Received: 2023-04-25 | Revised: 2023-07-19 | Accepted: 2023-08-25

DOI: 10.23916/0020230841210

Couns-Edu
The International Journal of Counseling and Education

The Developmental Trajectory of Teachers: A Theoretical Synthesis and Application to Counselor Education

Jodi Tangen* | Amy Qvammen Runcorn | Brenda Hall
North Dakota State University, United States

Correspondence Email
jodi.tangen@ndsu.edu*

Keywords
counselor education, development, teacher

Abstract

Teaching is an important component of counselor education. However, there is a lack of literature exploring the developmental progress of counselor educators as teachers. In the following article, we review the research on doctoral-level teaching preparation in counselor education, present a synthesized model of teacher development informed from thirteen historic teacher developmental models, discuss our model in the context of counselor education, and provide limitations and recommendations for future research. Through this manuscript, counselor educators will learn the developmental trajectory of doctoral students and counselor educators. This will lead to a better understanding of the ways we facilitate and strengthen counselor educators development as teachers.

INTRODUCTION

Teaching is a complex, nuanced discipline. In fact, according to Malott et al. (2014), "Teaching is a discipline of its own, complex and with learned skills to be practiced and improved over time" (p. 302). Although some might believe that learning a specific content area is preparation enough to teach, researchers (Orr et al., 2008) disagree, stating that knowledge of teaching methods and practice are key to the development of teaching effectiveness. In fact, across disciplines, university professors have acknowledged the importance of doctoral students learning how to teach (Orr et al., 2008).

Within counselor education, there is an increasing focus on doctoral students' development as teachers. Teaching is one of the five major components of counselor education doctoral programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (Cacrep, 2016), with specific standards focused on teaching methods, adult development and learning, instructional design, assessment, evaluation, etc. Amongst these standards, though, there is scant attention on the developmental process of teachers themselves.

In addition to the CACREP standards, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) developed a taskforce to identify best practices in teaching in counselor education (ACES Teaching Initiative Taskforce, 2016). Amongst the research on educational theories, student development, assessment practices, etc., they acknowledged a lack of literature focusing on the ways that counselor educators and doctoral students develop as teachers.

This paucity of research is curious, as an abundance of research exists into the ways that counselors, supervisors, and researchers develop. Furthermore, within the educational realm (especially PreK-12), there is copious research on the developmental trajectory of teachers (see models below); however, to our knowledge, these developmental theories have yet to be applied to the development of doctoral students and counselor educators as teachers. Thus, the purpose of this article is to review and synthesize the research on teacher development theories and apply them to counselor education. We review the research on doctoral-level teaching preparation in counselor education, present a synthesized model of teacher development informed from thirteen historic teacher developmental models, discuss our model in the context of counselor education, and provide limitations and recommendations for future research.

Literature Review

The research on pedagogical approaches in counselor education continues to grow and flourish; however, focus on doctoral-level preparation in teaching is still somewhat lacking (Barrio Minton et al., 2014). As far back as the early 1990s, Lanning (1990) and Hosie (1990) recommended that counselor education doctoral programs focus on training in teaching. Since then, many researchers have explored methods of doctoral-level teacher preparation in counselor education. Experiences such as co-teaching (Baltrinic et al., 2016; Baltrinic, 2014) mentorship and feedback around teaching (Hall & Hulse, 2010; Waalkes et al., 2018); teaching internships (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011); collaborative team teaching (Orr et al., 2008); and field work and instruction in teaching (Suddeath et al., 2020) have been found helpful in doctoral students' development as teachers.

Andragogical competence in counselor education is a growing field. Swank & Houseknecht (2019) highlighted expert teachers' competence in four areas: knowledge of teaching (e.g., teaching theories), skills (e.g., communication), professional

How to cite this article: Tangen, J., Runcorn, A. Q., & Hall, B. (2023). The Developmental Trajectory of Teachers: A Theoretical Synthesis and Application to Counselor Education. *COUNS-EDU: The International Journal of Counseling and Education*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.23916/0020230841210

behaviors (e.g., ethics), and dispositions (e.g., teacher traits). Similarly, Buller (2013)qualitatively explored the experiences of counselor educators who had been recognized for excellence in teaching. Themes emerging from her study included the teachers' experiences in teacher training, the influential teachers they had as students, and the teaching characteristics (e.g., passionate, creative, caring) they had cultivated. Although these explorations are beneficial, they fail to explain the teachers' developmental processes.

