Supporting PhD Completion: Student and Faculty Perspectives

David Burkholder
Monmouth University
Christopher Janson
University of North Florida

Abstract: *Doctoral student attrition rates across programs and disciplines have been persistently high. This study investigated departmental approaches believed to best support counselor education doctoral students toward the successful completion of their degrees. Twenty-four doctoral students and twenty-three faculty members in counselor education programs completed a Q sort of 38 statements. Four factors emerged from the data each representing distinct collective perspectives. These factors are described and discussed along with implications for counselor education programs.*

The financial, institutional, and personal costs of doctoral student attrition can be immense. In the United States, colleges and universities invest millions of dollars recruiting and financially supporting undergraduate and graduate students (Stover, 2005). Within the shadows of this substantial level of financial commitment to attracting and funding students, high rates of doctoral student attrition exist, with estimates across disciplines ranging between 40% and 70% (Nettles & Millett, 2006). Importantly, how institutions of higher education perceive student attrition has long ago undergone a paradigm shift. Specifically, colleges and universities have moved beyond the idea that high student attrition is a measure of academic rigor and now view it as "a sign of doing something wrong" (Richmond, 1986, p. 92). As a result of the paradigm shift in how higher education views student attrition, these low completion rates challenge both the quality and credibility of academic institutions.

In addition to the costs of student attrition to colleges and universities, the personal costs can also be profound. For instance, doctoral students who leave their programs often leave with significant student loan debt, frequently accept less esteemed jobs, and can often experience depression, anxiety, and feelings of hopelessness (Lovitts,

Contact author: dburkhol@monmouth.edu
Operant Subjectivity: The International Journal of Q Methodology, 2013, 36(4): 272-287

2001). In some ways, the personal costs of student attrition extend also to faculty members who are negatively affected by losses in time and energy expended in teaching, academic advising, and mentoring doctoral students who later discontinue their programs (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005).

As a result of the financial, institutional, and personal costs of high student attrition, student retention has been placed at the forefront of higher education issues (Stover, 2005). However, despite academic institutions leveraging institutional and academic research in order to identify strategies to increase completion rates (Nettles & Millett, 2006), no consensus for improving retention is present in the literature. The doctoral student attrition rate remains high, even as most of the student retention research has focused on undergraduate rather than doctoral students (Berger & Lyons, 2005).

Student Attrition in Counselor Education

Although no specific data exist regarding attrition rates in counselor education programs, the persistent high rate of doctoral student attrition across academic disciplines (Lovitts, 2001; Nettles & Millett, 2006) suggests that it is improbable that counselor education programs are free from this problem. For example, recent research (Golde, 2005; Nettles & Millett, 2006) has revealed that the highest rates of attrition occur in the humanities and social sciences, the latter being an area closely aligned with the curriculum of a PhD in counselor education. Additionally, many doctoral programs in counselor education are housed within education departments, and doctoral student attrition rates in education are also problematically high (Malone, Nelson, & Nelson, 2001; Nettles & Millett, 2006).

There also exists important counselor education research examining issues related to doctoral student retention and attrition. To date, these inquiries have been qualitative and focused exclusively on the experiences of doctoral students (Burkholder, 2012; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Hughes & Kleist, 2005; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). These studies have produced valuable results for counselor education students, faculty, and programs. They have, for example, indicated the value of mentoring and support systems for doctoral students (Protivnak & Foss, 2009), of the student–program match and student relationships with faculty (Burkholder, 2012; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005), and of the importance of doctoral students engaging in activities that engender confidence, such as teaching and presenting at conferences (Hughes & Kleist, 2005).

Along with reporting those results, these researchers each made various suggestions for future research that we considered while developing this current study. For instance, although research has

demonstrated that faculty significantly affect the experience of doctoral students (Lovitts, 2001; Protivnak & Foss, 2009) and their ability to persist with study (Burkholder, 2012; Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005), no research we know of has examined what counselor educators believe best assists doctoral students toward completing the PhD. It was suggested by previous researchers on this topic in counselor education that future studies might include both counselor education doctoral students *and* faculty as participants (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). Also related to participant recruitment, other researchers discussed the value of participants from "a variety of institutions and in a variety of geographical locations" (Hughes & Kleist, 2005, p. 107). Hoskins and Goldberg (2005) also expressed this call for broader participant inclusivity by suggesting the inclusion of men, students of color, students at various stages of doctoral study, and students from non-accredited programs. Aside from considerations regarding research participants, other researchers remarked that more "in-depth" studies might clarify themes expressed within their own study (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Finally, Hoskins and Goldberg (2005) described what they viewed as a lack of "research on the student voice" (p. 176) while also recommending "more studies be conducted at the programmatic level" (p. 177).

