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**Editorial**

**How a Counseling Degree has Helped Me**

**Timothy P. Winter, PhD, NCC**

Department Chair, Kinesiology/ Health Science Department,

Louisiana State University in Shreveport

**Meredith Nelson**

Counseling Program Director, Louisiana State University in Shreveport

The following article is a guest editorial by Dr. Timothy Winter, NCC, an LSUS Department Chair in the Kinesiology/Health Science Department. Our hope for this article is that in reading it, both state LPC’s and graduate students pursuing their degree in counseling will realize that the application of their education goes far beyond pursuing licensure. It is our goal that by sharing his experiences, students and counselors will see the variety of ways that the techniques and values taught within a CACREP accredited counseling program can effectively be used to make a difference in what may be referred to as unconventional settings.

~ Meredith Nelson, LJC Co-Editor

 *Keywords:* technology, ethics

As I sit in my office and see the National Certified Counselor (NCC) certificate on the wall, it reminds me that I have not been a licensed counselor for almost 20 years. What does it mean to me? I must reflect on why I pursued a counseling degree and how it has affected my career. As a part of the degree plan for doctoral students primarily studying motor behavior, cognate studies outside the college of motor behavior were required. Because both disciplines examine human systems of control, enrollment in courses such as Sensation and Perception, Physiological Psychology, Biofeedback, Learning Psychology, and Development Psychology were recommended and completed. I entered the program from the field of teacher education; my master’s degree specialized in working with individuals with disabilities. Upon completion of my studies with appointment in a professorial rank, I taught courses in Adapted Physical Education (APE), Motor Behavior, Sport Psychology, and Graduate Research.

After a relatively short time, I noticed two major deficiencies both in working with individuals with disabilities and athletes. I was fortunate early in my career to work at an institution that supported continued studies and professional development for faculty, staff, and spouses of employees. The majority of textbooks in APE did a relatively modest job at addressing emotional and mental health, however training from both nationally recognized programs did not provide the advanced skill sets to adequately prepare me for mental health issues. Teaching Sport Psychology, now viewed as Psychology of Sport and Exercise, I was presented with a professional dilemma; do I approach it from a theoretical, research, or clinical perspective? The answer came from the target group.

The majority of graduate students came from the professional roles of coaches or athletic directors. Their interests were in clinical skills such as communication, group processes, dealing with parents, and personal challenges such as handling defeat. Professionally, I was presented with another decision-making crossroads when the institution of my academic appointment offered master’s degrees in both psychology and counseling--not only housed in different departments, but also colleges. My research between the two programs led me to view counseling as a true “helping profession,” maximizing individual strengths versus demonstrable time focusing on diagnosis and evaluation.

From this point forward, I developed the belief that most Sport Psychologists are actually practicing counseling. This pathway decision was later supported by a book from the American Counseling Association (Kirk & Kirk, 1993). My work revealed that most issues athletes faced were based on life or personal issues and not athletic or performance problems. My research interest at that point examined “choking,” or not performing to expected level (Winter, 1996). This performance challenge directly parallels behaviors seen by individuals in the arts. The counseling preparation I received from a Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) accredited institution more than adequately prepared me for supporting such issues.

During this period, I was fortunate to have the opportunity to work with Olympic- level athletes and individuals attempting to recover from athletic injuries as part of a more holistic rehabilitative approach. Ironically, a number of books appeared soon after this which addressed the rehabilitative process and adding Sport Psychology into counseling practice (Lesyk, 1998; Philips, 1988; Etzel, Ferrante & Pinkney, 1991).The author of one of my favorite Sport Psychology books*, Performing Your Best: A Guide to Psychological Skills for High Achievers* (1986) by Tom Kubistant received an Ed.D. in Counseling. In my work with individuals with disabilities through our motor development lab and my volunteer work with the disabled skiing individuals enhanced my disposition and confidence and led to more success with others. One of my friends, who eventually became the first individual with a disability to climb Mount Everest, put it so eloquently: “I teach people to ski, not I teach skiing.” Learning to treat everyone as an individual is essential to the counseling relationship (T. Whittaker, personal communication, January 18, 1989).

Taking a slightly broader perspective, the utilization of skills from counseling have had a profound effect on my role as an administrator. In my professional progression toward roles as department chair, the value of counseling skills has increased exponentially. Being an active listener and having accompanying observation skills are vital to being a good administrator. I advocate for group process regarding it with the utmost respect. In many group meetings, I am constantly identifying resistance behavior and the various roles individuals play within task groups. In leadership, the process and changes in group behavior need to be recognized; only then can they be appreciated. Counseling tactics or strategies to address resistance behavior are invaluable.

Of course, continuing education studies are necessary and my initial professional studies focused more on student development. I believe a firm understanding of student development assists college or university faculty in their roles. Having completed a course in Career Planning has certainly assisted in my approach when advising students. I was exposed to specific ethical guidelines in my studies in counseling and have since found similarities between the ethical Standards from the National Board of Certified Counselors, the National Commission for Health Education Credentialing, and the American College of Sports Medicine. Since 1992, I have maintained my National Certified Counselor status, although I did not acquire licensure from this state. I have not focused my employment demands and personal interests on establishing my own client base, perhaps signifying the value I have placed on this education.

Currently, with translational research being promoted and supported by a number of government agencies, counseling may make a major contribution to addressing public health needs in areas such as health disparities, disease and injuries, the silver tsunami, and identifying risk factors. As a professional in public health, this understanding is even more important today. The CDC identifies determinants of health within the four categories of policymaking, social factors, health services, individual behavior, and biology/genetics. Counseling professionals are addressing many of these factors and can have a significant impact. Recent publications from Lee (2018) and Ratts and Butler (2018)are steps in the right direction!

The need for more mental health professionals is quite clear, but I write this believing the value of a counseling degree exceeds that of mental health services. If I may compare the degree to a Masters in Business Administration (MBA), the skills are applicable beyond what is typically believed as a defined profession. I encourage counseling professionals to examine the competencies expected and recognize the value and resources they may provide whether in consulting or following a different career path. Counseling is training leaders (Barreto, 2018). I hope that by sharing my experiences that I have been able to enlighten readers that training in counseling goes beyond the practice of being an LPC. It instills values and teaches techniques which are admirable and applicable in a variety of settings. It is not just teaching counseling. Counseling programs are teaching individuals how to lead, a quality welcomed by employers in all fields.

**References**

Barreto, A. ( 2018). Counseling for the training of leaders and leadership development: A commentary. The Professional Counselor, Retrieved from http://tpcjournal.nbcc.org/counseling-for-the-training-of-leaders-and-leadership-development-a-commentary

Etzel, E., Ferrante, A., & Pinkney, J. (1991). Counseling college student-athletes: Issue and interventions.. Morgantown, WV:Fitness Information Technology, Inc

Kirk, W. & Kirk, S. (1993). Student athletes: Shattering the myths & sharing the Realities. Alexandria, VA:American Counseling Association.

Kubistant, T. (1986).Performing your best: A guide to psychological skills for high achievers. Champaign, Illinois:Life Enhancement Publications.

Lee, C.(Ed.). (2018).Counseling for social justice, Third, Ed. American Counseling Association Foundation.

Lesyk, J. L. (1998). Developing sport psychology within your clinical practice: A practical guide for mental health professionals. San Francisco, CA:Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Pargman, D. (Ed.). (1993). Psychological bases of sport injuries. Morgantown, WV:Fitness Information Technology, Inc. Philips, H.C. (1988). The psychological management of Chronic Pain: A treatment Manual. New York, NY:Springer Publishing

Ratts, M., & Butler, S. (2018). Multicultural and social justice counseling competencies: A blueprint for the profession.American Counseling Association Foundation.

Winter, T. (May, 1998).A Snatching Defeat from the Jaws of Victory.Presentation at the Fifteenth Annual Conference on Counseling Athletes at Springfield College,Springfield, MA.

**Section I: Professionals’ Articles**

Practicing What We Preach: Faculty Level Factors Impact on Service Learning

**John A. Dewell**

Loyola University New Orleans

**Yu-Yun Liu**

University of Illinois, Urbana-Chanmpaign

Service learning has theoretical and empirical support as a pedagogy that can address the need to infuse social justice advocacy into the counselor education curriculum. Unfortunately, it is not widely utilized and there is a dearth of data shedding light on why this is. This study sought to address this by investigating how faculty level factors impact the use of service learning. The data indicates that faculty perception of the importance of professional roles, perceived teaching efficacy, and epistemic beliefs significantly predict the use of service learning. The data further indicates that faculty level factors predict attitudes towards service learning. Implications and limitations of these findings are discussed.

*Keywords*: Service Learning, Pedagogy, Individual Beliefs, Social Justice, Values

Over the last several decades the counseling field has acknowledged the impact of power, oppression, and diversity on mental health and placed an emphasis on social justice advocacy. (Ratts et al., 2016; Decker, Manis, & Paylo, 2016). The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and the American Counseling Association (ACA) require training programs to not only instruct students on the impact of multicultural factors on client mental health but also to instill social justice advocacy as a core component of counselor identity (CACREP 2016, 2.F. 1. e., Ratts, Toporek, & Lewis, 2010). Despite this, concerns have been raised that teaching strategies that effectively develop counselor identities rooted in social justice advocacy are inadequate or absent from most programs (Kiselica, 2004; Steele, 2008; Glosoff & Durham, 2010; Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007). One empirically supported pedagogical strategy that can address this gap is service learning (Toporek & Worthington, 2014).