To our knowledge, there is a lack of research around the specific stages of development that counselor educators experience as teachers. Just as these types of developmental models guide our understanding of students' progress as counselors (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 1992; Stoltenberg & McNeill, 1997) , supervisors (Watkins, 1993), and researchers (Borders et al., 2020), we believe a similar developmental guide could inform our understanding of teacher development within counselor education. Thus, we synthesized teacher development models (from the field of teacher education), developed a model, and applied it to counselor education.

METHODS

We utilized a variety of resources, including electronic databases, textbooks' tables of contents, and basic Google searches to locate as many teacher development models as possible. We included models that (a) we could access (e.g., no models were included from past presentations that were inaccessible); (b) described the developmental trajectory of teachers; and (c) described development within a holistic context rather than development focused on a particular aspect of teaching (e.g., teacher reflection, constructivist teaching, moral development, professional identity). Many of the models we found and included were focused on PreK-12 teacher education. Although the inclusion of these models is a limitation, we believe they could be used as a general guideline on teacher development.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The purpose of our study was to synthesize the literature on teacher development and apply it to counselor education. In our search, we located thirteen models of teacher development. Rather than reviewing each of them individually in a piecemeal, cursory manner, we synthesized the models into our own broad, overarching model: *A Synthesized Model of Teacher Development*. Please see Table 1 for a detailed perspective on the way we nested others' developmental stages into our own model. (Please note that in creating our table, we took liberties in situating theorists' specific stages into our own stages. However, we synthesized what we believed to be the most accurate fit.) Although a few other theorists (Borko & Putnam, 2013; Christensen et al., 1983) have created their models based on syntheses of previous models, ours is the most comprehensive we have encountered and the only one applied to counselor education.

In our model, we delineated four stages of development: *preservice, survival, stabilization*, and *mastery.* We recognize that there are limitations in conceptualizing development in tidy, linear stages. As stated by Richardson & Placier (2001), "Over the past several years, we have seen a movement from relatively rigid, deterministic, hierarchical, and traditional stage theories in teaching to more flexible accounts of the developmental process" (p. 10). Richardson and Placier proceeded to delineate the factors that affect teacher development: "biography, experience, context, personality (or stance), and beliefs" (p. 10). Despite this acknowledgement, descriptions of developmental stages, in and of themselves, can be useful heuristics for understanding the overarching trajectory of growth. In the following, then, we encourage readers to view the stages as general, flexible, permeable, and recursive.

Preservice

Our first stage, *preservice,* occurs when a student is still in training and includes time in school as well as student teaching experience. Applied to counselor education, the *preservice* stage occurs when doctoral students learn about instructional theories and methods and begin to co-teach with mentor teachers. In the literature, this stage is the most difficult to define, as it includes many complex and contradictory characteristics. We found three models (Adams, 1980; Reven et al., 1997; Wall, 2016) which focused *solely* on preservice teachers' development. Two other models (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001) included preservice stages in their overarching models. As we describe these models and stages below, one can begin to see the complexities of defining this complex stage in teacher development.

Adams (1980) delineated three stages of preservice development: *pre-teaching, early teaching,* and *late concerns.* During the *pre-teaching* phase, Fuller stated that student teachers were not concerned about their teaching, as they were not actually teaching yet. However, during the *early teaching* phase (e.g., student teaching), student teachers became very concerned about themselves and their performance, authority figures' perceptions of them, and their competence and ability to manage discipline in the classroom. In the *late concerns* phase, the student teachers' concerns focused more on the students and their overall progress.