We believed that a better understanding of how both counselor educators and PhD counselor education students perceive the ways in which doctoral programs can best support doctoral student completion is useful for constructing programmatic policy, processes, and practices aimed at graduating PhD students. Perspectives related to these departmental approaches were the focus of this research study because of the well-established imperative that retention should be the responsibility of the institution (Stover, 2005) as well as the recommendation from a previous study (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005). Therefore, the guiding research question for this study was: What do students and faculty members believe are the best departmental approaches that support counselor education doctoral students toward the successful completion of their PhD programs?

Method

The focus of this study was to identify and understand a range of shared perspectives held by both counselor educators and PhD-level counselor education students regarding departmental approaches and practices believed to best support counselor education doctoral students toward the successful completion of their degrees. As a result of our research focus on participant subjectivity as well as some of the recommendations from previous research related to counselor education doctoral student attrition and retention, we selected Q

methodology. First and foremost, we used Q methodology because it has been described as the "best-developed paradigm for the investigation of human subjectivity" (Dryzek & Holmes, 2002, p. 20). We also believed that Q methodology would also allow us to identify and describe resultant perspectives with depth and nuance while at the same time honoring participant voice (Brown, 2006), both of which were recommendations emerging from previous research on counselor education doctoral student attrition (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005; Protivnak & Foss, 2009). Additionally, there is growing use of Q methodology within counselor education in order to examine perspectives on matters such as leadership in the counseling profession (West, Bubenzer, Osborn, Paez, & Desmond, 2006), school counselor leadership (Janson, 2009), pre-treatment change (Kindsvatter, Osborn, Bubenzer, & Duba, 2010), and school counselor–principal relationships (Janson, Militello, & Kosine, 2008).

The concourse, and thus the Q sample, for this study was developed from three different sources. First, the primary author conducted interviews with eight doctoral-level counselor education students (3 Caucasian women, 2 African-American women, 1 multiracial woman, 1 Latino/Hispanic man, and 1 Caucasian man). These eight, one-hour interviews focused on responses to the prompt, "What approaches or practices within your counselor education department do you believe best support counselor education doctoral students toward the successful completion of their degrees?" From these responses we identified 67 statements reflecting perspectives in response to the prompt. Second, both authors conducted interviews using the same prompt with seven counselor educators (2 African-American women, 1 Caucasian woman, 1 Latina/Hispanic woman, 2 African-American men, and 1 Caucasian man) from six institutions with counselor education PhD programs. These interviews yielded 48 more statements reflecting perspectives in response to the prompt. Third, we gathered 34 statements from conceptual and empirical literature on the retention of both doctoral students generally and counselor education doctoral students specifically. These three different sources yielded a total of 149 statements. By eliminating duplicate or impertinent responses and combining statements that expressed similar ideas or identical content, we derived a 38-item representative Q sample (see Appendix).

We posted a link to our FlashQ (Hackert & Braehler, 2007) sort on the counselor education and supervision electronic mailing list (CESNET-L), along with a request for participation from counselor education faculty at programs with doctoral programs in counselor education, and from doctoral level counselor education students. Forty-seven participants sorted the 38 statements according to their understandings and interpretations of those Q- sample items most like

and most unlike their perspectives. Thirty participants identified themselves as female, and 17 identified themselves as male, 31 described themselves as white/Caucasian, four as African American, four as Latino/Hispanic, four as multiracial, two as "other," one as Native American, and one as Asian/Pacific Islander. Twenty-four participants described themselves as doctoral students, and 23 described themselves as faculty. Of those describing themselves as doctoral students, nine reported being doctoral candidates who had proposed their dissertation, eight reported to be still completing coursework, four had completed all coursework but had not yet passed their comprehensive examinations, and three had completed their coursework and comprehensive examinations but had not yet proposed their dissertation. Of those describing themselves as faculty, eight reported being non-tenured assistant professors, six reported being non-tenure track adjunct faculty, five reported being associate professors, three reported being full professors, and one reported being a tenured assistant professor. Finally, 31 participants identified the program in which they were either faculty members or students as being CACREP-accredited, while 16 identified their programs as not being CACREP-accredited.

