



8-2016

Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-to-Degree

LaSonda Wells

Western Michigan University, lwells@kvcc.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Counseling Commons, and the School Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Wells, LaSonda, "Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-to-Degree" (2016). *Dissertations*. 1944.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/1944>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



DIMENSIONS OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION ADVISING RELATIONSHIP
IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION: MENTORING EXPECTATIONS,
SATISFACTION, AND TIME-TO-DEGREE

LaSonda Wells, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2016

High attrition rates among doctoral students are of great concern. Based on national statistics in the United States, at least 50% of students who start a doctoral program do not complete their degree (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Lovitts, 2000). Although factors leading to attrition can vary given the individual student and the discipline, the faculty-student relationship is the most commonly noted problematic factor across disciplines (Fedynich & Bain, 2011; Lovitts, 2001). However, the research on doctoral advisor-advisee relationships remains sparse, particularly in counselor education (Protivnak & Foss, 2009).

The purpose of this study was to explore the demographic profile of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs by examining counselor educators' expectations of an ideal mentor, perceptions of their advisory working alliance and perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs. Additionally, this study explored the relationship of these perceptions and cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race, or both with time-to-degree.

This study was motivated by five research questions: (1) What were the ideal mentor expectations of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs? (2) What were the perceived advisory working alliance experiences of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs? (3) What is the relationship between perceived advisory working alliance as measured by the AWAI-S and time-to-degree? (4) What is the relationship between perceived willingness to mentor and time-to-degree? (5) What is the relationship between cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race, or both and time-to-degree?

The research design chosen for this study was retrospective cross-sectional survey design. The data were collected through three online self-administered instruments (a) the Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS; Rose 2003, 2005); (b) the Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Student Version (AWAI-S; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001); and (c) a demographic questionnaire. The researcher utilized a purposive sampling method to solicit full-time and adjunct counselor educators working in CACREP-accredited master's and doctoral counseling programs across the United States. Participants were encouraged to reflect on their experience during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program.

The findings support that the phenomenon of mentoring in doctoral education is as valued and expected in Counselor Education as it is in other disciplines. However, there was neither a statistically significant relationship between time-to-degree and perception of dissertation advisory working alliance, nor did advisory working alliance, perception of advisor's willingness to mentor, or cross-cultural advising relationships predict time-to-degree. However, expectations of an ideal mentor and the perceptions of the advisory working alliance provided insight into the dissertation advising experiences

of counselor educators. Limitations of this study, implications for Counselor Education and doctoral training and recommendations for future research are identified.

DIMENSIONS OF THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION ADVISING RELATIONSHIP
IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION: MENTORING EXPECTATIONS,
SATISFACTION, AND TIME-TO-DEGREE

by

LaSonda Wells

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University
August 2016

Doctoral Committee:

Stephen E. Craig, Ph.D., Chair
Gary H. Bischof, Ph.D.
Marianne E. Di Pierro, Ph.D.
Joseph R. Morris, Ph.D.

© 2016 LaSonda Wells

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my great grandmother, Beatrice Johnson, my grandparents, Herman and Rosie Pearl Cassell, and my father, Vinson Thomas Sr., who are always with me in spirit.

First and foremost, I am thankful to my Lord and Savior for His unwavering love, guidance, strength, and peace in my life, especially during this doctoral journey. This journey of earning a doctorate was more than I ever imagined and definitely took longer than I expected. God revealed my strength, purpose and new found family and friends. I learned God's plans are perfect and I give Him praise and honor for HIS love, mercy, and grace. I am thankful I was blessed to complete this journey with an abundance of support and love.

I am thankful to my mother, Catherine Lowe, who taught me how to be strong, to be independent, to hold my head high, to think about my choices and make good decisions, to strive for anything I wanted, to not be defined by others, to be kind to all and love deeply, and ultimately to never make APOLOGIES for what I stand for and who I am – THE SPECIAL ONE (Ha-Ha)! I will love you through all time.

I am thankful to my son, GaBreon Wells-Lindsey, who often asked “When will you be a real mommy?” meaning when will I be done with school. I thank you for the many times you went to class, study groups, and the library with me and sat ever-so quietly and patiently. I thank you for the many times you gave me a hug, kiss, prayer, and

just love when you saw that I was exhausted. Thank you for the sacrifice! You were and always will be my motivation to be my best me and true to myself.

To my co-parenting partners, Ross and Jolanda Lindsey for their love, support and continued inspiration for me to complete this chapter in my life. I could not have had this success without you. To my stepmom, Angela Thomas and my siblings, Vinson Thomas Jr., Jabbar Jones, Akiesha Thomas, Katrina Slayton, and Jermaine Wells, I love you all beyond measure.

To my sister and brother friends – Katrina Lee, Quincy Richards, Melissa Wilson, Shavon Baker, Katesha Biagas, Mark and Dr. Candy McCorkle, Dr. Nikita Murry, Dr. Kelsey Woodard, Dr. LaShonda Fuller, Dr. Jessie Grant, Dr. BaoChun (JoJo) Hind, Karen Steeno, Steven and Caroline Ray, Yvonne Duncan, Ronnie and LaJoyce Brooks, Miranda Lee, Heather Highhouse, Dr. Sheila Witherspoon, Dr. Glinda Rawls, Lisa Walker, Coty Dunten, Mary Johnson, Dr. Courtney Deloney, Dr. Janee Steele, Dr. Darrell Plunkett, Jason Penn and Noelle Blades-Penn, Tina Cole, Jill Chestang, Dr. Nan Allen, Dr. Julie Davis, Dr. Loretia Dye, Dr. Donald Knight, Sonya Harrison, Rodney and Lillian Manning, Caitlyn Haveman, Matt Covault, Chris Pressley, Patty Mitchell, Shannon Parlato, and Stacey Magrath – thank you for being my village and surrounding me and my son with your love and support.

I want to thank my dissertation committee, Dr. Stephen Craig, Dr. Gary Bischof, Dr. Marianne Di Pierro, Dr. Joseph Morris, and the late Dr. Charles Warfield for their continued support, words of encouragement and most importantly, not allowing me to quit. Dr. Craig, you traveled on this journey into the exploration of advising relationships all while we were learning and developing our own working alliance. That took courage

and vulnerability – thank you! To my mentor, Dr. Di Pierro, words cannot express my gratitude. Thank you for being dedicated to my success and calming my fears, being my subject matter expert, and guiding me holistically through this journey. You were my *Ideal Mentor* and you truly are the “Dr. for PhDs.”

A heartfelt thank you to my Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo Valley Community College and Kalamazoo families. I had a few cheerleaders who witnessed me at my worst, my best, and provided me the safe space to vent and recollect myself. Thank you to Linda Comrie, Tony and Dr. Betty Dennis, Dr. Ewa Urban, Dr. Martha Warfield, Dr. Sara Sue Schaeffer, Dr. Donald Amidon, Dr. Gloria Barton-Berry, Laura Cosby, Jenny Buysse, Tracey Quada, Erin Dominianni, Cathy Colella, Monteze Morales, Ezra Bell, Chris Stroven, Ciji Gamble, Colleen Olson, Gerri Jacobs, and my Stones Church Family. There are many others who God has blessed me to encounter but the names are too many to mention. Please know, I appreciate and love you all.

I am sincerely and forever grateful.

LaSonda Wells

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Doctoral Attrition.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Significance of Research.....	7
Research Questions	7
Overview of Literature Review	8
Overview of Methodology	8
Participants and Sampling.....	9
Instrumentation	10
Assumptions.....	12
Glossary of Terms.....	12
Organization of Dissertation	15
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Overview of Retention and Attrition	16
History of Retention Theory	20
Tinto's Theory of College Student Departure	23
Tinto's Theory of Doctoral Persistence	25
Doctoral Attrition.....	27

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER		
	Background	27
	Doctoral Attrition and Persistence	29
	Counselor Education Doctoral Attrition	33
	Overview of Advising and Mentoring	42
	Advising.....	43
	Mentoring.....	45
	Resources for Doctoral Advising and Mentoring	49
	Summary	51
III.	METHODOLOGY	53
	Research Design.....	53
	Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Data Analysis	53
	Research Question 1	54
	Research Question 2	54
	Research Question 3	54
	Research Question 4	55
	Research Question 5	55
	Participants and Sampling.....	55
	Instrumentation	56
	Data Collection Procedures.....	60
	Delimitations.....	63
IV.	RESULTS	64
	Reverse Scored Items on the AWAI-S	64

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Missing Data	64
Demographic Information.....	65
Current Personal Information	65
Personal Information at Dissertation Phase	67
Departmental Doctoral Advising/Mentoring Practices.....	71
Summary of Demographic Profile	79
Data Analysis	81
Research Question 1	81
Research Question 2	82
Research Question 3	84
Research Question 4	85
Research Question 5	86
Summary of Data Analysis	87
Research Question 1	87
Research Question 2	88
Research Questions 3–5	88
V. DISCUSSION	89
Overview of Study	89
Overview of Methodology	89
Discussion of Salient Findings.....	91
Research Question 1: Mentoring	91
Research Question 2: Advising.....	92

Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Research Questions 3–5	96
Implications for Counselor Education and Doctoral Training.....	97
Limitations	98
Recommendations for Future Research	100
REFERENCES	101

APPENDICES

A. Informed Consent.....	110
B. Ideal Mentor Scale	114
C. Advisory Working Alliance Inventory – Student Version	118
D. Demographic Questionnaire	122
E. Emails Granting Permission to Use and Publish Instruments	130
F. Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Letters of Approval	135
G. Email Invitations to Participants	138
H. ACES Flyer Invite.....	141
I. Notification Email for Drawing Winners	143

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Frequencies and Percentages of Current Demographic Information	66
2.	Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations of Dissertation Phase Demographic Information	68
3.	Frequencies and Percentages of Dissertation Phase Demographic Information	69
4.	Frequencies and Percentages of Departmental Doctoral Advising/ Mentoring Practices	73
5.	Demographic Questionnaire Qualitative Responses	75
6.	Ideal Mentor Scale Descriptive Statistics	82
7.	Ideal Mentor Scale Averaged Importance Proportions	82
8.	Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version Descriptive Statistics	83
9.	Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version Averaged Agreement Proportions	84
10.	Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version and TTD Correlations	85
11.	Perception of Advisors’ Willingness to Mentor and TTD Group Statistics	86
12.	Cross-Cultural Advising and TTD Group Statistics	87

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Doctoral Attrition

At our highest level of education among our brightest graduate students, high attrition rates are consistent. Based on national statistics in the United States, at least 50% of students who start a doctoral program do not complete their degree (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Lovitts, 2000). Doctoral student attrition rates have been of great concern dating as far back as 1950 (Tucker, 1964) and since that time, high attrition rates have remained steady across many disciplines in the United States (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Lovitts, 2000; Nettles & Millett, 2006). Gardner (2008) referenced that the sciences had low rates of attrition ranging about 24% while the humanities and social sciences had high rates of attrition ranging about 67%. This is similar to the attrition rates previously provided by Lovitts (2000). She noted the humanities as having the highest attrition rates ranging from 50% to 70%, the sciences having the lowest rates ranging from 24% to 50%, while the social sciences, the closest alignment to counselor education (CE) doctoral curriculum, being in the middle with rates of 40% to 65% (Lovitts, 2000). Currently there exists scant detailed attrition data specific to counselor education (Burkholder, 2012). Moreover, on average minority students drop out more than their White counterparts, women leave more often than men, and American students have lower completion rates than international students (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Smallwood, 2004).

Doctoral attrition is costly and damaging for universities and students alike, especially late-stage attrition that occurs most often during the dissertation phase of the doctoral program (Lovitts, 2001; Willis & Carmichael, 2011). For example, the university primarily encounters consequences such as loss of human and financial resources that can subsequently lead to jeopardizing institutional reputations, impeding accreditations, obstructing grant funding and compromising Carnegie research status due to loss of talent and new ideas generated by students pursuing graduate education. Such institutional losses are mirrored within students' individual encounters with attrition. Students that choose to "leave" have done so typically with their autonomy and dignity intact because they often "leave" for reasons such as job promotion, transition into a different major or transferring to another college or university due to better fit or the realization that a doctoral degree is not necessary for their career aspirations (Lovitts, 2001). Ultimately, they differ from those that have "dropped out" due to the inability to overcome various barriers and obstacles (Lovitts, 2001). Therefore, doctoral students who have decided to "drop out" often face emotional turmoil in addition to the loss of time and financial resources (Lovitts, 2001; Willis & Carmichael, 2011). Sometimes they experience feelings of failure and low self-worth (Lovitts, 2001). Unfortunately, for some "dropping out" has led to acts of violence, depression and even suicide attempts (Lovitts, 2001; Willis & Carmichael, 2011).

Factors contributing to attrition have resulted from a complexity of variables such as finances (Bair & Haworth, 1999; Girves & Wemmerus, 1988), personality conflicts (Bair & Haworth, 1999), low levels of integration with peers and faculty (Golde, 2000; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Lovitts, 2001), incongruence or misfit between the student

and program goals and focus (Bair & Haworth, 1999; Lovitts, 2001) and poor faculty-student relationships (Ferrer de Valero, 2001; Lovitts, 2001). Although factors leading to attrition can vary given the individual student and the discipline, the faculty-student relationship is the most commonly noted problematic factor across disciplines (Fedynich & Bain, 2011; Lovitts, 2001). In 2008, the Council of Graduate Schools, in its Ph.D. Completion Project, identified the importance of the doctoral advisor-advisee relationship as one of six institutional and program characteristics that positively influence doctoral student completion. This outcome was further supported in a study conducted by Bain, Fedynich and Knight (2010) that revealed a positive correlation between doctoral education completion and advising relationships. However, the research on doctoral advisor-advisee relationships remains sparse in counselor education (Protivnak & Foss, 2009).

Statement of the Problem

In counselor education, the literature on doctoral attrition and doctoral advising/mentoring relationships is very limited (Black, Suarez & Medina, 2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). In 2012, Del Rio and Mieling addressed the fact that although degree attainment statistics indicated an increase in doctoral degrees conferred across disciplines including the field of education, the statistics in CE indicated a decrease. Since Del Rio and Meiling's publication, a review of the most recent data available, which covers academic years 2008-2009 through 2011-2012, there continued to be a decrease for the next two years (Digest of Education Statistics, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013). The largest decrease was noted between the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 academic years (Digest of Education Statistics, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013). At the end of the academic

school year in 2009, 310 CE doctoral degrees were attained in the United States, whereas at the end of the 2010 academic school year only 279 CE degrees were attained (Digest of Education Statistics, 2010, 2011).

It is only in the last year of reported data that an increase in CE conferred degrees has become apparent. In the academic year 2011-2012, 320 CE degrees were attained (Digest of Education Statistics, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013). Unfortunately, despite the recent increase of CE degree conferment, the three-year academic span of degree attainment decrease is still of concern, especially since the data provided did not offer reasons for the decreases such as low enrollment, high attrition or other factors. Moreover, decrease for any reason is disturbing for the discipline of CE due to its small field of study in comparison to its counterparts in other disciplines such as psychology and social work.

Del Rio and Mieling (2012) also noted, as did Sangganjanavanich and Magnuson (2009), that there is not a written “hands-on” approach to guide CE doctoral students through the process of degree attainment. This researcher further notes, that the standards from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009) which provides guidance of counselor education doctoral curriculum does not explicitly reference a necessity for counselor educators to be trained in advising and mentoring nor how to train doctoral students in the process of advising and mentoring. Absence of this in the standards is conspicuous. Subsequently, mentoring may not be valued as a skill set that needs training or a skill set that can enhance counselor education leadership. This fact poses a significant problem, given that research indicates that students who lack sustained and expert guidance may attrite, especially at the

dissertation phase. For some, this lack of guidance may deter their interest in the doctorate degree overall considering the master's degree is the terminal degree needed to practice in the counseling field (e.g., Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2001; Willis & Carmichael, 2011). Moreover, in support of the consensus across disciplines that the lack of doctoral advising training may pose threats to doctoral degree completion, Epigeum, a leading global higher education online training company, launched an online doctoral advising training module for universities in March 2015 (Epigeum, 2015).

The literature on doctoral success indicates that advising and mentoring play key roles in timely degree completion. However, scholars agree that advising and mentoring characteristics may vary significantly across disciplines (e.g., Green & Bauer, 1995; Hunt & Michael, 1983; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001, 2005). Lovitts (2001) noted that, due to a lack of doctoral advising research across disciplines, some academic disciplines will need to utilize research from other disciplines. Subsequently, the disciplines that lack their own doctoral advising research may use advising and mentoring strategies that are not suited best to the unique needs of their discipline. In CE, currently there exists only a thin body of advising literature specific to CE and the concept of mentoring in CE is relatively new and remains limited conceptually, procedurally and empirically (Black et al., 2004; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Subsequently, counselor education has had to extrapolate doctoral advising and mentoring findings from research conducted in other disciplines. Given that counselor education is differentiated from other disciplines such as psychology and social work, the question remains as to how uniquely different might the advising and mentoring needs be for counselor education doctoral students.

Further, the counseling profession is only as strong as the counselor educators that achieve degree attainment. Counselor Education doctoral graduates are expected to be future leaders and advocates for the counseling profession, based upon the advanced proficiencies gained in instruction, clinical practice, supervision, research and leadership (CACREP, 2009; Sears & Davis, 2003; Sweeney, 2003). Consequently, the failure to investigate how CE doctoral graduates perceived their advising relationships, specifically at the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs and the resulting impact on their doctoral training could, inadvertently, foster inadequate and ineffective doctoral advisory relationships. By examining the advisory working alliance and ideal mentor expectations through the perspective of CE doctoral graduates, counselor education can seek to strengthen doctoral advisory relationships. The failure to do so may lead to inadequate and ineffective doctoral advisory relationships and thus potentially compromise students' success by protracting time-to-degree or even degree attainment.

Compromised advisory relationships could subsequently contribute to attrition in CE and potentially impact the counseling profession as a whole due to a lack of counselor educators in tenure-track positions at universities and colleges. In 1990, Lanning stated "We will always be driven by the master's level education we provide, but that can only continue if we prepare quality doctoral level graduates" (p. 168). These aforementioned facts, in addition to a vast body of literature, support the importance of this research to address doctoral attrition by examining and seeking to understand the perceptions of CE doctoral graduates in relation to their experiences of doctoral advising and ideal mentor expectations at the dissertation phase of their degree programs. This research is currently

not available to the level necessary to understand the phenomenon of doctoral advising/mentoring and its correlation to CE program success.

Significance of Research

This study is significance in three ways. First, in its most general form, this study adds to the body of CE literature on doctoral advising and mentoring. Secondly, the research examines CE doctoral advisory relationships with the goal of identifying what elements or characteristics CE doctoral graduates expected in an ideal mentor and received from advisors in order to ensure the maximum outcome of quality advising and/or mentoring relationships and degree attainment. Lastly, this study can ultimately contribute to the future development of CE data-driven doctoral advising/mentoring strategies that can be incorporated into the advising process of CE doctoral students. Results from this study may enhance the training of CE doctoral advisors, which could identify and explicate best practices that can enhance experiences, contribute to reducing attrition rates and ensure opportunities for degree completion. Currently, this information is not available to the extent that it should be.

Research Questions

1. What were the ideal mentor expectations of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?
2. What were the perceived advisory working alliance experiences of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?
3. What is the relationship between perceived advisory working alliance as measured by the AWAI-S and time-to-degree?

4. What is the relationship between perceived willingness to mentor and time-to-degree?
5. What is the relationship between cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race or both and time-to-degree?

Overview of Literature Review

The literature review consists of critical studies that provide a foundational platform that explicates important elements in the research questions: (1) a brief overview of retention and attrition, (2) the history of retention theory, (3) Tinto's theory of college student departure, (4) Tinto's theory of doctoral persistence, (5) examination of attrition at the doctoral level, (6) counselor education doctoral retention and attrition, (7) overview of advising and mentoring to include a comparison of both, (8) cross cultural mentoring, and (9) graduate advising and mentoring models.

Overview of Methodology

The research design used for this study was retrospective cross-sectional survey research. Cross-sectional survey research focuses on the relationship between variables (Punch, 2003) and uses quantitative methods of analysis such as descriptive statistics, t-tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and regression. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the demographic profile of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs by examining counselor educators' expectations of an ideal mentor, perceptions of their advisory working alliance and perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their

doctoral programs. Additionally, this study explored the relationship of these perceptions and cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race, or both with time-to-degree.

Participants and Sampling

The participants for this study were counselor educators who earned a doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) or a doctor of education degree (Ed.D.) from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited doctoral program in the United States; had served as full time or adjunct faculty members in a master's or doctoral counseling program in the United States; and asserted that they were confident in reflecting, with accuracy, upon their dissertation advising experience. Counselor educators who had not graduated from a CACREP-accredited doctoral counseling program, had not served as a full time or adjunct faculty member in a master's or doctoral counseling program, and/or did not feel confident in their ability to reflect accurately about their doctoral dissertation advising experiences were excluded from the research. These exclusionary criteria were based on the fact that CACREP accreditation standards provide the guidelines for uniformity for doctoral preparation in counselor education. Also, counselor educators primarily work within the professoriate and this allowed ease of access to an already small population. Lastly, if participants did not feel confident about reflecting accurately on their dissertation advising experiences they were not eligible for participation in this research.

Purposive sampling, a non-random selection process, was used to solicit participants for this study. This choice of sampling was used given the intentionality in targeting counselor educators listed as faculty (full or adjunct) on CACREP-accredited counseling program websites. The researcher also employed snowball-sampling

technique by asking participants to forward the email invitation with the survey link to other counselor educators they may know that meet the inclusionary criteria. The researcher planned to attain an effective response rate by collecting data over a five-week period of time at a minimum or until the minimum number of participants were retrieved.

Instrumentation

Counselor educators completed the following three measures after giving consent (see Appendix A): the Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS; Rose, 2003, 2005; see Appendix B); the Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Student Version (AWAI-S; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; see Appendix C); and a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix D) consisting of basic demographic information and departmental advising and mentoring questions. Author permission (see Appendix E) was obtained to use both the IMS and the AWAI-S.

The Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS; Rose, 2003, 2005) is a brief self-report instrument that is applicable to all doctoral level students regardless of their involvement, or lack thereof, in a mentoring relationship. The IMS does not define mentoring but instead was purposefully designed to evoke and assess the meaning and expectations of an ideal mentor from the doctoral student's perspective based on their attitudes, beliefs, or feelings (Rose, 2003, 2005). The IMS has 34 items scored on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*not at all important*) to 5 (*extremely important*). The IMS has three subscales that measure *integrity*, *guidance*, and *relationship*. The *integrity* subscale "represents a mentor who exhibits virtue and principled action and can be emulated as role model" (Rose, 2005, p. 57). The *guidance* subscale "represents a mentor who provides practical assistance with the tasks and activities typical of graduate study" (Rose, 2005, p. 57). The *relationship* subscale "represents a mentor with whom students

can form a personal relationship that might involve sharing personal concerns, social activities, and life vision or worldview” (Rose, 2005, p. 57).