As a type of experiential learning, service learning facilitates the application of theories and concepts discussed in an academic context through meaningful service with communities that have been disempowered and historically marginalized (Kronick, 2007; Burnett, Long, & Horne, 2005). The foundation of service learning is a collaborative relationship between a faculty member and community partner designed to develop structured experiences for students that respond to a felt need in the community (Toporek & Worthington, 2014). These structured experiences bridge the gap between academics and the real world as students apply classroom content by taking on the role of social justice advocate while concurrently engaging in guided reflection (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003). This approach develops student capability to work towards service, advocacy, and social justice and instills it as a foundational aspect of the counseling identity.

Service learning also can be used to address the demand for evidence based practices in counselor education as meta-analyses have shown an overall positive relationship between service learning and student learning outcomes (d=.332) (Warren, 2012). Specifically, research has demonstrated service learning is positively associated with student interpersonal development, empathy, cognitive development, reflective thinking, critical thinking, overall counselor self-efficacy, and negatively correlated with student anxiety (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Lundy, 2007; Warren, 2012). It also is positively associated with changes in cultural sensitivity, awareness of social problems, issues of social justice, and student self-efficacy in making a difference within communities (Koch, Ross, Wendell, & Aleksandrova-Howell, 2014; Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997).

 Despite the theoretical and emerging empirical support for service learning as an effective strategy to address the gap in social justice and advocacy training, it is not widely utilized within counselor education. Calley and Hawley (2008) suggested that this might be indicative of a profession that is willing to “talk the talk” but not “walk the walk” (p. 15), concluding that the field needs to systematically study what leads faculty to actually implement strategies like service learning if we are to move beyond dialog and good intentions and actually live our professed values. Accordingly, the authors investigated what impacts faculty implementation of service learning.

**Service Learning and Faculty Implementation**

In contrast to the growing body of literature on the benefits of service learning for students and training programs, there is limited research on what leads faculty to actually adopt service learning (Driscoll, 2000; Hou, 2010). Scholars have proposed several salient factors suggested to impact faculty decisions to implement service learning, including a lack of awareness of the benefits, lack of resources to implement it, and the overall time required to implement it (Gray, Ondaatje, Fricker, & Geschwind, 2000; Hammond, 1994; Levine, 1994). In the only research study to investigate motivators and deterrents to the use of service learning, Abes, Jackson, and Jones (2002) conducted a large scale qualitative study of faculty in higher education (N=500). They found that the strongest motivators for faculty use were increasing overall student outcomes and providing a useful service in the community. Barriers to the use of service learning were logistical support, lack of awareness of existing evidence that it does improve academic outcomes, and instruction on how to appropriately utilize service learning. They concluded that while their data provides some insight into why faculty might adopt service learning, quantitative studies that can analyze motivations and barriers with more depth and rigor are needed.

To the authors’ knowledge there are no quantitative investigations into what leads faculty to actually implement service learning or any other pedagogy focused on social justice advocacy. This makes sense given the dearth of research into faculty level factors and their influence on pedagogical strategies and student competence in general. For example, a content analysis of articles on teaching and learning published in ACA journals over a ten-year span did not identify a single article focused on how individual level factors (e.g. faculty beliefs, attitudes, competencies) impact what faculty do or how successful they are (Minton, Morris, & Yaites, 2014). Similarly, a 2015 content analysis of ten years of clinical supervision literature found that less than 1% (N=16) of the 184 articles focused on within supervisor factors (Bernard & Luke, 2015). This is curious given the decades of research clearly pointing to the import of within counselor variables on success in the therapy room (Crits-Christoph et. al, 1991; Wampold, 2001).

The need to develop a knowledge base on the influence of faculty level factors on pedagogical strategies is underscored by literature from other fields (i.e. higher education) indicating that only certain faculty are likely to utilize pedagogies like service learning. Faculty who engage in service oriented activities and pedagogies are more likely to be women, non-white, have a humanistic focus, and a constructivist epistemology (Demb and Wade, 2012; Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010). Personal values and socialization towards the role of service have also been shown to moderate the relationship faculty have with service oriented activities and pedagogies (Demb & Wade, 2012; Decker et al., 2016; Vogelgesang et al., 2010). Finally, personal epistemologies have been shown to impact faculty engagement with service oriented activities (Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006).

These assertions, taken with the conclusion of Abes et al. (2002) that professional roles, ability to improve student outcomes, and personal beliefs are relevant contributors to faculty pedagogical decisions, point to the relevance of within faculty level factors on the implementation of a pedagogy like service learning. Accordingly, we examined the impact of three individual level factors on the use of service learning: (a) faculty value of professional roles (e.g., how important to you is service?), (b) perception of teaching efficacy (e.g., how confident are you in your ability to develop meaningful relationships with your students?), and (c) epistemic beliefs (e.g., what do you think about the ability of students to change their beliefs in a short period of time).

The first individual level factor, the importance of professional roles, refers to faculty perception of what aspect of their job is most important to them. For example, educators who values the role of service are suggested to be more likely to utilize service oriented pedagogies (Deckeret al., 2016). The second variable, teaching efficacy, is grounded in Bandura’s social cognitive theory and refers to faculty judgment about their ability to influence student engagement and learning (Woolfolk Hoy; 2004). As might be expected increased teaching efficacy is positively related to student academic achievement, intrinsic motivation, and faculty being experimental in the classroom (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy; 2000). As a result, it is proposed that increased teaching efficacy might correlate with attempting to implement an innovative pedagogy like service learning. Finally, epistemic beliefs are notoriously difficult to measure but are suggested to have a profound impact on learning and teaching (Hofer & Pintrich, 2002). In general, epistemic beliefs refer to the set of beliefs faculty have about learning and knowledge. For example, faculty that view students as passive receptors of knowledge may be less likely to value or engage in an experiential pedagogy like service learning.

**Purpose of the Study**

In light of the demonstrated benefits of service learning, we sought to examine the influence of perceived import of faculty roles, teaching efficacy, and epistemic beliefs on the use of service learning. As service learning is a relatively new pedagogy, the authors also investigated the impact of faculty level factors on perceived benefits and barriers of service learning. Accordingly, our study examined the following research questions: (a) Do individual level factors influence the use of service learning? (b) Do individual level factors influence faculty attitudes about service learning? We hypothesized that within faculty level factors of faculty roles, teaching efficacy, and epistemic beliefs significantly influence the use of service learning and faculty attitudes about the benefits and barriers of service learning.

**Method**

**Procedure**

After obtaining Institutional Review Board approval, data was collected through an on-line survey. The survey was initially distributed via the CESNET list-serve. The survey was then distributed to program directors in all CACREP accredited Counselor Educator programs with a request to distribute it to their faculty. In order to obtain a broader picture of how this works for those in the mental health field as a whole, 50 social work and counseling psychology programs were also selected at random via a number generator from the list of accredited programs on Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and American Psychological Association (APA) web sites and a request for participation and a link to the survey was sent to all faculty in those programs. Finally, a follow up request was posted via the CESNET list-serve. The request for participation specified that participants had to (a) teach counselors, psychologists, or social workers at the graduate level and (b) be currently employed in mental health related programs. It was explicitly stated that participation did not require previous use or familiarity with service learning. Of the 142 participants who began the survey 102 met the requirements of the study.

**Participants**

The final sample consisted of 102 mental health educators (45 counselor educators, 33 social workers, 24 counseling psychologists). Sixty-eight percent of the participants were female. Of the participants 72% identified as Caucasian, 7% Hispanic or Latino/a, 7% Asian/Asian American/Pacific Islander, 7% biracial or mixed race, 4% African American, 1% Native American, and 2% percent identified as ‘Other’. The largest grouping of participants was between the ages of 25-44 (50%, n = 54), ages 45 to 54 comprised the second largest grouping (29%, n = 32), and ages 55 to 64 made up the final grouping (16%, n = 16). Eighty-six percent (n = 88) were either tenured or on a tenure track. Of the participants 43% (N=44) reported utilizing service learning and 57% had not (N=58).

**Measures**

The questionnaire consisted of an 84-item instrument developed to assess perspectives of service learning and individual beliefs. The instrument was comprised of four demographic questions, an item assessing experience with service learning, four items assessing participants’ belief about the importance of professional roles, a 20 item assessment measuring beliefs about service learning, a 23-item assessment measuring teaching efficacy, and a 32-item assessment measuring epistemic beliefs. Two of the three measures were English based; one was created in Mandarin Chinese and translated by Taiwanese scholars and adapted by researchers in this study.

**Value of professional roles.** The individual belief about the importance of professional roles was assessed through a four point Likert scale that asked the individual participants to rate the degree to which they valued the role of service, teaching, research, or advising. The format was adapted from the demographic questionnaire used in Abes’ et al.(2002) study.