Following their sorts, participants also responded to a prompt intended to gain fuller understandings of the meaning they made from the statements they sorted as either +4 or –4. The prompt read, "Please briefly explain why the following statements you have identified as 'most like' or 'most unlike' your perspective are either effective or not effective in helping doctoral students complete their degrees."

We selected a four-factor solution for this study, following principal components analysis (PCA) with a varimax rotation in PQMethod (Schmolck, 2002).

Results

As a result of our analyses, we named the four factors or distinct sets of perspectives shared by participants as: (A) Focused and Clear Mentoring, (B) Programmatic and Financial Clarity, (C) Relationships that Facilitate Relevant Learning, and (D) Caring and Support. Together, these four factors accounted for 45% of the explained variance and 36 of the 47 participant sorts (77%) loaded on one of the four factors. In this section, we present a summary of each factor. In our descriptions we have provided rankings/placements of relevant items. As an example, within the description below for Factor A, (21: +4) means that item 21 is ranked as a +4 position (most like my perspective) in the factor array. Additionally, participant comments collected as part of their post-sort responses that are cited to clarify the interpretation are indicated by the use of *italics*.

Factor A: Focused and Clear Mentoring

Rather than focusing on the consequences of student attrition and intervening once a student has withdrawn from study, professors must understand their distinct ability to positively or negatively impact doctoral students' experiences, on both an individual level and departmental level (30: −4; 6: −3; 15: +2; 31: +1). In teaching and other interactions with students, faculty should demonstrate qualities that facilitate trust between student and faculty member (19: +1). Engendering a relationship between student and faculty member in which the student's perspective on what helps them to be successful is valued important (34: +3), as opposed to a more hierarchical relationship between faculty member and student wherein the professor tells the student what is best (4: −3). An associate professor highlighted the importance of gathering and using student perspectives while remarking, "*We speak about the importance of being open to feedback . . . yet, our programs are often last to move outside our comfort zones and receive this feedback. Let's make sure we know what our students' needs are.*"

The more codified contexts for relationships between faculty member and student are mentoring and advising, and professors should take the initiative in forging mentoring relationships with doctoral students (21: +4) and assigning doctoral students to faculty advisors in an intentional manner (18: +2). A useful expression of the advising and mentoring relationship between faculty member and doctoral student is informing student expectations of the process of navigating the doctoral program, and collaboration with the student in professional activities, whether those be presenting at conferences or co-authoring papers (16: +4; 13: +4). As one doctoral student stated, "*This is similar to mentoring—the faculty should reach out and invite doc students to participate in research together and present together.*" Not surprisingly, boundaries do exist in relationships between faculty and student, namely around areas within the student's personal life (24: −2; 9: −4). Financial concerns are one example of this, referenced by both students and faculty. A professor noted, "*This is not an area we should discuss with students,*" while a student noted, "*I would not want faculty to be privy to my financial issues and concerns and would not be comfortable sharing this information.*"

Finally, a temporal component must be considered within the informal and formal interactions between faculty and student in addition to the content and tone. Although conventional wisdom would dictate that faculty concentrate attention on beginning doctoral students, doctoral student completion is more facilitated by remaining engaged with students through the dissertation phase of their study (28: +3; 29: +3; 37: −1; 38: −4).

Factor B: Programmatic and Financial Clarity

The challenges of doctoral study are best met by students who have informed understandings of what to expect from their program and what it will take to finish (27: +4; 16: +4). One professor commented, "*I think a lot of times students aren't aware of what getting a PhD is really going to require of them.*" Beginning doctoral study with accurate and informed understandings may be achieved through stressing first impressions—whether those first impressions are from doctoral student orientations, assigning the most effective faculty to teach first-year doctoral students, or a general program mandate for faculty to prioritize first-year doctoral students (36: +1; 37: +2; 38: +1). In addition to understanding the path to the PhD, supporting doctoral students to the completion of their degree also involves students engaging in activities in the classroom and through collaboration with faculty that will likely mirror what their post-PhD careers will require of them (35: +3; 13: +3). Support and collaboration, however, are not responsibilities of the faculty member (11: −4; 23: −4; 22: −4) and should not extend beyond professional activities (1: −2; 8: −3; 10: −1). This was communicated by a faculty member who wrote, "*I don't see how being friends with students will help them complete. This is a slippery slope and I would not go along with a departmental mandate to do so.*"