The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Student version (AWAI-S; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001) is a brief self-report instrument designed to assess the strength of the advisory working alliance from the student’s perspective. The construct of advisory working alliance is based upon supervisory working alliance, which is built upon working alliance (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Working alliance is a construct that addresses the aspect of a relationship that is identified by cooperation, mutuality, and collaboration in regards to the work being conducted and provides a means to establish agreed upon goals to work towards (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). The AWAI-S has a total of 30 items scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The AWAI-S has three subscales that measure *rapprochement*, *apprenticeship*, and *identification-individuation*. The *rapprochement* subscale refers to the advisor’s encouragement and support of the advisee along with the emotional bond that may develop based upon their work together (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). The *apprenticeship* subscale reflects the advisor’s promotion of the advisee’s professional development (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). The *identification-individuation* subscale reflects the degree to which an advisee wants to be like or admires their advisor or seeks to individuate from his or her advisor (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001).

The demographic questionnaire consisted of three sections: (1) basic demographic information at the time of completing the survey (e.g., age, gender, and ethnicity); (2) personal information during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program (e.g., working status and relationship status); (3) departmental doctoral advising and mentoring

practices during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program (e.g., advising and mentoring practices and previous mentoring experiences). The demographic questionnaire had 40 questions.

Assumptions

For this study, the researcher assumed that (a) the participants would answer the survey questions as accurately and truthfully as possible given that they are volunteers who asserted they were able to reflect on their dissertation advising experiences with clarity and accuracy, (b) respondents were able to accurately reflect back upon their dissertation advising experiences with clarity, (c) their dissertation advising experience was the sole focus of their reflection, and (d) the variables relevant to strong advising working alliances and ideal mentors correlate to timely and satisfying dissertation and doctoral program completion.

Glossary of Terms

ACES – the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) is the flagship association for counselor education and supervision and emphasizes the need for quality education and supervision of counselors in all work settings and has the purpose of advancing counselor education and supervision in order to improve the provision of counseling services in all settings of society, in accordance with the purposes of the American Counseling Association (ACES, 2013).

Advisor – is the counselor education faculty member who had the responsibility for guiding an advisee/doctoral student through her or his dissertation process at a CACREP-accredited CE doctoral program in the United States.

Advisory Working Alliance – the advisory working alliance is a construct based on the working alliance theory. Working alliance addresses the element of a relationship that is identified by cooperation, mutuality, and collaboration in regard to the work being conducted and provides a means to establish agreed upon goals towards that work. The advisory working alliance is of the same basis but is applied specifically to the advisory relationship in graduate education. Per Schlosser and Gelso's (2001) definition, the advisor is referred to as the faculty member with the greatest responsibility for helping guide the advisee through the graduate program. For the purpose of this study the definition for the "advisor" has been redefined and refers to the counselor education faculty member that had the responsibility for guiding the advisee/doctoral student through her or his dissertation process (see above).

CACREP – Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs; accredits counselor education programs based on preparation standards that promote program development and professional competence in counseling (CACREP, 2013).

Counselor educators – are faculty who train and prepare master's and doctoral level counselor education students. Master's level students are trained to be professional counselors whereas doctoral level students are trained to be Counselor educators (ACES, 2013).

Counselor education doctoral graduate – is a counselor educator who has graduated from a CACREP-accredited counselor education doctoral program in the United States. The counselor education doctoral graduate or counselor educator will also

be referred to as the advisee in regards to the doctoral advising relationship during their doctoral program.

Cross-cultural advising relationship – is defined as an advising relationship where the counselor education advisor differs in gender, race or both from their advisee.

Doctoral attrition – is defined as students who start a doctoral program but do not complete their degrees (Lovitts, 2001).

Ideal mentor – is what an ideal mentor is and does from the perspective of the student in the context of doctoral education (Rose, 2003, 2005).

Mentor – is a more experienced individual who addresses both the psychosocial and career development of a lesser experienced individual by guiding, training, supporting, role-modeling, providing access to networks, and sharing of knowledge (Kram, 1985).

Mentorship – is the established relationship between a mentor and protégé or mentee (Johnson, 2002).

Mentoring – the operational definition of mentoring used for this study will be Farrell's (2007) definition:

Mentorship in counselor education (and the counseling profession) is an interpersonal, interdependent, collaborative, and continuously evolving relationship between individuals who are differentiated by skills, experiences, expertise and knowledge. The more experienced individual [mentor] provides the lesser-experienced individual [mentee] with guidance, encouragement, support, resources and direction in the roles of educator, role model, and sponsor. The mentee, in turn, reciprocates support, encouragement, and direction. Additional resources may be provided for the mentor as well. Furthermore, the relationship is marked by trust, empathy, respect, open communication, active listening, genuineness, commitment, and clearly established boundaries. Through mentoring interactions, both the mentor and mentee develop holistic personal (psychosocial based) and professional (career based) identities. (pp. 35-36)

Persistence – refers to the desire and action of a student to stay within the system of higher education from beginning year through degree completion (Berger & Lyon, 2005).

Student retention – refers to the capability of an institution to keep a student from their time of entrance until graduation (Berger & Lyon, 2005).

Time-to-degree – refers to the amount of time (years and months) it takes to complete a doctoral degree.

Organization of Dissertation

Chapter I provides an overview of the dissertation project and introduce the statement of the problem; significance of the research; the research questions; the literature review; the methodology; assumptions of the researcher; delimitations, limitations, and glossary of terms specific to the research, as well as the organization of the chapters.

Chapter II provides a focused review of critical research studies that have informed and guided this research.

Chapter III addresses the specific details of the methodology by listing the hypotheses, explaining how participants were solicited, indicating the types of instruments and scales used, protection of the collected data, and demonstrating the statistical methods for data analyses.

Chapter IV provides the results and the analyses of the collected data.

Chapter V provides an overview of the most salient research findings, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following components comprise the literature review: a brief overview of retention and attrition, the history of retention theory, Tinto's theory of college student departure, Tinto's theory of doctoral persistence; examination of attrition at the doctoral level, counselor education doctoral retention and attrition, overview of advising and mentoring to include a comparison of both, cross cultural mentoring, and graduate advising and mentoring models.

Overview of Retention and Attrition

As our nation continues to strive forward in providing an opportunity for all persons to attend college, unfortunately many college students, undergraduate (Berger & Lyons, 2005; Chen, 2013) and graduate (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2000) alike, "dropout" or "attrite" and fail to complete their educational goals. Prior to exploring retention and attrition at the doctoral level, it is important to understand undergraduate retention and attrition and the history of retention theory. Student retention refers to the capability of an institution to retain students from the time of their admission through to graduation (Berger & Lyon, 2005). Attrition, on the other hand, is defined as students who start college but fail to complete their degrees (Berger & Lyon, 2005).

The golden age of American higher education which spanned from the end of World War II to 1970 was characterized by popularity, prestige, and prosperity due to the

fact that higher education was becoming more affordable and accessible; furthermore, there was an increase in advanced study in numerous areas (Rudolph, 1990). By the 1950s, many colleges and universities experienced rapid expansion and massive enrollment at the undergraduate level which brought about new challenges, one of which was student retention. Ease of access and affordability for students did not guarantee college readiness for the cognitive rigor and discipline necessary to the successful completion of a college degree. Consequently, colleges and universities were not prepared either and were unable to address the needs of a growing diverse student population. Therefore, as a result, many colleges and universities began to experience large numbers of students withdrawing and failing to complete their degrees (Berger & Lyons, 2005).

Although enrollment was rapidly growing, so was attrition. Colleges and universities were unable to retain the vast amount of students entering their institutions. Specifically, diverse populations such as underrepresented and low-income students for which higher education was not designed to accommodate, left college before completing degrees (Berger & Lyons, 2005). Consequently, attrition was becoming increasingly visible and of concern despite the increase in enrollment. This visible dilemma of rapid enrollment along with high attrition rates gave way to student retention taking on a higher precedence of concern. Unfortunately, previous research was limited because it focused on single institutions versus a national profile and academic failure, as explained through individual psychological attributes such as maturity, motivation and disposition as the main characteristics that contributed to the persistence or non-persistence of students

(Berger & Lyons, 2005). Tinto (2007) referred to this as blaming the victim. Students, not institutions, failed because they were less able, motivated, and willing (Tinto, 2007).

In the 1960s, as enrollment numbers dwindled due to a declining birth rate, lack of affordability of college, among other factors, student retention research evolved to the examination of more than just the personality traits of students. There existed six major types of research being conducted at the time (Spady, 1970):

1. Philosophical research sometimes referred to as theoretical studies, was founded on assumptions that college dropout should be prevented and prescribed recommendations for prevention.
2. Census research endeavored to describe within and across institutions the magnitude of transfer rates, dropout and attrition.
3. Autopsy research consisted of self-reported data for the reasons students departed college.
4. Case study research tracked identified at-risk students upon their entry to college with the purpose of exploring what led to their failure or success in completing college.
5. Descriptive research elicited the characteristics of dropout students and their experiences.
6. Predictive research used admission criteria to predict the potential for students to persist in college.

By the end of the 1960s, despite the evolution of retention research, researchers concluded that previous research remained limited in scope and indicated that there was a need to expand to address the complexities of student retention such as the role of

emotional characteristics, social contexts, the interactions between the two and how they impacted student success or failure in completing college (Berger & Lyons, 2005).

At the start of the 1970s, following the golden age of American higher education, many academic institutions were on the brink of fiscal ruin. This fiscal short-coming was seen as a result of the overdevelopment of current and new programs of study, the building of overelaborate campuses, and poor financial planning (Rudolph, 1990). This time was also marked by students who were reflecting the culture of our country by expressing their disappointment with our country's government, and also the government of colleges and universities. Despite the many areas of concern, the most alarming threat to the stability of colleges and universities was the financial distress (Rudolph, 1990). As a result of the economic situation, retention of students was an important factor if colleges and universities were to re-gain financial stability. In maintaining tuition revenue, it was more cost effective to retain students who were already enrolled than to invest in recruiting new students (Berger & Lyon, 2005).

Given the state of higher education, the Carnegie Corporation formed the Carnegie Commission to examine the condition of American higher education (Rudolph, 1990). Due to their findings, the government imposed standardized data tracking which included enrollments, budgets, and degree conferment. This was the first attempt towards holding institutions accountable and reliable for re-gaining financial stability. This data tracking also thrust student retention to the forefront of higher education concerns. As a result, many federal and state policies and interventions were created that used retention as a vital criterion for success and as a factor in determining funding for state campuses (Berger & Lyons, 2005).

History of Retention Theory

Retention theory builds its foundation at the undergraduate level of education. The study of undergraduate retention prior to the 1970s was still developing and by the early 1970s the phenomenon of “student failure” or “student departure” was officially titled “retention” and thus undergraduate student retention theory was at its beginning stages (Berger & Lyons, 2005). William Spady is known as one of the most notable researchers who began to examine the complexities of undergraduate student retention and the impact of college on undergraduate students. Prior to Spady’s (1971) work, many studies were focused on single institutions and emphasized generic models that explained the causes of attrition and provided suggestions for retention from a general phenomenon standpoint.

Spady (1970, 1971) sought to develop a comprehensive framework to explain student departure. In 1970, he synthesized previous empirical data and argued that future research needed to focus on the interaction between students’ attributes (e.g., values, interest, skills, and attitudes) and the campus environment (e.g., faculty, peers, and administrators). His sociological model explained the process of student departure being a result of students’ attributes being exposed to influences, expectations and demands from various sources such as course work, administrators, faculty member and peers. He posited that during the student-campus interaction, if successful assimilation into the academic and social systems of their college or university occurred then students were more apt to persist. Conversely, if assimilation was not successful, then students were more apt to withdraw (Spady, 1970, 1971).

Successful assimilation was viewed as sufficient or insufficient rewards available in both the academic and social systems (Spady, 1970, 1971). Spady referenced two types of rewards (extrinsic and intrinsic) relevant in each system. For the academic system, grades (extrinsic) and intellectual development (intrinsic) were rewards. Achieving good grades was viewed as an extrinsic reward because it was a connection to opportunities for career success. Intellectual development (intrinsic) was identified as being an important part of personal development; therefore, as students learned more, they grew more personally (Spady, 1970, 1971). For the social system, Spady described the rewards as normative congruence (intrinsic) and friendship support (extrinsic). Normative congruence was described as a student's attributes aligning with the college's environment, obtaining success in the social system. Developing close relationships with others in the college environment was also viewed as obtaining success into the social system. Spady's (1970, 1971) work transitioned retention research from examining only the student's psychological attributes to examining the sociological impact and contexts in which student retention was occurring (Berger & Lyon, 2005). Furthermore, Spady's efforts provided a platform for other theorists with sociological perspectives, such as Kamens (1971), Tinto (1975, 1993), and Astin (1977, 1985), to build upon and make further contributions to student retention research and its momentum.

Kamen's (1971) work addressed a college's and university's structural linkage to occupational and economic groups, basically the ability of the college or university to allocate their graduates to major social statuses. These structural linkages differ among colleges and universities and result in a "charter" which "defines and legitimates its distinctive student product" (Kamen, 1971, p. 270). Kamen hypothesized that college

“charter” and college size influenced students’ occupational commitment and student retention. His work supported that “larger schools have greater impact on students’ occupational commitments than smaller schools, and hence show lower dropout rates, because of their superior status-allocating capacity” (Kamens, 1971, p. 270).

Furthermore, despite a college’s and university’s internal socialization structures, prestige and college/university size may have a more direct impact on a student’s occupational commitment and persistence (Kamens, 1971). Although, Kamen’s theory was sociological in nature, his focus was primarily on the socialization contexts of the institution and society, rather than the socialization contexts between students and the institution.

Building directly upon Spady’s work, Vincent Tinto (1975, 1993) developed the interactionist theory of student departure and further supported the paradigm shift that called for institutional responsibility and accountability for students’ decisions to persist or leave. His work was the first “to lay out a detailed longitudinal model that made explicit connections between environment, in this case the academic and social systems of the institution and the individuals who shaped those systems, and student retention over different periods of time” (Tinto, 1975, 1993). Hence, Tinto (1975, 1993) addressed the interaction or level of engagement that takes place between the student and the institution, particularly the academic and social systems. He posited that the greater the student’s level of social and academic integration, the greater the student’s commitment to the institution and commitment to the goal of graduating from college (Tinto, 1975, 1993). Therefore, academic and social integration directly impacts student retention, as a result, the greater the level of a student’s commitment, the more likelihood a student will

persist (Tinto, 1975, 1993). Similar to Spady (1970, 1971), Tinto (1975, 1993) sought to explore how academic and social integration influenced the process of attrition.

Alexander Astin (1977, 1985), another notable researcher, further supported the notion that student-campus interactions impacted student retention. During the 1960s, Astin and his UCLA colleagues examined and analyzed large national databases of information collected by hundreds of colleges and concluded that involvement was a significant factor for undergraduate student retention (Berger & Lyon, 2005). Astin reasoned that decisions of student departure were directly impacted by the level of physical and psychological investment students had in their academic and social experiences at college. Astin's model was considered to have a level of simplicity and ease of use. However, despite this simplicity and ease of use, Tinto has become one of the best known theorists on student retention and the most often cited (Berger & Lyon, 2005). Moreover, Tinto (1993) is notable for expanding his theory to be applicable to doctoral student retention. Given this, Tinto's Interactionalist theory will be the framework for this study. The next sections will provide a more detailed examination of Tinto's (1975, 1993) Interactionalist Theory, his theory of doctoral persistence, and the demarcation between undergraduate and doctoral retention.

Tinto's Theory of College Student Departure

Tinto's theory of college student departure, which is also referred to as Tinto's Interactionalist or Integration Theory (Berger & Lyons, 2005; Golde, 2000, 2005; Spaulding & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2012), has become one of the leading and most often cited theories related to college student attrition (Berger & Lyons, 2005). Tinto's (1975) theory sought to explain "the processes of interaction between the individual and the

institution that lead differing individuals to drop out from institutions of higher education, and that also distinguishes between those processes that result in definably different forms of dropout behavior” (p. 90).

He conceptualized that psychological and background traits (e.g., sex, personality orientations, family background, secondary school performance) influenced not only the type of institution a student would attend but also how well a student would interact and integrate into an institution (Tinto, 1975, 1993). He also posited that along with these traits, a student’s level of commitment to an institution and commitment to the goal of graduating from college, coupled with academic and social integration, were determinants for college student departure (Tinto, 1975, 1993). More specifically, his theory focuses on the latter, academic and social integration with the institution (i.e., college or university) (Tinto, 1975, 1993). He posits that the degree to which students are integrated into the institution’s social and intellectual communities reflects their level of persistence (Tinto, 1975, 1993).

If high levels of integration take place, then commitment levels are reinforced and students are more likely to persist to degree completion. Conversely, if low levels of integration take place, then degree completion is less likely. Tinto (1975, 1993) cites two reasons for unsuccessful integration: “incongruence” and “isolation.” Incongruence occurs when there exists a mismatch between the intellectual development of the student and predominant intellectual climate of the institution (Tinto, 1975, 1993). Basically, there is not a good fit between students and their expectation of the college or university. Isolation, on the other hand, occurs when there is an absence of integration experiences such as developing peer group associations, attending extracurricular activities and

interaction with college faculty and administrative personnel. Isolation is considered the more common of the two (Tinto, 1975, 1993). When a student has successful social interactions, there is a development of social communication, friendship and faculty support and a sense of a “social fit” which leads to an increased likelihood to persist (Tinto, 1975, 1993). These theories, originally conceptualized against an undergraduate model, will later inform graduate education in profound ways.

Tinto’s Theory of Doctoral Persistence

Tinto’s primary work focused on undergraduate students but later he expounded his theory to be applicable to the process of doctoral education (Tinto, 1993). Tinto states that academic and social integration is important for both undergraduate and doctoral students. Conceivably, there are some differences between these populations and their integration processes. For undergraduates, the academic integration is focused on the formal education of students through situations such as classroom activities and faculty involvement. The social integration involves the personal needs and daily life that take place outside of formal education such as activities that may take place in residence halls, cafeterias, and through student organization events (Tinto, 1975, 1993). In 2005, Tinto addressed the National Conference on Student Recruitment, Marketing, and Retention which was held in Washington, D.C. (Tinto, 2007). In this address, he noted the growth his theory has experienced and that in the beginning it lacked complexity and detail (Tinto, 2007). Tinto also contented that although student retention is “everyone’s business” (p. 5), faculty, particularly, have a huge impact on student retention and unfortunately, faculty involvement was limited. He called for a continued movement

from theory to action and that institutions needed to be told “what they would do to achieve academic and/or social integration in their particular setting” (Tinto, 2007, p. 6).

At the doctoral level, assimilation into the culture of the department and discipline of study is considered the academic integration process (Golde, 2000; Tinto, 1993). This assimilation may also extend to the university or college community. This would incorporate all activities associated with doctoral level education such as course work, learning advanced theory, enhancing research skills such as statistical knowledge, assisting with research projects, obtaining a teaching or research assistantship, along with writing for publication and presenting at conferences (Golde, 2000; Tinto, 1993). Social integration for doctoral students focuses on the process of evolving into a professional colleague within the department. This is achieved through social activities such as attending social events or interacting in lounge areas that allow for informal interaction with department faculty (Golde, 2000; Tinto, 1993).

When compared to that of undergraduates, where their academic and social integration processes appear to be separate but both important, for doctoral students, their academic and social integration process is heavily intertwined. Tinto (1993) states that

Social membership within one’s program becomes part and parcel of academic membership, and social interaction with one’s peers and faculty becomes closely linked not only to one’s intellectual development, but also to the development of important skills required for doctoral completion. (p. 232)

Tinto goes on further to suggest that in the later stages of doctoral education a student’s social and work domains are more likely to become inseparable, and that over time

specifically, it is likely that the process of doctoral persistence, especially in the later stages, will be much more a function of the behaviors of a specific group of faculty or of a particular faculty member (e.g., one’s advisor) than it is of the local community generally (Clewell 1987, Girves and Wemmerus, 1988). As such, the process of doctoral persistence is more likely to reflect the specific character of

student-faculty interactions than is undergraduate persistence generally (Thomas, Clewell, and Pearson 1991). (p. 232)

Hence, the socialization and integration agents for doctoral students are primarily faculty (Golde, 2000). Golde (2000) goes on to support the continued theme in the literature that student-faculty relationships play a primary and important role in doctoral degree completion. Given this, it is important to note the degree to which satisfying and productive mentoring relationships play a role in the successful acculturation of doctoral students to their disciplines.

Tinto's theory is sociological in nature (Tinto, 1993) in that it does not exclude the idea that individuals' attributes do play a role in their decision to depart but "argues that the impact of individual attributes cannot be understood without reference to the social and intellectual context within which individuals find themselves" (p. 113).

Doctoral Attrition

Background

Historically, on average only 50% of all doctoral students who start a program will continue on to degree completion (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2000). These rates have remained consistent across disciplines over time (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2000; Smallwood, 2004; Terrell, Snyder, & Dringus, 2009). Gardner (2008) referenced that the sciences had low rates of attrition ranging about 24%, while the humanities and social sciences had high rates of attrition ranging about 67%. This is similar to the attrition rates previously provided by Lovitts (2000). She noted the humanities as having the highest attrition rates ranging from 50% to 70%, the sciences having the lowest rates ranging from 24% to

50%, while the social sciences, the closest alignment to counselor education (CE) doctoral curriculum, being in the middle with rates of 40% to 65% (Lovitts, 2000).

Currently there exist no detailed attrition data specific to CE (Burkholder, 2012). Moreover, on average minority students drop out at higher rates than their White counterparts, women leave more often than men, and American students have lower completion rates than international students (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Smallwood, 2004).

Early research on doctoral attrition focused on admission criteria, such as grade point average (GPA), Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores, and admission interviews, along with personal characteristics such as personality type, intrinsic motivation, and learning styles (Creighton, Parks, & Creighton, 2007, as cited by Terrell et al., 2009). As research progressed, the focus expanded to include factors such as academic and social integration (Golde, 2000, 2005; Lovitts, 2000; Tinto, 1975, 1993).

Lovitts (2005) expounds upon Tinto's (1975, 1993) theory in her research and provides three factors that impact degree completion. The first is individual resources which include such aspects as motivation, learning styles, personality, and intelligence (Lovitts, 2005). The second factor is the microenvironment which comprises department, faculty, and peers (Lovitts, 2005). Lastly is the macroenvironment which is the culture of the discipline and graduate education (Lovitts, 2005). Golde (2005), another leading researcher in doctoral persistence, also agrees with both Tinto and Lovitts that one of the strongest determining factors for doctoral attrition is inadequate academic integration. Academic integration for doctoral students consists of their academic studies along with their social integration within their department (Tinto, 1993). More specifically, the

faculty-student relationship is a crucial factor for doctoral persistence and is consistently noted in the literature (Fedynich & Bain, 2011; Golde, 2000, 2005; Lovitts, 2000, 2001; Tinto, 1993).

