DOCUMENT RESUME

ABSTRACT
        Noting that a major problem confronting competency
based teacher education (CBTE) programs was the development of
mutually acceptable perceptions of teacher education among college
faculty, school personnel, and prospective teachers, a cluster of
competencies developed by the State University College at Oneonta
(SUCO), New York, was critiqued by these three groups. Opinions about
the relative importance of the twenty-five generic competencies used
in the SUCO/CBTE program were collected from the faculty and students
of the college and from the faculty in the surrounding schools. A
factor analysis was made on the responses to identify categories of
competencies which could be defined as generic teacher roles. This
analysis resulted in four clusters or teacher roles as measured by
the twenty-five original competencies: (1) teacher as a strategist;
(2) teacher as a person; (3) teacher as an assessor; and (4) teacher
as a professional. An analysis of the results of the questionnaire
indicated that preservice teacher education students tend to rate the
importance of the role of the teacher as person higher than did the
faculty from both the college and the participating schools. A second
finding suggested that the students rate the importance of teacher as
a professional higher than the school faculty but not higher than the
college faculty. The findings from this study are discussed, and a
copy of the questionnaire is appended. (JD)

A COMPARISON OF I.H.E. FACULTY,

L.E.A. FACULTY, AND I.H.E. STUDENT PERCEPTIONS

OF SELECT TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Dr. Mark J. Staszkiewicz
State University of New York
Oneonta, New York

Dr. Robert E. Gabrys
State University of New York
Oneonta, New York

Introduction

Based upon the presentation of Denny and Wolf (1978) which described the procedure by which the State University of New York at Oneonta developed its original four clusters of twenty-five competencies for its CBTE program in elementary education, this paper discusses the similarities and differences among the various groups (I.H.E. faculty, L.E.A. personnel, and preservice elementary teachers) who formed the data base for the factor analysis and ANOVA of the competencies.

Need for the Study

Such a comparison is warranted because of the sparsity of research on effective teacher characteristics and of the sparsity of literature related to professional agreement between the practicing and training arms of the profession on desirable characteristics for teachers.

Early studies relating teacher behavior and pupil achievement attempted to define the "best teacher". However, A.S. Barr (1961) in reviewing and researching teacher effectiveness measures, found that much of the literature dealt with opinions. In fact, he noted that in uncontrolled situations the judgments of a group of supervisors, administrators, and teacher educators, observing the same teacher

at the same time, under identical conditions, vary so much
that some observers rated a single teacher as among the
very best they observed and others rated the same teacher
as among the very worst.

Medley and Mitzel (1959) noted similar findings and
Medley (1972) concluded that research based on opinions
was a relative waste of time if one wished to identify
effective teacher characteristics.

Dunkin and Biddle also commented that:

> ...(S)peculations about the specificity or generality
> of effective teaching have little support from research
> to date.   (1974, p. 74)

More specifically related to the problem of agreement
among different groups of evaluators, the literature is
inconclusive.

Taylor and Maguire (1967) in a study of the perceptions
of Illinois high school science teachers, professors and
doctoral candidates in biological sciences, and curriculum
materials authors found no major differences among the
group's perceptions of broad science objectives.

Weilbaker, Johnston, Marble, and Staszkiewicz (1976)
similarly suggested that while different groups of evaluators
may contribute a unique perspective to the assessment of
the teaching act, the differences may result from the
value assigned to each factor rather than from significant
differences in the character of the domains being evaluated.

A similar hypothesis was set forth by Thomas and Kay (1974) whose research findings indicated that teachers and supervisors manifested considerable agreement in designating hierarchies of competencies. College personnel were not included in this study, and the researchers were led to conclude that:

> Consensus of opinion on what teaching behaviors and skills are more important than others is difficult to obtain, because such judgments reflect a broad range of values based on diverse philosophies of education and theories of learning. (p. 156)

This view has been supported by the work of Rosenshine (1971), Del Schalock (1970), and Stake (1970). B.O. Smith (1969) carried the notion a step further and noted that judgments concerning necessary competencies to be exemplified by the work of Giles and Foster (1972) who, based upon their experiences at the University of Washington, Seatle, noted that a major problem confronting CBTE programs was the development of mutually acceptable perceptions of teacher education among professors, school administrators, teachers, and prospective teachers.