Starting doctoral students off on the right foot is not sufficient to ensure they complete study. In addition to initially evaluating students to determine their fit for a PhD program (25: +3), formative evaluation occurring throughout a PhD program is an important element to facilitating doctoral student completion, although the faculty—not the students—are the arbiters of what works and what does not (26: +2; 33: +2; 34: 0). Two critical components for completing a PhD that do need to be identified through formative evaluation are the financial element of PhD study and students maintaining balance in their lives (9: +4; 24: +3). A doctoral student encouraged faculty to account for the financial concerns of students, stating, "*Many doctoral students worry about money, and the willingness of faculty to address these worries makes a huge difference. At minimum, it normalizes it.*" Speaking on balance, a faculty member commented, "*Doctoral students need to understand that their program is going to require sacrifice, and sometimes they are going to have to put family and other things on the backburner.*"

Factor C: Relationships that Facilitate Relevant Learning

The student–faculty relationship is central to supporting doctoral students to degree completion. Doctoral students and faculty recognize the value to be gained from student–professor relationships based on nonjudgmental encouragement and support (7: +3; 2: +3; 20: +3). When faculty members initiate and develop such relationships with doctoral

students (11: +4; 21: +2), doctoral students are open to advice (4: +2) and the groundwork is laid for students to participate in a "dress rehearsal" of sorts with faculty, engaging in activities that will equip them for life after the PhD. Most notable are activities that involve writing and presenting with professors (13: +4; 35: +4), which was illustrated by a faculty member who reported, *"I value to this day the mentoring relationship I had with a faculty member. I had peers who did not have such a relationship with faculty and I believe my transition to being faculty myself has been easier by comparison."*

The importance of student–faculty relationships based on concern, flexibility, and empathy (8: +2; 12: +2) is also more salient than pedagogical approaches (19: −3), student expectations and understandings of completing the PhD (27: −1), tracking student progress (26: −3), and the way in which faculty conceptualize and address student retention and attrition (32: −2). The value of the relationship between faculty member and doctoral student is so fundamental to degree completion that it far outweighs programmatic structures aimed at increasing student completion, such as requiring a dissertation class, creating peer-support programs, and using data to track student progress (14: −4; 29: −4; 33: −4). The practices behind these programmatic approaches do not entirely lack usefulness, but if present, should form organically rather than artificially. For instance, one student wrote: *"I don't think we need our programs to over-structure our programs. A lot of these already happen frequently and organically."*

Factor D: Caring and Support

Doctoral study is a time where experiencing support from faculty (2: +2; 7: +2) and fellow students (14: +4) is key to successful degree completion. Support can take several forms, including affirming the autonomy and decisions of students (5: +3) and actively supporting students who may step away from doctoral study (6: +3), but is most appropriate and effective for such support to occur in professional contexts (17: −2; 23: −2). A faculty member recognized this when stating, *"Completion is not an easy process. I believe it requires motivation, courage, and strong self-esteem and so I believe a major part of my role is expressing the care and support needed by students for those characteristics to flourish."* While it is important for faculty to be supportive and exhibit empathy and flexibility with doctoral students (12: +3), it is also necessary that doctoral students maintain balance and practice self-care in their own lives (24: +3; 10: +4).

For faculty to demonstrate the support that students need, they must go beyond simply understanding and acknowledging that they can impact a student's experience (15: −2; 31: −4; 30: −4), and communicate to students their concern while at the same time creating a space for

students to do the same (8: +4; 1: +2). All must bear in mind that improving doctoral student completion is not achieved through a set of reductionist structures or programmatic policies aimed at increasing revenue (33: −4; 35: −1; 25: −3; 37: −3), but is addressed in a supportive atmosphere with the principles of student success and learning at the foundation (32: +2).