Doctoral Attrition and Persistence

In 1988, Girves and Wemmerus conducted research with the goal of developing a model that would account for time-to-degree. Their model consisted of two stages that influenced the rate at which graduate students progress through their respective program. The first stage consisted of four variables: students' characteristics, departments' characteristics, financial support, and students' relationships with faculty members. The second stage consisted of four variables: grades, level of involvement within the program, satisfaction with the department, and level of integration versus isolation (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988). The researchers administered their survey to 948 graduate students (this includes pilot testing participants) across 42 different departments at a Midwestern university. They received 486 completed responses and their findings supported that the most influential factor in degree completion was students' level of involvement. They defined "involvement" as the cultivation of faculty-student relationships and financial support, particularly graduate assistantships. The researchers concluded that some of the ways to increase involvement included being treated as colleagues in training, participating in research with faculty members and having graduate assistantships which allow for a more intense integration into the student's college or university department.

In Lovitts' (2001) seminal work, Lovitts shares that she was a two-time doctoral non-completer who met with success only on her third try. She noted that attrition is an invisible problem because many doctoral students withdraw quietly and without much

attention (Lovitts, 2001). Her research comprehensively reviewed the causes and consequences of withdrawing from doctoral education. Lovitts posited that the attrition of high achievers was the fault of department culture rather than that of the individual student. She concluded that department culture that exhibited poor communication, poor learning experiences and negative relationships with advisors influenced attrition (Lovitts, 2001).

In 2001, Ferrer de Valero studied departmental factors that impacted doctoral time-to-degree. Her work was qualitative and consisted of semi-structured interviews with 24 doctoral students and 16 faculty members and focused on financial aid, degree requirements, departmental policies, advising and departmental climate. Her findings posited that student success and graduation were aided when positive relationships existed with advisors, other faculty members, peers and sufficient financial support (Ferrer de Valero, 2001).

Golde (1998, 2000), one of the leading researchers in doctoral student attrition, has provided continued research that reinforces the idea that advising relationships have an impact on doctoral student attrition. In 1998, Golde's research focused on the cause of attrition in first-year doctoral students. She interviewed a total of 58 doctoral students of which 18 departed during the first year of doctoral education. The participants were from four departments: history, English, biology, and geology. A common reason for attrition among all the participants in all departments was the realization that the lifestyle of academia was not a good fit for their life goals (Golde, 1998). She then compared reasons for withdrawing between the sciences and the humanities.

Golde (1998) notes that doctoral education between the sciences and humanities differ immensely. Science students typically spend a great amount of undergraduate preparation for research science by working as research assistants (biology) or attending summer field schools (geology) (Golde, 1998). These students are oriented to the research environment early on and understand that their success in completing their doctoral education hinges heavily on the advisor they are paired with or choose (Golde, 1998). A connection must be made quickly, along with successful assimilation into the advisor's research team (Golde, 1998). Given that graduate education in the sciences is linked with industry and government funded research enterprise, it is imperative that academic and social integration, as Tinto (1993) posits, takes place because it impacts the student's research selection and execution, funding of tuition and research costs, and mentoring possibilities through graduate school (Golde, 1998). Participants in the sciences (biology and geology) referenced three common themes for attrition: poor fit with the department, poor job market, or a negative relationship with their advisor (Golde, 1998).

In contrast, humanity students do not have early exposure to the research environment in their undergraduate preparation or in the beginning of their doctoral education (Golde, 1998). More emphasis is placed on coursework and serving as teaching assistants rather than research assistants (Golde, 1998). Also in the humanities, developing faculty-student relationships and doing so quickly is less emphasized than in the sciences (Golde, 1998). Therefore, academic and social integration may stagnate and contribute to attrition (Tinto, 1993). Golde's (1998) participants from the humanities (history and English) identified three themes for attrition: intellectual difficulty in

learning advanced theory and methodology, the lack of a desire to be solely research focused, and a concern that a greater value was placed on the ability to become a researcher rather than on being a great instructor (Golde, 1998).

In her 2000 study, Golde sought to answer the broad question of why doctoral students leave by interviewing 68 participants who had withdrawn from doctoral study. She chose three interviews to present in detail based on four factors: (1) each of the participants had been in their doctoral programs for at least two years and the assumption was made that integration into their respective departments should have been accomplished; (2) each of the participants commented on issues of academic and social integration; (3) each participant represented a different field of study (social science, physical science and humanities); and (4) their attrition decisions varied in each case from leaving without a plan, transferring to another institution to complete their doctoral education and leaving for a more inviting opportunity (Golde, 2000).

The results of this research revealed that the participants' attrition was a result of several factors rather than a single one, and which included the interaction of academic factors and negative advising relationships (Golde, 2000). Some of the academic factors that were encountered were failing of oral exams, passing coursework but not the dissertation proposal, and the challenge of completing the dissertation from a distance. Two of the participants describe negative advising relationships while one described having a positive relationship (Golde, 2000). Surprisingly, the participant who had the positive advising relationship still chose to leave due to attractive work opportunities and a disconnect between the advisor and the student due to physical location (Golde, 2000). The two participants who experienced negative advising relationships were sparked to re-

evaluate their decisions to stay. One transferred to another school and had a more supportive advising relationship while the other decided doctoral education was not for her (Golde, 2000). All of the participants referenced positive social integration (Golde, 2000).

Interestingly, Golde's (2000) research also contended that attrition was still a possibility for those who were successfully integrated into their departments and who had positive relationships with faculty and peers due to external factors such as job opportunities or re-assessed goals. When students leave such as this, Golde questioned if it should be considered as attrition and associated with failure. Albeit, even in situations as this, Golde (2005) argues that disciplines and departments should be mindful of the direct impact they have on student attrition by the way in which departments portray disciplines based on department cultures and practices. Golde's (1998, 2000, 2005) work supports that academic and social integration are heavily intertwined and directly impact doctoral attrition (Tinto, 1993). Furthermore, her work supports and suggests that there is a need for doctoral curricula that will develop and cultivate faculty for the role that they play in doctoral student attrition.

Counselor Education Doctoral Attrition

A review of the literature indicates that there is limited research in attrition as it bears directly in the field of CE. Only seven documents were found; three were articles published between 2005 and 2012 (Burkholder, 2012; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Willis & Carmichael, 2011). The remaining four documents were dissertations published between 2007 and 2014 (Breckner, 2012; Burkholder, 2009; O'Malley, 2014; Willis, 2007). Two of the dissertations were later published as articles (Burkholder, 2012; Willis

& Carmichael, 2011). Additional studies were found but did not address attrition specifically. They focused primarily on the CE doctoral experiences and how those experiences contributed to doctoral persistence (e.g., Cusworth, 2001; Hughes & Kleist, 2005; Protivnak & Foss, 2009).

Hoskins and Goldberg (2005) conducted a qualitative study by interviewing 33 current and former (defined as graduates and students who left programs) students from 17 CACREP-accredited CE doctoral programs across the United States. Students that left their programs either temporarily or permanently did so between the first and third year and were identified as early leavers (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). This is reflective of national statistics (Bowen & Rudenstine, 1992; Golde, 1998, 2000). Hoskins and Goldberg (2005) explored doctoral persistence based upon student-program match which was defined as “a multifaceted interaction between the student and various components of the program” (p. 179). Two of the main components that were revealed were academic match and the social-personal match (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). Hoskins and Goldberg defined the academic match as the comparison of the student’s reasons for seeking the degree and the student’s goals with the curriculum and program focus. Program focus was described as the students’ perception of their program to prepare them to be researcher, teachers, practitioners, or some combination of the three (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). The social-personal match encompassed the evaluation of the students’ relationships with faculty and fellow students and assessed if those relationships added to or detracted from students’ decisions to persist or leave their program (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). Additional components that impacted student-program match were “student expectations” and “student experiences” (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005, p. 179).

Student expectations were described as a “combination of unexpected events and preprogram expectations that are perceived by the student as met or unmet” (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005, pp. 179-180). Student experiences, on the other hand, was the information the student learned about the life of a doctoral student and as a graduate of the program as a result of participating in the program; hence, these were not preconceived expectations (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005).

Hoskins and Goldberg (2005) found that due to “unmet expectations” (p. 179), such as a lack of faculty support and unanticipated events like changes in faculty and program requirements, some CE doctoral students recognized that there was a mismatch between their goals and the program. Many of these students decided to leave their doctoral programs rather than contend with these complexities. Students who experienced more congruence with the goals of their program rarely mentioned expectations or unexpected events in their interviews (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). Additionally, based on student experiences, students were able to clarify and reconsidered their career goals based on their experiences in their doctoral programs. Some students realized they preferred to be practitioners rather than researchers, while others found an enjoyment for teaching (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). Furthermore, through positive or negative academic and social-personal match, students were able to define, clarify, or readjust their goals for pursuing their doctoral degree and found that positive faculty and peer relationships enhanced their persistence towards degree completion. Specifically, faculty relationships were noted as essential (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005).

Hoskins and Goldberg’s (2005) work added to the literature and supported Tinto’s (1975, 1993) theory in that academic and social integration for the doctoral student is

heavily intertwined and exists primarily in the departments of the doctoral programs. Given Hoskins' and Goldberg's (2005) findings, it is conceivable that if students are capable of readjusting their goals while evaluating their educational experiences to inform them whether to leave or persist, then it is likely that faculty, who are trained to develop mentoring relationships and be aware of the negative experiences that lend themselves to student attrition, would have an impactful influence to persuade students to persist.

Willis (2007) conducted a qualitative study in which eight participants were interviewed. His study sought to investigate the participants' recollection of their lived experiences of doctoral attrition. There were six females, two males, six late-stage doctoral study withdrawals and two mid-stage doctoral withdrawals. Willis' study revealed there were two distinct types or experiences of attrition: those that had "dropped out" versus those that chose to "leave." Participants described as "dropping out" encountered negative experiences of barriers that acted against their internal desire to complete the doctorate. There were more participants that dropped out (five late-stage and one mid-stage) than those that chose to leave (one late-stage and one mid-stage) (Willis, 2007). Willis found that the barriers faced by those who "dropped out" were a problematic relationship with the dissertation advisor and a career that functioned as a place of refuge from the negativity of doctoral education. Those who chose to "leave" were defined as those who had positive experiences of an internal change that altered the priority of continuing doctoral education (Willis, 2007). Those that encountered a "leaving" experience commonly expressed a reassessment of personal goals during their doctoral studies that led to incongruence towards completing their CE doctoral degree

(Willis, 2007). Lovitts (2001) also referenced this phenomenon in her personal experience in completing her doctoral education. Those that “dropped out” had negative emotions such as depression, disappointment, and frustration, whereas those that “left” (specifically in Willis’ study) had positive emotions such as relief, peace, and closure (Willis, 2007). Conversely, other researchers such as Golde (2000) and Lovitts (2001) argue that even when doctoral students choose to “leave” either to transfer to another department or institution or to pursue other options, there is a level of ambivalence. A range of positive and negative emotions are experienced (Golde, 2000; Lovitts, 2001).

In 2009, Burkholder explored the perceived experiences of CE doctoral students who voluntarily left their doctoral education. His research was unique in that these same students who departed their CE doctoral programs successfully returned to the same institutions in which they left (Burkholder, 2009). The researcher does not indicate whether the students withdrew or took a leave of absence. Six female participants between the ages of 30 and 50 completed a series of semi-structured interviews (Burkholder, 2009). All of the participants left their doctoral programs for various reasons (Burkholder, 2009). Three participants cited physical and/or mental health as their reasons for leaving their doctoral programs (Burkholder, 2009). Two participants cited traumatic events such as death and cancer diagnosis of family members (Burkholder, 2009). One participant left her doctoral program due to lack of peace and grounding in her life which resulted in experiencing deep depression (Burkholder, 2009). Burkholder’s study revealed four themes that described the participants’ experiences of departing from and returning to doctoral study. The first theme acknowledged that departing and returning were salient personal events. All of the participants expressed

negative feelings of being despondent, depressed, a sense of failure, sadness, loss, diminished hope, disappointment, and anxiety when leaving their programs (Burkholder, 2009). Interestingly, upon returning, four of the six experienced negative feelings such as fear, anxiety, and overwhelming pressure while the other two experienced positive feelings such as a sense of vindications and ease of returning (Burkholder, 2009).

The second theme was marked by the importance the participants placed on how the counseling faculty responded to their departures and returns. Five of the participants experienced negative faculty-student interactions when leaving such as encounters with uncaring and less than empathetic faculty. One participant encountered her advisor expressing extreme disappointment in her, while another had several faculty members openly insist she not return (Burkholder, 2009). Upon returning, only four of the five students experienced positive re-engagement with faculty such as being welcomed back, receiving help, and being encouraged (Burkholder, 2009). The fifth participant noted that upon her return she felt “unsettled” because faculty interacted with her as if she never left (Burkholder, 2009). They did not acknowledge that she had left or returned and therefore did not inquire about her reasons for leaving or how they could help her re-engage in her doctoral education (Burkholder, 2009). Only one participant stated that she had positive faculty interactions when leaving and returning.

The third theme dealt with personal factors that negatively impacted students’ ability to persist (Burkholder, 2009). Three of the participants suffered serious health conditions, two experience personal traumatic events, and one expressed a period of significant inner conflict and confusion (Burkholder, 2009). The fourth theme addressed the academic culture as playing a role in departing from doctoral study (Burkholder,

2009). Most of the participants spoke of their academic departments as having limited faculty, lack of faculty support, experiences of being unappreciated and disrespected, non-responsive faculty, unhelpful advisors, and unprofessionalism among the department chair, faculty, and students (Burkholder, 2009). One participant noted that her department was experiencing major turnover due to the death of a faculty member and others leaving for “better opportunities” (Burkholder, 2009, p. 106). Subsequently, all the participants expressed a need for faculty to take a stronger lead in assisting students who are struggling to persist (Burkholder, 2009). Burkholder’s (2009) research is consistent with previous studies and suggests that counselor educators become aware of the culture and climate in their departments and understand how students may be impacted.

Breckner (2012) sought to explore the essence of withdrawing from a CE doctoral program by exploring why students started their programs, experiences they had while enrolled, and events that led to withdrawing. His study was qualitative and he interviewed nine individuals: eight females and one male, ranging between the ages of mid 20s and mid 60s who were enrolled in a CE doctoral program for various periods of time and eventually withdrew (Breckner, 2012). He noted that his participants began a CE doctoral program for two reasons: either to obtain an esteemed degree or due to career requisites or opportunities (Breckner, 2012).

Breckner (2012) found that about half of his participants shared that they did have positive experiences while being enrolled. These positive experiences were characterized as being challenged by the curriculum, opportunities to work with faculty on research projects and exposure to new roles such as co-teaching and being a doctoral supervisor (Breckner, 2012). Common negative experiences existed among his participants, as well,

such as program-student mismatch, program intensity, program politics, and program initiation and hazing rituals (Breckner, 2012). In regards to program initiation and hazing rituals, the participants did not provide specific examples and the researcher did not probe further for details. Instead the participants described program initiation and hazing rituals as being exposed to situations for the purpose of proving themselves worthy of being a doctoral student.

Breckner (2012) noted that program-student mismatch was the most widely reported. This mismatch was broad and could be in reference to curriculum or research agendas to incongruence with the student's goals and the program's focus of preparing researchers or practitioners. Two of his nine participants noted that the intensity and competitiveness of the program, along with program politics, created a negative impact on them (Breckner, 2012). In regards to program initiation and hazing rituals, four out of the nine participants shared that they were exposed to situations for the purpose of proving themselves as deserving to be doctoral students (Breckner, 2012). Experiences that led to withdrawal were categorized as diverse and eclectic and ranged from reasons such as professors leaving, financial concerns, and program termination (Breckner, 2012).

The participant who faced the situation of her program being terminated was at the dissertation phase of her doctoral program. Her program of study was not in compliance with accreditation requirements (Breckner, 2012). Therefore, to alleviate this concern, the college elected to terminate the student's program and then reinstate the program at a later date. Subsequently, a lawsuit was filed on behalf of the students who were at the dissertation phase of their doctoral program at the time of the program's

termination (Breckner, 2012). As a result of the lawsuit, the students were awarded their Ph.D.s. (Breckner, 2012). Breckner's (2012) participant, however, declined to receive her doctorate as a result of a lawsuit. She desired to earn her degree and did so. Breckner does not provide additional information as to the type of degree or which institution the degree was earned.

Being overwhelmed and losing interest along with program mismatch were the most two widely reported themes. Some participants had single sole reasons for departing while others had a multiplicity of reasons for departing (Breckner, 2012). As with previous research, Breckner's (2012) study indicated that participants experienced a range of emotions such as feelings of anxiety, disappointment, and a sense of failure. Some of Breckner's participants noted that these feelings subsided for them once they came to terms with their decisions to depart their doctoral programs (Breckner, 2012). It must be noted that this is not to say that feelings of anxiety are not present for students that stay in their doctoral programs (Burkholder, 2009).

The purpose of O'Malley's (2014) research was to identify reasons for attrition in CACREP-accredited CE doctoral programs. O'Malley interviewed four students and conducted narrative inquiry research which gleaned five reasons for attrition: lack of personal support, lack of guidance or mentoring, financial stressors, family obligations, and loss of motivation. She noted that her participants pursued CE doctoral education for the purpose of furthering their education or to become CE faculty (O'Malley, 2014). O'Malley's research was unique in that her participants had all successfully completed their comprehensive exams and provided suggestions for program faculty and incoming doctoral students. The participants' suggestions for faculty included providing more

financial, emotional, and academic support (O'Malley, 2014). The participants' suggestions for incoming doctoral students included reviewing a program early for the purpose of finding a mentor, understanding the cost of doctoral education, and lastly, discussing the obligations of doctoral education with their spouses, significant others, children, extended family and friends (i.e., those who represented a support system for the student) (O'Malley, 2014).

This body of CE attrition literature, although minute, supports Tinto's theory that academic and social integration at the departmental level are significant in doctoral persistence. Additionally, it reiterates the findings in the larger body of doctoral attrition literature that faculty-student relationships are a salient and consistent variable impacting doctoral persistence. Hence, this leads to a warranted overview of advising and mentoring which are two forms of faculty-student relationships outside of the classroom.

Overview of Advising and Mentoring

There are many tools for undergraduate academic retention but for graduate education, specifically doctoral education, the faculty-student relationship has been highly ranked in the literature as one of the most consistent factors impacting doctoral persistence (Golde, 2000, 2005; Lovitts, 2001). The literature also revealed that the term "faculty-student" relationship is often used interchangeably with the terms "advising relationship" and "mentoring relationship."

The doctoral advising relationship reflects two schools of thought. The first school refers to the relationship as an advising relationship that has various levels of engagement. The second school refers to the relationship as a mentoring relationship which signifies longevity and personal investment. The argument between these schools

suggests that mentoring reflects an inherent belief that the relationship is positive whereas the advising relationship can be positive or negative (Schlosser, Knox, Moskovitz, & Hill, 2003). Given these differing opinions in the literature, the following sections will provide an overview of both the constructs of advising and mentoring.

Advising

Undergraduate advising. According to the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA, 2006), assisting undergraduate students in developing meaningful educational plans is the primary purpose of the academic advisor and advising programs in higher education. Advisors are expected to accomplish this task by setting goals that are aligned with the mission and values of the educational institution in which the advising occurs (NACADA, 2006). Academic advising is comprised of three components: curriculum, pedagogy, and student learning outcomes. In addition to the institution's mission, the curriculum includes the institution's culture, expectations, meaning and values imbedded in the academic curriculum, thinking modalities, processes of learning, decision-making, academic program selection, developing life and career goals, and gaining an understanding of available resources, policies, and procedures. Ultimately, all of these factors will provide a positive impact on a student's ability to transfer skills and knowledge (NACADA, 2006).

The pedagogy on academic advising may vary in methods, strategies, and techniques based on the institution and the advisor but require preparation, facilitation, documentation, and assessment of the advising interactions. This component also builds strongly on the ideal of mutual respect, trust, and ethical behavior between the advisor and advisee. The last component, student learning outcomes, is based on institutional

missions, goals, and curricula. These outcomes should be defined in the advising curriculum and address what the student will gain as a result of academic advising. Institutions are charged with developing their own outcomes, assessment, and evaluation (NACADA, 2006).

Doctoral advising. The definition and components of academic advising provided by NACADA (2006) appear to be geared toward undergraduate education. However, the manner in which graduate students are advised is heavily dependent upon the structure of their institution (NACADA, 2006). Master-level students may have an academic advisor who provides the educational and procedural requirements while a faculty advisor may provide more career-specific information and guidance. On the other hand, doctoral-level students may only have a faculty advisor who provides both academic requirements for the program and career guidance for the profession the student is about to enter (NACADA, 2006). Often doctoral advisers are described as faculty members with the most responsibility for guiding the advisee through the graduate program and may be identified or titled as the major professor, faculty advisor, or chair of the graduate student's dissertation (Cardiener, 2003, Schlosser et al., 2003). Unfortunately, doctoral advising that is restricted to the NACADA standards and only seeks to accomplish institutional missions, goals, and curricula without encompassing the needed cultivation of advising relationships and their importance to doctoral education can be seen as task-oriented and counterintuitive to doctoral persistence (Dixon-Reeves, 2003; The Whole Is Greater Writing Group [TWIG], 1996).

Farrell (2007) contends that doctoral advising that does not lend itself to developing an engaging faculty-student relationship can be seen as a task that is similar

across disciplines, whereas doctoral mentorships would not be similar across disciplines due to the relationship being reflective of the specific discipline. Schlosser et al. (2003) argued that personal non-professional and non-educational information was less likely to occur in a faculty-student relationship that was limited to the task of advising only.

TWIG (1996) postulated that doctoral advising could be seen as a set of tasks or product to be provided rather than a process of developing future leaders, if the faculty-student relationship solely focused on program requirements, dissertation completion, and graduation. The argument is not that the fulfillment of these requirements is not mandatory but to offset doctoral attrition and cultivate future leaders, these requirements should be accomplished in an advising relationship that seeks to mentor. Bruns Schoen (1991) posited that advising was an inherent function of mentoring and that mentoring was an extension of advising.

Mentoring

As previously mentioned, advising and mentoring are not synonymous (Cardiener, 2003). Mentoring in its simplest form is defined as the act of a more experienced person (mentor) providing counsel and guidance to a less experienced person (protégé) (Anderson, 2001; Kram, 1985; Merriam, 1983). Although this is a simplistic definition of mentoring, it is quite a complex phenomenon. In order to understand the complexities of mentoring, its origin must be briefly addressed.

The term and concept of a mentor originated from the character “Mentor” in Homer’s epic poem *The Odyssey* (Anderson & Shannon, 1988; Gattis, 2008; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Rose, 2000). In this myth, Odysseus leaves for war and Mentor is assigned to protect and guide Odysseus’ royal family, including his son Telemachus. Athena, the

goddess of wisdom, disguises herself at times as Mentor, in order to lead Telemachus in search of his father and in developing his own identity (Anderson & Shannon, 1988; Gattis, 2008; Johnson & Nelson, 1999).