In contrast, Woods and Wood (1978) reported on a comparison study of most important and most emphasized areas of study (professional education content) and behavioral sciences in doctoral programs for curriculum

practitioners since 1969. Their data suggest that of ten
areas of study indicated as most important in 1969 by
professors and practitioners, nine of the areas were
identical with only slight variations in rankings. A
similar comparison of these two groups in terms of the
most important areas of behavioral sciences, showed agreement
on nine of the ten areas to be stressed.

The literature on comparisons of L.E.A., I.H.E., and
student groups is very scarce as noted by Eva Baker. Her
research (1972) utilizing parents, teachers, and junior
high students as raters of the importance of some fifteen
objectives related to junior high mathematics, yielded a
slightly negative correlation (-.21) between teacher and
student ratings.

It is in light of the inconclusiveness of data about
knowledge of and shared perceptions of the profession of
effective teacher characteristics as well as the fact
that although there was substantial practitioner input
into the observation of State University-Oneonta competencies,
the final clustering of competencies was a product of the
I.H.E. faculty, (Denny & Wolf, 1978) that the validation
of the competency clusters through factor analysis and
ANOVA was undertaken. The results of that analysis are
reported in Tables 1 through 7. A reporting of the

differences among the three groups (I.H.E. faculty,

L.E.A. personnel, and preservice elementary teachers)

follows.

PROCEDURES

The procedures employed during this study are itemized

below:

1) Opinions about the relative importance of the

twenty-five generic competencies used in the SUCO/CBTE

program were collected from faculty in the surrounding

schools, from S.U.C.O. faculty and from S.U.C.O. students

majoring in elementary education.

2) A factor analysis was performed on the responses

to identify categories of competencies which could be

defined as generic teacher roles. Factor scores were

computed for each factor.

3) Each factor score served as the dependent variable

in subsequent analysis of variance to determine differences

in I.H.E. faculty, I.H.E. student, and L.E.A. faculty

opinions concerning these teacher roles.

4) Scheffe's test was used to determine the cells

whose means were significantly different from one another.

QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was developed (Appendix A) containing

25 statements of teacher effectiveness. The statements

were constructed from the 25 competencies currently used
in the S.U.C.O. competency based teacher education program.
Using a fine-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree,
Disagree, Undecided, Agree, and Strongly Agree) respondents
were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed with
each competency statement. In an attempt to reduce
random error all participants were instructed to respond
to each item as it applied to the beginning first-year
teacher.

Sample

The questionnaires were mailed to all 145 teacher
education faculty at S.U.C.O., 400 randomly selected
S.U.C.O. education majors, and all teachers (grades N-9)
in the 34 school districts surrounding Oneonta. Responses
were obtained from 59 S.U.C.O. faculty (41%), 157 S.U.C.O.
students (39%), and 449 L.E.A. faculty. Since the exact
number of teachers employed by these 34 districts was
unknown (questionnaires were mailed to each school for
distribution), it was not possible to compute the exact
percentage of teacher responses. However, responses were
obtained from 26 of the 34 school districts (76%) so that
a fairly large geographic area was represented.

Table 1 contains a crosstabulation of the three
groups by sex. It should be noted, however, that not

all respondents completed the demographic portion of the
survey.

TABLE 1

CROSSTABULATION OF GROUPS BY SEX

GROUP	MALE	FEMALE	NO RESPONSE
I.H.E. FACULTY	36	18	5
I.H.E. STUDENT	31	125	1
L.E.A. FACULTY	81	340	28
TOTAL	148	483	34

Analysis and Results

The data analysis consisted of two steps: a factor

analysis* and an analysis of variance.** The factor

analysis was performed to reduce the original 25 competencies

into four clusters, which could be interpreted as teacher

roles. Factor scores were then computed for each role

and served as dependent variables in the analysis of variance.