In reference to the limitations of faculty simply understanding and acknowledging the impact they have on a doctoral student, one student reported: *"If faculty need to be educated about the impact that faculty dynamics have on our experiences and the consequences for us if we don't finish, then that's a bigger problem than simply providing more information or research so they can be better informed."*

Discussion

Given the theoretical and epistemological aims of Q methodology to identify various distinct perspectives that exist around a given subject, our own aim is to expand the palette of ideas related to departmental practices that are perceived to best support student completion rather than reduce these ideas to a decontextualized set of best practices. We identified and described four different ways in which faculty and PhD students in counselor education programs perceive departmental approaches that best support doctoral student completion of their degrees. In this section, we discuss our results within the context of previous scholarship while also offering our perspectives on how counselor education students, faculty, and programs might utilize elements of these results in order to improve PhD student completion.

Previous literature has identified and discussed the importance of student-faculty relationships (Hoskins & Goldberg, 2005) and mentoring (Protivnak & Foss, 2009) for student completion. The importance of mentoring and strong relationships between students and faculty can be seen most clearly within the Factor A and C perspectives. The mentoring role within these relationships was more prominent within Factor A. However, both factor perspectives emphasized the importance of these relationships including collaboration around activities that might prepare students for their future roles and activities as counselor educators (Hughes & Kleist, 2005). In contrast, Factor B represented a perspective focused on the importance of clear program processes and structures, including the financial. That perspective reflects the reality that PhD students often experience significant financial difficulty requiring assistance (Nettles & Millett, 2006). Finally, while the Factor D perspective's focus on approaches that directly extend care and support either personally or programmatically was not reflected in previous professional literature, the ethos of care and support clearly permeates the therapeutic context of counseling.

Just as we believe it was important to examine PhD student completion from the collective perspectives of both counselor education students and faculty, we believe that to be meaningful programs should engage in processes toward improving student completion that involve substantial conversation among students and faculty. These conversations should begin with an understanding that there are likely patterns of student needs within distinct programs (based on, for example, institutional and program resources and demographic patterns of students such as socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity), and also diverse individual student needs, necessitating varied departmental approaches to support degree completion. Consequently, faculty should consider and discuss the approaches suggested by this research within the context of their programs, soliciting feedback from both current doctoral students and past doctoral students. More specifically, departments could invite both faculty and students to examine the perspectives described here regarding programmatic practices believed to best support doctoral student completion. Additionally, program faculty might also consider inviting faculty and students to sort this study's Q sample in order to better facilitate these discussions and feedback processes. These sorts could subsequently be factor analyzed in order to determine patterns of perspectives that exist within the unique contexts of unique programs. However, the sorting process might be useful even without the accompanying statistical analyses by providing a common vocabulary of possible approaches and practices. Regardless, these conversations among faculty and between faculty and students may likely illuminate areas requiring improvement as well as areas in which programs are effectively supporting PhD student completion.

The range of the perspectives identified in this study indicates that a set of "best practices" would be unlikely to address the diverse needs of students, no matter how systematic and comprehensive in nature. Based upon the results of our study, in contrast, we suggest that program faculty examine their approaches and practices intended to support doctoral student completion across two categories: (a) programmatic elements, and (b) relational elements. The distinction between preferences for approaches that were either programmatic or relational was apparent across the factors in this study, and it is conceivable that certain departments and programs privilege approaches from one of these categories more than the other. In order to ensure more balanced practices, we encourage programs to consider and employ both programmatic and relational approaches. Statements 29 and 11 provide respective representative examples of these different approaches.

This study reflects an initial effort to learn more about how counselor education faculty and PhD students collectively perceive departmental approaches or practices that best support PhD student completion. While we do not generally favor scholarship that pursues the generation of tidy, yet limiting, "best practices," we are aware that in the current climate of educational accountability, the development of more comprehensive models for programs and practices are often desired. Still, we caution that the issue of student retention and completion is complex and in constant flux and so it therefore requires sustained exploration through inclusive dialogue involving both faculty and students.

