, that [additional co-teaching experiences] would be helpful. But, [ultimately] I would like to get some experience in teaching on my own.

Susan shared a similar viewpoint on co-teaching and future teaching roles. She added that co-teaching is a practice she would like to continue in her role as a counselor educator:

So, the co-teaching [experiences] further reinforced my desire—like, it made it really strong. I had such a good experience teaching in his class. I have such fervor. I really want to do this. I cannot wait for this to be my career. Because, I hope in the future I’ll get to co-teach with a doc student.

Kim valued the co-teaching experience for both herself and fellow doctoral students, especially those seeking future faculty positions:

I think that there is tremendous value in co-teaching, specifically with pairing doctoral students and counselor educators in preparation for faculty positions. I am glad that I was able to discuss my experiences and I hope that this practice becomes more widely practiced.

Some participants were aware that teaching demonstrations are part of the counselor educator faculty interview process. Co-teaching (and subsequently solo teaching) was viewed as a vehicle to develop teaching skills under supervision, which will help doctoral students with their job interview requirements. Kim illustrated this
point further: “Well, in wanting to be a counselor educator, teaching is going to be your primary vehicle. You want to be good at that.” She elaborated further saying: “When you go and interview and start doing faculty positions, they want to see those demonstrations. I don’t want to feel [nervous] if I have to teach, you know. I mean, because I’m not sure of my skills.” Finally, some participants believed that it is common practice during faculty interviews, for faculty members to ask doctoral students what they want to teach. Participants reported wanting increased confidence to reply to interview questions grounded in the knowledge of their teaching experiences, knowledge that originates during co-teaching. Kim explained this phenomenon to the researcher:

If you’re going to teach, I think universities will ask you: what is it that you want to teach? And so, I think part of that is—kind of feeling out—what is it that I want to teach? What am I good at teaching? So you have a more informed answer.

For Mary and Anton, co-teaching informed their perspectives on future teaching as instructors of record more so than future faculty teaching roles. Mary candidly illustrated this point:

I mean, I was really like, I don’t think I’ll ever teach. But, I kind of liked it. And, it prompted me to throw my hat in the ring for other classes [as an instructor of record] here. It also showed me that I didn’t hate teaching (Laughs). Anton’s experience was confirming on a personal and professional level while recognizing his future career aspirations:
My dream has been to be able to teach. I want to be able to teach. After co-teaching, I can actually see myself teaching now. It has made me a lot more comfortable with the process. So, I think that’s one way it’s informed me. And, I think like we talked about before, I don’t want to be the academician with limited clinical experience or background. I think that I would want to teach but also still see clients as well. So, I think that’s probably where it’s informed me the best, it really helps me see myself as a teacher now.

Participants agreed that their co-teaching experiences were helpful in preparing them for future teaching roles. By participating in the co-teaching process, participants were able to utilize the experience to better understand the breadth of responsibilities inherent in developing, planning, and delivering a course of instruction while in a lead role. In addition, participants reported that the experience of having opportunities to struggle and overcome challenges inherent in the teaching process were valuable for their learning. Faculty members and students from participants’ respective classes were reportedly helpful toward this end, which is addressed in the following section.

**Opportunities to overcome challenges.** Participants recognized that teaching is not an easy process. Lucy summarized this point: “It helps [for doctoral students] to understand up front that teaching is a process and challenges will occur. However, the struggle is going to add to the experience of learning how to teach.” Participants described the challenges with co-teaching relationships, with teaching responsibilities, and personal challenges affecting confidence about their teaching.
Susan described some of the significant challenges during her co-teaching experiences. For her, differences in approaches to classroom management, grading, and attendance stood out as challenges. In addition, Susan struggled with finding confidence to express her “voice” in the classroom. She believed that a more rigorous approach to attendance, classroom management, and grading was needed. She described her faculty member as “laid-back” regarding his approach to these issues. Susan presented her concerns to the faculty member and reported that he was able to listen and even modify his approach to certain issues (e.g., attendance and classroom management). However, he stood his ground on his approach to grading. Susan and the faculty member were able to compromise their differences on grading by having her add additional feedback for students to improve their writing skills. Susan recalled a discussion of differences with the faculty co-teacher:

I was like: Can we talk about something? Because, I had noticed that there was a student who literally missed seven classes. In graduate school, you can only miss so many classes before you start to drop a letter grade and that was not necessarily his viewpoint on things. I finally felt comfortable enough and I pointed out to him and I said: How do you want to deal with that? He changed his policy on attendance. So, I’d like to think that I helped him a little bit to not be taken advantage of by some of the students.

Lucy recalled a challenging situation in the classroom related to an incident of racism on campus. She fondly recounted the event and its impact on her relationship
with the students. Lucy felt supported by her faculty member to process and overcome challenges related to this issue:

There was a racist incident that occurred with the students. They painted the rock. It was a year-end activity for the students in the cohort. The next day, some folks had come around and wrote all these racist words on it. We ended up processing it. I think we were able to really be honest about it and get us to a point that felt like there was some closure to it. We wrestled with it, there was a lot of different opinions and we were able to really deeply touch our feelings. I was really able to show my emotions—I mean, I cried in class with them.

Lucy reported that student relationships and faculty support aided her with overcoming the emotional challenges brought on by this incident of racism.

Kim struggled with nervousness associated with public speaking, which she was able to address with her faculty co-teacher:

I’ve never been very comfortable at public speaking [or] any of that. He described [teaching] more as a conversation similar to what we’re having now. You have some information and you’re just trying to impart some of that to the class and getting them to interact with that information. You don’t need to come in as an authority or those kinds of things.

Kim reported that this and similar feedback was helpful in overcoming her personal challenges in the classroom. She stated, “I wanted feedback to improve my teaching. So, those pieces of feedback were extremely helpful.”
Participants discussed a variety of challenges (i.e., difficulties with teaching) associated with their co-teaching experiences. All participants reported some anxiety with the newness of the co-teaching experience. Susan, Darren, and Megan discussed the desire to do a good job and please the faculty member. Susan, Mary, Kim, Mary, and Lucy expressed a desire to be accepted by the students, the ability to discuss differences of opinion with faculty members, and the confidence to negotiate challenges in the classroom. In addition to navigating the difficulties of teaching, participants revealed aspects of their co-teaching experiences that were helpful towards developing teaching skills.

**Opportunities for skill development.** The findings revealed that co-teaching was perceived by participants as a vehicle to help them develop teaching skills. Participants identified the ability to take feedback, and consider alternative approaches to practice as important steps in developing teaching skills. The co-teaching experience with faculty members was viewed as an opportunity to learn “how” to teach. Furthermore, participants identified that co-teaching was an experience that preceded solo teaching activities and provided opportunities to “practice” skills and refine their approaches under the guidance of more experienced instructors. Kim explained that the process of incorporating feedback from faculty members to improve teaching skills gets easier over time and with practice:

So, as you’re trying to take that feedback and adjust yourself to that. I noticed that things became more relaxed more and it just seemed easier to go back-and-forth and interject and all that no matter who was [teaching] in the front.
And, wanting feedback to get better at my teaching. So, I think it was a good approach for both sides. And, I think him being able to say: where can I improve? What areas can I improve on?