FACTOR ANALYSIS

The data from the 665 respondents were submitted to

---

* The factor analysis program employed was from the
Statistical Packages For the Social Sciences (SPSS) by
Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent; Mc Graw Hill
Book Company, New York, 1970; Chapter 24, "Factor Analysis"
by Jae-On Kim.

** The Analysis of Variance program employed was also from
the Statistical Packages For the Social Sciences (SPSS);
Chapter 22, "Analysis of Variance and Covariance: Subprograms
ANOVA and Oneway" by Jae-On Kim and Frank J. Kohout.

principal components analysis and the resulting factors rotated employing the varimax transformation (SPSS MANUAL, p. 45). Since the S.U.C.O./C.B.T.E. program currently clusters the competencies into the four areas of teacher as a person, teacher as a diagnostician, teacher as an implementor, and teacher as an evaluator , it was decided that it would be helpful to control the number of factors by extracting only four. This information could then also be of use for internal program evaluation and possible . revision.

Inspection of the "high loading" items within each factor resulted in the following four clusters or teacher roles, as measured by the 25 original competencies (Denny and Wolf, 1978):

    FACTOR 1: Teacher as a strategist
    FACTOR 2: Teacher as a person
    FACTOR 3: Teacher as an assessor
    FACTOR 4: Teacher as a professional

Table 2 contains the varimax rotated factor loadings for each cluster and the percentage of variance accounted for in the original 25 items.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

The second stage of the analysis involved a one-way, three group, analysis of variance with each of the factor scores serving as dependent variables.

TABLE 2

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS
for CBTE QUESTIONNAIRE

FACTOR	LOADING	ITEMS
1: TEACHER as a STRATEGIST (PCT of VAR = 84.8)	.54	prescribes appropriate objectives for pupils under consideration
	.64	uses a variety of curriculum materials and/or learning activities
	.63	prescribes appropriate instructional strategies
	.58	measures and evaluates curriculum materials and/or learning activities to meet identified pupil needs and modifies accordingly
	.73	uses a variety of instructional strategies and teacher aids
	.68	prescribes appropriate curriculum materials and/or learning activities
	.49	organizes various pupil groupings as required
	.50	measures and evaluates pupil performance in relation to objectives and modifies accordingly.

FACTOR	LOADING	ITEMS
	.47	organizes classroom facilities to meet identified pupil needs
	.41	uses resource personnel within and without the school
2: Teacher as a Person (PCT of VAR = 8.2)	.59	demonstrates flexibility in adapting to varied situations
	.52	works cooperatively and effectively with students, teaching colleagues, and other school/community personnel
	.50	uses classroom regulatory procedures (regarding freedom and constraint) to meet pupil needs
	.53	fosters an atmosphere conducive to high student interest, enthusiasm, initiative, and/or creative pursuit
	.60	exhibits a realistic, secure, and positive self-concept
	.64	is sensitive, accepting, and respectful of the needs, feelings, concerns and worth of others

FACTOR	LOADING	ITEMS
	.57	fosters both independent and group efforts
	.44	demonstrates appropriate communication skills
	.49	fosters a realistic, secure and ʳ⁻ ⁱ⁺ive self-con⁻ ⟨tudents and othe⊥.
3: Teacher as an Assessor (PCT of VAR = 3.8)	.48	gathers, records, and accurately interprets non-test information to diagnose pupil needs
	.61	administers, scores, and accurately interprets teacher-made and commercially constructed diagnostic test instruments
4: Teacher as a Professional (PCT of VAR = 3.1)	.50	takes initiative in promoting professional, scholarly growth

Table 3 contains the means and stand.rd deviations

for all three groups on these four factors.