Reven et al. (1997) also explored the development of preservice teachers and delineated six categories of growth: *anticipation, adjustment, redefinition, transformation, commitment*, and *renewed anticipation*. *Anticipation* was characterized as idealism, whereas disillusionment occurred within the *adjustment* phase. Students started redefining their notions of the

Table 1: A Synthesized Model of Teacher Development

Theorist	Preservice (before teaching, student teaching)	Survival (first couple years)	Stabilization (5ish years)	Mastery (it depends)
Fuller (1969)	Pre-teaching, Early teaching, Late concerns			
Katz (1972)		Survival	Consolidation, Renewal	Maturity
Gregorc (1973)		Becoming	Growing	Maturing Fully Functioning
Watts (1980)		Survival	Middle	Mastery
Burden (1982)		Survival	Adjustment	Mature
Christensen et al. (1983)		Early years	Middle years	Later years
Feiman-Nemser (1983)	Pretraining, Preservice	Induction	Inservice	
Huberman (1989)		Survival and discovery	Stabilization, Experimentation/ activism or Reassessment/self-doubts	Serenity/relational distance or Conservatism, Disengagement
Reven et al. (1997)	Anticipation, Adjustment, Redefinition, Transformation, Commitment, Renewed anticipation			
Dubble (1998)	Formal training	Neonate	Consolidation, Renewal	Seasoned teacher
Berliner (2004)		Novice, Advanced beginner	Competent	Proficient, Expert
Arends (2012)		Survival	Teaching situation	Student results and mastery
Wall (2016)	Idealism, Cognitive dissonance, Authentic teaching, Confidence			

teacher role during the *redefinition* phase, and they transformed their understandings of teaching in the *transformation* phase. During the *commitment* phase, students committed to the teaching profession, and they felt a new sense of excitement to lead their own classes in the *renewed anticipation* phase.

Wall (2016) utilized a longitudinal study to explore six elementary preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching. She found that the preservice teachers generally progressed through four shifts, which we titled *idealism, cognitive dissonance, authentic teaching,* and *confidence.* In the beginning, preservice teachers were idealistic about teaching, believing it was a rather simple endeavor. When faced with the real practice, though, they experienced cognitive dissonance, recognizing the complexity of

teaching. From there, Wall highlighted preservice teachers' gradual movement toward authenticity. "They began to make a psychological shift from being authored by external forces such as standards or supervisory teacher preferences to authoring their own teacher identities. . ." (p. 374). Finally, she stated that they gained more confidence in their role throughout the experience.

Fuller (1969), Reven et al. (1997), and Wall (2016) *only* explored preservice teachers' development, whereas Feiman-Nemser (2001) and Dubble (1998) included preservice stages in their overarching models. Feiman-Nemser's (2001) first phase, the *pretraining* phase, occurred before teachers entered formal teacher training programs. She stated that their knowledge, at this point, was dependent upon their prior experiences as learners from teachers, parents, etc. In her next phase, the *preservice* phase, teachers entered in to formalized training programs and learned what to teach (content knowledge) and how to teach it (experiential training). At this stage, students often assumed the identities of their cooperating teachers.

Dubble's (1998) first stage, *formal training,* also took place before a teacher entered the classroom. She characterized this as "a period of major psychological change. . ." (p. 4) where students are faced with many questions about the enormity of teaching. Dubble (1998) highlighted the tension between protecting the idealistic notions of the future teacher and exposing them to the real-world issues in classrooms at this stage.

Based on the research from these five theorists, it remains difficult to fully define the *preservice* stage, as the defining characteristics are somewhat contradictory. Preservice teachers are idealistic and disillusioned, excited and scared, concerned and not concerned, imitating others and becoming authentic, and insecure and confident. This stage is so varied that one could posit that within the microcosm of preservice teaching, individuals experience a preview of the challenges and successes of teaching as a whole! Applied to counselor education, the *preservice* stage could capture the varied, contradictory, and complex experiences that doctoral students experience when they co-teach for the first time.