Participants favored feedback provided by faculty members in a non-threatening manner when discussing skills development. This reportedly added to their confidence to try new skills in the classroom. Kim illustrated this point in more detail:

Well, I think part of it was he was able to provide feedback in a way that didn’t seem attacking or highly critical and I was able to take that feedback. It wasn’t critical or shaming or anything. And, so we would take the time and go through and talk about [that] there’s got to be something. So, I think that those types of interactions—making it just very non-threatening—was a good way for me to feel like I could try new things and try to be different in ways. And [then] see what his response to that is going to be to my teaching.

Overall, participants agreed that feedback was essential to help them improve their teaching practice. This was true regardless of their stated career aspirations (e.g., full-time tenure-track professor, adjunct instructor, instructor of record as part of doctoral training, etc.). Mary discussed the implications of moving into a teaching role without sufficient skills and experiences in the classroom emphasizing the role of co-teaching:

I think everyone should have to co-teach a semester. I do. Before they leave the doc program. I think that if [you’re] gonna teach, it would really be important to have that kind of experience. I think people are like get a couple of co-teaching experiences—just like a lesson or a day with a faculty—and, I think it should be a
semester. I think it should be a whole class. And maybe, your internship—versus trying to get your own class to teach—as part of your internship, it should be a co-teaching experience with a faculty. I think if you’re going to be a counselor educator and if you leave the program with only having had a handful of co-teaching experiences, I’m not sure I think that’s okay. They make us go through practicums to see clients, why shouldn’t we have to go through a practicum to teach classes?

Lucy placed a great emphasis on co-teaching and its impact on developing teaching skills. She expressed a need for a more intentional teaching of skills as part of the co-teaching experience. In terms of teaching, she believed it would be helpful to hear about faculty members’ experiences. For example, “this is what I’ve done in the past and this is what I’ve struggled with.” Lucy elaborated that this would “really normalize some of the [teaching] experiences and [those experiences] working with difficult students.”

For some participants, skill development in teaching is initially fostered between a more experienced instructor and a less experienced co-instructor. Lucy and other participants are concerned with the question: What would an instructor with more experience recommend to me in terms of teaching? Lucy suggested that faculty members or instructors with experience may pose questions to aid in skill development: So, you’ve already tried this two ways, maybe you could try another way? Or, maybe you’ve done too much and, you’re going way out of your way. Open conversations about skills and feedback about the implementation of new or refined skills in subsequent classes was perceived as essential for growth.
Overall, participants’ experiences of quality co-teaching involved feedback, teaching examples, and opportunities to refine skill development in the classroom from their faculty co-teachers. In other words, participants’ quality experiences were linked to moments they felt faculty members were teaching them “how to teach.” Participants’ experiences of developing teaching skills included: (a) opportunities to develop and work from a syllabus, (b) opportunities to develop and implement course content materials, (c) the ability to plan and facilitate class discussion around identified content areas, (d) the ability to navigate students’ questions about content, and (e) opportunities to try out new approaches to delivering course content based on feedback from their faculty members. Furthermore, faculty members supported their development as they struggled to improve their practice through encouragement and feedback about their performance in the classroom. In other words, all participants experienced co-teaching as a vehicle for developing and improving teaching skills to some degree.

**Summary of Chapter 3**

Chapter 3 reported the findings of this phenomenological study of counselor education students’ co-teaching experiences with program faculty during their doctoral training. The analysis revealed that participants shared common experiences about the relational, structural, and development aspects of co-teaching. Participants’ beliefs were reflected in the following themes: (a) co-teaching experiences are built on relationships, (b) co-teaching experiences have a structure, and (c) co-teaching experiences impact students’ development as teachers. There was evidence that these themes reflect the
underlying components for the use of co-teaching as a vehicle for teacher preparation within counselor education doctoral programs.

Chapter 4 provides a discussion of the research results. The research results are discussed in context of the existing literature and introduced as contributions to the profession. Implications for counselor education and future research are offered.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The results of this phenomenological qualitative study revealed common themes comprising the essence of counselor education students’ co-teaching experiences with faculty members during their doctoral training. The common themes (and sub themes) embody relational, structural, and developmental features of co-teaching as a vehicle for teacher preparation within counselor education. The following three themes were identified in the data analysis: (a) co-teaching experiences are built on relationships, (b) co-teaching experiences have a structure, and (c) co-teaching experiences impact students’ development as teachers. Participants’ collective co-teaching experiences were mirrored in the identified themes and offered as a basis to understanding co-teaching practices within counselor education doctoral programs.

This chapter discusses the findings from the present study in relation to the literature including counselor education literature (see Orr et al., 2008). Implications for co-teaching practices in counselor education based on the research findings are provided along with remarks on the transferability of the current study. Future research recommendations are presented.

Contributions of Co-Teaching to Counselor Education

Co-teaching is a practice commonly understood in educational settings (e.g., elementary and secondary education, special education, etc.). However, its meaning and underlying structure are less understood within the field of counselor education. The results of this study reveal important aspects of co-teaching experiences for counselor
education students that have potential for contribution to the counselor education

literature.

First and foremost, this study is the first of its kind. Furthermore, contributions
are rooted in the shared experiences and “voices” of counselor education doctoral
students engaged in the co-teaching process. In other words, the perspectives of
individuals actually engaged in the phenomenon of inquiry. Participants’ experiences
yielded relational, structural, and developmental themes supporting the use of co-teaching
as a teacher preparation vehicle within counselor education. Findings revealed
descriptions of what participants considered to be quality co-teaching moments including
their recommendations for the intentional use of co-teaching as a developmental teaching
process. Finally, participants unanimously agreed that co-teaching is a progressive
experience with increased responsibilities over time that works best with consistent and
purposeful supervision.

The findings from this study are not surprising when taking into consideration the
literature on teacher preparation in higher education. Silverman (2003) reviewed the
literature on strategies for preparing doctoral students to teach (e.g., courses,
practica/internships, and mentoring). For Silverman, it is the development of basic
teaching skills that leads doctoral students to becoming more successful teachers.
Austin’s (2002, 2003) findings revealed the importance of faculty models and mentors
including the use of supervision that incorporates guided reflection. The importance of
the relationship and intentional use of supervision in teaching was supported in Orr et
al.’s (2008) findings as well. This study serves as a foundational contribution to the
literature and precedent for future studies on teacher development within counselor education.