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR L.E.A. FACULTY,
I.H.E. FACULTY, AND I.H.E. STUDENTS ON
THE FOUR FACTORS

GROUP	STRATEGIST	PERSON	ASSESSOR	PROFESSIONAL
L.E.A. FACULTY	$\overline{X}$ =-.04 S.D.= .83	$\overline{X}$ =-.06 S.D.= .87	$\overline{X}$ = .02 S.D.= .68	$\overline{X}$ =-.10 S.D.= .68
I.H.E. FACULTY	$\overline{X}$ =-.03 S.D.= 1.19	$\overline{X}$ = -.18 S.D.= 1.15	$\overline{X}$ =-.16 S.D.= .97	$\overline{X}$ = .08 S.D.= .86
I.H.E. STUDENT	$\overline{X}$ = .13 S.D.= .80	$\overline{X}$ = .24 S.D.= .69	$\overline{X}$ = .01 S.D.= .83	$\overline{X}$ = .26 S.D.= .67

The results of the ANOVA using teacher as a strategist

are found in Table 4.

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE USING TEACHER
AS STRATEGIST AS DEPENDENT VARIABLE

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	PL
Between	3.39	2	1.69	2.28	.10
Within	491.31	662	.74		
Total	494.69	664			

The univariate F- ratio of 2.28 is not significant (= .05)
and consequently no significant differences existed among
the perceptions of the three groups on role of teacher
as a strategist and no follow-up analysis was necessary.

Table 5 contains the results of the second ANOVA
using teacher as a person as the dependent variable.
The F - ratio of 8.68 is significant well beyond the .05
level indicating that a significant difference exists

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE USING TEACHER
AS PERSON AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	PL
Between	12.78	2	6.39	8.68	.0002
Within	487.39	662	.74		
Total	500.16	664			

among these groups. Scheffe's test was then employed to
identify which groups were responsible for this overall
significance. The student group scored significantly
higher than both faculty groups, while no difference was
found between I.H.E. and L.E.A. faculties.

Table 6 shows the ANOVA results using teacher as
assessor as the criterion. The univariate F of 1.58
was not significant indicating that no significant

differences existed among these groups in their perceptions

of the role of the teacher as an assessor.

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE USING
TEACHER AS ASSESSOR AS THE DEPENDENT
VARIABLE

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	PL
Between	1.76	2	.88	1.58	.21
Within	369.28	662	.56		
Total	371.03	664			

Results of the final ANOVA, using teacher as a

professional, appear in Table 7.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE USING TEACHER
AS A PROFESSIONAL AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

SOURCE	SUM OF SQUARES	D.F.	MEAN SQUARES	F	PL
Between	15.65	2	7.83	16.08	.0001
Within	322.12	662	.49		
Total	337.77	664			

These results indicate that there is an overall significant difference among the three groups. Again, Scheffe's Post Hoc procedure was employed to identify where these differences occured. The follow-up test showed that students scored significantly higher than the L.E.A. faculty but not higher than the I.H.E. faculty and that there were no differences between I.H.E. and L.E.A. faculties.

In summary, it was found that no differences existed between I.H.E. and L.E.A. faculties on any of the four factors. Differences were found to exist, however, between the students and both faculty groups on the Teacher as Person factor and between students and the L.E.A. faculty on the Teacher as Professional factor.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study indicate that preservice teacher education students tend to rate the importance of the role of the teacher as a person higher than did faculty from both the I.H.E. and the L.E.A. A possible explanation for this finding is that students have a more idealistic outlook of teaching since they lack actual classroom experience. This suggests a need to investigate the degree to which preservice teachers hold different opinions of teacher roles at various stages of their

program. Another implication for future study deals with
follow-up of graduates after employment. For example,
do ratings of the importance of various teacher roles
change after one year, three years, or five years of
actual teaching experience? Currently Stoehr (1978) is
investigating the attitudinal changes of students as a
function of varying amounts of field experiences. This
investigation is presently at the data collection stage.