Survival

The survival stage is exactly as it is titled, *survival.* The experience is so pervasive that five of the models (Arends, 2012; Burden, 1982; Huberman, 1989; Katz, 1972; Watts, 1980) also titled their first stage *survival.* Other names for this stage included *becoming* (Gregorc, 1973), *early years* (Christensen et al., 1983), *induction* (Feiman-Nemser, 2001), *neonate* (Dubble, 1998), and *novice* and *advanced beginner* (Berliner, 2004). It is an incredibly impactful year, some going so far as to describe it as "fragile" (Dubble, 1998, p. 5) and "*. . . the* critical year in learning to teach" (Feiman-Nemser, 2001, p. 15). During this time – which typically occurs during the first to the first couple years of teaching – teachers are merely trying to get through the day intact. They are described as anxious (Arends, 2012; Katz, 1972, Watts, 1980), vulnerable (Arends, 2012; Dubble, 1998), rigid (Berliner, 2004; Burden, 1982; Christensen et al., 1983; Watts, 1980), lacking confidence (Arends, 2012; Berliner, 2004; Burden, 1982; Feiman-Nemser, 2001), self-conscious and focused on themselves and their performance (to the exclusion of idiosyncratic student needs) (Arends, 2012; Dubble, 1998; Hammerness et al., 2005; Huberman, 1989; Watts, 1980), subject-centered (Burden, 1982), and idealistic (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

Additionally, they feel incompetent (Berliner, 2004; Burden, 1982; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Katz, 1972, Watts, 1980), ambivalent about teaching (Gregorc, 1973), stressed (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001), worried about classroom management (Arends, 2012), and shocked by the complexity of it all (Huberman, 1989). To remedy these feelings, they may rely on authority figures' (e.g., seasoned teachers', principals') advice (Berliner, 2004; Christensen et al., 1983; Gregorc, 1973) or form a teacher identity based on their preconceived notions of what it means to be a teacher (Burden, 1982).

Teachers at this stage need support (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Katz, 1972), reassurance (Katz, 1972), guidance (Burden, 1982; Christensen et al., 1983; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Katz, 1972), permission to experiment (Dubble, 1998), overarching rules about teaching (without focusing on contextual specifics) (Berliner, 2004), and opportunities to reflect on accumulated practical experience (Berliner, 2004).

Taken together, the first year is painted as quite intimidating. Teaching is certainly not an easy task. As stated by Hammerness et al. (2005): Developing an authoritative classroom presence, good radar for watching and interpreting what many different students are doing and feeling at each moment, and skills for explaining, questioning, discussing, giving feedback, constructing tasks, facilitating work, and managing the classroom – all at once – is not simple. (p. 374) Having said that, teachers during this stage are also enthusiastic (Huberman, 1989). They have finally stepped into *their* classroom and the possibilities are endless! And as the years go by, they settle into a more stable identity.

Stabilization

At some point, teachers settle into their roles and become stable, hence our title *stabilization.* Other titles for this stage include *consolidation* and *renewal* (Katz, 1972), *growing* (Gregorc, 1973), *middle* (Watts, 1980), *adjustment* (Burden, 1982), *middle years* (Christensen et al., 1983), *inservice* (Feiman-Nemser, 2001), *stabilization* and then *experimentation/activism* or *reassessment/self-doubt* (Huberman, 1989), *consolidation* and *renewal* (Dubble, 1998), *competent* (Berliner, 2004), and *teaching situation* (Arends, 2012). Exactly *when* this takes place is difficult to determine, as researchers' speculations have spanned from as little as the second year (Burden, 1982; Dubble, 1998; Katz, 1972) to as many as seven years (Feiman-Nemser, 2001) in the profession. Watts (1980) described this confusion well: "Teachers, like learners everywhere, develop at different rates, with

different modes of learning, and often with a foot on two different steps of the ladder" (p. 4). Many of the researchers asserted that this period of stabilization occurs around five years (Berliner, 2004; Christensen et al., 1983; Feiman-Nemser, 2001).

During this stage, teachers are better able to focus on the individual needs of children (Berliner, 2004; Burden, 1982; Christensen et al., 1983; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Katz, 1972, Watts, 1980), can manage the classroom with ease (Berliner, 2004; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 1983; Watts, 1980), have a clearer understanding of the complexity of teaching (Arends, 2012; Burden, 1982; Christensen et al., 1983; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Gregorc, 1973), can view the classroom and content from a long-range lens (Feiman-Nemser, 1983), and are generally more comfortable in the role (Arends, 2012; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Huberman, 1989; Watts, 1980). With all of this, they are more confident (Burden, 1982; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Watts, 1980), authentic (Dubble, 1998; Huberman, 1989; Watts, 1980), flexible (Christensen et al., 1983), secure (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Huberman, 1989), competent (Berliner, 2004; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 1983), self-directed (Berliner, 2004; Dubble, 1998), motivated (Dubble, 1998), and committed (Huberman, 1989).