**The Essence of Co-Teaching Experiences in Counselor Education**

This study intended to uncover familiar and commonly shared aspects of co-teaching experiences for counselor education students during their doctoral training. In essence, the study sought to answer the question: what is this experience like? Nine participants were identified as having readily engaged in co-teaching experiences. Each participant was interviewed and thoughtfully shared their experiences in response to the researcher’s prompts such as: describe in as much detail as possible your co-teaching experiences with faculty members during your doctoral training. Additionally, participants responded to the researcher’s inquiry about quality or “stand out” co-teaching moments and the impact of co-teaching on one’s career aspirations.

Three broad themes and corresponding sub themes emerged from the data analysis procedures. The following paragraphs summarize and discuss the data in the context of the existing literature guided by the emergent themes. This differs from the results section, which presents lengthy verbatim quotes and other supporting data by theme (see Chapter 3).

**Relational**

Doctoral training is challenging and places many demands on students including the need to develop teaching skills (Austin, 2002, 2003). Part of the challenge for participants in this study was navigating the relationship with faculty members while engaging in new teaching experiences. There was agreement that a recognizable level of
anxiety and desire to perform well was present as each participant engaged in the co-teaching process. Relationships with faculty members were identified by all participants as key to a successful co-teaching experience. In fact, participants’ experiences reflected that co-teaching experiences are built on the backs of relationships between doctoral students and faculty members. The relational aspects of co-teaching identified in the findings clustered into three sub themes including: (a) faculty member reputation, observations of faculty teaching, and advisor/advisee relationships; (b) students feeling valued and invited to share life experiences; and (c) open communication and constructive feedback.

It is critical that students be active participants in their own professional development (e.g., teaching), and that this occur in the context of a mentoring relationship with an experienced faculty member (Benjamin, 2000; Lester & Evans, 2009; Orr et al., 2008; Reybold, 2003). Reybold recognized that the transformation from doctoral student to professional involves collaborative mentoring relationships. For participants, the co-teaching relationship began before ever stepping into a classroom. The role of reputation and prior experience with faculty members while in their student roles led to a familiarity with their personalities and teaching styles. This familiarity was described as positively influencing participants’ comfort level within the co-teaching relationship. Increased comfort level led to increased receptivity to collaborate including sharing the workload, sharing concerns, and developing solutions (see Benjamin, 2000).

Austin (2002) noted that graduate students learn from observing and interacting with their faculty. She highlighted that students’ formal and informal conversations and
observations of faculty behaviors are viewed as valuable sources of feedback by graduate students during their program training. For non-matriculating participants, observing and interacting with faculty transpired after they were engaged in their doctoral studies. Regardless of doctoral student status or how the co-teaching experience was initiated, participants reported that the relationships (e.g., time spent together, interactions, etc.) with faculty members impacted their co-teaching experiences.

Participants agreed that co-teaching relationship was collaborative when they felt valued and invited by faculty members to share their life experiences. For them, a relationship that embodied the spirit of collaboration led to collaborative practices in and out of the classroom. This is, in fact, what participants described as part of their co-teaching experiences. For Mary, Megan, Lucy, Susan, Anton, Kim, and Janet, it was the invitation to share their life experiences (e.g., experiences working with clients in agency and school settings) that made for quality co-teaching moments and served to enhance the co-teaching relationship.

Benjamin (2000) described core collaborative practices in co-teaching milieu as those that include: (a) the sharing of new or untried ideas, (b) the critiquing ideas in order to improve practice, and (c) being comfortable with collaboration and confrontation when conclusions about teaching practice prompted a struggle to deepen one’s understanding. For participants the more they were invited and able to share in the classroom the more collaborative the co-teaching relationship.

The vehicle for fostering and maintaining the co-teaching relationship was related to open communication that included constructive feedback about one’s teaching.
Faculty members who embody an awareness of co-teaching’s relational qualities provided feedback to participants in a candid but non-threatening manner. Participants noted that communication and feedback about their teaching would generally take place in supervision (see Supervision and Guided Reflection below). At times, feedback would be shared between faculty members and doctoral students in the classroom. Sharing and trying out new ideas in the classroom required a feeling of “safety” or having a sense of the classroom being a “safe space” to make mistakes. This included having opportunities to “rebound” when things didn’t go as planned.

All participants agreed that they had uncertainties going into the co-teaching relationship, but open communication and constructive feedback from faculty members helped them increase their comfort levels with the process. Lester and Evans’ (2009) findings support the importance of open communication recognizing its role and value to increase one’s comfort with the co-teaching process. All participants agreed—in accordance with Lester and Evans—that for those new to teaching, uncertainty or unfamiliarity with the process is the common reality.

All in all, the importance and impact of the relationship in co-teaching is present in the findings. Faculty members can engage in co-teaching practices with this in mind. One intentional practice would be the incorporation of a model or systematic approach to fostering the relationship in co-teaching (Badiali & Titus, 2010; Friend & Bursuck, 2011; Friend & Cook, 2000; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012; Orr et al., 2008). The mentor modeling approach pairs a novice teacher with an experienced teacher. This model provides novice teachers with an orientation to an experienced teacher’s approach to
instruction (Badiali & Titus, 2010; Friend & Bursuck, 2011; Friend & Cook, 2000). With this model, novice teachers observe experienced teachers to pick up on obvious and subtle aspects of instruction in order to facilitate a reflective conversation on the effects of the teaching strategies. The experienced teacher can observe the novice teacher’s work to evaluate effective and developing teaching behaviors by providing feedback about the students’ performance. The use of a mentoring model is in line with participants’ experiences of the relational aspects of co-teaching, which emphasized observation, open communication and feedback, and the relationship as a vehicle to increase trust and confidence with one’s teaching practice.

**Structural**

The research findings revealed structural aspects of co-teaching experiences. This is an important finding because all participants characterized the initial co-teaching experience as containing a degree of uncertainty about the process, roles, responsibilities, and benchmarks for their skill development. The presence of a co-teaching structure responds to the questions: What is co-teaching? and How do I do it? While graduate students’ development is complex and non-linear (Austin, 2002), having an underlying structure or organizational process can provide a pathway for increasing awareness, comfort, confidence, and the development of teaching skills (see Orlander et al., 2000; Orr et al., 2008). The structural aspects of co-teaching identified in this study include: (a) co-teaching involves identifiable responsibilities that occur in and out of the classroom, (b) a doctoral student’s teaching responsibilities increase and evolve over time, and (c)
Co-teaching structure includes regular supervision with opportunities for guided reflection with a faculty member.