**Faculty beliefs about service-learning.** The perception of benefits and barriers regarding service learning pedagogy was assessed by the Web-based Faculty Service-Learning Beliefs Inventory (Hou, 2010). The instrument has a four-factor structure with two factors that look at perceived benefits and two that identify perceived barriers. For perceived benefits, there are 7 items assessing perceived benefits of SL at the classroom level while there are 6 items addressing perceived benefits of SL at the community level. As for perceived barriers, there are 5 items and 3 items measuring these barriers at the classroom and institutional levels respectively. All items utilize a five-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In a sample of 362 participants (Hou, 2010), the Faculty Beliefs Inventory Cronbach *alphas* ranged from .65 to .85 among faculty with SL experience and the *alphas* ranged from .74 to .91 for those without SL experiences. The instrument also has preliminary validity on three of the four sub-scales; with only perceptions of barriers to the institution displaying no evidence of validity in the use of service learning. As a result, this sub-scale was excluded from the analysis.

**Teaching efficacy.** Faculty’s teaching efficacy was assessed by the Faculty Teaching Efficacy Questionnaire (FTE; Chang, McKeachie, & Lin, 2010).The FTE was originally developed to measure teaching efficacy of college faculty members in Taiwan. The scale can be utilized as a total measure of teaching efficacy or to assess it along six dimensions: course design, instructional strategy, technology usage, classroom management, interpersonal relation, and learning assessment. The correlation coefficients of each dimension ranged from .86 to .93 in a sample of 505 Taiwanese participants. Researchers of this study adapted the items based on cultural considerations and the present research objectives. The dimension of technology usage (TU) was not included in the survey due to relevance. The 23 items included in this study were coded on a four-point Likert scale and calculated into a total score, in which higher scores indicate increased teaching efficacy.

**Epistemic Beliefs.** Faculty member beliefs about knowledge were measured by the Epistemic Beliefs Inventory (EBI; Schraw, Bendixen, & Dunkle, 2002; DeBacker et al., 2008). The EBI was designed to capture the five factors of epistemic beliefs proposed by Schommer (1990); simple knowledge, certain knowledge, omniscient authority, quick learning, and fixed ability. Each item utilizes a five-point Likert scale in which participants are asked to rate their agreement with the item. The EBI has been used in a number of studies and the internal consistency of the five factors ranged from .67 to .87 (Schraw et al., 2002). The factors of EBI simple and EBI authority were dropped due to their low internal consistencies in the current sample (.53 and .47 respectively).

**Results**

Prior to addressing the research hypotheses, we constructed a correlation matrix to assess bivariate correlations between all study variables (see Table 1). The results of bivariate correlations analyses yielded several significant relationships. The use of service learning was significantly positively correlated with the importance of the role of advising (*r* = .24, *p*< .05), professional service (*r* = .28, *p*< .01), and teaching efficacy (*r* = .36, *p*< .01). The use of service learning was also negatively correlated with the role of research (*r* = -.23, *p*< .05). The use of SL was not correlated to epistemic beliefs.

As expected, there was a positive correlation between use of service learning and beliefs about the benefits of it to the classroom (r= .41, p<.01) and benefits to the community (r= .22, p<.05), and a negative correlation to barriers in the classroom (r= -.43, p<.01). Beliefs about benefits of service learning in the classroom were significantly positively correlated to individual’s value of advising (*r* = .34, *p*< .01), professional service (*r* = .35, *p*< .01), and teaching efficacy (*r* = .28, *p*< .05) and negatively correlated to the role of research (*r* = -.28, *p*< .01). Beliefs about benefits in the community were significantly correlated to individual’s value of professional service (*r* = .25, *p*< .05), teaching efficacy (*r* = .27, *p*< .05), and certain (*r* = .21, *p*< .05) and fixed (*r* = -.26, *p*< .05) epistemic beliefs. Beliefs about barriers of service learning in the classroom were significantly negatively correlated to individual’s value of professional service (*r* = -.29, *p*< .01), advising (r=-.21, p<.05), teaching efficacy (*r* = -.24, *p*< .05), and positively correlated to fixed epistemic beliefs (*r* = .30, *p*< .01).

**Hypothesis 1: Do individual level factors influence the use of service learning?**

A multiple hierarchical logistic regression analysis was conducted to determine if perception of importance of professional roles, teaching efficacy, and epistemic beliefs influence faculty use of service learning (Table 2). The tests of each model against a constant only model were statistically significant, indicating that the predictors are a set of reliable factors in distinguishing use. The first step of the regression examined faculty self-perceived importance of the roles of service, advising, teaching, and research as predictors - the result yielded a significant model fit (*chi square* = 11.120, *p*< .05 with *df* = 4). The next step added teaching efficacy as another predictor and also showed statistical significance (*chi square* = 17.541, *p*< .01 with *df* = 5). The full model added epistemic beliefs as the third level of predictors and continued to show statistical significance (*chi square* = 21.769, *p*< .01 with *df* = 8). Nagelkerke’s R2 of .304 indicated a weak but significant relationship between prediction and grouping. Prediction success of the overall model on use of service learning was 67.3. Prediction success was 59.6% for those who had utilized service learning and 83.7% for those who had not. The Wald criterion demonstrated that faculty value of professional service, research, and teaching efficacy made significant contributions to prediction (*B*= .774, SE= .343, Ex(B)= .461, *p*= .027; *B*= -.663, SE= .326, Ex(B)= 1.94, *p* = .031; *B*= 1.977, SE= .813, Ex(B)= .138, *p* = .014 respectively).

**Hypothesis 2- Do faculty level factors predict beliefs about service learning?**

To gain insight as to the impact of individual level factors on beliefs about the benefits and barriers to the use of service learning, a hierarchical multiple linear regression analysis was conducted (Table 3). Individual factors (professional values, teaching efficacy, and epistemic beliefs) explained a significant portion of the variance in the perception of the benefits of service learning to the classroom, F(8, 98) = 4.145, p < .01, R2 = .271. There were also several significant main effects on the perception of benefits of service learning in the classroom; the role of research (*B*= -.223, SE= .077, *t*= -2.495, *p*=.025), professional service (*B*= .253, SE= .91, *t*= 3.002, *p*=.004), and quick epistemic beliefs (*B*= .231, SE= .148, *t*= 2.381, *p*= .020). In predicting perceived benefits of service learning to community, the overall model fit was also significant, F(8, 98) = 2.825, p < .05, R2 = .202. The role of service (*B*= .192, SE= .088, *t*= 2.484, *p*=.015), and certain and fixed epistemic beliefs (*B*= .277, SE= .111, *t*= 2.484, *p*=.015; *B*= -.236, SE= .112, *t*= 2.198, *p*= .031) had main effects on positive beliefs of service learning’s impact in the community. As for the perceived barriers of service learning in the classroom, the overall fit was also significant, F(8, 98) = 3.134, p < .01, R2 = .220 and yielded main effects for professional value of research (*b*= -.318, SE= .114, *t*= 2.001, *p*= .049) and professional value of professional service (*b*= .228, SE= .096, *t*= -2.266, *p*= .026).

Overall, the individual level factors of professional values, teaching efficacy, and epistemic beliefs are significantly associated with the likelihood of faculty utilizing service learning. These factors also were significantly associated with faculty beliefs of the perception of benefits in the classroom and community and barriers in the classroom setting. There were several significant main effects that explain variance in the use of service learning and beliefs about it. Notably, perceived importance of the role of research negatively influenced the use of service learning and beliefs about the benefits of it. Perceived importance of the role of service positively influenced the use of service learning and beliefs about it, faculty teaching efficacy influenced the use of service learning, and certain and fixed epistemic beliefs influenced beliefs about the benefits and barriers of service learning.

**Discussion**

 This study sought to contribute to our knowledge base through an investigation into what impacts faculty use of pedagogies that incorporate social justice advocacy as a core component. In particular, we investigated the role of individual level factors on the use of service learning in mental health training. Developing our knowledge base as to why faculty adopt pedagogies like service learning is crucial if we are to actually “walk the walk” (Calley & Hawley, 2008, p. 15) in our training programs and instill social justice advocacy as a core piece of the counselor identity.

 The data showed that individual level factors have a significant impact on faculty use of service learning in this sample. The hierarchical logistic regression model of the three factors tested was significant in predicting use across all three levels (65.3%, 66.3%, & 67.3%) - supporting the hypothesis that the value of professional roles is a meaningful predictor, teaching efficacy is a meaningful predictor above and beyond the personal value of professional roles, and epistemic beliefs are valuable predictors above and beyond both. Furthermore, the data showed main effects for faculty teaching efficacy (B=2.385) and the individual value of the role of research (B=-.698). This led the authors to conclude that faculty’s belief in their ability to effectively teach students is positively associated with utilizing service learning while the value of the professional role of research is negatively associated with using service learning. This appears to make logical sense as mental health educators using an innovative pedagogy that requires additional time and resources would need to be confident that their efforts will translate to positive outcomes for their students. Conversely, it also may be that those who see their role primarily as researchers are not as likely to dedicate as much time and energy into their pedagogy.

 These findings were further supported by the analysis of how these factors impact attitudes about service learning. The hierarchical multiple regression found that it was a significant predictor of beliefs about the benefits of service learning to both the classroom and community and a significant negative predictor of perception of barriers in the classroom. This led to the inference that these individual level factors all play a significant role in how educators think about, and presumably make decisions about, implementing service learning.

