



Faculty Members' Understanding of Teaching Efficacy Criteria

Vali Mehdinezhad

To cite this article: Vali Mehdinezhad (2012) Faculty Members' Understanding of Teaching Efficacy Criteria, Education Inquiry, 3:1, 49-69, DOI: [10.3402/edui.v3i1.22013](https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v3i1.22013)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v3i1.22013>



© 2012 The Author(s). Published by Taylor & Francis.



Published online: 01 Mar 2012.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 289



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)

EDU

EDUCATION INQUIRY

Volume 3, No. 1, March 2012

CONTENT

Editorial

Glenn Hultman, Ragnhild Löfgren & Jan Schoultz *Subject Didactics in Practice – Hidden in the Process. A Study of Teaching Logics and Classroom Cultures*

Ylva Backman, Eva Alerby, Ulrika Bergmark, Åsa Gardelli, Krister Hertting, Catrine Kostenius & Kerstin Öhrling *Improving the School Environment from a Student Perspective: Tensions and opportunities*

Marta Mendonça, Oleg Popov, Gun-Marie Frånberg & Eugénia Cossa *Introducing a Student-centred Learning Approach in Current Curriculum Reform in Mozambican Higher Education*

Vali Mehdinezhad *Faculty Members' Understanding of Teaching Efficacy Criteria*

Constance Oterkiil & Sigrun K. Ertesvåg *Schools' Readiness and Capacity to Improve Matter*

Catarina Player-Koro *Factors Influencing Teachers' Use of ICT in Education*



Umeå School of Education

Umeå University
Sweden

EDUCATION INQUIRY

Education Inquiry is an international on-line, peer-reviewed journal with free access in the field of Educational Sciences and Teacher Education. It publishes original empirical and theoretical studies from a wide variety of academic disciplines. As the name of the journal suggests, one of its aims is to challenge established conventions and taken-for-granted perceptions within these fields.

Education Inquiry is looking for lucid and significant contributions to the understanding of contextual, social, organizational and individual factors affecting teaching and learning, the links between these aspects, the nature and processes of education and training as well as research in and on Teacher Education and Teacher Education policy. This includes research ranging from pre-school education to higher education, and research on formal and informal settings. Education Inquiry welcomes cross-disciplinary contributions and innovative perspectives. Of particular interest are studies that take as their starting point, education practice and subject teaching or didactics.

Education Inquiry welcomes research from a variety of methodological and theoretical approaches, and invites studies that make the nature and use of educational research the subject of inquiry. Comparative and country-specific studies are also welcome.

Education Inquiry readers include educators, researchers, teachers and policy makers in various cultural contexts.

Every issue of Education Inquiry publishes peer-reviewed articles in one, two or three different sections. *Open section*: Articles sent in by authors as part of regular journal submissions and published after a blind review process. *Thematic section*: Articles reflecting the theme of a conference or workshop and published after a blind review process. *Invited section*: Articles by researchers invited by Education Inquiry to shed light on a specific theme or for a specific purpose and published after a review process.

Education Inquiry is a continuation of the Journal of Research in Teacher Education, which is available in printed copies as well as electronic versions and free access at <http://www.use.umu.se/forskning/publikationer/lof/>

Editors:

Per-Olof Erixon
Linda Rönnberg

The editorial board

Professor Marie Brennan, School of Education, UniSA, Australia
Professor Bernard Cornu, Directeur de la Formation – CNED, Directeur de CNED-EIFAD, France
Professor David Hamilton, Umeå University, Sweden
Professor Brian Hudson, University of Dundee, UK
Professor Gloria Ladson-Billings, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA
Professor Martin Lawn, University of Edinburgh, UK
Assistant Professor Eva Lindgren, Umeå University, Sweden
Assistant Professor Linda Rönnberg, Umeå University, Sweden
Professor Kirk Sullivan, Umeå University, Sweden
Professor Gaby Weiner, University of Edinburgh, UK
Professor Pavel Zgaga, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Language Editor

Murray Bales, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Guidelines for Submitting Articles

See Education Inquiry's homepage: <http://www.use.umu.se/english/research/educationinquiry>

Send Manuscripts to: EducationInquiry.Editor@adm.umu.se

©2012 The Authors. ISSN online 2000-4508

Faculty Members' Understanding of Teaching Efficacy Criteria

Vali Mehdinezhad

Abstract

This study examines university teaching and aims to understand more about university faculty members' sense of teaching efficacy criteria in the hope of providing insights for future strategies in faculty development training programme universities and colleges. This study uses a descriptive and correlational survey. The population of this study was all faculty members at four state universities in Sistan and Baluchestan Province in Iran. The research instrument for the study was a questionnaire called the Faculty Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (FTSE). The findings showed that the faculty members felt efficacious in their work in the following criteria: communication skills, assessment, subject matter, curriculum and instruction, learning environment, and implementing technology. In other words, the faculty members rated their teaching efficacy in all criteria as good. The study also found a relatively high positive correlation between criteria of teaching efficacy, and some significant differences for faculty members with different backgrounds. For example, faculty members with more than 20 years' experience had a good assessment of skills in comparison with other groups. Faculty members in the education discipline had greater efficacy than their counterparts in some or even all dimensions of teaching efficacy.

Keywords: teaching efficacy, university teaching, faculty members

Introduction

Iran is an important country in the Middle East. With a population of 63 million and a GDP of US\$ 115 billion, it is the second most populous country and second largest economy in the region. It is also the second largest OPEC oil producer and has the world's second largest gas reserves. Iran is progressively emerging from a long period of uncertainty and instability marked by the destructive war with Iraq, internal post-revolutionary strife, international isolation and deep economic instability. Iran is currently in the midst of a major process of economic re-orientation, and an important evolution of its social and institutional system. In March 2000, the Parliament approved the third Five-Year Development Plan (FYDP) which provided broad directions for a wide-ranging programme of economic reforms and social priorities over the periods of 2000 to 2005. Since then noticeable progress has been made in implementing this reform programme.

* Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Sistan and Baluchestan, Zahedan, Iran.
E-mail: mehdinezhad@gmail.com

©Author. ISSN 2000-4508, pp.49–69

Most higher education institutions pursue a mission of teaching, research, extension and service, while their major focus varies according to the nature of the particular institution. It seems that teaching, research and publications are the main expectations. Teaching efficacy refers to a judgment about capabilities to influence student engagement and learning (Woolfolk Hoy, 2004). Teacher competence in teaching efficacy is defined as a teacher's ability to deal adequately with the demands of the teaching profession using an integrated set of knowledge, skills and attitudes as manifested in both the performance of the teacher and reflection on his or her performance. In other words, professional competencies are the systems of knowledge, skills, abilities and motivational disposition which provide the effective realisation of professional teaching activities. Various authors (for example, Grosso de Leon, 2001; Reynolds & Muijs, 1992; Jegede et al., 2000; Borko & Putnam, 1995; Murray & Porter, 1996; Darling-Hammond, 1997; NCTAF, 1996, 2003; NCES, 2000d; Mitchell, 2001; Hermann, 2002; Rosenthal & Ogden, 1998; Räsänen & Sunnari, 2000; Brusling, 2005; Haynes, 1998; Hostetler, 1997) have proposed different kinds of skills, knowledge, dispositions and values in which effective teachers must be proficient. They include: subject matters or content knowledge; curriculum and instruction knowledge (pedagogy); interaction or communication competencies; evaluation of learning or assessment; knowledge of the learning environment and knowledge and skills regarding how to implement technology in the curriculum. In the following these factors are elaborated further.

Subject matter knowledge

Research on teaching and on teacher knowledge reveals ways in which teachers' understandings affect their students' opportunities to learn and that knowledge of the subject is very important to teaching (Passe, 1999). Shulman's (1986) three categories of content knowledge, subject matter content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and curricular content knowledge are at the heart of much of the current inquiry. Many researchers (Carpenter et al, 1989; Grossman, 1990) suggest that teaching in new ways, in ways focused on understanding, is highly dependent on the teacher's own understanding and conception of the subject matter. Teachers cannot be expected to know every little fact in science and there are advantages for having a "big picture" rather than an array of unconnected details.

Consistent with common belief, several studies showed a positive connection between teachers' subject matter preparation and both higher student achievement and higher ratings on teacher performance evaluations, particularly in mathematics, science, and reading (Darling-Hammond 1999a and 1999b, Goldhaber & Brewer 2000). Another study, Monk and King (1994), finds both positive and negative, generally insignificant effects of teachers' subject matter preparation on student achievement.

In addition there are other studies of the effects of subject matter preparation (Adams, 1998; Ball, 1990a & 1990b; Borko et al, 1992; McDiarmid & Wilson, 1991; Stoddart et al, 1993; Wilson, 1994). These studies suggest that the subject matter

preparation that prospective teachers currently receive is inadequate for teaching toward high subject matter standards, by anyone's definition. It appears that prospective teachers may have mastered basic skills but lack the deeper conceptual understanding necessary when responding to student questions and extending lessons beyond the basics (Wilson et al., 2002).

Curriculum and instruction

According to Curtis (1998:46), all teachers use curriculum and instructional techniques to integrate theory with practice, academic and workforce education, professional education and subject matter, and learning theory and workforce preparation. Research indicates dozens of activities that all teachers can use to help students with their school-to-work transition. Examples include involving students in organised workplace experiences, linking up with employers and the community, and including workplace representatives in school curriculum and instruction activities. If teachers want to be more successful in organising and conducting school-to-work programmes they must develop new talents that extend beyond their current capabilities. Examples of these talents include being willing to change along with technological advances, understanding the many needs of employers and the community, having knowledge of curriculum and instructional techniques coupled with knowledge of school-based learning that goes beyond specific teaching areas.

Curriculum and instruction are central to educational improvement, constituting the what, how and why of teaching and learning. The study of curriculum and instruction not only entails content, methodology and assessment but also entails an understanding of why curriculum and instruction are important in affecting change both within and outside of schools. Instruction is the creation and implementation of purposefully developed plans for the teaching of curriculum content. It is what teachers often concisely refer to as "planning" and "teaching". Moore (2002:2-3) says that while a school's curriculum consists of the "total experience", instruction can be more narrowly defined as the strategies selected and implemented by the teacher to deliver the intended curriculum. Teachers need to know district expectations regarding planned curriculum and instruction in order to implement the written curriculum successfully. Teachers need to provide knowledge in a professionally meaningful manner, include different contexts and scenarios as well as work with authentic problems, and use assessment to drive and improve learning (Chambers & Glassman, 1997; Van et al., 2000; Kaufman, 2003; Friedman Ben-David, 2000). Education specialists believe that the success of educational reform depends on teachers' ability to continually renew curriculum and instruction, the core of educational practice.

According to Hiebert et al. (2007), the goal of teaching is to support student learning. It is hard to imagine teachers becoming more effective over time without being able to analyse teaching in terms of its effects on student learning. What did students learn, and how and why did the instruction influence such learning? How can les-

sons based on this information be revised to be more effective when teaching them the next time? They also state that two quite different kinds of knowledge, skills and dispositions or competencies contribute to the analytic expertise required to study and improve teaching. According to them, the first kind of competence is subject matter knowledge for teaching. This refers to the kind of subject matter knowledge needed to unpack the content learning goals for students, to understand students' thinking about the subject, to simplify the complex ideas of the subject in ways that sustain the integrity of the subject, to represent ideas in accessible ways for students, to pose key questions and problems, and so on. Many researchers (e.g. Ball, 1999; Ball & Bass, 2000; Ma, 1999; Sherin, 2002) have extended these ideas in their own studies.

Communication skills

The importance of communication skills is widely accepted for educators, whether they be administrators or teachers. A teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, non-verbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom. The first stage of a teacher education course normally begins with a period of classroom observation during which student teachers are invited to focus on certain aspects of teaching technique, e.g. classroom organization, use of voice, methods of presentation of material. The consideration of questioning skills and techniques may also be included. Work on developing communication skills focuses upon the use of key words, becoming a good listener, and giving constructive, helpful feedback (Hughes, 1999). Case studies of high-wage companies also state that essential skills for future workers include problem-solving, working in groups and the ability to communicate effectively (Murane & Levy, 1996). Rosenthal and Ogden (1998) found that of the 383 who responded, 64.8 percent agreed with the statement: "Greater emphasis should be placed on communication skills", suggesting that the majority of students valued learning communication skills. However, response rates varied according to the year of training. For example, first, second and fourth-year students had higher response rates (89.3, 78.6 and 88.8 percent, respectively) than third- and fifth-year students (65.4 and 54.2 percent, respectively). This suggests that the findings may not be generalisable to a wider population of third and fifth-year students. The findings of Rees and Garrud (2001) showed that some medical students had positive attitudes to learning communication skills. They also thought that communication skills were lifelong skills and helped them to work in teams. Finally, these findings suggested that learning communication skills was valued and that many students wanted more. Duncombe & Yinger (1999:91) pointed out that as organisational and systemic competence become more important in carrying out the work of teaching and learning, "communication, collaboration, and interdisciplinary and interprofessional conceptualizations and actions become increasingly necessary".