Co-teaching occurs in the context of a new or novice teacher learning while teaching alongside an experienced or ‘expert’ teacher (Crow & Smith, 2005). Similarly, co-teaching within counselor education can be conceptualized as a teaching “training ground” for doctoral students under the guidance of experienced faculty members. Teaching has been identified as a time-intensive aspect of a counselor educator’s duties (Davis et al., 2006). There is an increased emphasis on preparing graduate students for teaching roles (Austin, 2002; Meacham, 2002; Silverman, 2003). To prepare students for these professional realities, counselor education doctoral students need teacher training experiences that embody a structural awareness of the co-teaching process. Specifically, faculty members operating from a structural awareness of co-teaching: (a) acknowledge students’ anxieties around co-teaching by providing clear parameters and defining the co-teaching process for students, (b) acknowledge the incremental nature of co-teaching by titrating demands and student involvement with the co-teaching process, and (c) acknowledge students’ initial need for autonomy and collaboration by providing concrete examples with flexibility in students approaches to developing skills.

Research findings revealed that the structure of co-teaching included supervision conversations between faculty members and doctoral students yielding experience-informed feedback. Supervision conversations within a co-teaching structure included: (a) feedback about doctoral students’ teaching performance and responsibilities from the perspective of a faculty member who has “been there,” and (b) opportunities to
process doctoral students’ feelings about the co-teaching process leading to self-improvement. These findings are supported by the co-teaching literature (Badiali & Titus, 2010; Crow & Smith, 2005; Graziano & Navarrete, 2012; Orlander et al., 2000; Orr et al., 2008).

For Orlander et al. (2000), supervision transpires through an iterative process that pairs junior and senior faculty members with a focus on developing teaching skills and sharing responsibility for supervising students’ progress. This approach could be extended to counselor education by pairing experienced counselor education faculty members with doctoral students seeking to gain teaching experience through the co-teaching process. Findings from this study parallel Austin’s (2002) work in that faculty led mentoring with guided reflection about one’s teaching was a desirable experience for students during their doctoral training. Findings from this study parallel the work of Lester and Evans (2009) suggesting that feedback with guided reflection (e.g., in a supervision conversation) makes a difference in novice teachers’ ability to learn from their mistakes and implement modifications to their teaching practice.

The structure of co-teaching reveals a number of responsibilities related to the teaching role as well as the progressive nature of doctoral students’ involvement with the co-teaching process. Orr et al. (2008) developed the Collaborative Teaching Teams Model (CTT) in order to assist doctoral students with progressively developing teaching competencies under the supervision of experienced faculty members. Doctoral students seeking teaching experiences progress from observer roles, to single teaching events (e.g., delivering a lecture), and eventually to assuming the lead instructor role for a class.
The CTT model provides a structure that was developed a priori and still requires further research. The co-teaching experiences in this study contributed to the structural understanding of process as lived by the participants. Nevertheless, having an organizational structure (a priori or otherwise) proved to be helpful for students learning the building blocks of teaching in counselor education.

The structural aspects of co-teaching revealed in the findings acknowledge the uncertainties of counselor education doctoral students who are new to the teaching process. The findings from this study suggest that the “what” of co-teaching (e.g., preparing materials, giving a lecture, leading a discussion, etc.) was grasped early on in the co-teaching process. However, the “how” of co-teaching (e.g., overcoming anxieties about teaching, delivery style, self-improvement of teaching practice, etc.) involves a gradual learning curve for doctoral students. The structural aspects of co-teaching experiences suggest that doctoral students benefited from feedback, opportunities to improve on their practice, and to try out new ideas in the classroom generated in supervision conversations. In order to usher students into the process of teaching, it is essential to have some level of organization or structure as they become more comfortable and familiar with the phenomenon over time. This is true despite the less-than-linear nature of students’ development and the realities of teaching practice (Austin, 2002). In other words, a starting point and a map of the co-teaching process is needed including supervision and opportunities to learn from their mistakes while improving their teaching practice over time (Badiali & Titus, 2010; Crow & Smith, 2005; Orlander et al., 2000; Orr et al., 2008).
Developmental

Counselor education doctoral students are faced with the reality of teaching in future professional roles (e.g., tenure-track, adjunct, contract instructors of record, etc.). Yet, many university doctoral programs still do not emphasize the importance of preparing doctoral students to teach (Austin, 2002; Austin, 2003; Utecht & Tullous, 2009). In counselor education, students who have teaching experiences during their doctoral training report being better prepared to participate in the counselor education profession (Orr et al., 2008). For those interested in pursuing the professorate, doctoral students with teaching experiences are perceived as more marketable in securing counselor education faculty positions (Warnke et al., 1999). The findings support the experience of co-teaching as a means to the development of teaching skills, which may help counselor education doctoral students meet future teaching demands.

Developmental aspects of co-teaching experiences were revealed in the findings of this study. The developmental aspects of co-teaching identified in the findings include: (a) co-teaching helped prepare students for lead instructor roles, (b) co-teaching provided opportunities to overcome challenges, and (c) co-teaching provided opportunities for skill development in teaching. The findings in this study suggest that co-teaching is a progressive, interactive, and developmental process for counselor education doctoral students. Through the co-teaching process, doctoral students experienced chances to develop, overcome challenges, and implement teaching skills.

Teaching in counselor education can be conceived as the sharing of knowledge and skills intended to foster student expertise during their graduate training (Nelson &
Neufeldt, 1998). Co-teaching, therefore, can be viewed as the experience of teaching future counselor educators how to share counseling knowledge and skills with students during their graduate training. In order to do this, future counselor educators need to draw upon aspects of pedagogy and experiential training above and beyond the practice of counseling (i.e., learning how to plan, deliver, and evaluate a counseling course).

Evidence in the findings supports the experience of co-teaching as a means to obtaining teaching skills, which begins with doctoral students observing and trying out the teaching style of the faculty member. Doctoral students emulate a teaching style and gradually settle on an integration of the faculty member’s teaching and their own emergent style as the co-teaching experience unfolds. Teaching skills identified by participants in this study included: (a) the ability to deliver course content in a competent and seamless manner, (b) the ability to attend to student reactions and the classroom process, (c) the ability to handle classroom concerns, (c) the ability to identify and implement one’s teaching style, (d) the ability to participate in assignment selection and evaluation activities, and (e) the ability to contextualize one’s teaching through the inclusion of real-world counseling encounters. Counselor education doctoral programs often contain specific courses in pedagogy to assist with students’ skill development related to teaching (CACREP, n.d.; Carter et al., 1994; Lanning, 2009; Orr et al., 2008). Yet, findings of this study support the need for additional experiences to foster the development of teaching skills. Participants (e.g., Mary, Anton, Janet, Kim, Brian) agreed that the experience of co-teaching helped them move beyond the curriculum and into the classroom to obtain teaching skills.
In sum, findings regarding the developmental aspects of co-teaching resound with the respondents in Austin’s (2002) study. Austin’s respondents identified recommendations for improving the experience of graduate school in preparation for future faculty roles including teaching. Graduate students’ recommendations from Austin’s study included: (a) faculty members’ attention to the regular mentoring, advising and provision of feedback to students; (b) students have structured opportunities to observe and discuss teaching-related issues; and (c) students participate in diverse, developmentally-oriented teaching opportunities including taking on increasingly complex and autonomous responsibilities in the teaching role. Taken together, the findings from this study relevant to the relational, structural, and developmental aspects of co-teaching experience have implications for counselor education.