At the same time, *stabilization* is the time when teachers may experience boredom (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Gregorc, 1973; Huberman, 1989; Katz, 1972) and burnout (Christensen et al., 1983; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Gregorc, 1973; Huberman, 1989). They also may challenge authority figures or become difficult (Christensen et al., 1983; Dubble, 1998). Researchers have postulated that teachers may progress down one of two paths: growth, where a teacher commits to learning and growing, or stagnation, where a teacher simply settles into the status quo and resists change (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Huberman, 1989). Huberman (1989) detailed this process at great length, stating that teachers can enter *experimentation/activism* or *reassessment/self-doubts.* The former is characterized by a continued desire for increased knowledge and expertise, where the latter could be described as a "mid-career crisis" (p. 35).

Teachers in the stabilization stage need continued guidance for specific issues (Dubble, 1998; Katz, 1972), professional development opportunities (Christensen et al., 1983; Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Katz, 1972), continued individualized support and reflection opportunities (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Katz, 1972), and collegial collaboration (Dubble, 1998; Feiman-Nemser, 2001). From this, they gradually develop greater mastery.

Mastery

The final stage in our model is *mastery* in teaching. Other theorists also have titled this stage *mastery* (Watts, 1980) or *student results and mastery* (Arends, 2012). Additional titles included *maturity* (Katz, 1972), *maturing* and *fully functioning* (Gregorc, 1973), *mature* (Burden, 1982), *later years* (Christensen et al., 1983), *serenity/relational distance* or *conservatism* and *disengagement* (Huberman, 1989), *seasoned teacher* (Dubble, 1998), and *proficient* and *expert* (Berliner, 2004). Similar to the *stabilization* stage, it is difficult to determine exactly when teachers reach the *mastery* stage. Some have posited that this could occur as early as three years (Katz, 1972), whereas others stated that very few teachers actually become experts (Berliner, 2004).

Describing a master teacher, Watts (1980) stated, "The teacher exudes an air of quiet competence: there seems to an outside to be nothing she can't handle" (p. 5). Master teachers can intuit patterns emerging in the classroom and *predict* what might happen in the future (Arends, 2012; Berliner, 2004). As stated by Berliner (2004), "These teachers can read the patterns in the classroom as air traffic controllers can read locations of plans ion a radar screen" (p. 207). He further described:

Experts engage in performance in a qualitatively different way than do novice or competent performers. They are more like the race car driver or fighter pilot who talks of becoming one with his or her [*sic*] machine or the science teacher who reports that the lesson just moved along so beautifully today that he or she [*sic*] never really had to teach. The experts are not consciously choosing what to attend to and what to do. They are acting effortlessly, fluidly, and in a sense, this is arational because it is not easily described as deductive or analytic behavior (Berliner, 2004, p. 207).

Teachers at this stage are described as aware and able to handle deep philosophical and contextual factors impacting education (Arends, 2012; Dubble, 1998; Katz, 1972, Watts, 1980), committed (Dubble, 1998; Gregorc, 1973), confident (Arends, 2012; Burden, 1982; Huberman, 1989; Watts, 1980), competent (Arends, 2012; Burden, 1982; Watts, 1980), insightful (Berliner, 2004; Burden, 1982; Gregorc, 1973, Watts, 1980), self-directed (Dubble, 1998; Gregorc, 1973), self-accepting (Berliner, 2004; Dubble, 1998; Huberman, 1989), flexible and creative in their approaches to teaching (Arends, 2012; Berliner, 2004; Burden, 1982; Gregorc, 1973, Watts, 1980), and reflective (Watts, 1980). Master teachers also have integrity and may serve as mentors for new teachers (Gregorc, 1973).