Future Research Considerations

In keeping with the spirit of generative discourse and research, we also have some specific recommendations for future research. Given the importance of culture and race in mediating student educational experiences, future research might endeavor to develop an even more diverse participant pool than the one developed here. Additionally, because some of the approaches identified for this study and contained within the Q sample represent concrete programmatic elements (for example, items 14, 25, 27, & 29), future research might examine the relationship between the presence of these programmatic elements and counselor education PhD program completion rates. Finally, given the deeply personal nature of how students experience and make meaning from their PhD programs, future studies might focus more intensively on a smaller number of participants in order to better understand the individual meaning-making involved in such an intensive and prolonged experience such as doctoral studies.

These recommendations aside, this study added value and nuance to conversations and inquiry within counselor education regarding doctoral student degree completion because it revealed holistic perspectives shared by students and faculty. Furthermore, much of this value and nuance was due to some of our research choices, the most notable being our use of Q methodology. Whereas previous qualitative studies focused on "the dissection of a viewpoint or subject matter into its pertinent sub-themes or issues," (Watts & Stenner, 2012, p. 177), our study permitted us to see whole perspectives, and to recognize the relationship between and among some themes within them. So although elements of the four factors here were evident as themes in those previous studies, we contend that the holistic nature of this study's Q factors represents opportunities for deeper understanding of distinct shared perspectives regarding departmental approaches believed to best support doctoral student degree completion. For example, although previous qualitative research described the theme of "mentoring," this

theme was explored in fairly broad terms of participant expressions of its general helpfulness, beneficial nature, and difficulties (Protivnak & Foss, 2009). In contrast, Factor A in this study provided a deep and holistic substructure of this shared perspective that revealed understandings of mentoring that included among other things: considerations of the power inherent in the relationship to impact doctoral student experiences; the importance that the relationship facilitates trust; the importance of a more egalitarian relationship that honors student voice; a belief that faculty should initiate these relationships; and the idea that there should be a professional development focus. In sum, the process and results of this study further support the usefulness of Q methodology in the development of understanding of subjectivity related to topics, trends, and phenomena in counselor education.

References

Berger, J. B., & Lyons, S. C. (2005). A historical look at retention. In A. Seidman (Ed.), *College student retention* (pp. 1–29). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Brown, S. R. (2006). A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality & Quantity, 40*, 361–382.

Burkholder, D. (2012). Returning counselor education doctoral students: Issues of retention, attrition, and perceived experiences. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision, 4*(2), 6–23.

Dryzek, J. & Holmes, L. (2002). *Post-communist democratization: Political discourses across thirteen countries.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Golde, C. M. (2005). The role of the department and discipline in doctoral student attrition: Lessons from four departments. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*(6), 669–700.

Hackert, C., & Braehler, G. (2007). FlashQ (version 1.0) [Computer software]. Freeware. www.hackert.biz/flashq/home/.

Hoskins, C. M., & Goldberg, A. D. (2005). Doctoral student persistence in counselor education programs: Student-program match. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 175–188.

Hughes, F. R., & Kleist, D. M. (2005). First-semester experiences of counselor education doctoral students. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 45*(2), 97–108.

Janson, C. (2009). High school counselors' views of their leadership behaviors: A Q methodology study. *Professional School Counseling, 13*, 86–97.

Janson, C., Militello, M., & Kosine, N. (2008). Four views of the professional school counselor and principal relationship: A Q methodology study. *Professional School Counseling 11*(6), 353–361.

Kindsvatter, A., Osborn, C. J., Bubenzer, D. L., & Duba, J. (2010). Client perceptions of pretreatment change. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 88*, 449–456.

Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Malone, B. G., Nelson, J. S., & Nelson, C. V. (2001). Completion and attrition rates of doctoral students in educational administration. Paper presented at The National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, Texas.

Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to Ph.D.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Protivnak, J. J., & Foss, L. L. (2009). An exploration of themes that influence the counselor education doctoral student experience. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 48*(4), 239–256.

Richmond, J. (1986). The importance of student involvement: A dialogue with Alexander Astin. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 65,* 92–95.

Schmolck, P. (2002). PQMethod (version 2.11) [Computer software]. Freeware. Retrieved from www.lrz.de/~schmolck/qmethod/.

Stover, C. (2005). Measuring—and understanding—student retention. *Distance Education Report, 9*(16), 1–3.

Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q methodological research: Theory, method and interpretation.* Los Angeles: Sage.