 The data also revealed several main effects that are notable in predicting the perception of benefits and barriers to service learning. The professional value of service was significantly associated with the perception of benefits to the classroom and community and barriers to the classroom. This finding flows logically as faculty values of service would be expected to have a positive association with beliefs about the benefits and barriers of service learning. As a result, it seems that faculty most likely to adopt service learning are faculty who believe that service is a core piece of their professional role.

 The role of research was also negatively associated with the perception of benefits in the classroom and positively associated with the perception of barriers. This finding taken in conjunction with the finding that it is negatively associated with overall use poses notable concerns for a field interested in infusing pedagogies like service learning. It may be that educators who identify research as a primary role require increased and more robust evidence of effectiveness to make pedagogical decisions. It also might be that educators that endorse a strong value of the role of research, standing in opposition to those that value service as a core component are less likely to implement service learning or other advocacy oriented pedagogies. In either case these findings do lead to the inference that faculty who endorse research as a major focus of their jobs are not likely to utilize service learning and also likely to hold beliefs that would keep them from using it.

 As might be expected the data revealed that epistemic beliefs were predictors of faculty beliefs about service learning. This is a notable finding as it provides data to support the theoretical suppositions (Hofer & Pintrich, 2002) that epistemic beliefs are meaningful predictors of how we teach. This is particularly relevant for those interested in implementing pedagogies that infuse service and advocacy as it implies that faculty beliefs about the nature of knowledge and how it is acquired is associated both with the use of service learning and factors shown to directly impact the pedagogical decision to utilize it.

 There were also main effects for Quick and Certain beliefs about knowledge on the benefits to the classroom and benefits to the community respectively. These findings indicate that not only does the way that faculty think about knowledge impact the use of service learning overall, but specifically their belief about the ability of their students to develop and grow during a relatively short time (quick knowledge) positively impacts the perception of benefits to the classroom. The main effect for Certain beliefs on benefits to the community indicates that faculty who are more dogmatic in their knowledge claims (i.e. I am certain I know what is correct) are more likely to believe that what they are doing can have a positive impact on the community. Coupled with the finding that epistemic beliefs on the whole are positively associated with beliefs about the benefits and barriers of service learning, this data suggests that epistemic beliefs play a meaningful role in faculties pedagogical strategies and the likelihood that they will see the benefits of adopting new ones. It may be that the more fluid one is in one’s epistemic beliefs the more likely one is to see benefits in pedagogies in general. This suggests that there is a strong need to investigate the role of epistemic beliefs in the adoption of new pedagogies.

 The strongest predictor of the use of service learning was teaching efficacy. While this makes intuitive sense (i.e. you are more likely to implement a new teaching strategy if you believe you are good at teaching), these findings are significant for several reasons. First, while Teaching Efficacy is acknowledged as an important component to effective teaching in K-12 there is a noticeable absence of literature on it in the mental health fields or higher education. These findings highlight the potentiality of it as a significant construct in understanding pedagogical decisions and on implementing service learning in particular, opening the door for continued investigations into the impact it has on our training programs. Secondly, these findings suggest that if advocates of service learning want to continue to spread its use throughout the field, then presentations and trainings should specifically target developing faculty skills in implementing it. This finding is supported by qualitative data that shows uncertainty about implementation as a significant barrier to implementation (Abes et al., 2002).

**Limitations**

The results from this study should be interpreted within the scope of its methodological strengths and limitations. First, we were not able to obtain a true random sample. Our use of convenience sampling limits the predictive validity of this study and the data must be understood in terms of all of the limitations present with a volunteer sample. For example, our sample may be more likely to utilize or endorse positive beliefs about service learning than a true random sample. Second, the use of the CESNET list-serve makes it impossible for us to know the response rate of Counselor Educators. Meaning that even within the sample of Counselor Educators we don’t know how generalizable the sample is to the field as a whole. Third, relying upon multiple mental health fields limits the generalizability of the results for Counselor Education. Unfortunately, an examination across disciplines was outside of the scope of this article and as a result we were not able to report potential differences between the disciplines. Fourth, while our assessment tools were drawn from the best available measures and the nature of the study was exploratory they are not as rigorous as we would have liked them to be. As no instrument to our knowledge has been developed to look at teaching efficacy in higher education we adapted an assessment from Mandarin Chinese, opening up the possibility that it did not measure teaching efficacy as effectively as it could have. The measurement of epistemic beliefs also resulted in us dropping two of the five subscales as their internal consistency was below the recommended alpha of .6. This is not all that unusual in the measurement of epistemic beliefs (see Schraw, Bendixen, & Dunkle, 2002 for a review), however, it does mean that the findings from the study about the role of epistemic beliefs is far from conclusive. Finally, as this was the first time many of these scales have been utilized in our field any findings require replication before strong conclusions can be drawn.

**Implications & Suggestions for Future Research**

These data suggest that individual faculty level factors influence faculty implementation of service learning. Considering the broad implications of faculty interaction with students on their competence, professional identity, and the future of the field as a whole, this is an area that warrants further investigation. Several individual factors were particularly noteworthy in influencing both use of and beliefs about the value of service learning. Teaching efficacy was a significant predictor in the use of service learning. It stands to reason that educators who are confident in their ability to make a difference with their students are more likely to utilize a pedagogy that requires a bit more work. As noted, teaching efficacy has up until this point never been investigated in counselor education and considering the emerging research on personal efficacy in clinical settings on client outcomes this area appears to be a significant gap in the literature.

The negative association between faculty perception of the importance of research in their professional lives is also noteworthy. It may be that researchers are simply not interested in adopting pedagogies that take extra time to implement. Considering the disconnect between research produced in academia and those in the field (Murray, 2006), it may also be that this finding speaks to a larger divide within the field between those that see themselves as researchers and those that see themselves as service providers or advocates. More research is needed to shed light on this dynamic but the data from this sample does imply that the more faculty endorse valuing the role of researcher the less likely they are to implement pedagogies focused on service and advocacy.

Suggestions for advocates of service learning are to focus presentations and trainings on developing teaching efficacy in faculty when utilizing service learning. Sharing real life successes and building some basic skills on implementing pedagogy in general may increase the likelihood of use and beliefs that support use. Mentoring opportunities for faculty interested in incorporating service learning could provide continued support and development of skills needed to effectively implement it. Following Moore & Ward’s (2010) comment that there are “critical questions concerning how participation in service-learning affects faculty careers” (p. 68),efforts to integrate service learning and other advocacy based pedagogies might bear more fruit if they were focused on reaching non-tenure track faculty or faculty at non-research intensive universities.

There are also several significant implications for the way we train our doctoral students as future educators. Developing an identity that coherently incorporates service and advocacy as a part of the field seems to be of notable significance in the adoption of service learning. Students’ teaching efficacy is also an area that needs further research, but is perhaps a key in understanding how they engage with students and what pedagogical decisions they’ll make as professionals. As a result, doctoral programs should consider offering increased training in the implementation of strategies specifically focused on service and advocacy. Finally, while the research on the role of epistemic beliefs is murky this research also provides evidence that the way we think about knowledge matters in what we do and, as a result, incorporating pedagogies designed at challenging and developing beliefs about knowledge may be crucial.
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As the profession of counseling continues to develop in a technological world, the need for quality supervision and training is crucial (Aasheim, 2012). The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Other Educational Programs (CACREP) (2016) recognizes the benefits of technology, and requires graduate programs to demonstrate evidence of the integration of technology throughout the curriculum. The authors aimed to explore if counselor educators could utilize advanced technology tools to enhance teaching and learning in counselor education and supervision. The findings from this exploratory study and grant experience suggest that the incorporation of a play analyzer software can greatly enhance the learning process in supervision, providing for an efficiency and depth that can significantly impact both the professional and personal growth of counselors-in-training.
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 Clinical supervision at the master’s level is a significant factor and critical component in the professional training and development of counselors (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Borders, 2005; Fernando & Hulse-Killacky, 2005; Gazzola & Theriault, 2007; Nelson & Johnson, 1999). The clinical supervisor has a responsibility to protect the welfare of clients receiving services, teach additional skills, and foster self-awareness of the supervisee (Lawson, Hein, & Stuart, 2009; Marino, Fazio-Griffith, Williams, David, & Esmaeli, 2015; Milliren, Clemmer, & Wingett, 2006).  The art of supervision is an intervention consisting of teaching, supporting, counseling, and consulting (Marino et al., 2015). Bernard and Goodyear (2013) defined supervision as:

an intervention provided by a more senior member of a profession to a more junior member or members of that same profession. This relationship is evaluative, extends over time, and has the simultaneous purposes of enhancing the professional functioning of the more junior person(s), monitoring the quality of professional services offered to the clients that she, he or they see, and serving as a gatekeeper for those who are to enter the particular profession. (p. 8).