Similar to the *stabilization* stage, teachers may move into two directions at this stage (Huberman, 1989). They may become conservative (Huberman, 1989), dogmatic (Huberman, 1989), negative (Huberman, 1989), burnt out (Watts, 1980), and bored (Watts, 1980). Or they can find a sense of serenity (Huberman, 1989), deep intuition (Berliner, 2004), and true mastery (Berliner, 2004). Thus, it is important that teachers are nurtured with both support and challenge (Watts, 1980). Master teachers need ongoing professional development opportunities (Christensen et al., 1983; Katz, 1972; Watts, 1980), and leadership opportunities (Christensen et al., 1983; Dubble, 1998; Watts, 1980).

Discussion and Application to Counselor Education

The purpose of our study was to synthesize the literature on teacher development and apply it to counselor education. As evident in the model, there are a variety of characteristics (some seemingly contradictory) associated with the *preservice*

stage. We postulated that the *preservice* stage almost seemed to be a full cycle of all the stages in a smaller dose. In other words, teachers, under the guidance of their mentor teachers, experience the stages of *survival, stabilization*, and *mastery* on a much smaller and more sheltered scale. Perhaps this is the reason that experiences such as co-teaching (Baltrinic, 2014; Baltrinic et al., 2016); mentorship (Hall & Hulse, 2009; Waalkes et al., 2018); teaching internships (Hunt & Gilmore, 2011); collaborative team teaching (Orr et al., 2008); and field work (Suddeath et al., 2020) have been found beneficial in doctoral students' teaching development.

Our *survival* stage mirrored the extant literature in counselor education. For example, in Magnuson (2002) Magnuson's (2002) longitudinal research on the first year of counselor educators' experiences, the participants deemed their first year stressful and anxiety-provoking. Interestingly, though, teaching proved to be one of the highlights of participants' first year, and time management proved to be one of the most challenging elements. In fact, in Magnuson et al. (2006) final reflection of the longitudinal study, they again highlighted teaching as a source of satisfaction for participants. This begs the question, then, in the *survival* phase that most theorists describe, what are the teachers surviving? Is it specifically teaching? Is it the bureaucracy in education? Is it classroom management? Since teaching is a smaller aspect of a counselor educator's role, perhaps new counselor educators do not experience survival as strongly as full-time PreK-12 teachers; however, they do experience survival regarding their new role in academia. Much more empirical research is needed in this area.

Our *stabilization* stage paralleled the literature in counselor education and academia as well. In Magnuson et al.'s (2006) longitudinal study of counselor educators' experiences over the years, they found a wide variety of experiences in the third year. Some of the experiences pointed toward growth and stabilization, whereas others' experiences foretold an emerging sense of burnout. However, Magnuson et al. did emphasize the growth in confidence in counselor educators within this third year.

The extant literature in higher education abounds with research on the experiences of professors in the post-tenure period, which could be categorized in our *stabilization* stage. Although much of the literature on professors' experiences post-tenure paint a grim picture of job dissatisfaction and burnout, Beauboeuf-Lafontant et al. (2019) offered a more nuanced perspective. In their theory, they stated that after tenure, educators can move into four distinct pathways based on their job satisfaction and connection to the institution. They reiterated the importance of growth opportunities for midcareer faculty.

Our *mastery* stage complements the extant literature on expertise. For example, Dreyfus (1986) outlined detailed characteristics of expertise including context-free and situational understanding (as opposed to the "one size fits all" approach of novices) and intuitive, and at times, arational, modes of decision making. As they stated, "An expert's skill has become so much a part of him [*sic*] that he need be no more aware of it than he is of his own body" (p. 30).

The research on teaching expertise in counselor education aligns a little more closely with our *stabilization* phase. Both Buller (2013) and Swank and Houseknecht (2019) highlighted characteristics and competencies that expert teachers in counselor education hold; however, their descriptions failed to capture some of the intuitive and arational components of teaching as described by others like Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986). More research is needed.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

One of the most prominent limitations of our study is the presumption that development occurs in tidy stages. Richardson and Placier (2001) delved into this topic in great depth, stating, "Over the past several years, we have seen a movement from relatively ridged, deterministic, hierarchical, and traditional stage theories in teaching to more flexible accounts of the developmental process" (p. 912). In fact, this movement also explains why so many of the theories and models we reviewed were dated, with most of them having been created before the twenty first century. We believe that a much more nuanced view of the development of specific teaching components (e.g., professional identity, cognitive complexity, beliefs about teaching) is needed. However, we also believe the overarching developmental theories can provide some insight into the grand process of teacher development, even if the stages blur and teachers move through them in haphazard and idiosyncratic ways.