Implications of Co-Teaching for Counselor Education

Programs that promote teaching among students before they learn how to teach have no place in counselor education (Lanning, 1990). Lanning extended his observations to describe the role of the counselor educator. From his view, counselor educators are skilled counselors who are systematically prepared to perform the tasks of an educator including “systematic preparation to teach” (p. 171).

A commonly used practice among certain counselor education programs is co-teaching. Orr et al. (2008) developed the CTT Model in response to the 2009 CACREP standards, which outlined a way to assist doctoral students with developing teaching skills through faculty relationships and supervised practice. It is the desire to understand doctoral students’ experiences of learning how to teach through the
phenomenon of co-teaching that drove the current study. To that end, the meaning of co-teaching was explored through the lived experiences of counselor education doctoral students. The findings revealed relational, structural, and developmental aspects of the phenomenon. The resultant findings have implications for defining the meaning and the intentional use of co-teaching as a practice for developing students’ teaching abilities.

**Defining Co-Teaching in Counselor Education**

The findings of this study suggest that co-teaching in counselor education may differ in its meaning from other educational disciplines (e.g., secondary education, special education, etc.). That is, co-teaching may be employed to assist special needs students by having two teachers with specialized knowledge co-leading a classroom and providing intensive supports (see Badiali & Titus, 2010, for a discussion of models). Other applications of co-teaching may involve two teachers introducing an integrated curriculum (e.g., English and Language Arts) in secondary or higher education settings.

Co-teaching in counselor education can be conceptualized as the progressive practice of experienced faculty members training doctoral students to develop the teaching skills needed to eventually perform in lead instructor roles. In other words, more akin to the teacher training or student teaching models used in teacher preparation programs (e.g., Scheeler, 2008). This is similar to the co-teaching practices described by Orlander et al. (2000) and Orr et al. (2008). These researchers developed structured models involving the gradual learning and application of teaching responsibilities (e.g., from observation roles to lead teaching) under the supervision of an experienced faculty member. Supervision within these models included constructive feedback and debriefing
with opportunities for guided reflection. The importance of the supervision of co-teaching was an important finding in this study as well. Defining the co-teaching experience up front for doctoral students in the context of the co-teaching relationship was highlighted as a quality co-teaching experience for participants. Overall, findings point to the need for intentional—albeit time-consuming—practices associated with co-teaching in counselor education. Defining co-teaching practice in counselor education doctoral programs allows for a greater promotion of its practice.

**Intentional Practice of Co-Teaching in Counselor Education**

An intentional approach to co-teaching considers the relational, structural, and developmental aspects of the co-teaching experience. Participants’ co-teaching experiences described in this study are characteristic of a mentor model (Badiali & Titus, 2010). Mentor modeling pairs a new teacher with an experienced teacher in order to provide the new teacher with an orientation to an experienced teacher’s approach (Badiali & Titus, 2010; Friend & Bursuck, 2011; Friend & Cook, 2000). Extending this model to counselor education, doctoral students would observe experienced faculty members, observe, gradually develop and implement skills, and engage in reflective conversation about teaching.

Extending mentor modeling to co-teaching counselor education is a plausible pathway to incorporating the findings from this study. Learning how to teach under the guidance and supervision of experienced faculty members is the desired outcome reflected in the findings. Two-way reflective conversations about teaching between the experienced faculty and novice teachers (i.e., counselor education doctoral students) are
of primary importance to the mentor model. The use of reflective conversations to assist with students’ (i.e., new teachers) learning and skill development is supported by Orr et al. (2008) and Austin (2002), and in the findings of the current study.

Crow and Smith (2005) identified an array of mechanisms for facilitating reflective conversations about the shared experience of teaching: (a) individual self-reflection completed in a journal in between supervision sessions, (b) using evaluation protocols to stimulate conversations, (c) observations and supervised practice, (d) supervision with an ongoing mentor, (e) reflective conversations with a critical colleague, and (f) reflective conversations with peers on shared professional experiences. Extending these reflective mechanisms to co-teaching would involve their implementation in the context of the supervision. The deliberate use of reflective conversation mechanisms is addressed in the Recommendations for Future Research section below.

The intentional practice of co-teaching is an educational experience for doctoral students. It is important to note that participants in this study (e.g., Anton, Kim, Janet, and Susan) cautioned against the use of co-teaching as a forum for making the faculty members’ teaching loads more manageable. Co-teaching—as an intentional teacher training vehicle—requires more than having students share faculty members’ teaching workloads (Austin, 2002, 2003; Badiali & Titus, 2010; Lester & Evans, 2009; Orlander et al., 2000). Co-teaching experiences in the current findings acknowledge that the relationship and students’ impressions of faculty members begin before ever stepping foot in the classroom (e.g., through observations, advisor/advise relationships, etc.). In
addition, co-teaching involves the thoughtful use of modeling and explanations about the decisions that inform one’s teaching practice. Finally, co-teaching requires the regular use of supervision that includes candid constructive feedback and opportunities for guided reflection. The end result of a quality co-teaching experience is a counselor education doctoral student who: (a) can navigate a co-teaching relationship with faculty members, (b) can develop and implement the teaching responsibilities associated with leading a course, (c) can identify and implement a teaching style, and (d) has a clear sense of his or her future teaching goals as a result of the co-teaching experiences (e.g., wants to be a full time faculty member, adjunct instructor in counselor education, etc.).

**Transferability and Trustworthiness of the Data**

The credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative data is important when considering its potential transferability. In this case, potential transferability refers to counselor education programs’ consideration of the findings when considering co-teaching as a means to train doctoral students to teach. The procedures used to increase the transferability and trustworthiness of findings for this study included: (a) bracketing in order to minimize the potential intrusion of researcher experiences, (b) the use of multiple member checks, and (c) detailed descriptions to inform transferability of the co-teaching experience.

Bracketing was used at the outset of the study to capture the researcher’s preferences towards co-teaching and then again during the data analysis process to continuously monitor any intrusion of researcher subjectivity. The goal of bracketing in this study was to raise awareness and reflect on any preferences and assumptions toward
the practice of co-teaching. This allows the researcher to be aware of any preferences that may influence the data analysis process (Creswell, 2007; Hatch, 2002).