  Clinical supervision is a process that provides a multitude of strategies, techniques, and models that enhance trainees’ development, including receiving constructive feedback of client sessions (Bernard & Goodyear, 2013; Marino et al. 2015; Nelson, Johnson, & Thorngren, 2000; Neufeldt, 2007). Throughout the process of supervision, master’s level interns and provisionally licensed professional counselors can obtain a personal and professional understanding of client cases that require constructive feedback and consultation with licensed clinical supervisors. Supervision is a form of qualitative learning that is significantly different from the process of didactic learning in the classroom setting.  The supervised experience offers meaningful learning, diversity, the opportunity to integrate theory into practice, and allows counseling trainees to develop a professional identity as well as demonstrate personal growth. Therefore, the supervision process, especially in counselor training programs, is central to trainees’ development (Devlin, Smith & Ward, 2009; Dollarhide & Miller, 2006; du Preez & Roos, 2008; Gibson, Dollarhide, & Moss, 2010; Haag-Granello & Young, 2012; Harris, 2009; Henderson, Cook, Libby, & Zambrano, 2007; Ladany & Bradley, 2010; Lawson et al., 2009; Marino et al., 2015; Nelson & Jackson, 2003; Studer, 2006).

One of the most frequently used and cited models of supervision is Bernard’s (1979) Discrimination Model. This integrative model attends to three separate foci for supervision, including three supervisor roles. The foci during the supervision process consist of intervention, conceptualization, and personalization. The roles for the supervisor are teacher, consultant, and counselor. The goal of this model is that supervisors will tailor their responses to the trainee’s unique needs, which requires that the supervisor’s roles and foci should change not only across sessions, but also within sessions(Bernard & Goodyear, 2013).

According to Bernard and Goodyear (2013), “The supervisory relationship is a product of the uniqueness of two individuals, embedded within the process of supervision and modified by the demands of the various contexts within which supervision occurs” (p.101). Bernard and Goodyear (2013) recognize that the context within which supervision occurs can change, therefore, it is imperative that advanced technology for supervision be introduced to allow for the ever-changing context in which the supervision process occurs. Such technological adaptation is critical for trainees’ growth and development as future professional counselors.

IRIS Technologies (2006) emphasizes the necessity for students to hone and master clinical counseling skills for working with clients. To assist students in effectively learning these skills, techniques such as mock sessions, role-playing and peer feedback are typically used.  During one-on-one instructional supervision, students can enhance the development of skilled activities through video recording and subsequent detailed self-analysis of core skills. The use of advanced technology could prove to be extremely beneficial during the supervision process, as clinical supervisors provide supervisees with direction to enhance conceptualization and clinical skills in their work with clients (Marino et al., 2015).

**Infusing Technology in Counseling Training Programs**

As the profession of counselor continues to develop, the need for quality supervision and training is crucial (Aasheim, 2012). Additionally, a study conducted by Ellis, Berger, Hanus, Ayala, Swords, and Siembor (2014),found that over 50 percent of trainees had received inadequate or harmful supervision. Incorporating technology in the supervision training process is one way to increase effectiveness (Marino et al., 2015).   Technology provides flexibility to enhance the effectiveness of the supervision process by allowing supervision to occur across many different modalities, not only in face-to-face supervision (Marino et al., 2015).

Recognizing the benefits of technology, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Other Educational Programs (CACREP) (2016) requires programs to demonstrate evidence of the integration of technology throughout the curriculum. The use of technology in supervision is one aspect of this; however, students, faculty members, and site supervisors need to have a familiarity with technology in general so that they can most effectively implement technology in supervision. Without previous knowledge of technology, online technology, and camera functions, many students and supervisors would be less skilled in providing technological support for one another in their counseling program. Similarly, Chapman, Baker, Nassar-McMillan, and Gerler (2011) proposed that supervisors and supervisees alike should have previous exposure to online learning or attend an orientation to outline learning mechanics of technology prior to utilizing it as a catalyst for growth. At some universities, students enrolled in practicum and internship have effectively implemented technology with the help of their supervisors and their basic understanding of technology.

The use of two cybersupervision modalities has proven to be effective in professional counselor education programs. These two modalities are synchronous (real-time communication) and asynchronous (delayed time communication) (Chapman et al., 2011).  The method used by supervisors to view counseling sessions has evolved from the use of audiotapes, videotapes, and DVDs to the current widespread use of digital recordings.  For many supervisors, viewing counseling students in action while having counseling students view themselves provides an effective facilitation of self-integration in the learning process (Moody, Kostohryz, & Vereen, 2014).

Infusing technology in counseling programs not only enhances the process of supervision, but also contributes to the learning process of students using the technology. Renfro-Michel, O’Halloran, and Delaney (2010) found that using technology with adult learners is an effective teaching modality, especially if that specific technology provides students more control over their learning and offers a more diverse set of learning styles.  Parikh, Janson, and Singleton (2012) studied student experiences with the creation of reflective video journals during the first semester of internship and noted that students explored their apprehension and the challenge of viewing themselves on camera while hearing their own responses toward their clients. The students expressed feeling nervous energy related to the idea of videotaping themselves; however, they recognized the positive impact the technology had on their self-growth as professional counselors.

Through using technology, counseling students can gain insight into their own skills and self-development while also focusing on areas of growth. The use of technology is highly supported and recommended in the use of counseling and supervision (American Counseling Association, 2014; Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, 2011; Louisiana Licensed Professional Counselors Board of Examiners, 2014; National Board for Certified Counselors, 2012; Marino et al., 2015).

**Benefits of Incorporating Advanced Technology in Supervision**

The primary focus of technology in counselor education programs has been enhancing playback of student sessions in supervision via a variety of tools (e.g., digital cameras, webcams). Although this form of technology has proven to be effective in the process of supervision, more advanced technologies are now available that allow for a greater depth of the supervised experience. These advanced technologies include software systems, such as the *Landro Play Analyzer (Landro)* **(**IRIS Technologies, 2006), which allow students and supervisors to engage in a more thoughtful review of student’s clinical skills and case conceptualizations (Marino et al., 2015).

According to Salandro, Dandeneau, and Guth, (2006), students typically retain only 3 percent of what they are taught in traditional lecture formats. They suggested that memory and recall climbs to 70 percent when visual aids, such as presentations and video, are incorporated into the teaching format. These benefits are further magnified when supervising counselors-in-training who are required to log hundreds of hours of field experience to develop and refine their individual performance techniques. Furthermore, Salandro et al. (2006) stated that when used for research evaluation and analysis, videotapes and DVDs have proven to be inefficient for gauging student or client progress because endless linear rewinding and searching through footage has rendered this process cumbersome and time-consuming, taking away valuable time from instruction and skills development.

*Landro* allows students and university supervisors to easily tag video segments based on themes, patterns, or skill sets being utilized. The tagging feature combined with rapid search and review options support quicker access to relevant sections of recordings to be shown and discussed in class (Salandro et al., 2006).  Using *Landro* allows students and university supervisors to circumvent the tedious process of scanning, fast-forwarding, and rewinding through extensive amounts of recorded material to view specific segments of the counseling session (Dandeneau & Guth, 2005).  This not only leaves more room for crucial instruction time, but also heightens student recall and memory as they acquire information in a clear, straightforward, visual and auditory format (Salandro et al., 2006).  Additionally, students can access readily available playback segments from previous recordings in order to improve their counseling techniques and enhance skills (Dandeneau & Guth, 2005). *Landro* software provides supervisors with a clear method to incorporate corrective feedback by using technology that will improve students’ counseling and case conceptualization skills (Salandro et al, 2006). The access to tagged segments allows for target areas for growth to be developed immensely (Dandeneau & Guth, 2005).

The primary goal of utilizing the *Landro* technology is to cultivate a more effective and efficient counseling environment that supports the development of talent, provides a reliable and valuable learning environment, and enhances the counseling experiences of our clients. *Landro* can help to enrich the experiences of students by expanding the scope and depth of the services available in the counseling facility, equipping them to succeed in an increasingly competitive world (Salandro et al., 2006).

**A Counseling Program’s Grant Experience: An Overview**

 Counselor educators in a CACREP-accredited graduate counseling program recognized the potential benefits of incorporating advanced technology into their supervision of practicum and internship students. The faculty supervisors recognized that too much supervision time was spent searching for segments of videos and viewing extraneous material unrelated to the specific clinical skills the students needed or wanted to strengthen. As a result, they collaborated to find a software system that counselor educators and students alike could utilize in supervision to more effectively and efficiently enhance trainees’ clinical skills. Since the *Landro Play Analyzer* **(**IRIS Technologies, 2006) had been implemented by other counseling programs (Dandeneau & Guth, 2005) to assist students and supervisors to engage in a more thoughtful review of student clinical skills and case conceptualization, a grant was written to fund the project with this software. The title of the grant was “*The Need for and Potential Benefits of a Play Analyzer Software System in a Master’s Level Counseling Program*.” The state Board of Regents recognized the importance and potential benefits as well, fully funding a grant project to enhance the supervision experience of practicum and internship students in the counseling program.

 Counseling program faculty used the funds from the enhancement grant to purchase 30 laptops, 30 video cameras, 30 tripods, 30 SD card readers, six full software licenses for the *Landro play analyzer* **(**IRIS Technologies, 2006) software for counselor educators, and 26 student user software licenses for the practicum and internship students. The principal investigator was responsible for the entire project for the year, from start to finish, including the training of the students and faculty members on the software. The principal investigator requested funds in the grant specifically to have the owner of the software system visit the university and train the faculty and students on the software to ensure that everyone had a quality training experience. Once all faculty and students were trained, the software was incorporated into all sections of the practicum and internship courses in all three concentrations (i.e., school counseling; clinical mental health counseling; and marriage, couple, and family counseling).