In reviewing Athena's characteristics, while in human form as Mentor, the multiple roles and complexities of mentoring are revealed (Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Warren, 2005). Anderson and Shannon (1988) noted five basic concepts about mentoring and its process based on Mentor's role in Homer's poem: (1) the first concept is intentionality based on Mentor being accepting, accountable, and intentional about the responsibilities given to him from Odysseus; (2) secondly, Mentor established a nurturing process that fostered growth and development into full maturity; (3) thirdly, wisdom from Mentor was imparted for Telemachus to apply which created an insightful process; (4) the fourth concept was support and protection due to Mentor providing a safe haven for Telemachus to process the advice and wisdom provided; and (5) lastly, Mentor was a role model and exemplified a standard and style of behavior that Telemachus could understand and model.

Mentoring definitions. Mentoring is widely used and referenced by professions such as law, medicine, business, and education (Benishek, Biechke, Park, & Slattery, 2004; Schwiebert, 2000; Tentoni, 1995). Consequently, several mentoring definitions have arisen. Philip-Jones (1982) described mentoring as providing significant help for the protégé to achieve major life goals. Merriam (1983) described mentoring as an emotional interaction with a mentor who is trusted, older in age, loving, and is experienced in guiding protégés. In 1986, Clark and Corcoran described mentoring as the process of advancing the careers of others through informal strategies that are present in

professional environments. Crosby (1999) described role modeling as the act of mentoring and its pertinence to the personal and professional development of others.

Johnson and Nelson (1999) defined mentoring as a personal relationship in which a more experienced individual acts as a role model, teacher, sponsor, and guide of a less experienced individual. Schwiebert (2000) thought of mentorship in terms of providing support, teaching, protecting, guiding, nurturing, supervising, and advising with the intent of facilitating professional and personal growth. Farrell (2007) suggests that the purpose of mentorship is to cultivate connections, contributions, a sense of belonging, and development which is expressed in her mentoring definition specific to counselor education:

Mentorship in counselor education (and the counseling profession) is an interpersonal, interdependent, collaborative, and continuously evolving relationship between individuals who are differentiated by skills, experiences, expertise and knowledge. The more experienced individual [mentor] provides the lesser-experienced individual [mentee] with guidance, encouragement, support, resources and direction in the roles of educator, role model, and sponsor. The mentee, in turn, reciprocates support, encouragement, and direction. Additional resources may be provided for the mentor as well. Furthermore, the relationship is marked by trust, empathy, respect, open communication, active listening, genuineness, commitment, and clearly established boundaries. Through mentoring interactions, both the mentor and mentee develop holistic personal (psychosocial based) and professional (career based) identities. (pp. 35-36)

Rose (2000) notes that “‘mentoring,’ like ‘intelligence’ or ‘personality,’ is a term with a commonly understood general meaning but a specific meaning that is difficult to articulate. It is a phenomenon that is better known by example than by definition” (p. 2). Therefore, a false sense of agreement in defining mentoring is developed (Farrell, 2007). Even though there continues to be lack of a unified definition, there exists a trend in thought and essential agreement about mentoring despite the different ways in which people describe it (Rose, 2000).

Mentoring benefits and outcomes. In addition to the basic concepts expressed in Homer's poem, it is postulated that successful mentoring relationships are advantageous and yield benefits for both the protégé and mentor alike (Anderson & Shannon, 1988; Dixon-Reeves, 2003; Jacobi, 1991; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Tentoni, 1995). Career development, professional advancement, higher pay, greater career satisfaction, networking, field exposure, and enhancement of professional and personal identity are noted in the literature as the most likely benefits for protégés (Burke, 1984; Gattis, 2008; Kram, 1985; Scandura, 1992; Wright & Wright, 1987). Additionally, the general benefits that mentors receive are generativity, career rejuvenation, validation, increased visibility, increased productivity, ability to share knowledge and expertise, and personal satisfaction (Black et al., 2004; Dalton, Thompson, & Price, 1977; Green & Bauer, 1995; Johnson & Nelson, 1999; Ragins & Scandura, 1999). Despite its history, popularity and professed benefits, mentoring remains ambiguous (Farrell, 2007; Jacobi, 1991; Kram, 1985; Tentoni, 1995).

Cross-cultural mentoring. Cross-cultural mentoring is described as a mentorship that extends beyond the typical mentoring boundaries of same-sex, same-race or same-culture and not solely because there exist differences of genders, races, ethnicity, religion, cultural backgrounds, socioeconomic statuses, sexual orientation or nationality (Crutcher, 2014). Cross-cultural mentoring is viewed as intentional relationships in which the members recognize their differences and acknowledge that a person cannot be defined by one feature such as gender or race (Collins, 2000, as cited by Crutcher, 2014). Trust and understanding are crucial aspects for cross-cultural mentorship and are developed by

seeking to find commonality and common ground among the mentor and protégé in regards to their values, virtues, and visions (Crutcher, 2014).

Historically, mentorships have been viewed as being hierarchical and patriarchal in nature rather than, collaborative and communal, with the expectations that the protégé will emulate the mentor and maintain status quo (Gonzalez-Rodriguez, 1995).

McCormick (1997) argued that mentoring that is monocultural ultimately only supports the white male and must be transformed to be inclusive of women and minorities. Garcia (1995) contends that mentorships that address cross-cultural differences allow for successful integration processes for women and minorities who may otherwise be forced to assimilate into the dominant culture. Ultimately, cross-cultural mentoring is an intentionality that fosters an acceptance and celebration of differences, encourages dialogue, feedback, and honesty (Gonzalez-Rodriguez, 1995). Given that doctoral students are expected to be leaders in their respective disciplines, aspiring to have positive mentoring relationships should be fostered. Doing so develops a regenerative process (Lanning, 1990) that can impact the professional field or discipline that the doctoral student is entering.

Resources for Doctoral Advising and Mentoring

In 1993, Hazler and Carney reviewed the CACREP standards and the Association for Counseling and Development (AACD, now the American Counseling Association (ACA) (AACD, 1988) code of ethics, only to find no specific guidance for faculty regarding how to effectively develop faculty-student relationships in Counselor Education. Given this, Hazler and Carney challenged the counseling profession to address the lack of research on faculty-student interactions, student expectations or even

student assessments of their programs. Hazler and Carney argued that given that faculty-student relationships are a meaningful aspect for graduate education, more literature should be available. Despite Hazler and Carney's efforts, the counselor education literature is still lacking in this area. They contended that "the degree to which counselor education programs confirm and direct the role of faculty member as systematic planner and provider of student-faculty relationships should be visible in the basic accreditation standards of our profession" (Hazler & Carney, 1993, p. 81). A comparison of the previous and current CACREP standards and ACA ethical guidelines indicates that this problem still exists.

In 2004, Fallon analyzed the work-behaviors of counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs and found that there were important and frequently engaged work behaviors within 12 conceptual categories: (1) program administration, (2) clinical counseling practice, (3) scholarship, (4) teaching and mentoring, (5) clinical supervision, (6) shared governance, (7) infusing technology, (8) community building, (9) consultation, (10) counselor-educator professional development, (11) program evaluation, and (12) research oversight. Fallon also noted that there is "a lack of coherent objectives, curricular experiences and structures that specifically address the preparation of doctoral students who are competent to perform work behaviors expected of counselor educators (Adams, 2002)" (p. 1). Golde and Dore (2001) noted that although doctoral programs are tasked with preparing doctoral students to become future faculty, there are gaps in the manner in which the preparation should occur.

A review of the literature for advising/mentoring guides or training tools on how to develop faculty-student relationships revealed that there still exist gaps in the

literature. Only two comprehensive documents were retrieved. The first is from the Rackham Graduate School at the University of Michigan and is often cited by other university websites. The second from the Graduate School at the University of Washington, was constructed based on the University of Michigan's faculty mentoring guide. Both guides provide an overview of mentoring, as well as strategies for developing mentoring relationships from a faculty and department standpoint. The University of Washington does, however, provide a companion guide for graduate students titled "How to Obtain the Mentoring You Need." This guide also provides an overview of mentoring and strategies on developing mentoring relationship, but does so from the standpoint of the graduate student's role in the mentoring relationship. Unfortunately, this is far too little information to appropriately address the most consistent factor impacting doctoral attrition, the advising relationship.

Summary

As retention has moved to the forefront for doctoral education, faculty-student relationships have been recognized as one of the consistent variables for doctoral persistence and completion. However, doctoral advising and mentoring literature in graduate education remains limited and even more so in Counselor Education. Subsequently, the lack of detailed procedures in CACREP standards, lack of training to foster advising/mentoring relationships, coupled with national doctoral attrition rates at 50%, warrants the necessity to learn more about how counselor education graduates perceived their advising experience. Specifically, this research is of importance because it contributes to the scant body of CE literature on doctoral advising and mentoring, identifies elements or characteristics counselor education graduates expect in an ideal

mentor and received from advisors, and provides CE doctoral advising/
mentoring data that can be incorporated into strategies for the advising process of CE
doctoral students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the demographic profile of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs by examining counselor educators' expectations of an ideal mentor, perceptions of their advisory working alliance and perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs. Additionally, this study explored the relationship of these perceptions and cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race, or both with time-to-degree. Therefore, this chapter includes (1) research design; (2) research questions, hypothesis, and methods of analysis; (3) participants and sampling; (4) instrumentation; and (5) data collection procedures.

Research Design

The research design chosen for this study was quantitative in nature and used retrospective cross-sectional survey design. Cross sectional survey design is comprised of the use of correlational surveys to collect numeric data from a sample at one point in time (non-longitudinal) (Punch, 2005) and provides quantitative descriptions of attitudes, trends, or opinions to show relationships between variables (Creswell, 2009).

Research Questions, Hypotheses, and Data Analysis

The research questions that guided this study, the hypotheses, and methods of analysis are listed below. The IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences 23.0 for Mac

(SPSS) was used to analyze the data collected from the online survey. Professional statistical consultation from the Western Michigan University Graduate Center for Research and Retention was sought in developing the research questions and data analyses.

Research Question 1

What were the ideal mentor expectations of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?

Method of analysis: Descriptive statistics such as mean, median, mode, standard deviation and frequency were employed.

Research Question 2

What were the perceived advisory working alliance experiences of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?

Method of analysis: Descriptive statistics such as mean, median, mode, standard deviation and frequency were employed.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between perceived advisory working alliance as measured by the AWAI-S and time-to-degree?

Research hypothesis: Positive perceptions of the advisory working alliance will have a positive relationship with time-to-degree.

Method of analysis: Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between advisory working alliance perceptions (independent variable) and time-to-degree (dependent variable).

Research Question 4

What is the relationship between perceived willingness to mentor and time-to-degree?

Research hypothesis: Positive perceptions of advisors' willingness to mentor will have a positive relationship with time-to-degree.

Method of analysis: A two independent sample test (*t* test) was used to examine the relationship between counselor educators' perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor (independent variable) with time-to-degree (dependent variable).

Research Question 5

What is the relationship between cross-cultural advising based on gender, race or both and time-to-degree?

Research hypothesis: Cross-cultural advising will have a relationship with time-to-degree.

Method of analysis. A two independent sample test (*t* test) was used to examine the relationship between cross-cultural advising based on differing gender and or race (independent variable) with time-to-degree (dependent variable).

Participants and Sampling

The participants sought for this study were counselor educators who earned a doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) or a doctor of education degree (Ed.D.) from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited doctoral program in the United States; served as full time or adjunct faculty members in a master's or doctoral counseling program in the United States; and asserted that they were confident in reflecting, with accuracy, upon their dissertation advising

experience. Counselor educators who had not graduated from a CACREP-accredited doctoral counseling program, had not served as a full time or adjunct faculty member in a master's or doctoral counseling program, and did not feel confident in their ability to reflect accurately about their doctoral dissertation advising experience were excluded from the research. These exclusionary criteria were based on the fact that CACREP accreditation standards provide the guidelines for uniformity for doctoral preparation in counselor education. Also, counselor educators primarily work within the professoriate and this allowed ease of access to an already small population. Lastly, if participants did not feel confident about reflecting accurately on their dissertation advising experience, they were not eligible for participation in this research.

Purposive sampling, a non-random selection process, was used to solicit participants for this study. This choice of sampling was used given the intentionality in targeting counselor educators listed as faculty (full time or adjunct) on CACREP-accredited counseling program websites. The researcher also employed a snowball sampling technique by asking participants to forward the email invitation with the survey link to other counselor educators they may know that met the inclusionary criteria.

Instrumentation

Counselor educators completed the three self-administered instruments for this study after completing the informed consent (see Appendix A). The first was the Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS; Rose, 2003, 2005; see Appendix B). The second was the Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Student Version (AWAI-S; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001; see Appendix C). The third was a demographic questionnaire (see Appendix D) consisting of three sections: (a) basic demographic information at the time of completing the survey,

(b) demographic information during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program, and
(c) departmental doctoral advising and mentoring practices during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program. Author permission was obtained to use and publish both the IMS and the AWAI-S (see Appendix E).

It must be noted that the IMS and the AWAI-S have some similarity but each have a different focus. The IMS was purposefully designed for use as a tool for developing and/or enhancing doctoral relationships that are identified as mentoring relationships. The IMS has the ability for use as a tool for students and doctoral programs alike (Rose, 2003, 2005). The AWAI-S was designed as a tool to assess the working alliance of advising relationships from the perception of the advisee/graduate student. The AWAI-S is specific in using the term advisor (major advisor, etc.) versus mentor to distinguish between the term and function of advisors and a similar, yet quantitatively different term, mentor. The AWAI-S focuses on the advising portion of the relationship that encompasses a mutual project or goal such as completion of a dissertation or thesis (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001).

The Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS; Rose, 2003, 2005) is a brief self-report instrument pertinent to all doctoral-level students regardless of their involvement, or lack thereof, in a mentoring relationship (see Appendix B). The IMS does not define mentoring but instead is purposefully designed to evoke and assess the meaning and expectations of an ideal mentor from the doctoral student's perspective based on their attitudes, beliefs, or feelings (Rose, 2003, 2005). The IMS is grounded in Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee's (1978) theory of adult development and informed by Anderson and Shannon's (1988) comprehensive model of mentoring (Rose, 2003, 2005). The IMS uses

a structured, closed-ended approach to measure how doctoral students rate the importance of selected functions and characteristics in defining their ideal mentor (Rose, 2003, 2005).

The IMS has a total of 34 items scored on a 5-point rating scale ranging from 1 (*not at all important*) to 5 (*extremely important*). The IMS has three subscales that measure *integrity*, *guidance*, and *relationship* which were based on exploratory factor analyses using two different samples from two research-intensive institutions (Rose, 2003). The first sample was comprised of 250 Ph.D. students and had Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .77 to .87 (Rose, 2003). The second sample of 380 Ph.D. students had similar Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients which ranged from .77 to .84 (Rose, 2003).

The *integrity* subscale has 14 items (e.g., respect the intellectual property rights of others) and “represents a mentor who exhibits virtue and principled action and can be emulated as role model” (Rose, 2005, p. 57). The *guidance* subscale has 10 items (e.g., give me specific assignments related to my research problem) and “represents a mentor who provides practical assistance with the tasks and activities typical of graduate study” (Rose, 2005, p. 57). Lastly, the *relationship* subscale has 10 items (e.g., help me to realize my life vision) and “represents a mentor with whom students can form a personal relationship that might involve sharing personal concerns, social activities, and life vision or worldview” (Rose, 2005, p. 57).

Hence, participants were directed to complete the IMS based on their expectations of an ideal mentor and not the expectations of a previous or current mentor. For the purpose of this study, the directions were altered, with author permission, to remind

participants to answer the IMS based on their reflection of the dissertation phase of their doctoral program (not the clinical aspect of training or supervision). Subsequently, the stem for all questions was change to “During the dissertation phase of my doctoral program, my ideal mentor would have ...” rather than the original stem of “My ideal mentor would ...” Additionally, the verb tense of the IMS was changed from present to past tense.

The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Student version (AWAI-S; Schlosser & Gelso, 2001) is a brief self-report instrument designed to assess the graduate level advisor-advisee working alliance from the advisee’s point of view (see Appendix C). The construct of advisory working alliance is based upon supervisory working alliance, which is built upon working alliance (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Working alliance is a construct that addresses the portion of a relationship that is identified by cooperation, mutuality, and collaboration in regards to the work being conducted and provides a means to establish agreed upon goals to work towards (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Advisees are instructed to complete the AWAI-S based on the faculty member who has the greatest responsibility for helping guide them through their graduate program. The faculty member may have various titles such as “advisor,” “major professor,” “committee chair,” or “dissertation chair” depending upon the department (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). Advisees are asked to indicate their level of agreement with 30 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The AWAI-S has three subscales which are based on exploratory factor analyses (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). The three subscales measure *rapprochement*, *apprenticeship*, and *identification-individuation*. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranged from .77 to .93.

The *rapport* subscale has 11 items (e.g., my advisor welcomes my input into our discussions) and refers to the advisor's encouragement and support of the advisee along with the emotional bond that may develop based upon their work together (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). The *apprenticeship* subscale has 14 items (e.g., I learn from my advisor by watching him/her) and reflects the advisor's promotion of the advisee's professional development (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). The *identification-individuation* subscale has 5 items (e.g., I tend to see things differently from my advisor) and reflects the degree to which advisees want to be like or admire their advisor or seek to individuate from their advisor (Schlosser & Gelso, 2001). For the purpose of this study, the directions were altered to request participants to answer the AWAI-S based on their reflection of the dissertation phase of their doctoral program and the faculty member who had the responsibility for guiding them through the dissertation process. Additionally, the verb tense of the AWAI-S was changed from present to past tense.

The demographic questionnaire was designed by the researcher to obtain demographic information such as (1) personal information at the time of completing the survey, (2) personal information during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program, and (3) departmental doctoral advising and mentoring practices during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program. The demographic questionnaire has a total of 40 questions (see Appendix D).

Data Collection Procedures

In October 2015, the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) granted approval for this study (see Appendix F). QuestionPro was used to convert the IMS, AWAI-S and the demographic questionnaire to an online

survey format. QuestionPro is an online survey development cloud-based company that provides free and upgradable packages to develop online customizable surveys, data analysis along with sample selection, bias elimination, and data representation tools. As technology grows and the use of the World Wide Web increases, the use of an online survey is appropriate for the purpose of this study due to the timeliness of response, format control and flexibility (Granello & Wheaton, 2004), timeliness and ease of data collection and entry, and cost effectiveness (Couper & Rowe, 1996).

When using online surveys, it is important to discuss response rates. Shannon and Bradshaw (2002) argued that online surveys may decrease the number of respondents due to internet speed and access and degree of technical comfort and skill level. Given that counselor educators primarily work in the professorate, the above-mentioned obstacles were not anticipated to be deterrents in completing the online survey. Conversely, Salgado and Moscoso (2003) noted that participants were more comfortable with the use of internet-based test because it was less fatiguing than paper tests. To increase response rates as much as possible, especially in survey research, Punch (2003) suggests that researchers have a detailed plan at the forefront of their research for attaining an effective response rate. Therefore, this researcher's plan to obtain as an effective response rate as possible was to solicit counselor educators by sending an electronic mail (email) invitation directly to their work email addresses and via the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) listserv (CESNET) over a five-week period of time at a minimum or until the minimum number of participants (100) were retrieved. Utilizing the G*Power 3.1.9.2 power and sample size calculator, a priori power analysis indicated a sample size of 314 counselor educators was needed for this study. However, based on

statistical consultation with the Director of the Statistical Consulting Center, Western Michigan University, and given that the counselor education population is small, a minimum of 100 participants was determined as both feasible and acceptable for this study (J. Naranjo, personal communication, November 17, 2014).

Once approval was obtained for this study, 1,885 counselor education faculty (full-time and adjunct) listed on CACREP-accredited counseling program websites (public access) from 48 states totaling 309 colleges and universities received an email invitation (see Appendix G) for participation in the study. The email invitations included the purpose of the study, confidentiality of data, drawing information for one of four \$50 gift cards, and the URL link to complete the survey. One week later participants received a reminder email invitation (see Appendix G). On the third week an email invitation (see Appendix G) was sent to 3,389 members of the ACES CESNET-L. Membership consists of doctoral students and counselor educators. The fourth week a reminder email invitation (see Appendix G) was sent to 3,397 members of the ACES CESNET-L. Six weeks later, due to the holiday break and the ending and beginning of academic semesters, a final reminder email invitation (see Appendix G) was sent to 3,419 members of the ACES CESNET-L. Additionally, solicitation for participants was made through personal contact at the national ACES conference in October 2015 (see Appendix H), and with colleagues in professional networks via multiple means of correspondence (e.g., word of mouth, email, phone, Facebook messaging, etc.). Three hundred and ninety-five counselor educators viewed the survey, 121 started the survey, and 101 completed the survey. Four participants were randomly chosen and notified by email (see Appendix I) as the winners of the research drawing for one of four \$50 gift cards.

Delimitations

The delimitations of the study were as follows: (1) only the counselor education doctoral graduate perceptions of the advisory working alliance were solicited, (2) participants solicited were limited to counselor educators who completed their doctoral programs from a CACREP-accredited CE program in the United States, (3) participants solicited were limited to those who had served as a full time or adjunct faculty member in a master's or doctoral counseling program in the United States, and (4) participants were instructed to respond to questions restricted solely to the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs based on their reflections.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The statistical findings for this study are reported in this chapter. The IBM Statistical Package for Social Sciences 23.0 for Mac (SPSS) was used to analyze and run the statistical tests of the collected data to answer the research questions for this study. The first section addresses reverse scored items, the pattern of missing data, and the participants' demographic information. The subsequent section provides the results of the statistical tests used to analyze the data and answer the study's research questions.

Reverse Scored Items on the AWAI-S

The Advising Working Alliance Inventory-Student version consists of three subscales that measure rapport, apprenticeship, and identification-individuation and has a total of 30 items. Participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement based on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Items 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 26, 22, 24, and 29 are reversed scored items and were recoded using SPSS. Therefore, the value for these items ranged from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*).

Missing Data

Of the 101 surveys, seven surveys were incomplete due to missing values. After a review of the collected data, the majority of the missing values were in the demographic portion of the survey which was located at the end of the survey. Consequently, the pattern of missingness appeared to be a result of survey fatigue and the survey being

exited rather than a non-response due to the type of question. Given the small sample the researcher elected to keep the surveys with the missing values. Furthermore, based on the statistical analysis, the surveys with missing values were omitted from the computations.

Demographic Information

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic information for the study's sample. The demographic information collected related to three areas:

(1) personal information at the time of completing the survey, (2) personal information during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program, and (3) departmental doctoral advising and mentoring practices during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program.