The purposeful sampling of counselor education doctoral students was used to increase the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings. Interview transcripts and identified segments from the interviews (i.e., meaning units) were extracted, organized under articulated themes or headings, and presented to participants for review. Participants’ meaning units were presented in a series of member checks to obtain their perspectives (see Chapter 2, Member Checks and Second Member Checks). The data were derived directly from the participants’ (not the researcher’s) words and descriptions. Participants all reviewed the data and agreed to the accuracy and representativeness of their respective co-teaching experiences.

The process of collecting and analyzing the data maintained a focus on the lived experiences of counselor education students who co-taught with faculty members while in the pre-candidacy phases of their doctoral training. Some of the participants had prior teaching experience as high school teachers and some as undergraduate instructors. None of the participants had experience teaching at the graduate level and thus met the inclusion criteria. However, those participants with previous teaching experience may have had pre-existing knowledge and experiences that informed their descriptions of co-teaching during the interview process.

When reviewing the findings of this study, a question to consider in the spirit of phenomenological inquiry is: Does the description of counselor education doctoral students’ co-teaching experiences resound with other experiences of co-teaching?
Similarly, one may read the results of this study and ask: Does this description of co-teaching sound familiar to me? Finally, for those with no prior knowledge of practice of co-teaching, one could ask: Do the findings of this study provide a solid description of what co-teaching is like and how it may be implemented in a counselor education doctoral program? It is the researcher’s view that the answer to all these questions is: yes.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

In this study, participants shared their co-teaching experiences with faculty members while engaged in counselor education doctoral programs. More precisely, they revealed relational, structural, and developmental aspects of the co-teaching experience including quality co-teaching moments. Quality co-teaching moments frequently centered around a trusting open relationship with faculty members, feeling valued, being able to contribute their life experiences while teaching, obtaining constructive feedback, having opportunities for guided reflection about one’s teaching, and participating in regular supervision meetings with the faculty members. Future research on co-teaching could extend this study through additional sampling, investigations of faculty perspectives, and variations of the study including the use of alternative methodologies. Additionally, the findings of this study have implications for future research and model-building around the supervision of teaching.

The current study represents the co-teaching experiences of counselor education doctoral students from Northeastern and Northwestern Ohio universities. Additional purposeful samples of doctoral students from different states or regions of the country
may yield compelling similarities or variations of how co-teaching is experienced in the respective programs. Future qualitative research (e.g., ethnographies, case studies, etc.) on co-teaching could extend this study’s findings by including research questions about students’ prior knowledge of co-teaching and how the co-teaching experiences were initiated may serve to strengthen the findings around the co-teaching relationship. For example, a research may ask: What does co-teaching mean to you? How did you come to learn about co-teaching in your doctoral program? How did the co-teaching process begin for you? What did you do first? What did you do from week to week in and out of the classroom?

In addition, future studies could focus more exclusively on students’ perceptions of the ideal faculty co-teaching mentor. This could be accomplished through the use of Q-methodology with the concourse being constructed from the interview transcripts. Additional interviews could be conducted to complete the concourse (i.e., the population of ideas about ideal teaching mentors in counselor education) and obtain factors around what constitutes the ideal faculty mentor in counselor education for students seeking co-teaching experiences.

Variations of the current study could focus more exclusively on the “how” and the “what” (i.e., the structural aspects) of co-teaching practice by asking: What are the responsibilities of a doctoral student learning how to teach by participating in the co-teaching process with a faculty member? How does co-teaching with faculty members impact doctoral students’ learning? What kind of feedback is helpful for developing teaching skills? Observational studies of what transpires in the classroom and
during faculty-student supervision conversations may serve to further illustrate the structural aspects of co-teaching by corroborating the current findings and generating new insights.

The development of teachers in counselor education is the platform for this study and a future body of scholarship. The training of teachers within counselor education extends beyond the possession of counseling skills. A distinct skill set is needed that represents the array of responsibilities needed to conduct oneself successfully in the classroom. Bernard and Goodyear (2009) distinguished teaching from supervision suggesting that: “Teaching and supervision are alike in that each has an evaluative aspect. Teaching however, typically relies on an explicit curriculum with goals that are imposed evenly on everyone” (p. 8). The authors further suggested that supervision (vs. teaching) is tailored to the unique individual needs of supervisee. This implies at the broadest level that teaching is as distinct from supervision as counseling is from supervision.

Specifically, while some areas of overlap exist among these practices, there are distinguishing and unique features that necessitate viewing them as distinct from one another. If teaching is a distinct practice within counselor education, how do future counselor educators learn how to develop this skill-set? One vehicle for this skill development is via co-teaching under the guidance of an experienced counselor educator.

Finally, the importance of supervision that includes constructive feedback and guided reflection was identified in the findings. Future research could investigate the level and quality of faculty members’ feedback on doctoral students’ experience of co-teaching relationship and their self-reported acquisition of teaching skills. Future
research needs to identify the essential teaching skills in counselor education including measures of counselor education doctoral students’ progress while participating in the co-teaching process.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to obtain a rich and detailed description of counselor education students’ co-teaching experiences obtained during their doctoral training. A phenomenological qualitative approach was used to obtain the accounts of purposefully sampled participants’ lived and shared experiences of co-teaching. The findings revealed relational, structural, and developmental aspects of the co-teaching experience. The findings of this study point to the need for a working definition and the intentional implementation of co-teaching practices in counselor education doctoral programs. Additional research extending the study to include a new sample, investigating faculty members’ perspectives on co-teaching, the deliberate use of mechanisms for reflective conversations, the use of different methodologies (e.g., ethnography, case study, Q-methodology, etc.), and the distinguishing features of teaching supervision in counselor education is warranted.
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Institutional Review Board Approval

Hello,

I am pleased to inform you that the Kent State University Institutional Review Board reviewed and approved your Application for Approval to Use Human Research Participants as a Level II/Expedited, category 7 project. Approval is effective for a twelve-month period:

November 19, 2013 through November 18, 2014.

*A copy of the IRB approved consent form is attached to this email. This “stamped” copy is the consent form that you must use for your research participants. It is important for you to also keep an unstamped text copy (i.e., Microsoft Word version) of your consent form for subsequent submissions.

Federal regulations and Kent State University IRB policy require that research be reviewed at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but not less than once per year. The IRB has determined that this protocol requires an annual review and progress report. The IRB tries to send you annual review reminder notice by email as a courtesy. However, please note that it is the responsibility of the principal investigator to be aware of the study expiration date and submit the required materials. Please submit review materials (annual review form and copy of current consent form) one month prior to the expiration date.

HHS regulations and Kent State University Institutional Review Board guidelines require that any changes in research methodology, protocol design, or principal investigator have the prior approval of the IRB before implementation and continuation of the protocol. The IRB must be informed of any adverse events associated with the study. The IRB further requests a final report at the conclusion of the study.