According to Andrew et al. (2005:69), teachers are generally expected to be able to do the following: Clearly and cogently present information; give clear explanations;

help students put their ideas into words; help students improve their communication skills; help students understand the meaning of written language; provide apt analogies to assist learning; communicate well with parents both in speech (be “well spoken”) and in writing and communicate effectively with administrators.

Assessment skills

Assessment is the systematic collection, review and use of information to increase students' learning and development. Educators use the results of tests and other assessments to monitor the progress of students, diagnose their needs and make instructional plans. Assessment can also be used to provide information about the quality of programmes, schools and districts that are providing education and training. Several authors have argued there are a number of essential assessment concepts, principles, techniques and procedures that teachers need to know about (e.g. Calfee & Masuda, 1997; Cizek, 1997; McMillan, 2001; Sanders & Vogel, 1993; Schafer, 1991; Stiggins & Conklin, 1992), yet there continues to be relatively little emphasis on assessment in the preparation or professional development of teachers and administrators. In addition to the admonitions of many authors, there are established professional standards for assessing the skills of teachers (STCEAS, 1990). The purpose can be formative assessment and assessment for learning. The latter is based on a student-involved approach to classroom assessment and has been well documented by Guskey (2003), Stiggins (2002, 2001) and others. Formative assessment refers to the feedback provided by teachers during the formation stage of learning to check on student learning outcomes (Black et al., 2004). Gronlund and Cameron (2004:14) emphasise the importance of formative assessment where the purpose is to “monitor learning progress and to provide corrective prescriptions to improve learning”. Some literature on teachers' classroom assessment practices points out that the principles and practices inherent in assessment reform need elaboration and development beyond generally accepted practices (McMillan, 2003; Brookhart, 2003). Further, literature on classroom assessment has delineated the content domain in which teachers need to develop assessment skills (e.g., Airasian, 1994; Carey, 1994; O'Sullivan & Chalnack, 1991; Schafer, 1991; Stiggins, 1992, 1997). Finally, Boston (2002), Rolheiser and Ross (2000) and others have emphasised the value of training and professional development for teachers to help them better understand and implement effective practices that are important elements of assessment.

Learning environment

One of the most important things a teacher can provide their students with is a learning environment in which they feel comfortable. Teachers should create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. Learning environment research has provided a useful focus in evaluations of educational innovations (Fisher et al., 2001; Fraser & Maor, 2000;

Maor & Fraser, 1996; Newby & Fisher, 1997; Teh & Fraser, 1995; Zandvliet, 2003; Jegede et al., 1995; Taylor & Maor, 2000; Walker, 2002). Past research has found links between classroom environments and student outcomes (Fraser, 1994, 1998a; Goh et al., 1995). Technology in the school is one of the best resources that allow students to become actively engaged in the learning process (Aldridge et al., 2003; Trinidad et al., 2001). Such research has shown that students' outcomes are likely to be better when the actual learning environment more closely matches their preferred learning environment (Aldridge et al., 2003; Fraser, 1998b, 1999). An important factor in creating a positive learning environment is classroom management. Teachers should manage their time and resources in the most efficient way possible. To create a positive learning environment, teachers should access any and every resource possibly provided by the school or community they teach in.

Educational technology

In reviewing the literature, the term educational technology tends to be implicitly defined. Ely in 1995 updated (2000:1) wrote that "educational technology is a term widely used in the field of education ... but it is often used with different meanings.... Educational technology properly refers to a particular approach to achieving the ends of education". This definition, like others found in the literature, can be seen as focusing on processes for teaching and learning as much as they are about pieces of hardware or software.

Educational technology, especially the use of computers and associated information technology, is rapidly solidifying a prominent role in education. The computer has the capacity to be employed for instance as a cognitive tool (Salomon et al., 1991), a memory tool (Swan, 1996), a motivational tool (Means & Olson, 1995b), a communication tool (Doucette, 1994), or a project support tool (Marx et al., 1997). Understanding the range of possibilities, the appropriate applications and the relevant pedagogical strategies requires an array of knowledge on the part of the teacher. This knowledge can be acquired from a variety of sources. For both student teachers and mentor teachers, the sharing of knowledgeable educational technology in the context of the student teaching placement may be a contributor to professional development (Easdown, 1994). Preservice teachers have reported that their student teaching experience is a very consequential portion of the teacher preparation process (Dowrick, 1997). Their classroom experience, subject matter knowledge, and familiarity with particular teaching settings cause them to be viewed as a respected source of knowledge for the student teacher.

According to Margerum-Leys (2004:423-424), the sharing of knowledge is important for teacher preparation and development generally; it may be especially important in the acquisition of educational technology knowledge. Educational technology is an area in which mentor teachers are eager to access content knowledge held by student teachers. Mentor teachers view student teachers by virtue of their relative youth as

members of a generation that holds more knowledge of technology than they themselves do. They also perceive that student teachers' teacher education coursework will have contained more educational technology information than their own coursework (Lundeberg et al., 2001; Margerum-Leys & Marx, 2000). An additional motivation for studying the knowledge of teachers regarding technology is that the role of educational technology, especially computers in education, is changing rapidly. In the early days of computer use in education, computers were thought to be useful for teaching logic through programming (Papert, 1993). Subsequently, there was a conceptualisation of computers as standalone information processing and document production tools. More recently, the computer has been thought of as a communication tool; computers are now used and viewed as portals to an ever-expanding array of information through electronic mail and the World Wide Web (Jonassen et al., 2000; Tiene & Ingram, 2001). Parallel to these changes in our perceptions of the utility of technology has been a steady movement towards more student-centered learning environments and activities. This has implications for the preparation and development of teachers. To use technology in ways that are congruent with our current understandings of teaching and learning as well as of technology itself, teachers need to be familiar with an expanding variety of pedagogical techniques (Forcier, 1999; Jonassen et al., 2000; Marx et al., 1997; Mergendoller, 1996).