Upon completion of the practicum/internship course, students were asked to participate in a survey as part of an exploratory research project regarding their experiences utilizing advanced software technology in their fieldexperiences. The survey, entitled *Play Analyzer Software Technology Questionnaire*, was designed to serve as an exploratory measure for collecting data regarding the advanced use of technology in the counseling supervision experiences of graduate level students. Electronic communication via email was used to request participation in the study and used to collect the survey data. Data was collected for the study using the online survey database Surveymonkey.com. The data was exported to an Excel document and downloaded to a zip file through email.

**Format of Supervision**

Students enrolled in practicum and internship courses were provided with a computer, camera, tripod, and SD card reader and asked to record their sessions with clients during the semester using this equipment. To prepare for in-class presentations, students reviewed their sessions and extracted specific skills to showcase to the class, as well as small clips of the session where they wanted feedback from the supervisor. Students were typically able to present up to 15 clips in their presentations.

Stargell (2015) introduced the empirical idea of spot-checking videotapes. She defined spot-checking as a method in which a supervisor watches specific segments of videotape rather than the entire videotape. Stargell (2015) further clarified in her research that supervisors can watch minutes 0–5, 15–20, 30–35, and 40–45 of a counseling video (20 minutes total) to obtain a representative sample of the entire video. This research supports the rationale for using a software system such as *Landro* *Play Analyzer* (Iris Technologies, 2006) since students had the autonomy to show any portion of the client session that they perceived as valuable to their learning. While the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software (Iris Technologies, 2006) does not provide a systematic and empirical method of selecting specific time frames, the authors concur with Stargell’s spot-checking method and found that the student clips shown in class provided more than an accurate picture of the session.

Once students received feedback in class from both their supervisor and peers, the supervisor viewed the entire session individually and provided more in-depth feedback to the student. The supervisor then commented on the areas they showcased, as well as the areas they chose not to focus on. Much discussion occurred with students about why particular segments of the session were not shown in class. The feedback from faculty supervisors and students were noteworthy. Most students who utilized the *Landro play analyzer* *software* **(**IRIS Technologies, 2006) in their practicum and internship supervision courses reported that the software was beneficial to their learning.

The *Landro* *Play Analyzer* technology (Iris Technologies, 2006) plays an integral piece in the supervision process for masters’ level counseling students. Counseling students have been able to integrate theory to practice and improve counseling and case conceptualization skills for the benefit of the clients they are serving. Counselor educators have likely also recognized the benefits of incorporating technology within the supervision process. The mechanism for providing feedback when using the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* system is greatly enhanced and the supervision process becomes more than just a review of counseling skills, but a forum to promote professional and personal growth and development.

**Demographic Data of Graduate Student Participants**

The participants were comprised of 18 graduate students; seven were enrolled in practicum and 11 were enrolled in internship 1. Their ages ranged from 21-60 years old, and all but one participant identified as female. Five students were on the school counseling track, nine students were on the clinical mental health track, and four students were on the marriage, couple and family track.

**Survey**

Since this was an exploratory study, no other questionnaire existed in the literature. The *Play Analyzer Software Technology Questionnaire* was designed to serve as an exploratory measure specifically for this counselor education program to collect data regarding the advanced use of technology in graduate field and counseling supervision experiences. The researchers intended to analyze the results to better understand and implement best practice training procedures for counselor supervision in a counseling program.

The survey was composed of 19 items and took students approximately 15 minutes to complete the instrument. All information provided was anonymous as there was no way to identify students once answers were submitted. Student participation in this study was encouraged but entirely voluntary, and students could withdraw their consent and terminate participation without consequence at any time. The risks associated with this study were minimal.

**Content Validity and Expert Panel**

 Content validity is oftentimes determined by having experts form subjective opinions by carefully comparing the content of the measure against an outline that specifies the instrument’s claimed domain (Huck, 2009). Experts can provide an accessible source of information that can be quickly gathered to gain an opinion, and they often provide insight into topics that have not been published (Baker, Lovell, & Harris, 2006). Utilizing expert panels can be helpful in a study to determine the face validity of a survey (Belafsky et al., 2008; Nakazawa et al., 2009). Since this study was exploratory in nature, the faculty members of the counselor education program served as the “experts” and collaborated to finalize questions for the survey.

The panel of four counselor educators screened survey items for content validity, as well as for ease of understanding. The four counselor educators were excluded as potential respondents to the proposed research study. A pool of the best items were identified by panel recommendations and selected for final item inclusion. As a result, the tasks were considered valid items of the *Play Analyzer Software Technology Questionnaire.*

**Results**

The study consisted of 18 participants; however, only 10 participants completed the survey. As a result, all participant responses (n=10) will be reported throughout the results section as descriptive statistics and exact responses from students in the open-ended questions will be shared. Overall, participants (n=10) reported that they were either somewhat satisfied (40 percent) or satisfied (60 percent) with the training of the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software. Ten participants answered the following open-ended question, “One strength of this training that helped me utilize this software was…” One participant stated that the training “explained how to use the software to tag separate skills I wanted to highlight.” Other responses highlighted the “hands on-demonstration,” “practicing the tagging process,” and “user-friendly” nature of the training.

 When asked about the limitations of the training, ten participants responded with some important themes emerging around the amount of time allocated for the training. Two respondents specifically commented about the pacing of the training, with one stating “It was difficult to keep up because the trainer was moving extremely fast” and another commenting that “the training was fast paced; a lot to learn in a small amount of time.” Similarly, one of the respondents stated that the training “was not thorough enough to fully explain all of the available options.” Similar responses were obtained in response to the experiential demonstration of the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software, with such comments as “useful but not exhaustive,” “helpful, but too fast,” and “the training was helpful, but it was too fast.”

Regarding the actual implementation of the software, participants were asked to assess their overall level of satisfaction as well as the amount of time required to implement the software. In response to the question “How satisfied are you with incorporating the *Landro Play Analyzer* software technology as a part of your clinical field experience in the counseling program?” sixty percent were somewhat satisfied, thirty percent were satisfied, and ten percent were very satisfied. In response to a question about their satisfaction with the time required to tag the sessions, forty percent participants reporting being somewhat dissatisfied, fifty percent reporting feeling somewhat satisfied, and ten percent reporting feeling very satisfied. Similarly, regarding their satisfaction with the time required to code the sessions, forty percent reported feeling somewhat satisfied, ten percent reported feeling satisfied, and ten percent reported feeling very satisfied. The highest level of satisfaction was reported regarding the time required to analyze the session, with eighty percent of participants reporting being somewhat satisfied, ten percent reporting feeling satisfied, and ten percent reporting feeling very satisfied.

A few of the survey questions focused on the supervision that the students received in relation to the *Landro Play Analyzer* software. In response to their overall satisfaction with the supervision received from their university supervisor, ten percent of participants were not satisfied, ten percent were somewhat satisfied, thirty percent were satisfied, and fifty percent were very satisfied. Regarding their level of satisfaction with the amount of time it took to receive feedback from the university supervisor specifically related to the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software, ten percent of participants were not satisfied, ten percent were somewhat satisfied, forty percent were satisfied, and forty percent were very satisfied.

An open-ended question was asked of participants about supervision. The question was to: “Describe the strengths regarding your supervision process utilizing the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software technology.” All comments are shown below:

*“Timeliness of providing feedback using the tagging feature.”*

*“I was able to choose portions of the videos to focus on, and it didn't take as long to find these portions in class when it was time to present.”*

*“The software was useful in identifying areas of concern and interest, rather than scheming through a larger portion of the video for feedback.”*

*“The supervision process was great. We met each week and used the software to highlight our strengths and get immediate feedback from classmates and the supervisor”.*

*“I was able to show techniques to my peers and supervisor using the software technology.”*

*“It was easier than watching the entire video.”*

*“She was very understanding of my difficulties with the software.”*

*“Nice to have supervisor see your work.”*

*“Good communication.”*

*“I was able to show techniques to my peers and supervisor using the software technology.”*

*“My supervisor was able to view strengths and areas of improvement.”*

An open-ended question was asked of participants about the limits of supervision. The question was to: “Describe the limitations regarding your supervision process utilizing the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software technology.All comments are shown below:

 “*Being able to save clip as new video or new file for use in presentation, such as PowerPoint.”*

*“Only part of our internship class was using the software, so it wasn't incorporated into our class as was explained to us during the training.”*

*“Supervisor might have not gotten full picture of session with only clips. I think the whole session needs to watch for more accuracy of supervision.”*

*“Not everyone in my internship class used the software because the class comprised of internship 1 and 2 students (internship 2 students did not have to participate in the program).”*

*“It was time consuming to try to figure out the best way to view it and read the tags.”*

*“Difficulty with playing segments and skipping.”*

*“It was frustrating to have difficulties with it and not be able to access a guide or help until meeting with my supervisor or a classmate.”*

The final questions focused on the overall benefits of the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* in supervision, whether the students’ supervision experiences were strengthened by incorporating the program, and how user-friendly they considered the software to be. In response to the question about whether they considered the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software to be a beneficial technological advancement for providing supervision in a graduate counseling program, sixty percent of participants somewhat agreed, twenty percent agreed, and twenty percent strongly agreed. Regarding the extent to which they thought their supervision experiences had been strengthened by using the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software technology,fifty percent of participants somewhat agreed, thirty percent agreed, and twenty percent strongly agreed. Finally, in response to the extent that they viewed the *Landro Play Analyzer* software as user-friendly, ten percent of participants somewhat disagreed, seventy percent somewhat agreed, ten percent agreed, and ten percent strongly agreed that the software was user friendly.