The second finding from this study suggests that
preservice teacher education students rate the importance
of Teacher as a Professional higher than L.E.A. faculty
but not higher than I.H.E. faculty. While this may again
be a result of idealism on the part of students, a more
plausible explanation is that colleges generally place
more emphasis on professional and scholarly growth.
Frances Fuller's research (1969) on students, lends
credibility to this interpretation since her findings
indicate that preservice teachers tend to first be con-
cerned with self image, feelings, sucess in the classroom
and satisfaction and gains. Students are in the process of
completing coursework and working on projects. By the same
token I.H.E. faculty generally feel more need (due to
promotions and tenure) to publish and to conduct research.

Finally, the general agreement between the I.H.E.
and L.E.A. faculties suggests that differences between
these groups regarding the importance of various teacher
roles are mostly of degree and not of kind and that these
differences are more a function of the nature of the
institutions in which they teach rather than on fundamental
differences between the two groups.

APPENDIX A
CBTE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name (optional): _____

School: _____

Position: Faculty _____

           Administration _____

Subject area currently teaching _____

Teaching experience (in years):   Elementary _____

                                        Jr. High _____

                                        Secondary _____

Age: _____

Highest degree earned: Bachelors _____

                           Masters _____

                           Doctorate _____

Sex: Male _____

      Female _____

Familiarity with the concept of CBTE: Extensive _____

                                               Some _____

                                             Very little _____

                                             None _____

****

Key
SD - strongly disagree
D -- disagree
U -- undecided
A -- agree
SA - strongly agree

✱ PLEASE NOTE: To help minimize random error, please respond to each statement in terms of the <u>BEGINNING FIRST-YEAR TEACHER</u>.

1. The effective teacher must measure and evaluate instructional strategies in relation to pupil performance, objectives, curriculum materials and/or learning activities and modify accordingly.   SD D U A SA

2. The effective teacher must demonstrate flexibility in adapting to varied situations.   SD D U A SA

3. The effective teacher must work cooperatively and effectively with students, teaching colleagues, and other school community personnel.   SD D U A SA

4. The effective teacher must use classroom regulatory procedures (rules/guidelines regarding freedom and constraint) to meet identified pupil needs, abilities and learning styles.   SD D U A SA

5. The effective teacher must measure and evaluate objectives in relation to pupil performance, instructional strategies, curriculum materials and/or learning activities and modify accordingly.   SD D U A SA

6. The effective teacher must foster an atmosphere con-   SD D U A SA
   ducive to high student interest, enthusiasm, initiative
   and/or creative pursuit to meet identified pupil needs,
   abilities and learning styles.

7. The effective teacher must exhibit a realistic, secure, SD D U A SA
   and positive self-concept. (emotional maturity).

8. The effective teacher must gather, record, and   SD D U A SA
   accurately interpret other (non-test instrument)
   information to diagnose pupil needs, abilities
   and learning styles.

9. The effective teacher must administer, score and   SD D U A SA
   accurately interpret both teacher-made and commercially
   constructed diagnostic test instruments.

10. The effective teacher must be sensitive, accepting,   SD D U A SA
    and respectful of the needs, feelings, concerns
    and worth of others.

11. The effective teacher must foster both independent   SD D U A SA
    (self-directed) and group efforts to meet identified
    pupil needs, abilities, and learning styles.

12. The effective teacher must demonstrate appropriate   SD D U A SA
    communication skills.

13. The effective teacher must take initiative in pro-   SD D U A SA
    moting professional, scholarly growth.

14. The effective teacher must organize classroom   SD D U A SA
    facilities to meet identified pupil needs, abilities
    and learning styles.

15. The effective teacher must prescribe appropriate   SD D U A SA
    objectives for pupils under consideration.

16. The effective teacher must use resource personnel   SD D U A SA
    within and without the school to meet identified
    pupil needs, abilities and learning styles.

17. The effective teacher must use a variety of curricu-   SD D U A SA
    lum materials and/or learning activities to meet
    identified pupil needs, abilities and learning styles.

18. The effective teacher must prescribe appropriate   SD D U A SA
    instructional strategies for pupils under consideration.