The use of technology in an appropriate manner can actually enhance the learning process. Technology can play a vital role in helping students meet higher standards and perform at increased levels by promoting alternative, innovative approaches to teaching and learning (George, 2000). A review of the literature shows that teachers must be effective users of information and educational technology (Allen, 2001; Davidson et al., 2000; Dwyer, 1994; McNabb et al., 1999; Nevens et al., 2001; US Department of Education Study, 2003; Brennan, 2000). Since it is believed that instructional technology can improve the quality and quantity of teaching and student learning, technologies are described as essential tools of the teaching trade (Sandholtz et al., 1997). In terms of research into these developments, issues concerning technological literacy (Gabriner & Mery, 1998), interface design (Wild and Stoney, 1998), software adaptability (Stahl et al., 1995), professional development (Schrum, 1995) and the cost-effectiveness of educational technology (Bacsich & Ash, 2000) are abundant and well represented. Many studies have investigated teachers' attitudes to the use of technology and their anxiety about using technology. These studies are particularly important because a teacher's attitude to computers and related technologies can positively or negatively influence their students' attitudes to technology (Sheingold & Hadley, 1990). Finally, as reported by Green and Staley (2000), technologies such as computer conferencing systems can provide an effective learning tool if they attend to constructing a safe context and interpersonal rapport. It is a challenge to design educational systems where technology is in the service of, values and supports diverse learner and learning contexts (Wise et al., 1997; Vannatta & Beyerbach, 2000;

Yildirim & Kiraz, 1999; Bryant, 2001; Hasselbring et al., 2000; NCATE, 1997; McCoy, 2001). According to Howey (1996), practitioner preparation programmes should not underestimate the power of modern communications technology for learning to teach. Technology must be integrated into the classroom and the practitioner preparation programme so that it acts as a facilitator of quality education. Shields and Behrman (2000) proposed that the most effective use of technology in classrooms is as a tool for accessing information and interpreting, organising and representing personal knowledge. These are the types of activities that empower children to play active roles in the emerging digital world, not merely to navigate in it. In the area of teacher preparation, Sosniak (1990) suggested better use of alternative instructional technologies, e.g., the Internet, for the development of subject matter and professional knowledge. The relationship between perceived teaching efficacies among faculty members is still unknown. Without information about this teaching development may not meet the teaching goals. This study examines university teaching and aims to understand more about university faculty members' sense of teaching efficacy in the hope of providing insights for future strategies in faculty development training programme universities and colleges. In fact, this research tries to answer these questions: How do faculty members rate their teaching efficacy? Is there any correlation between the factors of teaching efficacy? Are there significant differences between teaching efficacy and faculty members' characteristics?

Method

This study uses a descriptive and correlational survey. The population of the study was all faculty members at four state universities in Sistan and Baluchestan Province in Iran. From the existing population, the researcher sampled 300 faculty members out of the target population. The simple random sampling technique was used to select the subjects. Of the 300 possible respondents contacted by e-mail, 231 responded to the survey and of the 231 respondents, the data of 215 samples was usable. The research instrument for the study was a questionnaire called the Faculty Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (FTSE) by Chang et al. (2006) and revised and developed by author. The questionnaire was made up of two sections, with the first section containing 4 items about demographic and other background information (Table 1) and second section including faculty members' self-ratings of their teaching efficacy (35 items) clustered around six teaching self-efficacy factors: subject matter or content knowledge (5 items); curriculum and instruction knowledge (10 items); interaction or communication competencies (5 items); evaluation of learning or assessment (5 items); knowledge of the learning environment (5 items); and knowledge and skills regarding how to implement technology in the curriculum (5 items). The FTSE scale was rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5 points) to strongly disagree (1 point). The questionnaire was designed and validated with regard to its contents and face values. The reliability of the test battery was estimated by Cronbach's

alphas. Table 2 reports summary measures of reliability for all scales and six teaching self-efficacy factors. SPSS 15 was used to produce the Mean; Standard Deviations; Pearson's Product Moment Correlation (r); T-test; one-way analysis of variance, and post-hoc Bonferroni test.

Table 1 Summary of faculties' background (N=215)

<i>Background</i>		<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Male	186	86.5
	Female	29	13.5
Teaching Experience	1 - 10	70	32.6
	11 - 15	51	23.7
	16 - 20	50	23.3
	21 - 25	20	9.3
	26 - Over	24	11.2
Rank	Lecture	60	27.9
	Assistant	136	63.3
	Associate and Professor	19	8.8
Discipline	Technical and Engineering	38	17.7
	Science	50	23.3
	Humanities	109	50.7
	Education	18	8.4

Table 2. Summary measures of reliability

<i>Factors</i>	<i>No. of Items</i>	<i>Cronbach's Alpha</i>
subject matter or content knowledge	5	.81
curriculum and instruction knowledge (pedagogy)	10	.93
interaction or communication competencies	5	.90
evaluation of learning or assessment	5	.72
knowledge of the learning environment	5	.86
implementing technology in the curriculum	5	.89
Total	35	.93

Findings and discussion

Question 1: How faculty members rate their teaching efficacy?

The findings in table 3 indicate that the respondents rated their teaching efficacy in all factors as good. The ranges of the means of teaching self-efficacy factors were 3.91 to 4.25 (5-point scale). The orders of means from high to low for these six factors are communication, assessment, subject matters, curriculum and instruction, learning environment, and to implement technology, respectively.

Table 3 Mean and standard deviation of faculty members' teaching self efficacy (N=215)

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Min.</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. D.</i>	<i>Rank</i>
subject matter	1.00	5.00	4.1116	.82971	3
curriculum and instruction	2.00	5.00	4.0000	.68359	4
communication competencies	2.00	5.00	4.2512	.73763	1
assessment	2.00	5.00	4.1302	.69158	2
learning environment	2.00	5.00	3.9721	.78488	5
implementing technology	2.00	5.00	3.9163	.81600	6
Total	2.00	5.00	4.2372	.65888	-

Question2: Is there any correlation between factors of teaching efficacy?

Table 4 shows there was relatively high positive correlation between factors of teaching efficacy. The highest correlation was between communication competences and curriculum and instruction ($r=.867$), to implement technology and learning environment ($r=.834$), and lowest correlation was between learning environment and subject matters ($r=.385$).

Table 4 Correlation between factors of teaching efficacy (N=215)

<i>Factors</i>	<i>SM</i>	<i>CI</i>	<i>CC</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>LE</i>
subject matter	1				
curriculum and instruction	.489(**)				
communication competencies	.502(**)	.867(**)			
assessment	.434(**)	.479(**)	.499(**)		
learning environment	.385(**)	.611(**)	.605(**)	.416(**)	
implementing technology	.473(**)	.713(**)	.761(**)	.480(**)	.834(**)

**P < .01

Question 3: Are there significant differences between faculty members' teaching efficacy by gender, teaching experience, rank, and discipline?