Kent State University has a Federal Wide Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP); FWA Number 00001853.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the Office of Research Compliance at Researchcompliance@kent.edu or 330-672-2704 or 330-672-8058.

Respectfully,
Kent State University Office of Research Compliance
224 Cartwright Hall | fax 330.672.2658

Kevin McCreary | Research Compliance Coordinator | 330.672.8058 | kmccrea1@kent.edu
Paulette Washko | Manager, Research Compliance | 330.672.2704 | Pwashko@kent.edu
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Consent Form and Recording Release

Title: Counselor Education Students’ Experiences of Co-Teaching with Program Faculty

Principal Investigator(s): Marty Jencius, Associate Professor, Counseling and Human Development Services, School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences, Graduate School of Education, Health, and Human Services.

Co-Investigator: Eric R. Baltrinic, Doctoral Student, Counseling and Human Development Services, School of Lifespan Development and Educational Sciences, Graduate School of Education, Health, and Human Services.

Purpose: You have agreed to participate in this study, which is being undertaken by the principle investigator as part of his dissertation research. You are invited to participate as an interview respondent in an effort to obtain perspectives on your co-teaching experiences with program faculty during your doctoral training.

Procedures: The initial interview will be approximately one hour in length and consist of you reflecting and discussing your co-teaching experiences with the interviewer. Prior to the initial interview, you will be asked for demographic information, such as age, marital status, academic status, and so forth. A week following the initial interview, in a second interview (approx. 30 minutes) you will be asked about some of the statements from the initial interview in an effort to clarify meaning and to accurately represent your perspective. All interviews will be recorded for transcription and data analysis purposes.

Benefits and Risks: The immediate benefits will be in terms of your being afforded the opportunity to express and clarify your views about the qualities of co-teaching practice, the results of which may benefit other doctoral students as well as counselor education (CE) program faculty. There is no anticipated risk to your participation.

Confidentiality: Information gathered will remain confidential within the limits of the law by the researchers. Your name will not be attached to your response; only your interviewer will know your identity. Your consent form, study-related information, and recorded interviews will be kept confidential within the limits of the law. Any identifying information will be kept in a secure location and only the researchers will have access to the data. Research participants will not be identified in any publication or presentation of research results; only aggregate data will be used. Your research information may, in certain circumstances, be disclosed to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), which oversees research at Kent State University, or to certain federal agencies.

Voluntary Participation: Taking part in this research study is entirely up to you. You may choose not to participate or you may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty.

Contact Information: If you have any questions or concerns about this research, you may contact Eric Baltrinic at 330.224.4569. This project has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or complaints about the research, you may call the IRB at 330.672.2704.
Consent Statement and Signature
I have read this consent form and have had the opportunity to have my questions answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. I understand that a copy of this consent will be provided to me for future reference.

____________________________________  ________________________
Participant Signature                  Date

Recording Release

Counselor Education Students’ Experiences of Co-Teaching With Program Faculty

I _______________________________ give consent to have two (initial and follow-up) interviews video recorded by the researcher ______________________________.

(Name of participant)                  (Researcher)

I am aware that the interviews will be transcribed and that portions of the transcriptions will be used for a class project in advanced qualitative research methods. The results of these interviews will not be used for any publications, presentations, or dissertations. The purpose of these interviews is strictly for a class exercise. I am aware that my name and any other identifying information will not be associated with the video recordings of the interviews and that I can choose to be out of the camera view if so desired. Only the researcher will know my identity. I am also aware that the video recordings of my interviews will be destroyed at the end of the project (MONTH/YEAR).

___________________________________  ________________________
Signature of Participant                Date

I have been informed that I have a right to watch the video-taped interviews. I have decided:

_____ I do not want to view the recordings       _____ I do want to view the recordings

Sign below if you DO NOT want to view the interview recordings. If you would like to view the interview recordings, you will be asked to sign after the viewing is complete.

___________________________________  ________________________
Signature of Participant                Date
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Recruitment Script

Dear Dr. ________,

My name is Eric Baltrinic. I am a doctoral candidate at Kent State University. My dissertation research is a phenomenological qualitative study on counselor education doctoral students’ experiences of co-teaching with program faculty.

My dissertation co-directors are Marty Jencius, Ph.D., and Jason McGlothlin, Ph.D. This study has been approved by the Kent State University Institutional Review Board (Insert IRB number). I believe this research will fill a gap in the counselor education literature by identifying doctoral students’ experiences of co-teaching; a phenomenon not yet researched in our discipline. In addition, I believe the research will serve as a foundation for understanding how doctoral students experience events (e.g., co-teaching) relevant to their preparation for teaching in future faculty positions.

The participants in my study must be counselor education doctoral students at least in their second semester and with at least one co-teaching experience with a program faculty member. Co-teaching experiences need to be relevant to counseling content courses (e.g., counseling theories, multicultural counseling) and not clinically-oriented courses like practicum or internship.

In order to find participants I am contacting program chairs/coordinators/directors at CACREP accredited institutions that have a doctoral program in order that they may help me identify two or three doctoral students who meet the above criteria and are willing to participate in at least two face-to-face interviews (approx. one hour each). Can you help me identify two or three students, or are you aware of program faculty who regularly co-teach with doctoral students who can?

If you have two or three people in mind, please provide me with the students or faculty members’ names, office phone numbers, and professional e-mail addresses, so that I may 1) add their names to a pool of potential participants and 2) contact them to determine if they are interested in participating in this dissertation research study. If you’d prefer, or if you have questions, you can also contact me by phone at (330) 224-4569, or by e-mail: ebaltrin@kent.edu.

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

Sincerely,

Eric Baltrinic, MA Ed. PCC-S
Doctoral Candidate,
Counseling and Human Development Services Kent State University
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Background Information Form

Counselor Education Students’ Experiences of Co-Teaching With Faculty

The following are a list of demographic items and questions. Please complete the following and return this form with your informed consent. All answers will remain confidential.

Age: _______ Gender: _________ Race: __________ Relationship Status: ___________

Why are you seeking a doctorate in counselor education?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

What are your plans when you graduate (e.g., clinical practice, faculty position, etc.)?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

How many counseling content courses (e.g., theory, diagnosis, career, substance abuse) have you co-taught with faculty during your program? (Do not include clinical courses such as practicum or internship.)?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

If applicable, what classes are you co-teaching currently?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Please list any prior teaching experience (i.e., before you entered your doctoral program).
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
Appendix E

Interview Questions

1. Can you tell me as completely as you can, your experiences of co-teaching with program faculty?
   a. What, where, when, with whom, how, why?
   b. Give me an example.
   c. Tell me more about…
   d. What was that like for you?

2. What makes one aspect of co-teaching better than another for you?
   a. Can you give me an example?
   b. Tell me more.
   c. What specifically? Why?