**Discussion and Limitations of the Study**

 After reviewing the results from this graduate school grant experience with advanced technology, it can be concluded that most students viewed the advanced technology as beneficial to their supervision. Given that video recording and reflective processing have been noted in the literature to be central to the growth of graduate students in counseling (Parikh et al., 2012), the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* (Iris Technologies, 2006) software similarly provides an opportunity for students to enhance their clinical skills by tagging, coding, and analyzing their videos. The tools provided in the Landro *Play Analyzer* (Iris Technologies, 2006) software allows students to focus on the areas in which they want to focus more quickly than traditional viewing of the entire session. Echoing the findings of Renfro-Michel et al. (2010), the researchers in this study concur that utilizing technology with adult learners is an effective teaching modality.

 For the second semester of the grant experience, the faculty intend to focus on improving the training process. Since all of the participants noted that they were satisfied with incorporating the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software technology into their clinical supervision, but forty percent of participants were dissatisfied with the timeliness of the software program in relation to the coding and tagging of sessions, more training for students on the implementation of the software may increase the students’ ability to implement the tools more efficiently. If students still report dissatisfaction with the timeliness of tagging and coding of sessions after the second semester of data is collected, the faculty will re-evaluate the *Landro* *Play Analyzer* software for use in the supervision of practicum and internship. If, however, students report a higher level of satisfaction with tagging and coding of sessions, it is likely that the training process could have been the factor in the dissatisfaction, rather than the actual tagging and coding of sessions. The researchers hope that the ease of understanding will increase the students’ level of satisfaction with the software.

 Another factor to consider is that internship students were not required to take the extra step of utilizing the software in their practicum supervision course. Future quantitative analyses can provide more in-depth data as to whether the differing experiences (i.e., being required to utilize the software versus not being required to utilize the software) was a factor in the levels of dissatisfaction with the coding and tagging of the sessions reported in this study.

**Implications for Counselor Education**

 A commonly defined role for counselor educators is to cultivate and strengthen professional growth and development for counselors-in-training. To do this effectively and efficiently, counseling faculty must be proficient in infusing appropriate technology into professional counseling curricula.  Counselor educators must not only recognize the significance, benefits, and applicability of employing technology in the classroom and supervision experiences, but must also increase and utilize their competence in incorporating advanced technology into graduate programs to enhance student development (Marino et al., 2015).

Increasing the use of technology in programs to train future counselors will also benefit the community at large.  Students who have more quality instruction time and tailored feedback facilitated through advanced technology will possess a greater skill set and knowledge base to better serve students and clients.  Both short-term and long-term benefits can be obtained through using software such as *Landro* as students gain access to a wider variety of learning experiences and challenges with a range of populations, settings, and clients (Marino et al., 2015).

 Most counseling programs do not utilize advanced technology such as the *Play Analyzer* software and could greatly benefit from incorporating this significant component into the curriculum. With the current trends in education moving towards online models and massive open online courses (MOOCS), it is essential that faculty members join the technological movement (Crain, J., as cited in Marino et al., 2015).

Educators have the seemingly overwhelming task of analyzing complex psychological problems, which are of concern for teaching counselors and treating clients; therefore, clinicians need modern visual analysis tools to speed up the process of learning and to help clients become better, sooner in their treatment. (Dandeneau & Guth, 2005, p.27)

Faculty members could engage in course development by making the necessary pedagogical modifications to integrate this advanced technology into the class curriculum (Dandeneau & Guth, 2005). These efforts will support the current paradigm shift in higher education related to how information is taught to students. The technology can also generalize to benefitting school counselor supervisors, mental health supervisors, and marriage, couples, and family therapy supervisors in the community. Hence, better-trained students will result in better service to students and clients, and in turn, benefit the overall community.

Bernard and Goodyear (2013) surmised that technological capacity has and will continue to affect clinical supervision. Since counselor educators, supervisors, and counselors are clearly moving in the direction of greater use of technology, it is beneficial to enhance graduate counseling programs by advancing the current use of technology to maximize time in supervision sessions for teaching and learning to occur at its fullest potential. We propose that the incorporation of a play analyzer system will greatly enhance the learning process in supervision, providing for an efficiency and depth that will significantly impact both the professional and personal growth of counselors-in-training. Utilizing advanced technology tools will greatly enhance teaching and learning in counselor educator programs, allowing both instructors and students to more fully reach their potential, positively impacting the profession and society (Marino et al., 2015).
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Shaping Trauma-Responsive Schools with Relational-Cultural Theory
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Traumatized students often struggle to meet the academic and behavioral expectations of schools. Interpersonal trauma in particular can damage children’s capacities for healthy social relationships and participation in community. In this article, I explore some of the detrimental effects of interpersonal trauma on students. I then offer relational-cultural theory as a lens for conceptualizing how interpersonal trauma affects children’s relational skills and for promoting mutually empathetic relationships that foster healing. Finally, I recommend strategies for school counselors to cultivate trauma-responsive school environments by working directly with traumatized students, advocating for safe and inclusive school cultures, and training educators in skills for trauma-responsive relationships.
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Childhood trauma significantly affects schools, as many students face the neurobiological and psychological consequences of traumatic stress. High levels of traumatic stress in childhood can lead to long-term challenges with physical and mental health (Anda et al., 2006). School counselors provide critical support for traumatized students, building skills and relational capacities to improve behavior, academic achievement, and socio-emotional development.

Neurobiological researchers have noted that maltreated children can experience changes in brain structure and function that disrupt cognitive development, social adjustment, and emotional regulation (Cicchetti, 2002). Traumatized youth can struggle with the academic expectations of schools, as they are more likely to struggle with cognitive impairments and executive functioning. Researchers have linked trauma exposure to low academic achievement, lower performance on IQ tests and other neurocognitive measures, poor linguistic development, and diminished memory (De Bellis, Woolley, & Hooper, 2013; Goodman, Miller, & West-Olatunji, 2012; Overstreet & Mathews, 2011; Thompson & Massat, 2005). Oehlberg (2006) noted that traumatized students’ survival-driven behaviors can overwhelm the brain and compromise academic skills, a state of anxiety she labels “cognitive lockout.” In addition to cognitive and academic difficulties, traumatized students often exhibit problems with behavior and social functioning. Teachers have reported that child maltreatment relates both to internalizing and disruptive, externalizing behaviors (Gamache Martin, Cromer, & Freyd, 2010). Behavioral and cognitive issues can lead educators to misinterpret and misdiagnose symptoms of traumatic stress as conduct disorders or learning disabilities.

Students who have experienced interpersonal trauma often face heightened challenges. Trauma within relationships, particularly maltreatment perpetrated by a caregiver, often results in especially adverse reactions, including disruption in the capacity for healthy relationships. Researchers have connected childhood interpersonal trauma to emotional regulation difficulties (Ehring & Quack, 2010), oppositional defiant and conduct problems (Price, Higa-McMillan, Kim, & Frueh, 2013), post-traumatic stress symptoms, and dissociation (Hulette et al., 2008). DePrince, Weinzierl, and Combs (2009) found lower executive functioning among children exposed to familial-trauma compared to those exposed to non-familial trauma. Maltreatment harms students’ emotional regulation skills, relationships with peers and adults, and adaptation to school.

Students who experienced interpersonal trauma present a challenge for schools. To best serve traumatized students, school counselors and educators must recognize how trauma can undermine children’s sense of trust, safety, and interpersonal connectedness. In this article, I propose that relational-cultural theory (RCT) offers insight for schools serving traumatized students. After exploring effects of trauma through the lens of RCT, I make recommendations for school counselors to translate the theory into effective action. RCT provides a framework for school counselors to assess and improve relationships within schools, ultimately promoting the safety and growth of all students.

**Trauma and Relationships in Relational-Cultural Theory Perspective**

Relational-cultural theory (RCT), a feminist theory of psychotherapy rooted in psychodynamic theories, offers a process for healing after interpersonal trauma. RCT proposes that healthy human development requires growth in relationships and movement towards authenticity, mutuality, and life-giving connections. “Five good things” characterize growth-fostering relationships: zest, clarity (knowledge about the self, the other person, and the relationship), capacity for creativity and productivity, sense of self-worth, and desire for more connection (Jordan, 2010).