Q 3.1 Male and female faculty members

The ranges of the self-efficacy scores were in the 3.90 - 4.25 for male faculty members, and 3.93 – 4.27 for female faculty members. In fact, male and female university educators scored their teaching efficacy in high level. The lowest and highest teaching self efficacy for males was to implement technology and communication competences and for females was assessment and subject matters, respectively. (Table 5)

Table 5 Mean, standard deviation, and t-test of teaching efficacy by Gender (N=215)

Factors	Male N = 186		Female N = 29		t df(213)
	M	SD	M	SD	
subject matter	4.086	.8466	4.275	.7018	-1.147
curriculum and instruction	4.000	.6896	4.000	.6546	.000
communication competencies	4.252	.7538	4.241	.6355	.077
assessment	4.161	.6864	3.931	.7036	1.675
learning environment	3.973	.7741	3.965	.8653	.048
implementing technology	3.903	.8129	4.000	.8451	-.593
Total	4.236	.6641	4.241	.6355	-.037

P > .05

Q 3.2 Faculty members with different years of teaching experiences

As shown in table 6, there was significant difference between faculty members with different years of teaching experience on factor of assessment. In fact, faculty members with more than 20 years of experience have had good assessment skill in comparison with other groups (M=4.30). The post hoc Bonferroni test comparisons revealed this difference. There were no significance differences between groups in other factors.

Table 6 Mean, standard deviation, and analysis of variance of teaching efficacy by years of teaching experiences (N=215)

Factors	1 - 10 N = 70		11 - 15 N = 51		16 - 20 N = 50		21 - 25 N = 20		26 - Over N = 24		F df (4,210)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
subject matter	4.157	.6051	4.156	1.065	3.900	.8391	4.100	.8522	4.333	.7613	1.342
curriculum and instruction	4.000	.6370	3.902	.7281	4.020	.6223	4.150	.8750	4.041	.6902	.531
communication competencies	4.357	.6601	4.196	.8251	4.200	.670	4.300	.923	4.125	.740	.686
assessment	4.185	.5969	3.862	.8004	4.180	.6907	4.350	.745	4.250	.531	2.866(*)
learning environment	3.928	.6878	4.058	.8345	3.900	.8144	3.950	.887	4.083	.829	.435
implementing technology	3.928	.6878	3.843	.924	3.980	.7690	3.950	.944	3.875	.9469	.203
Total	4.214	.5354	4.196	.7216	4.260	.6327	4.400	.882	4.208	.7210	.398

P > .05 *P < .05

Q 3.3 Faculty members with different rank

There was significant difference between faculty members with different rank on factor of learning environment. The post hoc Bonferroni test comparisons revealed that assistant professors (M=4.06) had higher score than associate and full professors (M=3.58) on teaching efficacy of learning environment. There were no significance differences between groups in other factors.

Table 7 Mean, standard deviation, and analysis of variance of teaching efficacy by rank (N=215)

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Lecture</i> <i>N = 60</i>		<i>Assistant</i> <i>N = 136</i>		<i>Associate & Full</i> <i>N = 19</i>		<i>F</i> <i>df(2, 212)</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
subject matter	4.033	.9736	4.169	.7359	3.947	.9703	.966
curriculum and instruction	3.933	.7333	4.058	.6296	3.789	.8549	1.701
communication competencies	4.266	.8410	4.286	.6656	3.947	.8481	1.796
assessment	4.150	.7089	4.139	.6685	4.000	.8165	.372
learning environment	3.900	.7059	4.058	.7675	3.578	1.0173	3.550(*)
implementing technology	3.833	.8060	4.000	.7793	3.578	1.0173	2.691
Total	4.283	.6911	4.250	.6055	4.000	.8819	1.409

P > .05 *P < .05

Q 3.4 Faculty members with different discipline

As shown in table 8, faculty members from the discipline of education scored highest on the teaching efficacy scale respectively with the four factors and, consequentially highest with the overall score. In terms of statistical significance, education's faculty members had higher score than those from technical and engineering and humanities on curriculum and instruction, assessment, learning environment, use of technology, and the total score. The post hoc Bonferroni test comparisons revealed these differences. However, there was no significance difference between groups in communication competences, but faculty members of education had highest score than other groups. There were no significance differences between discipline groups in subject matters and communication competences factors. The finding also showed that faculty members of technical and engineering had high score in subject matters in comparison with other groups.

Table 8 Mean, standard deviation, and analysis of variance of teaching efficacy by discipline (N=215)

<i>Factors</i>	<i>Tech & Eng</i> <i>N = 38</i>		<i>Science</i> <i>N = 50</i>		<i>Humanities</i> <i>N = 109</i>		<i>Education</i> <i>N = 18</i>		<i>F</i> <i>df(3, 211)</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
subject matter	4.263	.8280	4.140	.7287	4.073	.9098	3.944	.5393	.760
curriculum and instruction	3.868	.5775	4.120	.6892	3.935	.7107	4.333	.5940	2.799(*)
communication competencies	4.184	.6516	4.380	.6966	4.165	.7878	4.555	.6157	2.163
assessment	4.157	.5939	4.380	.6966	4.027	.6999	4.410	.6859	3.312(*)
learning environment	3.789	.8106	4.080	.8290	3.908	.7520	4.444	.6157	3.536(*)
implementing technology	3.605	.7897	4.000	.8571	3.908	.7997	4.388	.6076	4.213(**)
Total	4.131	.6645	4.280	.6401	4.211	.6676	4.500	.6183	1.416

P > .05 *P < .05 **P < .005

This study has confirmed that the faculty members felt efficacious in order of importance, in the following areas: communication, assessment, subject matters, curriculum and instruction, learning environment, and to implement technology. This study has also found relatively high positive correlation between factors of teaching efficacy,

and some significant differences for faculty members with different backgrounds. In this study, faculty members with more than 20 years of experience have had good assessment skill in comparison with other groups. It seems that most of the new faculty members are learning about teaching by teaching, specifically in the areas of curriculum and instruction (pedagogy). This study revealed that assistant professors had higher score than associate and full professors on teaching efficacy of learning environment. Traditionally most of higher education institutes emphasize the importance of research and publication when they evaluate, and promote professors. Maybe for this reason, the faculty members with higher rank don't pay attention more to their teaching. Faculty members in the education discipline had higher efficacy than their counterparts in some or even all dimensions of teaching efficacy, because they have a good knowledge of whatever educators need to teach.