3. What impressions have your co-teaching experiences made on your career aspirations?
   a. What are they?
   b. What did the experiences mean for you?
   c. What did you take away from the experience relevant to your career goals?
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Example of Meaning Unit Summary for Mary

**Research Question 1:** Describe your co-teaching experiences (e.g., in and out of the classroom, personal reflections, faculty member, students, etc.)

**Theme:**
Co-teaching includes relationships that are inviting, trusting, and may begin prior to actual co-teaching experiences through student roles, advising, mentoring, and observations of faculty members’ teaching.

**Meaning Units** (i.e., excerpts of dialogue from the transcript):
1. “I had to for a pedagogy course, teach a class as part of an assignment.” “She has always been kind of a mentor to me. So, I did my one class experience with her.”

2. “We talked about that it might be a good idea to co-teach a whole semester . . . a whole class at some point during my doctoral experience.”

3. “She was one of my advisors and then just in general for my master’s program even was a mentor. It was just a conversation about, you know—you’re in the doc program and it’s important to get some teaching experience under your belt”

4. “I think she was very inviting to the experience.” “Because, I had had the class with her when I was a master’s student.” “She pointed out that she enjoyed having me in class.” “I guess what stands out for me with the experiences is . . . having had the opportunity to see her co-teach with others and then feeling like my experience was different, and maybe richer.”

5. “I felt like she really valued my input in the class, and interestingly when I took the class as a master’s student, she had a doctoral student that was co-teaching with her.” “She also had a doctoral student when I took one of her classes that came in a few times.” “When I observed them as a master’s student.” “And, I was a little concerned that I might not get a great experience because the doctoral students that did that, seemed very quiet.” “But, I’m a talker, and I always offer information in class. So, I thought it’d be a good fit and, and I was right.”

6. “So even though I felt when I was a master’s student and saw her co-teaching with doc students.” “I wasn’t sure my experience would be great. And, it ended up being very good.”

7. “I mean throughout all of the classes . . . she would invite my input.” “I mean I did feel like I was a participant. And, I felt like when she turned a lesson over to me she really turned a lesson over to me.”
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Example of Integrated Narrative for Mary

There is an understanding among students and faculty members that gaining teaching experience is an important aspect of the doctoral training process. Participating in co-teaching (as a way to gain teaching experience) is one way to achieve this aim. For Mary, the importance of gaining teaching experience was inherent in the goals of her doctoral training. Mary acknowledged this point even though she does not intend to be a full time faculty member or emphasize teaching in her future endeavors. Regardless of what one does with their doctoral degree, Mary stated: “I think if you’re going to be a counselor educator and you leave the program with only a handful of co-teaching experiences, I’m not sure I think that’s okay.”

The pathway to initiating a co-teaching experience varies for doctoral students despite the common knowledge that counselor education doctoral students ought to obtain some experience and practice with becoming an “educator.” Mary’s foray into co-teaching began with a conversation with her doctoral faculty advisor. Mary’s advisor told her that gaining teaching experience is an important part of the training process. Mary was willing to consider co-teaching with her advisor as a starting point. The relationship and trust level with her advisor factored into her co-teaching experiences:

I believe I articulated the importance of choosing a mentor as it relates to teaching. The professor I co-taught with, knew me and my experiences, and understood what I needed to learn from the experience. I just feel like it got more comfortable the more you get to know someone. And, I feel like her and I have a
very open and honest relationship. I was never afraid to ask questions. And, I
never felt like there was any kind of hidden agenda or anything like that. She was
always very open with what her expectation was.

Familiarity with the faculty co-teacher helped Mary transition to a “new”
experience. Mary had experience as a clinician, which buffered her anxiety about
teaching. Mary and the faculty co-teacher agreed that she would provide real-world (and
recent) clinical examples to support the course material. Mary felt that her quality co-
teaching moments often involved her ability to give the students real-world examples
from her practice. These experiences were invited by the faculty member:

She knew my clinical background that I already had and felt, not just would it be
a good experience for me to teach, but it would be a good experience for her to
have me co-teach with her. I think the best, probably the best moments in it were
ones where I was using my clinical knowledge to enhance the learning in the
classroom.

Overall, drawing from her strengths and experiences helped Mary engage in early co-
teaching moments with a degree of confidence, especially when she struggled with
aspects of the course content:

There were points during that time I was lecturing that I was a little
uncomfortable because I didn’t feel like I could answer some of the questions
students might have as well. Just because I wasn’t as familiar with the stuff that
she had on the PowerPoints.
Co-teaching experiences progress over time gradually leading to increased teaching responsibilities for Mary. At the beginning of the co-teaching experience, the faculty member led while encouraging Mary to be involved in the class discussion and small group processing. Mary illustrated that “she [would] invite my input during class to make sure I knew that I was going to be part of the class even though she was doing the lecture.” As time progressed, Mary realized that co-teaching taught her a lot about what goes into preparation and leading a class. And, feeling more comfortable teaching in front of a class. According to Mary, [She] would actually say “that is the biggest piece [co-teaching] gave me was getting comfortable in front of a group of students.”

Collectively, co-teaching experiences influenced Mary’s teaching style and desire to continue her development as a teacher. Mary felt like her co-teacher really helped her “learn how to teach” while “allowing me enough space to explore what my style might be.” For example, Mary realized that she and the faculty member had different styles, which prompted her to consider “splitting the difference” in her future endeavors.

What I learned when I co-taught with her is that using the PowerPoints and that kind of stuff seemed a little unnatural for me. And, that I’m very more process-oriented. I felt that it was more important to get them to start being process-oriented in their thoughts about clients. And, I got there because of co-teaching.

As a developing teacher, Mary observed the faculty member and considered aspects of her teaching style:
There’s a lot of control in the class and she’s very planful. And, I think you need to know how to do that. And, it might not end up being your style, but I think you need to know how to do it.

Overall, the experiences of co-teaching led Mary to the desire to teach as an instructor of record (i.e., teach her own class). Mary was given her own class (the same course she co-taught) and proceeded with confidence and thoughts about her own approach to teaching the course. Mary articulated her vision of teaching, which was clarified through her co-teaching experiences:

[Teaching] is an opportunity to train soon-to-be counselors in a way that I would like to see them be counselors. Teaching is an opportunity to make an impression on counselor trainees on what kind of counselor they might be, and who they might be willing to work with in the future.

The rewards of a quality co-teaching experience were noticeable for Mary. Her approach and contributions to the course were validated through discussions with students and course evaluations. For Mary, “[it was] getting good feedback from the students. [They] would say: thanks for sharing your real-life experiences that makes it more real for us. And, you know they were appreciative of what I brought to the class.”

Mary’s final thought on co-teaching as she reflected on the experience: “I think everyone should have to co-teach a semester—I do. Before they leave the doc program.”
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