Current Personal Information

The frequencies and percentages of the participants' gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, current teaching status, department number of CACREP-accredited programs and whether they were practicing as a counselor are presented in Table 1. As shown, females (75.5%, $n = 74$) represented the majority of the sample, while males represented 24.5% ($n = 24$). White or Caucasians (69.4%, $n = 68$) represented the largest racial/ethnic group. Black or African Americans (18.4%, $n = 18$) represented the next largest group represented, followed by Hispanic/Latino(a) (4.1%, $n = 4$); Asian or Pacific Islander (3.1%, $n = 3$); Bi-racial/Multi-racial (3.1%, $n = 3$); American Indian or Alaskan Native (1%, $n = 1$) and one (1%) who chose not to identify. In terms of sexual orientation 85.7% ($n = 84$) identified as straight or heterosexual; 7.1% ($n = 7$) identified as bisexual; 3.1% ($n = 3$) identified as gay; 2% ($n = 2$) identified as lesbian; and 2% ($n = 2$) chose not to identify their sexual orientation.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Current Demographic Information

Variable	Category	<i>f</i>	%
Gender			
	Female	74	75.5
	Male	24	24.5
Race/Ethnicity			
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	1	1
	Asian or Pacific Islander	3	3.1
	Black or African American	18	18.4
	Hispanic/Latino(a)	4	4.1
	White or Caucasian	68	69.4
	Bi-racial/Multi-racial	3	3.1
	Prefer Not to Indicate	1	1
Sexual Orientation			
	Bisexual	7	7.1
	Gay	3	3.1
	Lesbian	2	2
	Straight or Heterosexual	84	85.7
	Prefer Not to Indicate	2	2
Current Teaching Status			
	Full Time, CACREP-accredited programs	70	71.4
	Full Time, non CACREP-accredited programs	13	13.3
	Adjunct, CACREP-accredited programs	10	10.2
	Adjunct, non CACREP-accredited programs	3	3.1
	Not Currently Teaching	2	2
CACREP Programs			
	One program only	23	24.5
	Two or more programs	58	61.7
	Not Sure	1	1.1
	Not Applicable	12	12.8
Practicing Counselor			
	Yes	43	45.7
	No	51	54.3

Current teaching status was represented by 71.4% ($n = 70$) of the sample being employed as full-time faculty at institutions with CACREP-accredited programs, followed by 13.3% ($n = 13$) being employed as full-time faculty at institutions with non CACREP-accredited programs; 10.2% ($n = 10$) being employed as adjunct faculty at institutions with CACREP-accredited programs; 3.1% ($n = 3$) being employed as adjunct faculty at institutions with non CACREP-accredited programs; and 2% ($n = 2$) were not currently teaching. Of those teaching at institutions with CACREP-accredited programs, 61.7% ($n = 58$) reported their department had two or more CACREP-accredited counseling programs. In addition to being employed as faculty, 45.7% ($n = 43$) of the sample also worked as practicing counselors.

Personal Information at Dissertation Phase

As shown in Table 2, participants' age at the completion of their dissertation ranged in age from 26 years through 62 years old ($n = 94$, $M = 37.5$, $SD = 8.82$). The time-to-degree completion ranged from a minimum of 2 years to 18 years ($n = 94$, $M = 4.06$, $SD = 2.33$). Years since completion of degree ranged from 1 year to 31 years ($n = 94$, $M = 7.30$, $SD = 6.83$).

Table 3 shows non-U.S. citizenship status was represented by 6.4% ($n = 6$). In regard to relationship status, married participants (54.3%, $n = 51$) represented the largest group. Single status (23.4%, $n = 22$) was the second largest group, followed by partnered or committed relationship (14.9%, $n = 14$); divorced (5.3%, $n = 5$); separated (1%, $n = 1$); and widowed (1%, $n = 1$). Participants who identified as raising children during their dissertation phase of their degree was 36.2% ($n = 34$). Of the participants raising children, the number of children ranged from 1 child to 4 children with 42.9% ($n = 15$) of

these participants raising two children. Thirteen participants (13.7%) identified as being responsible for other family members.

Table 2

Frequencies, Percentages, Means, and Standard Deviations of Dissertation Phase Demographic Information

Variable	Category	<i>f</i>	%	<i>M (SD)</i>
Age at Completion of Degree				
	26-35	49	52.1	37.5 (8.82)
	36-45	29	30.9	
	46-55	11	11.7	
	55 and over	5	5.3	
Time to Degree Completion				
	2 Years	5	5.3	4.37 (2.13)
	3 Years	30	31.9	
	4 Years	29	30.9	
	5 Years	13	13.8	
	6-10 Years	16	17	
	11 Years or more	1	1.1	
Years Since Degree Completion				
	1-5 Years	51	54.3	7.30 (6.83)
	6-10 Years	19	20.2	
	11-15 Years	12	12.8	
	16-20 Years	7	7.4	
	21-25 Years	3	3.2	
	26 Years or more	2	2.1	

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages of Dissertation Phase Demographic Information

Variable	Category	<i>f</i>	%
Citizenship Status			
	U.S. Citizenship	88	93.6
	non-U.S. Citizenship	6	6.4
Relationship Status			
	Single	22	23.4
	Married	51	54.3
	Separated	1	1.1
	Divorced	5	5.3
	Partnered / Committed Relationship	14	14.9
	Widowed	1	1.1
Raising Children			
	Yes	34	36.2
	No	60	63.8
How Many Children Being Raised			
	1	12	34.3
	2	15	42.9
	3	7	20
	4	1	2.9
Responsible for Other Family Members			
	Yes	13	13.7
	No	82	86.3
Working During Dissertation			
	Yes, Full Time	36	37.9
	Yes, Part Time	52	54.7
	No	7	7.4

Table 3—Continued

Variable	Category	<i>f</i>	%
ACES Region	North Atlantic	7	7.4
	North Central	27	28.4
	Southern	42	44.2
	Rocky Mountain	9	9.5
	Western	3	3.2
	Not Sure	7	7.4
Type of Degree Attained	Ph.D.	80	85.1
	Ed.D.	14	14.9
Type of Doctoral Program	Traditional Campus	85	90.4
	Online	1	1.1
	Hybrid	8	8.5
Carnegie Research Status	Very High Research Activity	37	39.4
	High Research Activity	32	34
	Doctoral/Research University	13	13.8
	Not Sure	12	12.8
Time to Completed Dissertation	6-12 Months	37	39.4
	1-2 Years	31	33
	2-3 Years	13	13.8
	3-4 Years	5	5.3
	5 Years or more	8	8.5
Stage of Dissertation Struggle	Conceptualization Stage	28	29.8
	Writing Stage	31	33
	Research Stage	30	31.9
	Two of Three Stages	4	4.3
	All Three Stages	1	1.1

As shown in Table 3, 54.7% ($n = 52$) of the sample worked part-time while completing their dissertation. The majority of the sample (44.2%, $n = 42$) was enrolled in doctoral programs that were in the ACES southern region. More Ph.D.s (85.1%, $n = 80$) were earned than Ed.D.s (14.9%, $n = 14$). Those attending a traditional brick and mortar counselor education program was represented by 90.4% ($n = 85$) of the sample. The majority of the sample (87.2%, $n = 82$) attended research-intensive institutions. In reference to the amount of time to complete the dissertation (e.g., based on your program's structure, from the official start of your dissertation process to the completion of your dissertation defense), 39.4% ($n = 37$) of the sample completed between 6-12 months, followed by 33% ($n = 31$) completing between 1-2 years, 13.8% ($n = 13$) completing between 2-3 years, 5.3% ($n = 5$) completing between 3-4 years, and 8.5% ($n = 8$) completing after 5 or more years. Participants were asked to identify the stage of the dissertation process in which they struggled the most. Thirty-one (33%) participants selected the writing stage, 30 (31.9%) participants selected the research stage, 28 (29.8%) participants selected the conceptualization stage, 4 (4.3%) participants selected two of three of the stages, and 1 (1%) participant selected all three stages.

Departmental Doctoral Advising/Mentoring Practices

Advising. Eighty-one (86.2%) participants reported experiencing a satisfying dissertation advising relationship and 75.5% ($n = 71$) of the sample selected their dissertation advisors (see Table 4). Thirty-one participants (33%) identified having a dissertation advising style similar to their advisor while 10 participants (10.6%) differed in dissertation advising style and 53 participants (56.4%) did not advise doctoral students during dissertation. Fifty participants (53.2%) reported that the gender of their advisor

was male while 78 participants (83%) reported that their advisor was white or Caucasian. Therefore, 61.7% ($n = 58$) were in a cross-cultural advising relationship represented by differing gender, race, or both. Twenty-two (23.4%) participants noted that they had a change in dissertation advisor during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program. Of those that had a change of dissertation advisor, the number of times making a change ranged from one time (77.2%, $n = 17$) to four times (4.5%, $n = 1$). Reasons for a change in dissertation advisor were noted as follows: advisor retired or left position (40.9%, $n = 9$); advising conflict (31.8%, $n = 7$); and other (e.g., too many students, advisor mental health challenges, conflict between committee members) (27.2%, $n = 6$).

Mentoring. As shown in Table 4, 89.4% ($n = 84$) of the sample expected to be mentored during the dissertation phase. Seventy-nine (84%) participants perceived their advisor as having a willingness to mentor. Seventy-four participants (78.7%) noted having a previous mentoring relationship prior to dissertation. Of those participants, 95.9% ($n = 71$) noted that those previous mentoring experiences were satisfying. The majority of the participants (87.2%, $n = 82$) reported that their departments did not have a formal mentoring program. Almost half of the sample (47.9%, $n = 45$) identified as having a faculty mentor in their department and 88.9% ($n = 40$) of that group stated they were satisfied with their faculty mentor relationship. Of this group, 73.3% ($n = 33$) selected their faculty mentor, 15.6% ($n = 7$) were selected by their faculty mentor, 11.1% ($n = 5$) were assigned their faculty mentor and 33.3% ($n = 15$) reported that their faculty mentor was also their dissertation advisor.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages of Departmental Doctoral Advising/Mentoring Practices

Variable	Category	<i>f</i>	%
Satisfying Dissertation Advising Relationship			
	Yes	81	86.2
	No	13	13.8
How Assigned to Dissertation Advisor			
	I selected	71	75.5
	I was assigned and notified	8	8.5
	Other	15	16
Dissertation Advising Style Similar to Advisor			
	Yes, Similar	31	33
	No, Dissimilar	10	10.6
	I do not advise during dissertation	53	56.4
Cross-Cultural Advising Based on Gender and Race			
	Yes	58	61.7
	No	36	38.3
Change in Dissertation Advisor			
	Yes	22	23.4
	No	72	76.5
How Many Times a Change in Dissertation Advisor			
	1	17	77.2
	2	2	9
	3	2	9
	4	1	4.5
Reason for Change in Dissertation Advisor			
	Advising Conflict	7	31.8
	Advisor Retired/Left Position	9	40.9
	Other	6	27.2

Table 4—Continued

Variable	Category	<i>f</i>	%
Expected to be Mentored During Dissertation			
	Yes	84	89.4
	No	10	10.6
Perception of Advisor Willingness to Mentor/Definition			
	Yes	79	84
	No	15	16
Previous Mentoring Experiences Prior to Dissertation			
	Yes	74	78.7
	No	20	21.3
Satisfying Previous Mentoring Experiences			
	Yes	71	95.9
	No	3	4.1
Formal Mentoring in Department			
	Yes	8	8.5
	No	82	87.2
	Not Sure	4	4.3
Faculty Mentor in Department (not advisor)			
	Yes	45	47.9
	No	49	52.1
If Faculty Mentor, Were you satisfied			
	Yes	40	88.9
	No	5	11.1
If Faculty Mentor, Did you select FM			
	Yes, I selected	33	73.3
	No, FM selected me	7	15.6
	Faculty mentor assigned	5	11.1
If Faculty Mentor, Was FM your dissertation advisor			
	Yes	15	33.3
	No	30	66.7

In regards to the last question of the demographic survey which was optional and open-ended (e.g., If you advise doctoral students, briefly provide additional comments that explain how your current dissertation advising style is impacted by your past dissertation advising experiences as a doctoral student.), 27 (28.7%) participants provided responses. In reviewing the responses in Table 5, three trends surfaced in the type of responses provided. The first type of response was the participant identifying as having a positive dissertation advising relationship and desiring to emulate that type of relationship with their advisees. The second type of response was the participant identifying as having a negative experience and desiring to emulate the opposite in the relationship with their advisees. The third type of response was the participant that did not indicate a positive or negative relationship but provided techniques they use in the relationship with their advisees. For information provided that limited anonymity, a pseudonym was used, the word was changed to generalize, or the information was deleted.

Table 5

Demographic Questionnaire Qualitative Responses

Response 1	<p>“Although I am an adjunct, I do serve on doctoral committees and I believe that I take my understanding of the loneliness of the dissertation process into my understanding and encouragement of others in that process. I try to be warm and encouraging and balance the constructive feedback with a lot of encouragement because students are not receiving a lot of feedback during that dissertation phase. I believe it can be easy to be lost during that time. A good advisor spurs you forward and helps you see your potential. I would NOT have a PhD if it were not for my patient rock-star advisor. Quitting was never an option even when I moved out of state. She was a relentless encourager. She did not academically direct my study, direction, or topic, but she offered constructive feedback, always empowered myself as a researcher and continually provided the vision of my completion. She didn't work harder at my dissertation than I did, but she certainly provided more emotional fortitude than I could at times, and that made ALL the difference.”</p>
------------	--

Table 5—Continued

Response 2	“I inform students about the process of being a doctoral student. I am more willing to share with them my mistakes as a doctoral student as well as my successes. I feel I am more genuine with my students than my dissertation advisor.”
Response 3	“I am much more willing and able to engage in more relational aspects of advising and mentoring. For example, my mentors and [committee members] were mostly focused on my work, but seemed indifferent or clumsy regarding my family and life outside the program. It was as if they didn't exist. For me, I recognize the importance of family - they are often the people supporting us and allowing us the space and time to do what we do. As such, I believe the academy should honor them more fully and consider the impact of a dissertation on their lives. I try to model this importance by often meeting at my house with my family or at their residences with their families. I think my [committee members] knew a lot of information about multiculturalism (at least CE [Jones]), but they didn't live it any other way than as middle aged white men. Now, although I am an [older] white man myself, I generally work within communities of color and the doc students who seek me out are mostly students of color. I have learned a lot about the power and impact of family from many of these students and within these communities and have learned to apply some of these learnings to my work as a counselor educator. These things, by the way, are not the kinds of things that are taught well in any institution of higher education or counselor ed programs within them. Our profession is really stuck working through very old and stale role archetypes that have existed in the academy for millenia. Another example of the poverty of imagination limiting the development of more impactful counseling and counselor education.”
Response 4	“[My advisor] served as a good role model. She returned edits in a timely manner, helped me focus, set deadlines, was warm and open. I try to emulate her approach with my own students.”
Response 5	“belief in individual potential, as a guide, respect for emerging scholarly identity of PhD student.”
Response 6	“I'm much more available...I enjoy the time discussing and editing and providing feedback.”
Response 7	“I explore with doctoral students their initial interest in their perceived topics; their desire of work and explore how their interests and desire of work connects. I empower students' strengths to encourage the work toward areas for improvement; and I also normalize the experience of tension, anxiety, and confusion to develop and direct their focus on perseverance rather than stagnation and fear.”
Response 8	“It was impacted in regards to the respect I provide to students but dissimilar in that I attempt to mentor each student based on their unique individual needs.”
Response 9	“I've wanted to pass on to my dissertation students the strong mentoring that I received during my dissertation work, including numerous conversations about conceptualizing my dissertation and the detailed feedback on my research ideas and writing.”
Response 10	“Responsive, available, open.”

Table 5—Continued

Response 11	“I am accessible to my students. I make expectations clear and make myself available to assist as needed. I encourage and support while promoting personal accountability and autonomy. I provide timely, individualized feedback. I work to be a good role model, an excellent collaborator, and a strong support system.”
Response 12	“We were told who our [committee members] were at the beginning of our doc programs. In my current program, the students ask and we are able to have conversations about 'fit.' I work hard to make sure my advisees and I connect on various levels. I invest a lot of time and energy in them and want to make sure we are on the same page. I also like to get to know them prior to us establishing our formal dissertation relationship. I like to make sure that we are philosophically consistent and work well together. My first few advisees were miss-matches so I have gotten better at the process.”
Response 13	“I try to always put students first like my advisor/mentor did for me. He was also very timely in providing feedback and I try to do the same.”
Response 14	“I am much more involved with my dissertation students now than my advisor was with me. I brainstorm research models with them, meet with them weekly to help them stay on track, encourage them, publish and present with them, and am flexible with them.”
Response 15	“I do advise Master's level thesis students, and while I realize a thesis is not a dissertation there is much overlap. I find that my advising style was impacted both by my first, unsuccessful advisory relationship (how I don't want to be: disingenuous, overly involved in personal issues etc.) and by my second and more successful advisory/mentoring relationship which was characterized by support, empathy, trust and belief in my ability.”
Response 16	“My doctoral/dissertation chair was very clear in the feedback given. If there were aspects of the dissertation proposal and/or dissertation that needed to be updated, even discarded - I did it. It proved to be very effective; thus, I provide the same type of mentorship via feedback as to make the process as smooth for the doctoral student as possible.”
Response 17	“Number one, I am available - and want to engage in the intellectual leaps by providing scaffolding for the doctoral students. My advisor was helpful, supportive, but in a sense expected my independence on the project, and I wanted to be intellectually challenged and stretched at that point, and imagined more discussion. It was like writing a big paper for class - I wanted there to be a sense of being 'brought up' into the colleague role, but there was a vacuum there. Unfortunately, I come across doctoral students who just want to write the paper and reject mentoring, challenge, etc., where feedback is just what they need to incorporate to get through.”
Response 18	“I try to treat my advisees as junior colleagues and provide a counseling and consulting role similar to supervision. I was an adult when I started my doctoral program and I try to treat my students that way, removing barriers and boundaries wherever possible. This is what my mentor did.”

Table 5—Continued

Response 19	<p>“I created a [...] all doc student meeting in which beginning through dissertatin' students developed vertically and horizontally. I have my dissertatin' students run a [...] workshop on their research idea and lit review for MS students. Then I have them submit a conference proposal on the current state of the literature on their area of interest. When they are ready to prospect, they do so in front of the doc student meeting. After they prospect, I insist the submit a conference proposal on preliminary results of their study. I discourage them from taking jobs while ABD. I encourage them to apply for grants related to their area (ASGW, AADA, etc.) I offer to read over all proposals and grants and offer feedback. Since I started this process not a single ABD student has not finished their dissertation and successfully defended it (we have two collecting data right now, one writing Chp 4 and 5 and scheduled to defend next week).”</p>
Response 20	<p>“I like to meet with my doctoral student consistently throughout the process. Actually, from the time a student asks me to be his/her chair, I begin to work as a mentor with the student. We develop the dissertation question as the student works through his/her academic program. Then, I help the student to point most of the research for all classes at the dissertation topic. During the actual process, I like to set firm deadlines for pieces of the dissertation to be completed. I help the student break the project into very small and manageable pieces so that there is maximum success.”</p>
Response 21	<p>“I am more active in reaching out to my advisees than I experienced in my own doctoral program. I help them consider options for internship. I discuss how to balance school, work, family, and social lives. I encourage them to find professors who have similar research interests and to write with journal publication in mind.”</p>
Response 22	<p>“I use similar strategies that my chair taught me. I am available to students when they need to vent and I encourage students to take care of themselves throughout their process. I have successfully supported 3 students to complete their dissertations.”</p>
Response 23	<p>“My dissertation advisor acted as my mentor and I have incorporated this into the way I advise doctoral students.”</p>
Response 24	<p>“I felt very supported by my dissertation chair and strive to support my doc students in the same way.”</p>
Response 25	<p>“I make sure that I remain in contact with my advisees and send motivational emails if the person is not contacting me in return. That would have been very helpful for me and something that my dissertation advisor nor Committee did.”</p>

Table 5—Continued

Response 26	<p>“My original dissertation advisor gave vague feedback; like 'it isn't ready yet; you need more.' After she left the university, my new dissertation advisor (the person I described in this survey) gave specific feedback and collaborated with me to find ways to complete my dissertation. I try to give specific feedback and to help students develop realistic schedules for completing their work. The scope of my project was about right, but some of my students come to me with project ideas that are too narrow or broad. I try to help them make the scope of their projects reasonable. I do not provide feedback as quickly as my second dissertation advisor. I would like to provide overnight feedback, but my course load and university responsibilities are greater and I am not as quick a reviewer. The challenges I face with my dissertators are different from the challenges my dissertation advisor faced with me. I was a good writer (professional writer in a previous career) and was competent at organizing information. Many of my dissertation students have weak writing and organizing skills, and some are ESL students. Although I reflect back on my experiences as a dissertation student and want to be more like my dissertation advisor, my capabilities and our programs and student needs are different. I'd like to believe that I demonstrate many of my dissertation advisor's best qualities, but I know that I only partially succeed in this. I have less time to model through my own research, publishing, and professional involvement, but I try to model something in all of these areas.”</p>
Response 27	<p>“My initial experience was that a genuine mentoring relationship had been formed, however as that advisor became busier in her own faculty/admin requirements, she became less and less available and eventually abandoned me without conferring with me, transferring me to someone unknown to me. The relationship with my students is of the utmost importance. There needs to be strong communication and I would never abandon my students.”</p>

Summary of Demographic Profile

The majority of the sample for this study comprised of Caucasian heterosexual females who earned doctorates of philosophy from traditional counselor education programs in the ACES southern region at research-intensive institutions. The majority of the sample were full-time counselor educators at institutions with two or more CACREP-accredited counseling programs and did not work as practicing counselors. The majority of the sample reported as not advising doctoral students during the dissertation phase. However, those that did, identified as having a similar style to their dissertation advisor. The average years since completing the doctoral degree was 7 years with time-to-degree

completion averaging 4 years. At the time of the dissertation phase, the sample identified as married, U.S. citizens who were not raising children or responsible for family members and worked a part-time job. The average age at the completion of the dissertation phase was 37 years. On average the completion of the dissertation took between 6 months and 2 years with the writing, research, and conceptualization stages being equally expressed as areas of struggle.

The majority of the sample reported having a satisfying dissertation advising relationship and had selected their dissertation advisor. The majority of the sample had white or Caucasian males as advisors and were in cross-cultural advising relationships based on differing gender, race, or both. The majority of the sample did not change or replace their dissertation advisor. However, those that did, only did so once due to advisor leaving their position for one reason or another (e.g., retired, new position, fired, or sabbatical).

The majority of the sample expected to be mentored during the dissertation phase and perceived their advisor had a willingness to mentor. The majority of the sample had mentoring relationships prior to their dissertation phase and found those relationships satisfying. The majority of the sample reported that their counselor education doctoral programs did not have formal mentoring programs. Interestingly, the sample was equally divided with those that did and did not have a faculty mentor in their department. Those that did have a faculty mentor had selected their faculty department mentor and expressed having a satisfying mentoring relationship. Surprisingly, those that had a faculty mentor noted that the faculty mentor was not their dissertation advisor. Lastly, almost a third of

the sample provided input as to how their past dissertation advising experiences as a doctoral student influenced their current dissertation advising style.

Data Analysis

The following section reports the results of the data analysis for each of the research questions used in this study.

Research Question 1

What were the ideal mentor expectations of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?