It can suggest that supervision and evaluation center at the universities should create workshop spaces where faculty members with various experiences to share their teaching and learning excitements and concerns. The supervision and evaluation center should position them as working with faculty members to work through the difficulties emerged in their teaching, rather than teaching faculty members how to teach. Continuous professional development is a catalyst for professional growth as it increases curiosity, motivation, and educators' knowledge about their professions. It will supply best practices, new ways of thinking, and problem solving skills that empower them. Overall, it will improve the quality of schools and prepare and support educators to help all students achieve high standards of learning and development (Moore, 2000). The quality of professional development programs for teachers depends on the content characteristics, process variables, and context characteristics. Content refers to what will be included in professional development activities (Guskey, 2000; Sparks & Hirsh, 1997; Sparks, 2000; Ganser, 2000; Reed, 2000; Inquiry and National Education Standards, 2000). Process refers to how activities are planned, organized, carried, and followed up (Ganser, 2000; McCarthy & Riley, 2000; National Staff Development Council, NPEAT, 2000; Cobb, 2000). The context of professional development refers to the organization, system, and culture in which the professional development activities are implemented (Guskey, 2000; NCES, 1998; Ganser, 2000; NPEAT, 2000; Villa et al, 1996). Overall, they improve the quality of schools and prepare and support educators to help all students achieve high standards of learning and development (Moore, 2000).

In summary, the professional development of teachers is a key factor in ensuring that reforms at any level are effective. Successful professional development opportunities for teachers have a significant positive effect on students' performance and learning. Thus, when the goal is to increase students' learning and to improve their performance, the professional development of teachers should be considered a key factor, and this at the same time must be featured as an element of a larger reform. With regard to possibilities for future studies, there are other factors that might shape

how teachers think about their ability to perform the task of teaching. It is encourages future researcher to study about what teachers believe to be their capability in some dimensions of teaching might be at variance with what they are really able to teach. The link between teachers' conceptions of teaching efficacy and their teaching practices could be confirmed by direct observation in future studies.

Vali Mehdinezhad received his B.A. in educational planning & management from Shiraz University (1991) and M.A. in educational planning from University of Isfahan (1993) in the Iran. He has received his PhD in educational sciences at the University of Turku (2008) in the Finland. Currently, he is an assistant professor at the Department of Education, Faculty of Education and Psychology, University of Sistan and Baluchestan.

References

- Airasian, P. W. (1994) *Classroom assessment*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Aldridge, J. et al. (2003) *Monitoring the Success of an Outcomes-Based, Technology-Rich Learning Environment*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, Chicago, IL.
- Allen, R. (2001) *Technology and Learning: How Schools Map Routes to Technology's Promised Land*. ASCD Curriculum Update, 1–3, 6–8.
- Andrew, Michael D., Cobb, Casey D., Giampietro, Peter J. (2005) Verbal ability and teacher effectiveness. *Journal of Teacher Education* 56(4), 343–354
- Bacsich, P. and Ash, C. (2000) Costing the lifecycle of networked learning: Documenting the costs from conception to evaluation, *Association of Learning Technology Journal*, 8(1), 92–102.
- Ball, D. L. (1990a) The mathematical understandings that prospective teachers bring to teacher education. *The Elementary School Journal* 90, 449–466.
- Ball, D. L. (1990b) Prospective elementary and secondary teachers' understanding of division. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 21(2), 132–144.
- Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B. and Wiliam, D. (2004) Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom, *Phi Delta Kappan* 86(1), 13–22.
- Borko, H. and Putnam, R. T. (1995) Expanding a teacher's knowledge base: A cognitive psychological perspective on professional development. In T. R. Guskey and M. Huberman (eds.) *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms & Practices* (pp. 35–66). NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Boston, C. (2002) *The concept of formative assessment, Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*. Retrieved 23 March 2005 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=9>
- Brookhart, S. M. (2003) Developing measurement theory for classroom assessment purposes and uses, *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 22(4), 5–12.
- Brown, A. L., and Palinscar, A.-M. (1989) Guided cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition. In L. B. Resnick (ed.) *Knowing, Learning, and Instruction: Essays in Honor of Robert Glaser* (pp. 393–454). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum Associates.
- Brusling, C. (2005) *Professional Ethics in Teacher Education: Students' Expectations and Experiences*. Centre for the Study of Professions. Oslo University College.
- Bryant, G. D. (2001) Student-related management concerns. In B. J. Brown (ed.) *Management of the Business Classroom* (pp. 141–153), *National Business Education Yearbook*, No. 39. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association.
- Calfee, R. C., and Masuda, W. V. (1997) Classroom assessment as inquiry. In G. D. Phye (ed.) *Handbook of Classroom Assessment: Learning, Adjustment, and Achievement*. NY: Academic Press.
- Carey, L. M. (1994) *Measuring and Evaluating School Learning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Carpenter, T., Fennema, E., Peterson, P., and Carey, D. (1989) Teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of students' problem solving in elementary arithmetic. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education* 19(5), 385–401.
- Chambers DW, Glassman P. (1997) A primer on competency-based evaluation. *J Dent Educ.* 61:651–66.
- Chang, Te-Sheng, Lin, Huei-Hsuan and Song, Mei-Mei (2006) *College Faculty's Perceptions of their Teaching Efficacy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Australian Association for Research in Education held in Adelaide, Australia, 27–30 November 2006.