West, J. D, Bubenzer, D. L., Osborn, C. J., Paez, S. B., & Desmond, K. J. (2006). Leadership and the profession of counseling: Beliefs and practices. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 46*(1), 2–16.

Appendix: Q Sample and Factor Scores

		Factor Scores			
	Statement/Approach/Strategy	***A***	***B***	***C***	***D***
1	Provide students opportunities to share struggles.	−1	−2	0	2
2	Provide nonjudgmental support.	−1	−1	3	2
3	When students are considering leaving a program, actively explore with them all possible strategies that could help them stay.	1	−2	1	0

		Factor Scores			
	Statement/Approach/Strategy	***A***	***B***	***C***	***D***
4	Provide appropriate advice to students.	–3	1	2	–1
5	Advisors and counseling faculty support and affirm students' decisions.	–2	–2	0	3
6	Provide appropriate assistance when students need to step away from their program.	–3	–2	0	3
7	Provide encouragement to students.	0	0	3	2
8	Express caring/concern for students.	1	–3	2	4
9	Address students' financial concerns	–4	4	1	1
10	Communicate to students that it is okay to take care of themselves.	0	–1	1	4
11	Encourage individual faculty members to cultivate quality relationships with doctoral students.	2	–4	4	–1
12	Faculty develop an academic culture that embodies many of the dispositions underpinning the counseling profession (empathy, authenticity, flexibility, etc.).	3	2	2	3
13	Collaborate with students in professional activities—co-authoring, presenting at conferences, etc.	4	3	4	1
14	Create and promote programs and processes that engender peer support among students (eg. ABD support groups).	2	1	–4	4
15	Educating departmental faculty regarding the unique position they are in to positively or negatively influence students' experience.	2	–1	0	–2
16	Counseling faculty inform student expectations by helping students develop clear understandings of the structure and process of their doctoral program.	4	4	1	0
17	Involve students in social departmental activities.	–3	–3	–1	–2
18	Develop and use methods to better match students with assigned faculty advisors.	2	1	0	0

	Statement/Approach/Strategy	Factor Scores A	B	C	D
19	Model through teaching and other interactions with students, the qualities necessary to develop trust and interpersonal influence with clients.	1	0	−3	0
20	Encourage and support students' creativity, initiative, and curiosity.	1	−1	3	1
21	Focus on forming and cultivating faculty mentorships with individual students	4	−1	2	0
22	The counselor education program confirms and directs the active role faculty members should play in developing relationships with students.	0	−4	−3	−1
23	Faculty members make efforts to have out-of-class contact with students.	−2	−4	−1	−2
24	Address with students the need to reconcile the demands of multiple life roles (student, parent, spouse, etc.).	−2	3	0	3
25	Counselor education programs have adequate admissions processes in place to screen out students deemed inappropriate for the profession.	−2	3	3	−3
26	Faculty engage in frequent monitoring/reviews of individual student progress.	1	2	−3	−3
27	Establish clear time norms for completion of degree.	0	4	−1	0
28	Faculty maintains meaningful contact and advising of all ABD students.	3	−3	−2	3
29	Institute a required dissertation "class" that would involve doctoral candidates checking in with faculty regarding dissertation progress, concerns, and questions.	3	0	−4	1
30	Inform the counseling faculty about the institutional and human consequences of doctoral student attrition.	−4	−3	−2	−4
31	Educate counseling faculty about the influence department/faculty dynamics have on student retention and attrition.	1	0	−1	−4

		Factor Scores			
	Statement/Approach/Strategy	***A***	***B***	***C***	***D***
32	Faculty address issues of student retention and attrition through the lens of student success and learning, not enrollment numbers and revenue.	0	0	−2	2
33	Programs effectively use data to track student progress throughout the program (eg. department-focused retention and attrition statistics, program improvement studies).	−1	2	−4	−4
34	Solicit students' perceptions of the effectiveness of department and faculty procedures and practices intended to support student degree completion.	3	0	1	1
35	Provide learning experiences for students that are relevant to and inform what they will likely be doing in their careers.	0	3	4	−1
36	Ensure that the most effective faculty members are teaching first year doctoral classes.	−3	1	−3	−2
37	Conduct doctoral student orientations that include all counseling faculty as well as department chairs and deans.	−1	2	−1	−3
38	Faculty make first-year doctoral students a priority.	−4	1	−2	−3