Results. Responses to Research Question 1 were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics are used to describe the basic features of data (Creswell, 2009), including the frequency and central tendency of responses. These results are used to describe the sample. The Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS), which has three subscales, was used to examine the ideal mentor expectations of the sample. The IMS does not use total scoring, but instead uses the average scores for each of the subscales (see Table 6). The average score for the integrity subscale was 4.35, which suggests that it was “somewhat important” for an ideal mentor to be a person of integrity and set an example for doctoral students. The guidance subscale average was 4.08, thereby suggesting that it was “somewhat important” for an ideal mentor to provide guidance through practical graduate level tasks and activities. The relationship subscale was 2.40, indicating that it was “slightly important” for mentors to form personal relationships with doctoral students, ones that encompassed personal concerns and social activities.

Table 6

Ideal Mentor Scale Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
IMS Integrity Subscale Average	100	4.3543	0.49601
IMS Guidance Subscale Average	100	4.089	0.58619
IMS Relationship Subscale Average	100	2.4	0.55158

When reviewing these results proportionally, Table 7 indicates that the integrity subscale items (e.g., respect the intellectual property rights of others) had the greatest number of items (53.3%, $n = 55$) rated as “extremely important,” while the guidance subscale items (e.g., give me specific assignments related to my research problem) and the relationship subscale items (e.g., help me to realize my life vision) ranked second and third with 43.8% ($n = 44$) and 7.1% ($n = 7$), respectively.

Table 7

Ideal Mentor Scale Averaged Importance Proportions

IMS Subscales	Not at All Important	Slightly Important	Moderately Important	Somewhat Important	Extremely Important
Integrity	1 (1.2%)	3 (2.6%)	12 (11.9%)	31 (30.9%)	55 (53.3%)
Guidance	3 (2.5%)	5 (5.4%)	17 (16.6%)	32 (31.7%)	44 (43.8%)
Relationship	34 (33.6%)	21 (21.0%)	24 (24.3%)	14 (14.0%)	7 (7.1%)

Research Question 2

What were the perceived advisory working alliance experiences of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?

Results. Responses to Research Question 2 were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics are to describe the basic features of data (Creswell, 2009) including the frequency and central tendency of responses. These results are used to describe the sample. The Advising Working Alliance Inventory-Student version (AWAI-S) which has three subscales was used to examine the perceived dissertation advising working alliance for this sample. The AWAI-S does not use total scoring but instead has total scores for each of the subscales (see Table 8). Hence, the higher the score for each subscale the more likely that the respondent agreed that their advisory working alliance encompassed that particular attribute. The total score possible for the apprenticeship subscale, which represents the degree to which the advisor promoted the professional development of their advisee, is 70. The sample's apprenticeship subscale total score was 52.05. The total score possible for the rapport subscale, which represents that the advisor provided encouragement and support and developed a bond with the advisee, is 55. The sample's rapport subscale total score was 49.08. The total score possible for the identification-individuation subscale which represents the degree to which the advisee wants to be like their advisor or seeks to individuate themselves from their advisor is 25. The sample's identification-individuation subscale score was 19.04.

Table 8

Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
AWAI-S Apprenticeship Subscale Total	98	52.05	11.73
AWAI-S Rapport Subscale Total	98	49.08	8.17
AWAI-S Identification-Individuation Subscale Total	99	19.04	3.85

When reviewing these results proportionally, Table 9 indicates that the rapport subscale items (e.g., my advisor welcomes my input into our discussions) had the greatest number of items (68.3%, $n = 67$) rated as “strongly agree,” while the apprenticeship subscale items (e.g., I learn from my advisor by watching him/her) and the identification-individuation subscale items (e.g., I tend to see things differently from my advisor) ranked second and third with 37.7% ($n = 37$) and 36.6% ($n = 36$), respectively.

Table 9

Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version Averaged Agreement Proportions

AWAI-S Subscales	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Apprenticeship	8 (8.5%)	12 (12.0%)	15 (15.7%)	27 (27.2%)	36 (36.6%)
Rapport	3 (2.7%)	4 (4.2%)	6 (6.6%)	18 (18.2%)	67 (68.3%)
Identification-Individuation	5 (5.1%)	9 (9.5%)	22 (22.6%)	25 (25.3%)	37 (37.6%)

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between perceived advisory working alliance as measured by the AWAI-S and time-to-degree?

Hypothesis for RQ 3: Positive perceptions of the advisory working alliance will have a positive relationship with time-to-degree.

Results. Based on the results of correlational analysis, there was no relationship between perceived advisory working alliance subscales and time-to-degree (see Table 10). There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 10

Advisory Working Alliance Inventory–Student Version and TTD Correlations

		TTD
Apprenticeship Subscale Total Score	Pearson Correlation	-0.099
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.342
	<i>N</i>	94
Rapport Subscale Total Score	Pearson Correlation	0.07
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.50
	<i>N</i>	94
Identification-Individuation Subscale Total Score	Pearson Correlation	-0.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.798
	<i>N</i>	94

Research Question 4

What is the relationship between perceived willingness to mentor and time-to-degree?

Hypothesis for RQ 4: Positive perceptions of advisors' willingness to mentor will have a positive relationship with time-to-degree.

Results. As shown in Table 11, an independent sample *t* test demonstrated that there was not a significant difference in the time-to-degree mean scores for those that perceived their advisors as having a willingness to mentor and those that did not. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, $t(91) = .500, p = .618$.

Table 11

Perception of Advisors' Willingness to Mentor and TTD Group Statistics

		Perception of advisor willingness to mentor/definition		<i>N</i>		Mean		Std. Deviation		Std. Error Mean	
TTD		Yes		78		4.4359		2.24239		0.2539	
		No		15		4.1333		1.50555		0.38873	
Independent Samples Test											
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means							
		<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
									Lower	Upper	
TTD	Equal variances assumed	0.095	0.759	0.5	91	0.618	0.30256	0.60491	-0.89901	1.50414	
	Equal variances not assumed			0.652	27.58	0.52	0.30256	0.4643	-0.64917	1.2543	

Research Question 5

What is the relationship between cross-cultural advising based on gender, race or both and time-to-degree?

Hypothesis for RQ5: Cross-cultural advising will have a relationship with time-to-degree.

Results. As shown in Table 12, an independent sample *t* test demonstrated there was not a significant difference in the time-to-degree means scores for those that were in a cross-cultural advising relationship based on differing gender, race, or both and those that were not. There was insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, $t(92) = 1.299$, $p = .197$.

Table 12

Cross-Cultural Advising and TTD Group Statistics

		Cross-Cultural Advising Based on Gender and Race		<i>N</i>		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean		
TTD		Yes		58		4.569	2.47168	0.32455		
		No		35		4.0857	1.40108	0.23683		
Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variance		<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means						
		<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
TTD	Equal variances assumed	3.633	0.06	1.057	91	0.293	0.48325	0.45707	-0.42466	1.39116
	Equal variances not assumed			1.203	90.735	0.232	0.48325	0.40177	-0.31484	1.28135

Summary of Data Analysis**Research Question 1**

The Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS) has three subscales and does not use total scoring. The sample scored both the integrity subscale (e.g., ideal mentor person of integrity and example for doctoral students) and the guidance subscale (e.g., ideal mentor providing guidance through practical graduate level tasks and activities) as “somewhat important.” The relationship subscale (e.g., ideal mentor to form personal relationships that encompass personal concerns and social activities) was scored as “slightly important.” Proportionally, the integrity subscale had the greatest number of items rated as

“extremely important” with the guidance and relationship subscales coming in second and third, respectively.

Research Question 2

The Advising Working Alliance Inventory-Student version (AWAI-S) has three subscales and does not use total scoring. The higher the score for each subscale the more likely that the respondent agreed that their advisory working alliance encompassed that particular attribute. The scores for both the rapport subscale (e.g., advisor provided encouragement and support and developed a bond with the advisee) and identification-individuation subscale (e.g., degree to which the advisee wants to be like their advisor or seeks to individuate themselves from their advisor) were approximately six points from reaching the highest score possible. The apprentice subscale had the largest point spread from the highest score possible. Proportionally, the rapport subscale had the greatest number of items rated as “strongly agree” with the apprenticeship and identification-individuation subscales coming in second and third, respectively.

Research Questions 3–5

There was not a statistically significant relationship between time-to-degree and perception of advising working alliance. Additionally, time-to-degree was not predicted by the perception of advisory working alliance, the perception of advisor’s willingness to mentor, or based on cross-cultural advising relationships.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Overview of Study

High attrition rates among doctoral students are of great concern. Based on national statistics in the United States, at least 50% of students who start a doctoral program do not complete their degree (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008; Lovitts, 2000). Although factors leading to attrition can vary, given the individual student and the discipline, the faculty-student relationship is the most commonly noted problematic factor across disciplines (Fedynich & Bain, 2011; Lovitts, 2001). However, the research on doctoral advisor-advisee relationships remains sparse, particularly in counselor education (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Therefore, the results of this study will add to the literature on counselor education doctoral advisor-advisee relationships. The chapter will provide an overview of the methodology, discussion of salient findings, implications for counselor education and doctoral training, limitations, and recommendations for future research.

Overview of Methodology

The research design used for this study was retrospective cross-sectional survey research. Cross-sectional survey research focuses on the relationship between variables (Punch, 2003) and uses quantitative methods of analysis such as descriptive statistics, *t* tests, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and regression. The purpose of this study was to explore the demographic profile of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of

their doctoral programs by examining counselor educators' expectations of an ideal mentor, perceptions of their advisory working alliance and perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs. Additionally, this study explored the relationship of these perceptions and cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race, or both with time-to-degree.

The participants sought for this study were counselor educators who earned a doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) or a doctor of education degree (Ed.D.) from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited doctoral program in the United States; had served as full-time or adjunct faculty members in a master's or doctoral counseling program in the United States; and asserted that they were confident in reflecting, with accuracy, upon their dissertation advising experience. Purposive sampling, a non-random selection process was used to solicit participants for this study. Snowball-sampling was also employed.

The research questions were as follows:

1. What were the ideal mentor expectations of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?
2. What were the perceived advisory working alliance experiences of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs?
3. What is the relationship between perceived advisory working alliance as measured by the AWAI-S and time-to-degree?
4. What is the relationship between perceived willingness to mentor and time-to-degree?

5. What is the relationship between cross-cultural advising based on differing gender, race or both and time-to-degree?

Discussion of Salient Findings

The purpose of this study was to quantitatively explore counselor educators' dissertation advising experiences by examining their expectations of an ideal mentor and the perception of their dissertation advisory working alliance. Additionally, this study examined the relationship between time-to-degree and advising working alliance perception, perception of advisors' willingness to mentor, and cross-cultural advising relationships. Next, the salient findings for each research question are discussed and, where appropriate, will be compared with previous literature.

Research Question 1: Mentoring

The majority of the sample expected to be mentored and had previous and satisfying mentoring relationships prior to their doctoral program, but less than half of the sample reported having a faculty mentor in their CE department. However, a majority of the sample perceived their dissertation advisor as having a willingness to mentor. Additionally, an extremely small number of participants reported that their dissertation advisor was also their faculty mentor and that their departments had formal mentoring programs. These findings highlight and support that, while mentoring in counselor education is desired and expected in doctoral training, students are often seeking someone, other than their major advisor, to serve as their mentor. Unfortunately, these findings also support that there is a lack coherent objectives and structure of mentoring (Fallon, 2004). Subsequently, there are gaps in the manner in which mentoring is used in doctoral preparation (Golde & Dore, 2001).

Of all the items on the Ideal Mentor Scale (IMS), the sample rated the integrity subscale items the greatest as “extremely important.” This subscale represents an expectation for an ideal mentor to exhibit virtue, principled action and the ability to be emulated as a role model. This suggests that the sample expected integrity from an ideal mentor during the dissertation phase of their doctoral program. Interestingly, on the relationship subscale, the sample population rated item 4 (my ideal mentor would have taken me to dinner and/or drink after work) and item 20 (my ideal mentor would have talked to me about his or her personal problems) the greatest as “not at all important.”

The relationship subscale represents an expectation of a mentor with whom advisees can form personal relationships that may include discussing areas such as personal concerns and life goals. From a professional standpoint, CE doctoral graduates are all trained master-level counselors and the ethical responsibility to be aware of dual or multiple relationships could possibly explain why the relationship scale items 4 and 20 were rated the greatest as “not at all important.” From a cross-cultural perspective, given that majority of the sample were white women with white male advisors, these items could have been rated the greatest as “not at all important” due to levels of uncomfortability based on gender stereotypes and biases.

Research Question 2: Advising

In regards to the Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Student Version, the sample rated the items on the rapport subscale higher than the other two subscales. The rapport subscale represents an advisor who supports, encourages and builds a bond with their advisees. This suggests that the sample perceived their dissertation advisory working alliance experiences as having support, encouragement and bonding based upon

their collaborative work with their advisors. Interestingly, counselor education doctoral graduates were primarily female, while their dissertation advisors were majority male. The majority of the sample as well as their dissertation advisors were White/Caucasian. Given this, the majority of those who were identified as having a cross-cultural advising relationship was based more on differences in gender rather than differences in race. This brings to the forefront the need to do further assessing of counselor education doctoral advising relationships to ensure adequate cross-cultural advising can be effectively provided. These further assessments should include, but are not limited to, seeking to learn how to build trust and understanding, recognizing the limitation of monocultural mentoring relationships, intentionally addressing gender and racial biases, and subsequently developing procedures that allow for successful integration processes for women and minorities who may otherwise be forced to assimilate into the dominant white culture (Crutcher, 2014).

Another noteworthy finding is that a majority of the sample did not advise doctoral students at the dissertation phase, but those that did, identified as having a similar advising style as their dissertation advisor. The large number of participants that did not advise at the dissertation phase may be due in part to the fact that majority of the sample had completed their doctoral program within the last five years and are possibly in the early stages of their tenure process.

The last question of the demographic survey which was optional and open-ended (e.g., If you advise doctoral students, briefly provide additional comments that explain how your current dissertation advising style is impacted by your past dissertation advising experiences as a doctoral student) allowed for a deeper insight into counselor

educators' dissertation advising experiences. Four responses explicitly provided profound and thought-provoking perspectives for counselor educators to contemplate in regards to the expectations of mentoring but also the pragmatic process of how to complete the dissertation.

Response 3:

I am much more willing and able to engage in more relational aspects of advising and mentoring. For example, my mentors and [committee members] were mostly focused on my work, but seemed indifferent or clumsy regarding my family and life outside the program. It was as if they didn't exist. For me, I recognize the importance of family—they are often the people supporting us and allowing us the space and time to do what we do. As such, I believe the academy should honor them more fully and consider the impact of a dissertation on their lives. I try to model this importance by often meeting at my house with my family or at their residences with their families. I think my [committee members] knew a lot of information about multiculturalism (at least CE [Jones]), but they didn't live it any other way than as middle aged white men. Now, although I am an [older] white man myself, I generally work within communities of color and the doc students who seek me out are mostly students of color. I have learned a lot about the power and impact of family from many of these students and within these communities and have learned to apply some of these learnings to my work as a counselor educator. These things, by the way, are not the kinds of things that are taught well in any institution of higher education or counselor ed programs within them. Our profession is really stuck working through very old and stale role archetypes that have existed in the academy for millenia. Another example of the poverty of imagination limiting the development of more impactful counseling and counselor education.

This statement addresses the importance and complexities of the dissertation advising relationship by emphasizing the need and expectation of dissertation advisors to practice what they teach and to cultivate cross-cultural, holistic relationships that engage students with an understanding and respect of the intersectionality of their multiple identities.

Response 17:

Number one, I am available—and want to engage in the intellectual leaps by providing scaffolding for the doctoral students. My advisor was helpful, supportive, but in a sense expected my independence on the project, and I wanted to be intellectually challenged and stretched at that point, and imagined more

discussion. It was like writing a big paper for class—I wanted there to be a sense of being “brought up” into the colleague role, but there was a vacuum there. Unfortunately, I come across doctoral students who just want to write the paper and reject mentoring, challenge, etc., where feedback is just what they need to incorporate to get through.

This statement echoes Cardiener’s (2003) argument that advising and mentoring are not synonymous and that advising can be viewed as an inherent function of mentoring and mentoring an extension of advising (Bruns Schoen, 1991). Hence, this statement highlights the reality of the incongruences in dissertation advising expectations.

Subsequently, both of these statements support TWIG’s (1996) notion that doctoral advising could be seen as a set of tasks or product to be provided rather than a process of developing future leaders, if the faculty-student relationship solely focused on program requirements, dissertation completion and graduation. The argument is not that the fulfillment of these requirements is not mandatory but to offset doctoral attrition and cultivate future leaders, these requirements should be accomplished in an advising relationship that seeks to mentor. This concept is expressed and supported in the following responses.

Response 19:

I created a [...] weekly all doc student meeting in which beginning through dissertatin’ students developed vertically and horizontally. I have my dissertatin’ students run a [...] workshop on their research idea and lit review for MS students. Then I have them submit a conference proposal on the current state of the literature on their area of interest. When they are ready to prospect, they do so in front of the doc student meeting. After they prospect, I insist the submit a conference proposal on preliminary results of their study. I discourage them from taking jobs while ABD. I encourage them to apply for grants related to their area (ASGW, AADA, etc.) I offer to read over all proposals and grants and offer feedback. Since I started this process not a single ABD student has not finished their dissertation and successfully defended it (we have two collecting data right now, one writing Chp 4 and 5 and scheduled to defend next week).

Response 20:

I like to meet with my doctoral student consistently throughout the process. Actually, from the time a student asks me to be his/her chair, I begin to work as a mentor with the student. We develop the dissertation question as the student works through his/her academic program. Then, I help the student to point most of the research for all classes at the dissertation topic. During the actual process, I like to set firm deadlines for pieces of the dissertation to be completed. I help the student break the project into very small and manageable pieces so that there is maximum success.

Research Questions 3–5

The data analyses conducted for this study did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between time-to-degree and perception of advisory working alliance, nor did perception of advisory working alliance, perception of advisor's willingness to mentor or cross-cultural advising relationships predict time-to-degree. According to Thompson (2002), there are three types of significance—"statistical," "practical," and "clinical"—and counselor education should not limit their inquiries and evaluations of research to only that of "statistical" significance which is the most common practice. Simply stated, "statistical" significance represents the precision of test or measurement used to determine if what you observed was by chance, "practical" significance represents the practical noteworthiness of the results, and "clinical" significance addresses the strength and size of the effect or difference in results. Therefore, despite not having "statistical" significance, this study has "practical" significance and relevance because it adds to the literature base and provides insight into the dissertation advising experiences of counselor educators during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs by providing a demographic profile of counselor educators, examining their expectations of an ideal mentor, exploring their perceptions of their advisory working alliance, and examining their perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor.

Implications for Counselor Education and Doctoral Training

The findings support that the phenomenon of mentoring in doctoral education is as valued and expected in Counselor Education as it is in other disciplines. As evidenced at the ACES 2015 national conference pre-conference opening panel of leaders in the field and the various presentations, mentoring is at the forefront of discussion as a viable tool in developing counselor education leadership. A call to the profession was given to counselor education department to develop formal mentoring programs and assess the mentoring needs of CE doctoral students and new faculty, as well as deliberately addressing gender and racial biases that can and may exist in advising and mentoring relationships, thus challenging counselor education to have more candid discussions about mentoring, practical applications of mentoring, inclusion of mentoring in curriculum, and incentives for mentoring and the development and publication of mentoring resources/guidelines for faculty and students.

Unfortunately, this is not the first call to the profession in regards to advising and mentoring and these findings provide a continued emphasis that there is a need for the formalization and publication of best practices for counselor education doctoral advising and mentoring to be addressed in CACREP standards and ACA code of ethics (Del Rio & Mieling, 2012; Hazler & Carney, 1993; Sangganjanavanich & Magnuson, 2009). Specifically, CACREP standards must explicitly reference the necessity for counselor educators' training in advising and mentoring. Absence of this in the CACREP standards is conspicuous and, subsequently, sends the message that mentoring is not a valued skill set required for counselor education leadership. It is essential for CACREP standards to evolve and develop either a domain specific for doctoral advising and mentoring

preparation or modify an existing domain to include doctoral advising and mentoring preparation as both a knowledge and skill objective. Given that doctoral students are expected to be leaders in their respective disciplines, aspiring to have positive mentoring relationships should be fostered. Doing so develops a regenerative process (Lanning, 1990) that can impact the professional field. As Lanning (1990) stated, “We will always be driven by the master’s level education we provide, but that can only continue if we prepare quality doctoral level graduates” (p. 168).

Limitations

The limitations of this study are framed based on threats to validity of the research design. Internal and external validity are the general types of threats. Internal threats impact how well a research study is designed and can control for, or avoid, confounding variables which are other possible independent variables functioning at the same time. External threats refer to the generalizability of the results of the study (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Several threats to validity posed limitations for the research design of this study.

The first and second limitations of the study are the possibility of maturation and recall bias threats given that the study was of a retrospective cross-sectional survey design. Maturation addresses changes in the sample over time in their perception of their dissertation advising experiences due to gained knowledge about the advising process from the perspective of being a counselor educator. Recall bias is an error caused by the inaccuracy or lack of completeness in recalling experiences from memory (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). The sample was tasked with recalling dissertation advising experiences on average from seven years ago.

The third limitation is identified as a threat to external validity due to the sample being small and nonrandom (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Therefore, the results of the study can only be suggested and not generalized to the entire counselor education population. The fourth limitation is the instrumentation utilized for this study. Likert-scaled instruments were used and did not have total or composite scoring. The IMS and AWAI-S both have three subscales for which scoring is provided but not as a total score for the entire scale or instrumentation. Both instruments are to be interpreted by totaling or averaging the subscale scores. Sullivan and Artino (2013) noted the controversy surrounding instrumentation that uses Likert scales being converted to numbers and being used as interval data. This is done to achieve means, standard deviations, and parametric statistics. Mean scores from ordinal data when converted to interval data does not provide the ability to rank the data or differentiate between respondents as to why they may have chosen the answers they chose (Sullivan & Artino, 2013). Therefore, the IMS and AWAI-S subscale mean scores are limited in value for ranking the importance of each subscale for the sample.

The fourth limitation of the study was the inability to calculate a response rate due to not knowing the specific number of participants contacted via email. A response rate is calculated by dividing the number of completed surveys by the number of participants contacted (Punch, 2014). Due to soliciting participants via their work email addresses and the ACES CESNET-L listserv a participant may have received an email invite more than once. The final limitation for the study was in the precision of measuring time-to-degree and its delineation from time to completion of the dissertation. To increase the precision of measurement for time-to-degree, the month and semester along with the year started

and year completed should have been requested, and additionally, a statement of clarity noting the difference between time-to-degree and time-to-completion of the dissertation. Doing so would have controlled for possible confusion of the two terms.

Recommendations for Future Research

As noted in the literature and from the results of this study, mentoring is a valued phenomenon that demands further exploration in the field of counselor education. As with all research, this study provided insight into recommendations for future research.