- Cizek, G. J. (1997) Learning, achievement, and assessment: Constructs at a crossroads. In G. D. Phye (ed.) *Handbook of Classroom Assessment: Learning, Adjustment, and Achievement*. NY: Academic Press.
- Cobb, J. (2000) The impact of a professional development school on pre-service teacher preparation, in-service teachers' professionalism, and children's achievement: Perceptions of in-service teachers. *Action in Teacher Education* 22(1), 64–76.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda (1999a) *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: A Review of State Policy Evidence*, Research Report, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda (1999b) *State Teaching Policies and Student Achievement*, Teaching Quality Policy Brief, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997) *The Right to Learn: A Blueprint for Creating Schools that Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977, pp. 294–7.
- Davison, L. J., Burr, D., Eberlein, J., Fuchs, D. J., Saucedo, L., Steffen, B. H. (May 2000) Building a technology foundation for future teachers, *Tech Trends* 44(4), 11–15.
- Doucette, D. (1994) Transforming teaching and learning using information technology: A report from the field. *Community College Journal* 65(2), 18–24.
- Duncombe, W. and Yinger, J. (1999) Performance standards and educational cost indexes: You can't have one without the other. In H.F. Ladd, R. Chalk and J.S. Hansen (eds.), *Equity and Adequacy in Education Finance: Issues and Perspectives* (pp. 260–297). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Dwyer, D. (1994) Apple classrooms of tomorrow: What we've learned. *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 51.
- Easdown, G. (1994) Student teachers, mentors and information technology. *Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education* 3(1), 63–78.
- Ely, D.P. (2000) The field of educational technology: Update 2000. A dozen frequently asked questions. ERIC Digest Clearinghouse on Information and Technology document # EDOIR-2000-01, pp. 1–4. <http://ericit.org/digests/EDO-IR-2000-01.shtml>
- Farr, J. (1997) Becoming a balanced teacher: Idealist goals, realist expectations. *English Journal* 86(6), 106–109.
- Fisher, D., Aldridge, J., Fraser, B. and Wood, D. (2001). *Development, Validation and Use of a Questionnaire to Assess Students' Perceptions of Outcomes-Focused, Technology-Rich Learning Environments*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, December, Perth, Western Australia. <http://www.aare.edu.au/oipap/fiso1028.htm>
- Forcier, R.C. (1999) *The Computer is an Education Tool* (2nd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ. Merrill/Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Fraser, B. J. and Maor, D. (2000) *A Learning Environment Instrument for Evaluating Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Constructivist Multimedia Learning Environments*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, April, New Orleans, LA.
- Fraser, B. J. (1994) Research on classroom and school climate. In D. Gabel (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Science Teaching and Learning* (pp. 493–541). New York: Macmillan.
- Fraser, B. J. (1998a) Science learning environments: Assessment, effects and determinants. In B. Fraser and K. Tobin (eds.) *International Handbook of Science Education* (pp. 527–564). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

- Fraser, B. J. (1998b) Classroom environment instruments: Development, validity and applications. *Learning Environment Research: An International Journal* 1, 7–33.
- Fraser, B. J. (1999) Using learning environment assessments to improve classroom and school climates. In H. J. Freiberg (ed.) *School Climate: Measuring, Improving and Sustaining Healthy Learning Environments* (pp. 65–83). London: Falmer Press.
- Friedman Ben-David M. (2000) The role of assessment in expanding professional horizons. *Med Teach*. 22, 472–7.
- Gabriner, R and Mery, P (1998) Technology Survey: Faculty Computer Expertise and Use of Instructional Technology, research report, City College of San Francisco Office of Research, Planning and Grants.
- Ganser, T. (2000) An ambitious vision of professional development for teachers. *NASSP Bulletin* 84, 6–12.
- George, P. (2000) Breaking ranks. *Principal Leadership* 1(4), 56–61.
- Goh, S., Young, D. and Fraser, B. J. (1995) Psychosocial climate and student outcomes in elementary mathematics classrooms: A multilevel analysis. *The Journal of Experimental Education* 43(1), 90–93.
- Goldhaber, D. and Brewer, D. (2000) Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 22(2), 129–145.
- Green, D. A., and Staley, A. (2000) *Using Information Technology in Traditional “Soft” Subjects*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Learning with Technology, “Does Technology Make a Difference?” Philadelphia, Temple University
- Gronlund, E. and Cameron, I. J. (2004) *Assessment of Student Achievement*. Toronto: Pearson.
- Grosso de Leon, A. (2001) *Higher Education’s Challenge: New Teacher Education Models for a New Century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation. Retrieved 1 October 2002 from <http://www.carnegie.org/pdf/teached.pdf>
- Guskey, T. R. (2003). *How Classroom Assessments Improve Learning*. Retrieved from www.ascd.org/publications/lead/200302/guskey.html
- Guskey, T. R. (2000) *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.
- Hasselbring, T. S., Smith, L., Glaser, C. W., Barron, L., Risko, V. J., Snyder, C. et al. (2000) *Literature Review: Technology to Support Teacher Development*, Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Haynes, F. (1998) *The Ethical School*. London: Routledge.
- Hermann, A. (2002) Teaching critical thinking online. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*. http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_mofcgs/is_2_29/ai_88761499/pg_1
- Hiebert, J., Morris, A.K., Berk, D., & Jansen, A. (2007). Preparing teachers to learn from teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education* , 58, 47–61
- Hostetler, K.D. (1997) *Ethical Judgment in Teaching*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Howey, K. (1996) Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In J. Sikula (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: A Project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (2nd ed.). (pp. 143–170). New York: Macmillan.
- Hughes, J. (1999) Improving communication skills in student music educators: a case study. *Music Education Research* 1(2), 227.
- Jegede, O., Fraser, B. and Fisher, D. (1995) The development and validation of a distance and open learning environment scale. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 43(1), 90–93.

- Jegede, O., Taplin, M., and Chan, S. (2000) Trainee teachers' perception of their knowledge about expert teaching. *Educational Research* 42(3), 287–308.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., and Stanne, M. B. (2000). *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis*. University of Minnesota, 60 Peik Hall, 159 Pillsbury Drive, S.E., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.
- Kaufman, D.M. (2003) Applying educational theory in practice. *BMJ* 326, 213–6.
- Maor, D. and Fraser, B. J. (1996) Use of classroom environment perceptions in evaluating inquiry-based computer assisted learning. *International Journal of Science Education* 18(4), 401–421.
- Margerum-Leys, J. (2004) The nature and sharing of teacher knowledge of technology in a student teacher/mentor teacher pair. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 01-11-04. http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-3055085/The-nature-and-sharing-of.html
- Margerum-Leys, J. and Marx, R. (2000) *Technology Knowledge in Student/Experienced Teacher Pairs*, New Orleans, Louisiana: Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P.C., Krajcik, J. S. and Soloway, E. (1997) Enacting project-based science: Challenges for practice and policy. *Elementary School Journal* 97, 341–358.
- Mayo, S. T. (1967) *Pre-Service Preparation of Teachers in Educational Measurement*. US Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, DC: Office of Education/Bureau of Research.
- McCarthy, J. and Riley, S. (2000) A new vision for teacher professional development. *Leadership* 30, 34–36.
- McCoy, R. W. (2001) Computer competencies for the 21st century information systems educator. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance* 19(2), 21–35.
- McDiarmid, G. W., and Wilson, S. W. (1991). An exploration of the subject matter knowledge of alternate route teachers: Can we assume they know their subject? *Journal of Teacher Education* 42(3), 93–103.
- McMillan, J. H. (2003) Understanding and improving teachers' classroom assessment decision-making. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 34–43.
- McMillan, J. H. (2001) *Essential Assessment Concepts for Teachers and Administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Publishing Company.
- McNabb, M., Hawkes, M. and Rouk, U. (1999) *Critical Issues in Evaluating the Effectiveness of Technology*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Educational Technology, Washington, DC.
- Mehralizadeh, Y. (2005) New Reforms in the Management of the University: Transition from Centralized to Decentralized (University-Based Management) in Iran. *Higher Education Policy* 18, 67–82. Doi: 10.1057
- Mergendoller, J. R. (1996) Moving from technological possibility to richer student learning: Revitalizing infrastructure and reconstructed pedagogy. Section 4: Grading the policymakers' solution. *Educational Researcher* 25(8), 43–45.
- Moore, K. (2002) Helping teachers build a challenging but achievable curriculum [Electronic version]. *Scholastic Early Childhood Today* 3–16.
- Moore, Janet C. (2002) Element of Quality: The Sloan-C Framework. *Learning Abstracts* 5(12). <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/learning/lelabs1202.html>
- Murane, R. and Levy, F. (1996) *Teaching the New Basic Skills*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Murray, Corry, (2002) Webcast Probes Meaning of “Scientifically-Based Research,” eSchool News. <http://www.eschoolnews.com/news/topnews/index.cfm?print&i=34767&CFID=942720&CFTOKEN=47613617>