Second, our synthesized model has yet to be empirically validated, which would lend weight to the accuracy (or inaccuracy) of the stages as they are described. Future researchers are encouraged to utilize qualitative and qualitative methodology to validate (or invalidate) our model.

Finally, our model is woefully inadequate when considering diverse, multicultural perspectives – both for the teacher and in the teaching process. Teachers are diverse individuals, and the hierarchical, stage model we have proposed aligns more with a Western notion of development and inherently presumes one stage is "better than" another. Furthermore, within the stages, there is a lack of attention toward teachers' understanding of multicultural components within their classrooms as well. A decolonized classroom could look very different and cast teacher development in a completely different perspective. More research is needed in this area.

In closing, perhaps our stage model could be captured in a famous quote by Ward (n. d.), "The mediocre teacher tells. The good teacher explains. The superior teacher demonstrates. The great teacher inspires" (para. 14). May you grow and inspire in all of your teaching endeavors!

CONCLUSION

Our study intended to combine the current teacher development literature and modify it for counselor education. We created a thorough "Synthesized Model of Teacher Development" using the thirteen identified models of teacher development. This paradigm divides growth into four stages: preservice, survival, stabilization, and mastery. It is distinctive in its application to counselor education. Even while we are aware of the inherent drawbacks of dividing development into precise stages, we think that these divisions provide important information about how growth generally progresses. However, it's crucial to approach these stages adaptably because development is influenced by a variety of elements, such as individual experiences, the environment, and one's views. As a result, rather than offering a strict framework, our model acts as a heuristic, giving a comprehensive perspective.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to sincere our gratitude to who involved in this study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

We agree to the final version of this article.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. (1980). A Developmental Study of Teacher Concerns Across Time. *ERIC: Online Submission*. Google Scholar

Arends. (2012). Learning to teach. In *McGraw-Hill Companies.* (Vol. 32, Issue 5). https://doi.org/10.1188/05.ONF.889

Baltrinic, E. (2014). a Phenomenological Investigation of Counselor Education Students' Co-Teaching Experiences With Faculty During Their Doctoral Training. In *Kent State University*. Google Scholar

Baltrinic, E. R., Jencius, M., & McGlothlin, J. (2016). Coteaching in Counselor Education: Preparing Doctoral Students for Future Teaching. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *55*(1), 31–45. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12031

Barrio Minton, C. A., Wachter Morris, C. A., & Yaites, L. D. (2014). Pedagogy in counselor education: A 10-year content analysis of journals. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *53*(3), 162–177. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00055.x

Beauboeuf-Lafontant, T., Erickson, K. A., & Thomas, J. E. (2019). Rethinking Post-Tenure Malaise: An Interactional, Pathways Approach to Understanding the Post-Tenure Period. *Journal of Higher Education*, *90*(4), 644–664. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2018.1554397

Berliner, D. C. (2004). Describing the behavior and documenting the accomplishments of expert teachers. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 24*(3), 200–212. https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.ndsu.nodak.edu/10.1177/0270467604265535

Borders, L. D. A., Wester, K. L., & Driscoll, K. H. (2020). Researcher Development of Doctoral Students: Supports and Barriers Across Time. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *59*(4), 297–315. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12190

Borko, H., & Putnam, R. T. (2013). Learning to teach. In *Handbook of Educational Psychology* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203053874-29

Burden, P.R. (1982). Implications of teacher career development: New roles for teachers, administrators and professors. *Paper presented at the National Summer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators*, Slippery Rock, PA. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.1982.10519117

Buller, A. E. (2013). Exploring the Experiences of Counselor Educators Recognized for their Excellence in Teaching. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, *53*, 1689–1699. Google Scholar

Cacrep. (2016). *Council on Accreditation for Counseling and Other Related Educational Programs*. CACREP

Christensen, J., Burke, P., Fessler, R., & Hagstorm, D. (1983). Stages of Teachers' Careers: Implications for professional development. In *Eric*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education. Google Scholar