The first recommendation is to replicate this study and control for the limitations previously mentioned. Secondly, one could also do a companion study or replication of this study but from the advisor's perspective of the advisory working alliance and the expectations of an ideal mentee. Another idea would be to study current doctoral students and their major advisors as they are actively engaged in the advising relationship. To further understand the ongoing nature of the advising process and the various factors that are acting both on and within the advising relationship could provide useful information on factors that enhance or detract from the process. By continuing to study the doctoral advising relationship between students and their advisors in counselor education, researchers may be able to provide a more holistic, and complete, view of a multifaceted process. Such findings would help the profession to identify the unique knowledge and skill competencies that are needed to effectively mentor the next generation of counselor educators.

REFERENCES

- American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD). (1988). *Ethical standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Anderson, E., & Shannon, A. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(1), 38-42.
- Anderson, H. (2001). Clinical teaching and mentoring: Vital in the development of competent therapists. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 36(Suppl.), 138-143.
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). (2013). Retrieved June 8, 2013, from <http://www.acesonline.net>
- Astin, A. W. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin, A. W. (1985). *Achieving academic excellence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bain, S., Fedynich, L., & Knight, M. (2010). The successful graduate student: A review of the factors for success. *Journal of Academic and Business Ethics*, 3(7), 1-9.
- Bair, C. R., & Haworth, J. G. (November, 1999). *Doctoral student attrition and persistence: A metasynthesis of research*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED437008)
- Benishek, L. A., Bieshcke, K. J., Park, J., & Slattery, S. M. (2004). A multicultural feminist model of mentoring. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 32, 428-443.
- Berger, J. B., & Lyon, S. C. (2005). Past to present: A historical look at retention. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *College student retention: Formula for student success* (pp. 1-29). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Black, L. L., Suarez, E. C., & Medina, S. (2004). Helping students help themselves: Strategies for successful mentoring relationships. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 44(1), 44-55.
- Bowen, W. G., & Rudenstine, N. L. (1992). *In pursuit of the Ph.D.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Breckner, J. A. (2012). *A phenomenological study of doctoral student attrition in counselor education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved May 5, 2014, from http://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/1510
- Bruns Schoen, J. F. (1991). *Mentoring: A grounded theory study from the perspective of counselor educators in programs granting doctorates in counseling/counselor education* (Doctoral dissertation). Available ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 9137440)
- Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. *Group & Organization Studies*, 9(3), 353-372.
- Burkholder, D. U. (2009). *Returning counselor education doctoral students: Issues of retention and perceived experiences* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <https://etd.ohiolink.edu/>
- Burkholder, D. U. (2012). Returning counselor education doctoral students: Issues of retention, attrition and perceived experiences. *The Journal for Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 4(2), 6-23.
- Cardiener, J. (2003, February). Strengthening your academic program through one-on-one advising. *Recruitment and Retention in Higher Education*, 17(2), 5-8.
- Chen, X. (2013). *STEM attrition: College students' paths into and out of STEM fields* (NCES 2014-001). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(1), 20-43.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2009). *2009 standards*. Retrieved June 8, 2013, from <http://www.cacrep.org/2009standards.html>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2013). *Vision, mission, and core values*. Retrieved June 8, 2013, from <http://www.cacrep.org>
- Council of Graduate Schools (2008). *The Ph.D. Completion Project*. Retrieved January 5, 2013, from <http://www.Ph.D.completion.org/information/index.asp>
- Couper, M. P., & Rowe, B. (1996, Spring). Evaluation of a computer-assisted self-Interview component in a computer assisted personal interview survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 60, 89-108.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Crosby, F. J. (1999). The developing literature on developmental relationships. In A. J. Murrell, F. J. Crosby, & R. J. Ely (Eds.), *Mentoring dilemmas: Developmental relationships within multicultural organizations* (pp. 3-20). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crutcher, B. N. (2014). Cross-cultural mentoring: A pathway to making excellence inclusive. *Library Education*, 100(2). Retrieved June 14, 2015, from <https://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/2014/spring/crutcher>
- Cusworth, S. (2001, August). *Orientation and retention of counseling PhD students: A qualitative study*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED458513)
- Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H., & Price, R. L. (1977). The four stages of professional careers: A new look at performance by professionals. *Organizational Dynamics*, 6(1), 19-42.
- Del Rio, C. M., & Mieling, G. G. (2012). What you need to know: Ph.D.s in counselor education and supervision. *The Family Journal*, 20(1), 18-28.
- Digest of Education Statistics. (2010). *Bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by sex of student and discipline division: 2008-09* (Table 286). Retrieved September 1, 2013, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_286.asp
- Digest of Education Statistics. (2011). *Bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by sex of student and discipline division: 2009-10* (Table 290). Retrieved September 1, 2013, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d11/tables/dt11_290.asp
- Digest of Education Statistics. (2012). *Bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by sex of student and discipline division: 2010-11* (Table 317). Retrieved September 1, 2013, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_317.asp
- Digest of Education Statistics. (2013). *Bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees conferred by degree-granting institutions, by sex of student and discipline division: 2011-12* (Table 318.30). Retrieved March 23, 2015, from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_318.30.asp
- Dixon-Reeves, R. (2003). Mentoring as a precursor to incorporation: An assessment of the mentoring experiences of recently minted Ph.D.s. *Journal of Black Studies*, 34(1), 12-27.
- Epigeum. (2015). *Advising doctoral students: US version*. Retrieved from <https://epigeum.com/courses/research/advising-doctoral-students/>

- Fallon, K. M. (2004). *Work-behavior analysis of counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 3158798)
- Farrell, R. L. (2007). *Personal experiences of mentoring among doctoral students in counselor education* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 3258798)
- Fedynich, L., & Bain, S. (2011). Mentoring the successful graduate student of tomorrow. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, 12, 1-7.
- Ferrer de Valero, Y. (2001). Departmental factors affecting time-to-degree and completion rates of doctoral students at one land-grant research institution. *Journal of Higher Education*, 72(3), 341-367.
- Garcia, J. A. (1995). A multicultural America: Living in a sea of diversity. In D. A. Harris (Ed.), *Multicultural from the margins: Non-dominant voices of difference and diversity* (pp. 29-38). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gardner, S. K. (2008). Student and faculty attributions of attrition in high and low-completing doctoral programs in the United States. *Higher Education*, 58(1), 97-112.
- Gattis, D. M. S. (2008). *Mentoring doctoral students: Ideal mentors, perceived mentoring benefits, and relational health* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 3330313)
- Girves, J. E., & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate student degree progress. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 163-189.
- Golde, C. M. (1998). Beginning graduate school: Explaining first year doctoral attrition. In M. Anderson (Ed.), *The experience of being in graduate school: An exploration*. (No. 101, pp. 55-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Golde, C. M. (2000). Should I stay or should I go? Student descriptions of the doctoral attrition process. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(2), 199-227.
- Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 669-700.
- Golde, C. M., & Dore, T. M. (2001). *At cross purposes: What the experiences of today's doctoral students reveal about doctoral education*. Philadelphia, PA: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- Gonzalez-Rodriguez, X. E. (1995). Mentoring to diversity: A multicultural approach. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 66, 69-77.

- Granello, D. H., & Wheaton, J. E. (2004). Online data collection: Strategies for research. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82*, 387-393.
- Green, S. G., & Bauer, T. N. (1995). Supervisory mentoring by advisors: Relationships with doctoral students' potential, productivity, and commitment. *Personnel Psychology, 48*, 537-561.
- Hazler, R. J., & Carney, J. (1993). Student-faculty interactions: An underemphasized dimension of counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 33*, 80-88.
- Hoskins, C. M., & Goldberg, A. D. (2005). Doctoral student persistence in counselor education programs: Student-program match. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 44*, 175-188.
- Hughes, F. R., & Kleist, D. M. (2005). First-semester experiences of counselor education doctoral students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(2), 97-108.
- Hunt, D. M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. *The Academy of Management Review, 8*, 475-485.
- Jacobi, M. (1991). Mentoring and undergraduate academic success: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research, 61*, 505-532.
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. B. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, W. B. (2002). The intentional mentor: Strategies and guidelines for the practice of mentoring. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 33*(1), 88-96.
- Johnson, W. B., & Nelson, N. (1999). Mentoring relationships in graduate education: Some ethical concerns. *Ethics and Behavior, 9*, 189-210.
- Kamens, D. H. (1971). The college "charter" and college size: Effects on occupational choice and college attrition. *Sociology of Education, 44*(3), 270-296.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). Improving the mentoring process. *Training & Development Journal, 39*(4), 40-43.
- Lanning, W. (1990). An educator/practitioner model of counselor education doctoral programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 30*, 163-169.
- Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. N., Klein, E. B., Levinson, M. H., & McKee, B. (1978). *Seasons of a man's life*. New York: Ballantine.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2000). Context and attrition. *Making Strides, 2*(3), 1-7.

- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Lovitts, B. E. (2005). Being a good course-taker is not enough: A theoretical perspective on the transition to independent research. *Studies in Higher Education*, 30(2), 137-154.
- McCormick, T. (1997). An analysis of five pitfalls of traditional mentoring for people on the margins in higher education. In H. T. Frierson (Ed.), *Diversity in higher education: Mentoring and diversity in higher education* (Vol. 1, pp. 187-202). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and protégés: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 33(3), 161-173.
- NACADA. (2006). *NACADA concept of academic advising*. Retrieved on January 9, 2014, from NACADA Clearinghouse of Academic Advising Resources website: <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/Resources/Clearinghouse/View-Articles/Concept-of-Academic-Advising-a598.aspx>
- Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to Ph.D.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- O'Malley, D. V. (2014). *Experiences of non-completing doctoral students in counselor education and supervision: A narrative inquiry* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 3644166)
- Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors and proteges*. New York: Arbor House.
- Protivnak, J. J., & Foss, L. L. (2009). An exploration of themes that influence the counselor education doctoral student experience. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 48, 239-256.
- Punch, K. (2003). *Survey research*. London, UK: Sage.
- Punch, K. (2005). *Introduction to social research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Punch, K. (2014). *Introduction to social research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1999). Burden or blessing? Expected costs of being a mentor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 493-509.
- Rose, G. L. (2000). What do doctoral students want in a mentor? Development of the Ideal Mentor Scale. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(12B), 6418.
- Rose, G. L. (2003). Enhancement of mentor selection using the Ideal Mentor Scale. *Research in Higher Education*, 44, 473-494.

- Rose, G. L. (2005). Group differences in graduate students' concepts of the ideal mentor. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 53-80.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Salgado, J. F., & Moscoso, S. (2003). Internet-based personality testing: Equivalence of measures and assesses' perception and reactions. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 11(2-3), 194-205.
- Sangganjanavanich, V. F., & Magnuson, S. (2009). Averting role confusion between doctoral students and major advisers: Adviser disclosure statements. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 48(3), 194-203.
- Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42, 169-174.
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (2001). Measuring the working alliance in advisor-advisee relationships in graduate school. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(2), 157-167.
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Gelso, C. J. (2005). The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory-Advisor Version: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 650-654.
- Schlosser, L. Z., Knox, S., Moskovitz, A. M., & Hill, C. E. (2003). A qualitative examination of graduate advising relationships: The advisee perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 178-188.
- Schwiebert, V. (2000). *Mentoring: Creating connected, empowered relationships*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Sears, S. J., & Davis, T. E. (2003). The doctorate in counselor education: Implications for leadership. In J. D. West, C. J. Osborn, & D. L. Bubenzer (Eds.), *Leaders and legacies: Contributions to the profession of counseling* (pp. 95-108). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Shannon, D. M., & Bradshaw, C. C. (2002). A comparison of response rate, response time, and costs of mail and electronic surveys. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(2), 179-192.
- Smallwood, S. (2004). Doctor dropout. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(19), 1-3.
- Spady, W. G. (1970). Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. *Interchange*, 1(1), 64-85.

- Spady, W. G. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange*, 2(3), 38-62.
- Spaulding, L. S., & Rockinson-Szapkiw, A. J. (2012). Hearing their voices: Factors doctoral candidates attribute to their persistence. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 7, 199-219.
- Sullivan, G. M., & Artino, A. R. (2013). Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), 541-542.
- Sweeney, T. J. (2003). Counseling: Milestones and history makers. In J. D. West, C. J. Osborn, & D. L. Bubenzer (Eds.), *Leaders and legacies: Contributions to the profession of Counseling* (pp. 23-50). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Tentoni, S. C. (1995). The mentoring of counseling students: A concept in search of a paradigm. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 35(1), 32-42.
- Terrell, S. R., Snyder, M. M., & Dringus, L. P. (2009). The development, validation, and application of the doctoral student connectedness scale. *Internet and Higher Education*, 12(2), 112-116.
- Thompson, B. (2002). "Statistical," "practical," and "clinical": How many kinds of significance do counselors need to consider? *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 80(1), 64-71.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropouts from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45, 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tinto, V. (2007). Research and practice of student retention: What next? *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 8(1), 1-19.
- Tucker, A. (1964). *Factors related to attrition among doctoral students*. ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED003049
- TWIG (The Whole is Greater Writing Group). (1996). A feminist perspective on graduate student-advisor relationships. *Feminist Teacher*, 10(1), 17-25. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/224979492?accountid=15099>
- Warren, E. S. (2005). Future colleague or convenient friend: The ethics of mentorship. *Counseling and Values*, 49(2), 141-146.
- Willis, B., & Carmichael, K. D. (2011). The lived experience of late-stage doctoral student attrition in counselor education. *The Qualitative Report*, 16, 192-207.

Willis, B. T. (2007). *The lived experience of doctoral attrition: A post-reflective examination of counselor education students* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (Order No. 3270516)

Wright, C. A., & Wright, S. D. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. *Family Relations*, 36, 204-208.

Appendix A
Informed Consent

Informed Consent

Western Michigan University Department of Counselor Education & Counseling Psychology

Principal Investigator: Stephen E. Craig, Ph.D. ☐

Student Investigator: LaSonda Wells, M.A. ☐

☐

Title: Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-To-Degree

You are invited to participate in a research project titled “Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-To-Degree.” This project will serve as LaSonda Wells’ dissertation for the requirements of the Doctor of Philosophy Degree (Ph.D.) in Counselor Education and Supervision at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. This consent document will explain the purpose of this research project and will go over all of the time commitments, the procedures used in the study, and the risks and benefits of participating in this research project. Please read this consent form carefully and completely and please ask any questions if you need more clarification.

What are we trying to find out in this study? The purpose of this study will be to explore counselor educators’ perceptions of their dissertation advising relationships, expectations of an ideal mentor and perceptions of their advisors’ willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs and to correlate the relationship of these perceptions with time-to-degree.

Who can participate in this study? To participate in this study you must (1) be a counselor educator who has earned a doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) or a doctor of education degree (Ed.D.) from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited doctoral program in the United States, (2) have served as a full-time or adjunct faculty member in a master’s or doctoral counseling program in the United States, and (3) be confident that you can reflect accurately upon your dissertation advising experience.

Where will this study take place? The data collection will be conducted online through the use of QuestionPro survey platform.

What is the time commitment for participating in this study? The estimated time commitment for participating in this study is approximately 15 minutes.

What will you be asked to do if you choose to participate in this study? If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete an online survey which consists of questions about your dissertation advising relationship, ideal mentor expectations and demographic information to include the advising and mentoring practices in the department of your doctoral program.

What information is being measured during the study? The information being measured for this study are your perceptions of your dissertation advising relationship, your ideal mentor expectations, your perceptions of your advisor’s willingness to mentor and how these perceptions correlate to time-to-degree.

☐

What are the risks of participating in this study and how will these risks be minimized? There are no known risks. However, you may experience a range of emotions and feelings as a result of reflecting on your dissertation advising experiences, especially if this experience was negative. You are encouraged to seek support and/or professional assistance, as needed, if you experience any distress or discomfort. Additionally, participation is voluntary and you have the right to refuse to participate and withdraw at any time prior to and once the survey has started by leaving the survey website without penalty. However, participants who withdraw or who refuse to participate will not be included in the drawing.

What are the benefits of participating in this study? There is not a direct benefit to participants. Indirectly, however, your participation could advance the profession. The results could provide much needed feedback to doctoral advisors of the needs and expectations of their advisees. This, in turn, could result in improved doctoral advisory working alliances and enhance the time to completion for doctoral students in counselor education.

Are there any costs associated with participating in this study? Time commitment to complete the survey is the only cost to participants who choose to participate in this study.

Is there any compensation for participating in this study? There is no direct compensation for participating in this study. However, as an incentive for participation, a drawing will be conducted for four \$50 Visa gift cards. Contact information submitted for the drawing will be kept confidential, kept separate from survey for four \$50 Visa gift cards. Contact information submitted for the drawing will be kept confidential, kept separate from survey responses and only used for the purpose of contacting the gift card winners. Specifically, at the conclusion of the survey, if you choose to participate in the drawing you will be directed to select the link that will take you to a new window to submit your contact information.

Who will have access to the information collected during this study? All survey responses will be kept anonymous by NOT associating respondents' names, email addresses or IP addresses with any part of the survey. Names, email addresses and IP addresses will not be collected and a unique identification number will be used to protect your anonymity. Additionally, all data files will be maintained and secured by password protection on the student investigator's personal computer until the conclusion of the study. During the study, a backup of data files will be established and maintained on a USB drive that will also be secured by the student investigator in her home in a locked fire and water proof safe. Upon completion of the research project, the survey data will be downloaded from QuestionPro to a USB drive. Upon completion of the download, the data will be deleted from QuestionPro. The USB drive will be locked in a cabinet in Dr. Stephen Craig's office at Western Michigan University for at least three years. Dr. Craig will have the key to the cabinet and only the investigators will have access to the USB drive for this study.

What if you want to stop participating in this study? Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You can choose to stop participating in the study at any time for any reason. You will not suffer any prejudice or penalty by your decision to stop your participation. You will experience NO consequences either academically or personally if you choose to withdraw from this study. The investigator can also decide to stop your participation in the study without your consent. Subsequently, participants who withdraw or who refuse to participate will not be included in the drawing.

Should you have any questions prior or during the study, you can contact the investigators by email at lasonda.wells@wmich.edu or by phone (269) 873-3393 or Dr. Stephen E. Craig by email stephen.craig@wmich.edu or by phone at (269) 387-5100. Please include the following in the subject line of your message, "CE Dissertation Advising Study QUESTION." You may also contact the Chair, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board by phone at 269-387-7824 or the Vice President for Research by phone at 269-387-8298, if questions or problems arise during the course of the study.

This study was approved by the Western Michigan University Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB #15-10-02) on October 1, 2015. Please do not participate in this study after September 30, 2016.

BY CLICKING ON THE "I AGREE" BUTTON BELOW AND BY PARTICIPATING IN THIS SURVEY ONLINE INDICATES YOUR CONSENT FOR THE USE OF THE ANSWERS YOU SUPPLY.

☐ I agree

☐ I do not agree



Appendix B
Ideal Mentor Scale

Ideal Mentor Scale

Indicate how important each attribute or function was to your definition of an ideal mentor during the dissertation phase of your doctoral program. If you had a mentor during this time, please do not rate that person.

Not at all			Moderately			Extremely
1	2		3	4		5
During the dissertation stage of my doctoral program, my ideal mentor would have . . .						
1. ...shown me how to employ relevant research techniques.	1	2	3	4	5	
2. ...given me specific assignments related to my research problem.	1	2	3	4	5	
3. ...given proper credit to graduate students.	1	2	3	4	5	
4. ...taken me out for dinner and/or drink after work.	1	2	3	4	5	
5. ...preferred to cooperate with others than compete with them.	1	2	3	4	5	
6. ...helped me to maintain a clear focus on my research objectives.	1	2	3	4	5	
7. ...respected the intellectual property rights of others.	1	2	3	4	5	
8. ...been a role model.	1	2	3	4	5	
9. ...brainstormed solutions to a problem concerning my research project.	1	2	3	4	5	
10. ...been calm and collected in times of stress.	1	2	3	4	5	
11. ...been interested in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.	1	2	3	4	5	
12. ...treated me as an adult who has a right to be involved in decisions that affect me.	1	2	3	4	5	
13. ...helped me plan the outline for a presentation of my research.	1	2	3	4	5	
14. ...inspired me by his or her example and words.	1	2	3	4	5	
15. ...rarely felt fearful or anxious.	1	2	3	4	5	
16. ...helped me investigate a problem I am having with research design.	1	2	3	4	5	

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. ...accepted me a junior colleague. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. ...been seldom sad or depressed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. ...advocated for my needs and interests. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. ...talked to me about his or her personal problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. ...generally tried to be thoughtful and considerate. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. ...been a cheerful, high-spirited person. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. ...valued me as a person. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24.had coffee or lunch with me on occasion. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. ...kept his or her workspace neat and clean. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. ...believed in me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. ...met with me on a regular basis. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. ...related to me as if he/she is a responsible, admirable older sibling. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. ...recognized my potential. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. ...helped me to realize my life vision. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. ...helped me plan a timetable for my research. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. ...worked hard to accomplish his/her goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. ...provided information to help me understand the subject matter
I am researching. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. ...been generous with time and other resources. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Ideal Mentor Scale

Scoring Protocol

All items are to be scored on a 5-point rating scale ranging from:

- 1 not at all important
- 2
- 3 moderately important
- 4
- 5 extremely important

To calculate the score for each scale, simply add the scores for each item on that scale and divide by the number of items.

Integrity item numbers (14 items): 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 29, 32

Guidance item numbers (10 items): 1, 2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 27, 31, 33, 34

Relationship item numbers (10 items): 4, 11, 15, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28, 30

Interpretation

INTEGRITY: High scores indicate a preference for a mentoring style characterized by respectfulness for self and others and empowerment of proteges to make deliberate, conscious choices about their lives. Students who score high on Integrity desire a mentor who exhibits virtue and principled action and can be emulated as a role model.

GUIDANCE: High scores indicate a preference for a mentoring style characterized by helpfulness with the tasks and activities typical of graduate study.

RELATIONSHIP: High scores indicate a preference for a mentoring style characterized by the formation of a personal relationship involving sharing such things as personal concerns, social activities, and life vision or worldview.

Appendix C

Advisory Working Alliance Inventory – Student Version

**The Advisory Working Alliance Inventory –
Student Version (AWAI-S)**

Indicate your perceptions about your relationship with your advisor during the dissertation phase of your doctoral program. The term advisor is referring to the faculty member that had the greatest responsibility for helping guide you through your dissertation (e.g. advisor, major professor, committee chair, dissertation chair).