19. The effective teacher must measure and evaluate   SD D U A SA
    curriculum materials and/or learning activities to
    meet identified pupil needs abilities and learning
    styles in relation to pupil performance, objectives
    and instructional strategies and modify accordingly.

20. The effective teacher must organize various pupil   SD D U A SA
    groupings as required to meet identified pupil needs,
    abilities, and learning styles.

21. The effective teacher must use a variety of instruction-SD D U A SA
    al strategies and teacher aids to meet identified pupil
    needs, abilities and learning styles.

22. The effective teacher must foster a realistic, secure   SD D U A SA
    and positive self-concept in students and others.

23. The effective teacher must accept and carry out   SD D U A SA
    professional, administrative and school-community
    related responsibilities and activities.

24. The effective teacher must prescribe appropriate   SD D U A SA
    curriculum materials and/or learning activities for
    pupils under consideration.

25. The effective teacher must measure and evaluate   SD D U A SA
    pupil performance in relation to objectives, in-
    structional strategies, curriculum materials
    and/or learning activities.

****

    On the rest of this sheet please list any questions you have
concerning CBTE and any comments you have relating to specific
statements on this questionnaire.

REFERENCES CITED

1. Baker, E.L., "Parents, Teachers, and Students As Data Sources For the Selection of Instructional Goals," _American Educational Research Journal_, Vol. 9, No. 3, Summer, 1972.

2. Barr, A.S. _Wisconsin Studies of the Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Effectiveness_, Madison, Wisconsin: Demblar Publications, Inc., 1961.

3. Denny, D.A. and R.I. Wolf, "Verifying Generic Competency Clusters Through Factor Analysis," paper presented at EERA Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, March 8-11, 1978.

4. Dunkin, M.J. and B.J. Biddle. _The Study of Teaching_. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

5. Fuller, Frances, "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," _American Educational Research Journal_, Vol. 6, No. 2, March, 1969.

6. Giles, F.T. and C.D. Foster. _Changing Teacher Education in a Large Urban University_. Washington, D.C.: AACTE Committee on Performance Based Teacher Education, PBTE Series No. 6, 1972.

7. Medley, D.M. and H.E. Mitzel, "Some Behavioral Correlates of Teacher Effectiveness," _Journal of Educational Psychology_, 50, 1959.

8. Medley, D.M., "Early History of Research on Teacher Behavior," _International Review of Education_, Vol. 18, No. 4, 1972.

9. Rosenshine, B. _Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement_. London: National Foundation for Education Research, 1971.

10. Schalock, H.D., "Alternative Strategies and Foci for Teacher Education," paper prepared for 23rd annual conference on teacher education, Austin, Texas, October, 1970.

11. Smith, B.O., et. al. _Teachers For the Real World_. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1969.

12. Stake, R.E. "Objectives, Priorities, and Other Judgment Data," _Review of Educational Research_, 40, No. 2, 1970.

13. Stoehr, B.S. "An Investigation of the Effect of Amount of Field Experiences on Student Perceptions of Selected Teacher Competencies." Unpublished paper. State University of New York at Oneonta, March, 1978.

14. Taylor, P.A. and T.O. Maguire, "Perceptions of Some Objectives For A Science Curriculum," _Science Education_, Vol. 51, No. 5, December, 1967.

15. Thomas, A.K. and P.M. Kay, "Determining Priorities Among Competencies: Judgments of Classroom Teachers and Supervisors," _Exploring Competency Based Education_, W. Robert Houston, ed. Berkeley, Calif.: Mc Cutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

16. Weilbaker, C.R., et.al. _Determining The Most Efficient Measure of Teacher Effectiveness in the Follow-Up Evaluation of Certification Program Graduates_. Project 419, Ohio State Education Department, 1976.

17. Woods, B.G. and F.H. Wood, "Areas of Emphasis in Doctoral Programs For Curriculum Practitioners Since 1969," _Educational Leadership_, Vol. 35, No. 5, February, 1978.