Dreyfus. (1986). Mind over machine. In *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* (Vol. 7, Issue 9). FreePress. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2001

Dubble, S. L. (1998). Evolving people/evolving schools. *North American Montessori Teachers' Association Conference*. Google Scholar

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, *103*(6), 1013–1055. https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00141

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, *6*(2), 207. https://doi.org/10.2307/1161894

Gregorc, A. F. (1973). Developing Plans for Professional Growth. *NASSP Bulletin*, *57*(377), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/019263657305737701

Hall, S., & Hulse, D. (2010). Perceptions of Doctoral Level Teaching Preparation in Counselor Education. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, *1*(2), 2. https://doi.org/10.7729/12.0108

Hammerness, K. (2005). How teachers learn and develop. *Preparing teachers for a changing world*, 358-389. Google Scholar

Hosie, T. W. (1990). Recommendations for Improvement in Counselor Education. In *Counselor Education and Supervision* (Vol. 29, Issue 3, pp. 130–132). https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1990.tb01146.x

Hunt, B., & Gilmore, G. W. (2011). Learning to Teach: Teaching Internships in Counselor Education and Supervision. *The Professional Counselor*, *1*(2), 143–151. https://doi.org/10.15241/bhh.1.2.143

Katz, L. G. (1972). Developmental Stages of Preschool Teachers. In *The Elementary School Journal* (Vol. 73, Issue 1). ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education. https://doi.org/10.1086/460731

Lanning, W. (1990). An Educator/Practitioner Model for Counselor Education Doctoral Programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *30*(2), 163–169. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1990.tb01193.x

Magnuson, S. (2002). New assistant professors of counselor education: Their 1st year. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *41*(4), 306–320. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2002.tb01293.x

Magnuson, S., Black, L. L., & Lahman, M. K. E. (2006). The 2000 Cohort of new assistant professors of counselor education: Year 3. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *45*(3), 162–179. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2006.tb00140.x

Malott, K. M., Hall, K. H., Sheely-Moore, A., Krell, M. M., & Cardaciotto, L. (2014). Evidence-based teaching in higher education: Application to counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *53*(4), 294–305. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00064.x

Orr, J. J., Hall, S. F., & Hulse-Killacky, D. (2008). A model for collaborative teaching teams in counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *47*(3), 146–163. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2008.tb00046.x

Reven F, Cartwright C, M. R. (1997). Developmental Phases of Preservice Secondary Teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *24*(4), 240. Google Scholar

Richardson, Virginia, & Placier, P. (2001). Teacher change. In V Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (4th ed., Issue July, pp. 905–947). American Education Research Association. Google Scholar

Skovholt, T. M., & RONNESTAD, M. H. (1992). Themes in Therapist and Counselor Development. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*(4), 505–515. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1992.tb01646.x

Stoltenberg, C. D., & McNeill, B. W. (1997). Clinical supervision from a developmental perspective: Research and practice. In C. E. Watkins Jr (Ed.), *Handbook of psychotherapy supervision* (pp. 184–202). Google Scholar

Suddeath, E., Baltrinic, E., & Dugger, S. (2020). The Impact of Teaching Preparation Practices on Self-Efficacy Toward Teaching. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *59*(1), 59–73. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12166

Swank, J. M., & Houseknecht, A. (2019). Teaching Competencies in Counselor Education: A Delphi Study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *58*(3), 162–176. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12148

Waalkes, P. L., Benshoff, J. M., Stickl, J., Swindle, P. J., & Umstead, L. K. (2018). Structure, Impact, and Deficiencies of Beginning Counselor Educators' Doctoral Teaching Preparation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, *57*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12094

Wall, C. R. G. (2016). From student to teacher: changes in preservice teacher educational beliefs throughout the learning-to-teach journey. *Teacher Development*, *20*(3), 364–379. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1149509

Watkins, C. E. (1993). Development of the psychotherapy supervisor: Concepts, assumptions, and hypotheses of the supervisor complexity model. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *47*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.1993.47.1.58

Watts, H. (1980). *Starting out, moving on, running ahead or how teachers' centers can attend to stages in teachers' development*. National Institute of Education. Google Scholar