Strongly Disagree 1	2	Neutral 3	4	Strongly Agree 5	
1. I got the feeling that my advisor did <u>not</u> like me very much.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My advisor introduced me to professional activities (E.g. conferences, submitting articles for journal publication)	1	2	3	4	5
3. I did <u>not</u> want to be like my advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
4. My advisor welcomed my input into our discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My advisor helped me conduct my work within a plan.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I tended to see things differently from my advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My advisor did <u>not</u> encourage my input into our discussions.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My advisor had invited me to be a responsible collaborator in his/her own work.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I did <u>not</u> want to feel similar to my advisor in the process of conducting work.	1	2	3	4	5
10. My advisor was <u>not</u> kind when commenting about my work.	1	2	3	4	5
11. My advisor helped me establish a timetable for the tasks of my graduate training.	1	2	3	4	5
12. My advisor and I had different interests.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I did <u>not</u> feel respected by my advisor in our work together.	1	2	3	4	5
14. My advisor was available when I needed her/him.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I felt like my advisor expected too much from me.	1	2	3	4	5

16. My advisor offered me encouragement for my accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Meetings with my advisor were unproductive.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I did <u>not</u> think that my advisor believed in me.	1	2	3	4	5
19. My advisor facilitated my professional development through networking.	1	2	3	4	5
20. My advisor took my ideas seriously.	1	2	3	4	5
21. My advisor did <u>not</u> help me stay on track in our meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I did <u>not</u> think that my advisor had my best interests in mind.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I learned from my advisor by watching her/him.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I felt uncomfortable working with my advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I was an apprentice of my advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I was often intellectually “lost” during my meetings with my advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I consistently implemented suggestions made by my advisor.	1	2	3	4	5
28. My advisor strived to make program requirements as rewarding as possible.	1	2	3	4	5
29. My advisor did <u>not</u> educate me about the process of graduate school.	1	2	3	4	5
30. My advisor helped me recognize areas where I could improve.	1	2	3	4	5

Advisory Working Alliance Inventory – Student Version

Rapport Subscale

- *1. I got the feeling that my advisor did not like me very much.
- 4. My advisor welcomed my input into our discussions.
- *7. My advisor did not encourage my input into our discussions.
- *10. My advisor was not kind when commenting about my work.
- *13. I did not feel respected by my advisor in our work together.
- 16. My advisor offered me encouragement for my accomplishments.
- *18. I did not think that my advisor believed in me.
- 20. My advisor took my ideas seriously.
- *22. I did not think that my advisor had my best interests in mind.
- *24. I felt uncomfortable working with my advisor.
- *26. I was often intellectually “lost” during meetings with my advisor.

Apprenticeship Subscale

- 2. My advisor introduced me to professional activities (e.g., conferences, submitting articles for journal publication).
- 5. My advisor helped me conduct my work within a plan.
- 8. My advisor had invited me to be a responsible collaborator in his/her own work.
- 11. My advisor helped me establish a timetable for the tasks of my graduate training.
- 14. My advisor was available when I needed her/him.
- *17. Meetings with my advisor were unproductive.
- 19. My advisor facilitated my professional development through networking.
- *21. My advisor did not help me stay on track in our meetings.
- 23. I learned from my advisor by watching him/her.
- 25. I was an apprentice of my advisor.
- 27. I consistently implemented suggestions made by my advisor.
- 28. My advisor strived to make program requirements as rewarding as possible.
- *29. My advisor did not educate me about the process of graduate school.
- 30. My advisor helped me recognize areas where I could improve.

Identification-Individuation Subscale

- *3. I did not want to be like my advisor.
- *6. I tended to see things differently from my advisor.
- *9. I did not want to feel similar to my advisor in the process of conducting work.
- *12. My advisor and I had different interests.
- *15. I felt like my advisor expected too much from me.

Note: * indicates negatively worded item; during analysis, should be reverse-scored.

Appendix D
Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic Questionnaire

Current Personal Information - Please complete the following demographic questions based on your current status.

1. What is your gender? (Check one)

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Transgendered
- ☐ Prefer not to indicate

2. Which of the following best identifies your race/ethnicity? (Check one)

- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Hispanic/Latino(a)
- ☐ White or Caucasian
- ☐ Bi-racial/Multi-racial
- ☐ Prefer not to indicate

3. Which best describes your sexual orientation? (check one)

- ☐ Bisexual
- ☐ Gay
- ☐ Lesbian
- ☐ Straight or heterosexual
- ☐ Prefer not to indicate

4. Which best describes your current teaching status? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Full Time, CACREP-accredited Institution
- ☐ Full Time, non CACREP-accredited Institution
- ☐ Adjunct, CACREP-accredited Institution
- ☐ Adjunct, non CACREP-accredited Institution
- ☐ Not currently teaching

5. If teaching at a CACREP-accredited institution, which program types are accredited? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Addiction Counseling
- ☐ Career Counseling
- ☐ Clinical Mental Health Counseling (previously Community Counseling (CC) or Mental Health Counseling (MHC))
- ☐ Counselor Education and Supervision
- ☐ Gerontological Counseling (phased out in 2009 standards)

- ☐ Marriage, Couple and Family Counseling
- ☐ School Counseling
- ☐ Student Affairs and College Counseling (previously College Counseling (CIC) or Student Affairs (SA) or Student Affairs College Counseling (SACC))
- ☐ Not sure
- ☐ Not Applicable

6. In addition to teaching, do you practice as a professional counselor?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Demographic Questionnaire Continued

Personal Information - Please complete the following demographic questions based on your status during the dissertation phase of your doctoral program.

7. What was your age at the time you completed your degree?

8. What year did you begin your doctoral program?

9. What year did you complete your doctoral program?

10. What was your citizenship status at the time of your dissertation process?

- ☐ U.S. Citizenship
- ☐ non-U.S. Citizenship

11. What was your relationship status at the time of your dissertation process? (check one)

- ☐ Single
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Partnered or Committed Relationship
- ☐ Widowed

12. Were you raising children (e.g. birth children, step-children, foster-children or adoptive children) at the time of your dissertation process?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

13. If you were raising children, how many?

?

14. Were you responsible for the care of family members other than your child, children or significant other at the time of your dissertation process?

☐ Yes

☐ No

15. Did you work at the time of your dissertation process?

☐ Yes, Full Time

☐ Yes, Part Time

☐ No

16. Which region of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) did your doctoral program belong to? (check one)

☐ North Atlantic

☐ North Central

☐ Southern

☐ Rocky Mountain

☐ Western

☐ Not Sure

17. Was your doctoral program CACREP accredited?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ Not Sure

18. What degree type did you attain?

☐ Ph.D.

☐ Ed.D.

☐ Neither

19. Which best describes your doctoral program? (check one)

☐ Traditional Campus - Brick and Mortar

☐ Online - You actually attended classes online during a scheduled class time

☐ Hybrid - Combination of traditional and online learning

20. Which best describes the Carnegie research classification for the institution where you completed your doctoral program? (check one)

☐ Very High Research Activity (formally known as Research I)

☐ High Research Activity (formally known as Research II)

☐ Doctoral/Research University (formally known as Doctoral/Research-Extensive and Intensive)

☐ Not sure

21. How long did it take you to complete your dissertation (e.g. based on your program's structure, from the official start of your dissertation process to the completion of your dissertation defense)?

- ☐ 0-5 Months
- ☐ 6-12 Months
- ☐ 1-2 Years
- ☐ 2-3 Years
- ☐ 3-4 Years
- ☐ 5 Years or more

22. During the dissertation stages listed below, at which stage did you struggle the most with or not consider yourself as making satisfactory progress? (check all that apply)

- ☐ Conceptualization Stage (Forming topic, etc.)
- ☐ Writing Stage (Developing the proposal)
- ☐ Research Stage (Collecting data and finalizing dissertation)

Department Advising and Mentoring Practices

23. Which best describes how you were assigned to your dissertation advisor (e.g. major professor, committee chair, dissertation chair)? (check one)

- ☐ I selected who I wanted to serve as my dissertation advisor
- ☐ I was assigned my dissertation advisor and notified by the program
- ☐ Other, please describe:

24. Once you either made a selection or were assigned a dissertation advisor, did you change dissertation advisors (e.g. major professor, committee chair, dissertation chair)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

25. If you changed dissertation advisors, how many times?

26. Which best describes why you changed your dissertation advisor (e.g. major professor, committee chair, dissertation chair)? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Advising conflict
- ☐ Advisor died
- ☐ Advisor retired or left position
- ☐ Other, please specify

27. What was the race or ethnicity of your dissertation advisor? (check one)

- ☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
- ☐ Asian or Pacific Islander
- ☐ Black or African American
- ☐ Hispanic/Latino(a)
- ☐ White or Caucasian
- ☐ Bi-racial/Multi-racial
- ☐ Not sure

28. What was the gender of your dissertation advisor? (check one)

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Transgendered
- ☐ Not sure

29. Would you rate your dissertation advising relationship as satisfying?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

30. Did you expect to be mentored during the dissertation phase of your doctoral program?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

31. Did you have previous mentoring experiences prior to your dissertation phase of your doctoral program?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

32. Would you rate your previous mentoring experiences as satisfying?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

33. Did your department have a formal faculty/student mentoring program?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Not sure

?

34. Did you have a faculty mentor in your department (aside from your dissertation advisor)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

35. If you had a faculty mentor in your department, did you select your faculty mentor?

☐ Yes, I selected my faculty mentor
☐ No, my faculty mentor selected me
☐ My faculty mentor was assigned

36. If you had a faculty mentor in your department, was your faculty mentor also your dissertation advisor (e.g. major professor, committee chair, dissertation chair)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

37. If you had a faculty mentor in your department, were you satisfied with the faculty mentoring relationship?

☐ Yes
☐ No

38. Based on the mentoring definition below, did you perceive that your dissertation advisor had a willingness to mentor at the dissertation phase of your doctoral program?

Mentorship in counselor education (and the counseling profession) is an interpersonal, interdependent, collaborative, and continuously evolving relationship between individuals who are differentiated by skills, experiences, expertise and knowledge. The more experienced individual [mentor] provides the lesser-experienced individual [mentee] with guidance, encouragement, support, resources and direction in the roles of educator, role model, and sponsor. The mentee, in turn, reciprocates support, encouragement, and direction. Additional resources may be provided for the mentor as well. Furthermore, the relationship is marked by trust, empathy, respect, open communication, active listening, genuineness, commitment, and clearly established boundaries. Through mentoring interactions, both the mentor and mentee develop holistic personal (psychosocial based) and professional (career based) identities. (Farrell, 2007, p. 35- 36)

☐ Yes
☐ No

?

39. If you advise doctoral students, is your style of advising at the dissertation phase similar to the style of your dissertation advisor (e.g. major professor, committee chair, dissertation chair)?

☐ Yes, my advising style is similar to that of my dissertation advisor

☐ No, my advising style is dissimilar to that of my dissertation advisor

☐ I do not advise doctoral students during the dissertation phase

40. If you advise doctoral students, briefly provide additional comments that explain how your current dissertation advising style is impacted by your past dissertation advising experiences as a doctoral student.

Appendix E

Emails Granting Permission to Use and Publish Instruments

From: LaSonda Wells
To: Rose, Gail L.
Date: 4/11/2011 8:28 AM
Subject: RE: Ideal Mentor Scale

Hi Gail,

Thank you for your response. It was definitely helpful. I will keep you posted as I move forward.

LaSonda

LaSonda Wells, MA, LPC, NCC
 Licensed Professional Counselor
 Restorative~Individualization~Communication~Developer~Empathy

Kalamazoo Valley Community College
 6767 West O Ave Box 4070
 Kalamazoo, MI 49003
lwells@kvcc.edu, Phone 269-488-4669,
 FAX 269-488-4151

--NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient and the KVCC Counseling Office. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please reply to the sender and delete the original message. Thank you.

>>> "Rose, Gail L." <Gail.Rose@vtmednet.org> 4/11/2011 8:21 AM >>>
 LaSonda,

You have my permission to use the IMS however you see fit. The instrument was written with the aim of assessing the attitudes of doctoral students across disciplines. The data were obtained from students at two Research I institutions so the departments were all research-intensive. In order to find items that would be applicable across disciplines, I focused on the aspect of doctoral education that is common to all in that environment: research. You can see by inspecting the items on the IMS that a number of them pertain to research. If those questions are applicable to your population of interest, I don't think that limiting the sample to students in one field of study would affect the validity of the instrument. I presume, from the fact that you're planning an empirical dissertation, that your department has a major research component vs. being clinically focused. I would caution that the instrument would not necessarily tap into students' preferences for a counseling supervisor. I'm guessing that students might describe an ideal research mentor differently than an ideal clinical supervisor, but that's an empirical question! :)

Regarding its use with faculty, who presumably would be making judgments about the value of the different characteristics for students (i.e., they would not be rating their own preferences or their own style, right?), you are correct to acknowledge that there is no established psychometric data for this use of the instrument. That doesn't mean you shouldn't use it that way, of course, but perhaps you could consider gathering some other data on expected correlates of those variables so you can evaluate the validity as part of your research. One thing to note about the use of IMS in other ways or with other groups: There are a handful of items that were endorsed as very important to the vast majority of students, so they are not part of the IMS because the IMS aims to discriminate between groups of individuals who have different ideals. Thus, if you will be administering it to faculty it would be important to add those items back in because faculty may not be so unanimous about the value of those. You'll find those items on the cover page of the IMS.

Let me know if you have any other questions about this.
 Best wishes, Gail

RE: Permission to Publish IMS in Dissertation

Rose, Gail L. Gail.Rose@uvmhealth.org

Today 9:05 AM LaSonda Wells;Gail Lynne Rose Gail.Rose@uvm.edu

LaSonda,

Thanks for emailing this AM to follow up -- it will take me a while to dig back through all the emails from the past 2 weeks!

Yes, you have my permission to publish the IMS in your dissertation so long as the copyright is acknowledged.

Gail

From: LaSonda Wells [lasonda.wells@wmich.edu]
 Sent: Monday, July 25, 2016 8:53 AM
 To: Rose, Gail L.
 Subject: Fw: Permission to Publish IMS in Dissertation
 Hi Dr. Rose,

I am hoping I can get a quick reply as to whether I can publish your scale in my dissertation.

LaSonda

From: LaSonda Wells
 Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 10:24 AM To: Rose, Gail L.
 Subject: Re: Permission to Publish IMS in Dissertation
 Hi Dr. Rose,

I received your "out of office" reply. My deadline to submit my dissertation is July 29th. I hope your schedule permits you to reply by that date. Based on our previous emails, I believe you would grant permission but I need to have it in writing. So I look forward to hearing from you soon and I hope your travels were safe and enjoyable.

LaSonda

From: Rose, Gail L. <Gail.Rose@uvmhealth.org>
 Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 9:48:04 AM
 To: LaSonda Wells
 Subject: Automatic reply: Permission to Publish IMS in Dissertation

I'll be out of the country from July 8-25 and will not be checking email while away. I will respond to your email as soon as possible when I return.

Regards,
 Gail Rose

From : Charles J. Gelso <gelso@umd.edu>
 Subject : RE: Permission request for use of AWAI-S
 To : Lasonda Wells lasonda.wells@wmich.edu

RE: Permission request for use of AWAI-S

Thu, May 30, 2013 11:06 AM

Mine is okay. I'll get you the measures later today.
 Charlie Gelso

From: Lasonda Wells [lasonda.wells@wmich.edu]
 Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 11:03 AM
 To: Charles J. Gelso
 Subject: Re: Permission request for use of AWAI-S

Hi Dr. Gelso,
 Sorry about being unclear. Yes I am asking for permission and a copy of the inventory. Thank you very much.
 Is your permission alone okay or from here should I await to hear from Dr. Schlosser also?
 ----- Original Message -----

From: "Charles J. Gelso" <gelso@umd.edu>
 To: "Lasonda Wells" <lasonda.wells@wmich.edu>
 Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 10:51:15 AM
 Subject: RE: Permission request for use of AWAI-S

A little unclear if you are asking for permission to use the measure and a copy of the measure. You certainly have my permission. Do you need a copy of the measure?

Dr. Gelso

From: Lasonda Wells [lasonda.wells@wmich.edu]
 Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2013 10:36 AM
 To: lewis.schlosser@shu.edu; Charles J. Gelso
 Subject: Permission request for use of AWAI-S

Hello Drs. Gelso and Schlosser,

My name is LaSonda Wells and I am a doctoral student in Counselor Education at Western Michigan University. I would like to request permission to use your Advisory Working Alliance Inventory – student version in my dissertation research. I desire to explore advisory working alliance in Counselor Education among doctoral students. Please let me know if I need do something more in requesting your permission for use and obtaining a copy of the instrument and any additional information.

In advance, thank you for your time. I look forward to hearing from you both. Have a great day.

LaSonda Wells, MA, LPC, NCC

Re: Permission to Publish AWAI-S in Dissertation

Charles J. Gelso <gelso@umd.edu>

Fri 7/15

Lasonda Wells

You certainly have my permission. I'd love to see a copy of your Abstract.
Best wishes,

Charlie Gelso

On Fri, Jul 15, 2016 at 9:43 AM, Lasonda Wells <lasonda.wells@wmich.edu> wrote:

Hi Dr. Gelso,

I have finally come to the end of the Ph.D. journey. I want to thank you for the use of the AWAI-S and the research you have contributed to the field of psychology and counseling. I need your permission to publish the AWAI-S in my dissertation. Please let me know if this is okay. As always, hope all is well and thank you again.

LaSonda Wells

Appendix F

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board Letters of Approval

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY



Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: October 1, 2015

To: Stephen Craig, Principal Investigator
LaSonda Wells, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 15-10-02

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled "Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-to-Degree" has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may **only** be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., ***you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under "Number of subjects you want to complete the study."*** Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination:

September 30, 2016

1903 W. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5456
PHONE: (269) 387-8293 FAX: (269) 387-8276

CAMPUS SITE: 251 W. Walwood Hall

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY



Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: December 10, 2015

To: Stephen Craig, Principal Investigator
LaSonda Wells, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 15-10-02

This letter will serve as confirmation that the change to your research project titled "Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-to-Degree" requested in your memo received December 10, 2015 (to allow recruitment from non-CACREP-accredited master's and doctoral counseling program websites) has been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may **only** conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: September 30, 2016

1903 W. Michigan Ave., Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5456
PHONE: (269) 387-8293 FAX: (269) 387-8276
CAMPUS SITE: 251 W. Walwood Hall

Appendix G
Email Invitations to Participants

Email Invitation to Participants

Greetings Counselor Educator,

I am LaSonda Wells, a counselor education doctoral candidate at Western Michigan University and I would like to invite you to learn more about participating in my research project titled “Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-To-Degree.” The purpose of the study is to explore counselor educators’ perceptions of their dissertation advising relationships, expectations of an ideal mentor and perceptions of their advisors’ willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs and to correlate the relationship of these perceptions with time-to-degree.

The inclusionary criteria for this study is that the participant (1) be a counselor educator who has earned a doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) or a doctor of education degree (Ed.D.) from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited doctoral program in the United States, (2) have served as full time or adjunct faculty members in a master’s or doctoral counseling program in the United States, and (3) be confident that they can reflect accurately upon their dissertation advising experience.

Participants will be asked to complete an anonymous online survey taking approximately 15 minutes. As an incentive for participation, a drawing will be conducted for four \$50 Visa gift cards. Contact information submitted for the drawing will be kept confidential, kept separate from survey responses and only used for the purpose of contacting the gift card winners.

I would also like to invite you to forward this research study invitation to other counselor educators that you know who meet the inclusionary criteria to participate in this study.

In advance, I appreciate your willingness to support my research project. Should you have any questions or need clarification, please contact me by email at lasonda.wells@wmich.edu or by phone (269) 873-3393. You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Stephen E. Craig by email at stephen.craig@wmich.edu or by phone at (269) 387- 5100.

This study has been approved by the Western Michigan University’s Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. To learn more about this study, click here or cut and paste and place in your browser:

<http://cedissertationadvising.questionpro.com>

Sincerely,

LaSonda Wells, MA, LPC, NCC
Counselor Education Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University

Stephen E. Craig, Ph.D., LPC
Dissertation Chair, Associate Professor and Unit Director of Counselor Education
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University

Reminder Email to Participants

Greetings Counselor Educator,

Sending a second request with the hopes that you will complete my 15-minute survey to assist me in completing my dissertation research!

Research shows that faculty-student relationships at the doctoral level play a pivotal role in retaining doctoral students and especially at the dissertation stage (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008). Unfortunately, the literature on doctoral advising and mentoring in counselor education is sparse. Therefore, the purpose of my research is to explore counselor educators' perceptions of their dissertation advising relationships, expectations of an ideal mentor and perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs and to correlate the relationship of these perceptions with time-to-degree.

The inclusionary criteria for this study is that the participant (1) be a counselor educator who has earned a doctor of philosophy degree (Ph.D.) or a doctor of education degree (Ed.D.) from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited doctoral program in the United States, (2) have served as full time or adjunct faculty members in a master's or doctoral counseling program in the United States, and (3) be confident that they can reflect accurately upon their dissertation advising experience.

Participants will be asked to complete an anonymous online survey taking approximately 15 minutes. As an incentive for participation, a drawing will be conducted for four \$50 Visa gift cards. Contact information submitted for the drawing will be kept confidential, kept separate from survey responses and only used for the purpose of contacting the gift card winners.

In advance, I appreciate your willingness to support my research project. Should you have any questions or need clarification, contact me by email at lasonda.wells@wmich.edu or by phone (269) 873-3393. You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Stephen E. Craig by email at stephen.craig@wmich.edu or by phone at (269) 387- 5100.

This study has been approved by the Western Michigan University's Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. If you have already elected to participate in this research, thank you and please disregard this email. Otherwise to participate in this study, click here:

<http://cedissertationadvising.questionpro.com>

Sincerely,

LaSonda Wells, MA, LPC, NCC
Counselor Education Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University

Stephen E. Craig, Ph.D., LPC
Dissertation Chair, Associate Professor and Unit Director of Counselor Education
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology, Western Michigan University

Appendix H
ACES Flyer Invite

Dimensions of the Doctoral Dissertation Advising Relationship in Counselor Education: Mentoring Expectations, Satisfaction, and Time-to-Degree

Thank you for expressing your interest in my dissertation research project. The purpose of the study is to explore counselor educators' perceptions of their dissertation advising relationships, expectations of an ideal mentor and perceptions of their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the **dissertation phase** of their doctoral programs and to correlate the relationship of these perceptions with time-to-degree. This study was approved by the Western Michigan University's Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB # 15-10-02) on October 1, 2015. Please do not participate in this study after September 30, 2016.



To learn more about the study please go to the following link:
<http://cedissertationadvising.questionpro.com>

LaSonda Wells, MA, LPC, NCC
Counselor Education Doctoral Candidate
lasonda.wells@wmich.edu or (269) 873-3393
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University

Stephen E. Craig, Ph.D., LPC
Dissertation Chair, Associate Professor
stephen.craig@wmich.edu or (269) 387- 5100
Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
Western Michigan University

Appendix I

Notification Email for Drawing Winners

Notification Email for Drawing Winners

Dear Participant,

You were invited to participate in a dissertation research project to describe counselor educators' perceptions of their advisory working alliance, expectations of an ideal mentor and their advisors' willingness to mentor, as experienced during the dissertation phase of their doctoral programs and explore the relationship of these perceptions with time-to-degree. As an incentive to increase participant involvement in the research project, I offered four (4) Visa gift cards in the amounts of \$50.00 each to randomly selected participants.

I am pleased to inform you that you were one of the randomly selected participants! Please provide me with an address of where you would like me to send the Visa gift card. Again, thank you for being a part of my dissertation research project. I hope you enjoy the \$50 gift card!

Sincerely,

LaSonda Wells, MA, LPC, NCC
Doctoral Candidate
Counselor Education and Supervision
Western Michigan University
lasonda.wells@wmich.edu