Minor disconnections are inevitable, and people can recognize some conflicts as an opportunity for growth. Chronic and severe disconnections such as interpersonal traumas, however, can lead to feelings of isolation and to serious psychological distress (Miller, 2008). Relational experiences in early childhood lead people to construct relational images (RIs), or expectations for relationships (Jordan, 2010). RIs can be revised throughout life, but children who experienced abusive or neglectful caregiver relationships are particularly vulnerable to internalizing rigid and destructive RIs that limit possibilities for healthy relationships. In contrast to therapeutic approaches that pathologize individuals without a critical analysis of social context, RCT attends to the social and cultural contexts of relationships, noting that oppressive social structures stratify disconnections; culture and context can fuel psychological distress.

Trauma disrupts social relationships and the systems of meaning and attachment that bind individuals to their communities (Herman, 2015). Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) develops almost exclusively where trauma has severely damaged interpersonal and communal bonds (Charuvastra & Cloitre, 2008). Children are dependent on adults and therefore especially vulnerable to relational disruptions; experiencing harm at the hands of a caregiver who should provide comfort undermines a child’s sense of trust and safety. Maltreatment in early childhood can impair a survivor’s capacity for participation in social networks, including schools that could function to heal.

When trauma is rooted in interpersonal harm, healing demands the creation or repair of healthy connections (Birrell & Freyd, 2006). Caring and safe relationships can function to heal psychological wounds that resulted from disempowerment and disconnection (Herman, 2015). Trauma recovery thus requires empowering connection to communities that can provide survivors with a sense of safety and promote emotional regulation.

Schools can therefore promote healing or cause harm for traumatized students. Environments that fail to provide physical and emotional safety for children can foster disconnection, reinforce negative relational images, and exacerbate students’ traumatic stress. In contrast, schools with growth-fostering relationships promote security, healthy connectedness, and emotional regulation, empowering students to revise relational images and build interpersonal skills. School counselors are uniquely positioned and prepared to assess and transform patterns of relating, ultimately helping students experience schools as healthy and healing spaces.

**Recommendations for School Counselors**

In this section I demonstrate how a relational-cultural theory lens can guide school counselors in shaping trauma-responsive school environments. I elaborate three areas of opportunity for school counselors: direct work with traumatized students, advocacy for a trauma-responsive school climate, and leadership of professional development for educators.

**Work with Traumatized Students**

By recognizing symptoms of traumatic stress, school counselors can protect against misdiagnoses and ensure that students receive appropriate interventions. School counselors should recognize when students require a referral for mental health services outside the school and collaborate with outside service providers when possible. For students receiving services in school, RCT offers a framework for individual and group counseling and for classroom instruction. Tucker, Smith-Adcock, and Trepal (2011) recommended five strategies for applying RCT in schools: (a) encourage self-empathy, (b) explore students’ relational images, (c) educate students about power dynamics, (d) explain disconnections and conflict, and (e) expand capacities for healthy relationships. By applying these strategies, school counselors can empower students to achieve greater self-understanding and empathy for others, thus moving towards healthy connections. For classroom instruction, school counselors can integrate RCT values into an existing guidance curriculum or develop a new program. A program informed by RCT involves educating students about connections and disconnections and empowering them to respond to conflict in authentic and constructive ways.

Students with a history of interpersonal trauma need to develop relational skills by engaging in mutually enriching connections. Both individual and group counseling offer the opportunity for students to experience care and to experiment with the vulnerability and authenticity required for growth-fostering relationships. School counselors can teach skills that build self-regulation and emotional intelligence with a focus on patterns of behavior in relationships. When school counselors can identify students’ relational images, including those shaped by trauma, they can better understand and respond to challenging social behaviors.

In individual counseling sessions, students can experience mutuality and learn relational and emotional regulation skills in the context of a therapeutic relationship. RCT group sessions allow participants to work through feelings of vulnerability and experiment with authenticity and mutuality within a small, safe community (Comstock, Duffey, & St. George, 2002). As a school counselor intern, I led groups for middle school students with challenging interpersonal relationships and experiences of trauma. Using RCT as a framework, we focused on relationships, and the students came to identify for themselves what makes relationships life-giving and how to establish boundaries when they are not. The group itself offered a laboratory for exploring conflict in relationships and working through disconnections thoughtfully and intentionally and in a way that promoted growth. The participants both experienced and practiced empathy and were thus able to grow in understanding of their peers and themselves. At the conclusion of a group, the participants were eager for more connection; exhibiting the zest and creativity that come from growth-fostering relationships, they excitedly developed ideas for educating other students about what they learned in group. When school counselors recognize that a student’s capacity for healthy and authentic has been disrupted by trauma, they can apply RCT to create opportunities for the student to build relational skills in the context of safe and caring relationships.

**Advocate for Trauma-Responsive School Environments**

Traumatized students are best served within a school environment with trauma-responsive policies and supportive relationships. School counselors can use RCT as a framework for evaluating school culture, critically examining policies and relationships in terms of how they promote or diminish growth-fostering connections and experiences for students (Tucker et al., 2011). Caring relationships with adults predict resilience for youth, so it is critically important for traumatized students to feel engaged in relationships within schools (Masten, Herbers, Cutuli, & Lafavor, 2010). Using feminist-multicultural analysis and a critical consciousness about how power functions in schools, school counselors can recognize any power differentials in relationships that function to restrict authenticity and rupture connectedness. Counselors who recognize unhealthy patterns of relating can then advocate for marginalized persons within the school community. School leaders can use this critical assessment to inform school strategic planning and mental health programming. RCT values can inform school counselors’ efforts to shape tolerant and affirming school cultures.

School counselors have an ethical responsibility to exhibit multicultural competency and advocacy for marginalized students, including ethnic or racial minority and LGBTQIA+ students. Racial minority youth are particularly at risk for trauma and less likely to receive mental health care outside of school (Taylor, Lasky, & Weist, 2013). Unfortunately, schools can replicate oppressive social structures and practices that exacerbate trauma. Cultural discontinuity or discrimination in schools can aggravate students’ psychological distress and lower academic achievement (Cholewa & West-Olatunji, 2008). However, using RCT and culturally-responsive educational practices can promote student connectedness and psychological wellness by creating space for student authenticity (Cholewa, Goodman, West-Olatunji, & Amatea, 2014). School counselors can advocate for welcoming schools that honor students’ communities and cultural practices and respectfully partner with families. By creating opportunities for meaningful family collaboration, culturally competent school counselors promote social justice and foster environments where all students can be their authentic selves.

School counselors can also advocate for school policies that promote developmentally appropriate schedules and structure. Clear and consistent routines will foster feelings of predictability and safety for traumatized students. All children need time for play, movement, cooperation, and creativity; when recess and enrichment activities are cut for standardized test preparation, students lose critical opportunities for physical wellness and for developing social-emotional skills. School counselors can recognize the critical developmental needs of students and advocate for these alongside academic goals.

In addition, school counselors should advocate for disciplinary policies that honor the needs of traumatized students. Exclusionary discipline can be perceived by students as a rejection or a threat, provoking heightened responses from traumatized students (Oehlberg, 2011). Punitive disciplinary practices create intolerant school environments and foster disconnection and decreased school attachment, which corresponds to lower academic achievement (Ristuccia, 2013). In contrast, restorative practices will build students’ self-regulation and emotional intelligence while repairing relationships in the school community. RCT offers a philosophical framework to counter behaviorist models that function to exclude and shame traumatized students. Trauma-informed disciplinary policies will empower students to make positive choices, without threatening or excluding already vulnerable children. School counselors can help schools shape restorative disciplinary policies that foster accountability for behavior in the context of a safe and caring community.

**Empower Educators with Professional Development**

Though traumatized students often carry exaggerated levels of vigilance and emotional reactivity, classrooms can become safe spaces that make maladaptive defenses less necessary. In collaboration with school leaders, school counselors can empower teachers by providing the training and support necessary to serve traumatized students. With their expertise in mental health, school counselors can lead professional development sessions about the neurobiology of trauma and trauma-informed strategies for connecting with and managing the behaviors of traumatized students. Training educators about trauma can promote more compassionate and effective responses to challenging behaviors.

All students benefit when teachers are able to respectfully and effectively stay connected with traumatized children. According to RCT, growth-fostering relationships result from mutual empathy, which requires openness to affecting and being affected by another person (Jordan, 2010). School counselors can work with teachers to identify and overcome any barriers to mutuality in their relationships with students. Educator self-awareness becomes especially important when adults and students come from different cultural or socio-economic backgrounds. School counselors informed by RCT can help illuminate how power and privilege function within a school environment, particularly through cultural and gender dynamics. Trainings for educators can also promote self-care, including mindfulness and appropriate boundaries. School counselors can thus contribute to shaping an environment of wellness for teachers, who can too easily become overworked. Traumatized students will be best served by educators who have the knowledge to recognize trauma-based behaviors and the time, energy, and skills to build empathetic relationships with all students.

**Conclusion**

Trauma presents a major challenge to learning and appropriate social functioning, particularly when the event involves interpersonal harm, but schools can empower traumatized children to thrive. Students learn when they feel safe, connected, and supported. Relational-cultural theory offers a framework for promoting school environments that foster a sense of belonging and safety and facilitate interpersonal skills-building. School counselors who practice and advocate for trauma-responsive relational practices will shape healthy school cultures that serve all students.
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