- Murray, F. B., and Porter, A. (1996) Pathway from the liberal arts curriculum to lessons in the schools. In F. B. Murray (ed.) *Teacher Educator's Handbook: Building a Knowledge Base for the Preparation of Teachers* (pp. 155–178). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (1998) *Toward Better Teaching: Professional Development in 1993-94*. NCES 98230. Washington, D.C.: NCES. <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/teaching9394/index.html> [April, 2001].
- National Staff Development Council (2000) The National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching (NPEAT). Revisioning professional development. *Journal of Staff Development* 21, supp1-20.
- NCES (2000d). *Monitoring School Quality: An Indicators Report*. NCES 2001-030. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- NCTAF (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future) (1996) *What Matters Most: Teaching For America's Future*. New York: Author.
- NCTAF (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future) (2003) *No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Newby, M. and Fisher, D. (1997) An instrument for assessing the learning environment of a computer laboratory. *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 16(2), 179–190.
- NPEAT (2000) *Revisioning Professional Development: What Learner-Centered Professional Development Looks Like*. Oxford, OH: NAEP.
- O'Sullivan, R. G. and Chalnicks, M. K. (1991). Measurement-related course work requirements for teacher certification and recertification. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices* 10(1), 17–19.
- Papert, S. (1993) *The Children's Machine: Rethinking School in the Age of the Computer*. New York: Basic Books.
- Passe, J. (1999) *The Elementary School Curriculum* (2nd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Paul, R. (1982) Teaching critical thinking in the "strong" sense: A focus of self-deception, world views, and a dialectical mode of analysis. *Informal Logic* 4(2), 3–7.
- Reed, S.J. (2000) The importance of professional development for teachers. *Educational Horizons* 78(1), 117–118.
- Rees C.E. and Garrud P. (2001) Identifying undergraduate medical students' attitudes towards communication skills learning: a pilot study. *Med Teacher* 23, 400–6.
- Reis-Bergan, M. (2003) On the distinction between the scholarship of teaching and scholarly teaching. In W. Buskist, V. Hevern and G. W. Hill, IV (eds.). *Essays from Excellence in Teaching*, 2002 (Chap. 12). Retrieved 2011 from the Society for the Teaching of Psychology. <http://teachpsych.lemoyne.edu/teachpsych/eit/index.html>
- Reynolds, D. and Muijs, R.D. (1999) The effective teaching of mathematics: a review of research. *School Leadership and Management* 19(3), 273–88
- Rolheiser, C. and Ross, J. (2000) Student evaluation – What do we know? *Orbit* 30(4), 33–36.
- Rosenthal J. and Ogden J. (1998). Changes in medical education: The beliefs of medical students. *Med Educ.* 32, 127–32.
- Räsänen, R. and Sunnari, V. (2000). *Ethical Challenges for Teacher Education and Teaching*. Faculty of Education, University of Oulu, pp. 173–176
- Salomon, G. (1990) Cognitive effects with and of computer technology. *Communication Research* 17(1), 26–44.
- Sanders, J. R. and Vogel, S. R. (1993) The development of standards for teacher competence in educational assessment of students. In S. L. Wise (ed.) *Teacher Training in Measurement and Assessment Skills*, Lincoln, NB: Burros Institute of Mental Measurements.

- Sandholtz, J. H., Ringstaff, C. and Dwyer, D. C. (1997) *Teaching With Technology: Crating Student -Centered Classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press
- Schafer, W. D. (1991) Essential assessment skills in professional education of teachers. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 10(1), 3–6.
- Sheingold, K. and Hadley, M. (1990). *Accomplished Teachers: Integrating Computers Into Classroom Practice*. New York: Center for Technology in Education, Bank Street College of Education.
- Shields, M. K. and Behrman, R. E. (2000) Children and computer technology: Analysis and recommendations. In David and Lucille Packard Foundation (ed.), *The Future of Children: Children and Technology* (pp. 4–30). Los Altos, CA: The David and Lucille Packard Foundation.
- Shulman, L. S. (1986) Those who understand: knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher* 15(2), 4–14
- Sosniak, L. A. (1999) Professional and subject matter knowledge for teacher education. In G. A. Griffin (Ed.), *The education of teachers: Ninety-eighth yearbook of the National Society in the Study of Education* (pp. 184–204). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sparks, D. (2000) High Powered professional development for high poverty schools. *Principal Leadership*, 1(4), 26–29.
- Sparks, D. and Hirsh, S. (1997) *A New Vision of Staff Development*. Oxford, Ohio: National Staff Development Council.
- Stahl, G., Sumner, T., and Owen, R. (1995) Share globally, adapt locally: Software to create and distribute student-centered curriculum. *Computers and Education. Special Issue on Education and the Internet*. 24(3), 237–246. <http://gerrystahl.net/cscl/papers/cho5.pdf>
- Standards for Teacher competence in Educational Assessment of Students (1990) American Federation of Teachers, National Council on Measurement in Education, National Education Association. <http://www.unl.edu/buros/article3.html>
- Stiggins, R. J. (1992) High quality classroom assessment: What does it really mean? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 11(2), 35–39.
- Stiggins, R. J. (1997) *Student-centered classroom assessment* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2001) *Student-involved Classroom Assessment* 3rd edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Merrill-Prentice Hall
- Stiggins, R.J. (2002) Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 83(10), 758–765.
- Stiggins, R. J., & Conklin, N. F. (1992) *In teachers' hands: Investigating the practices of classroom assessment*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Stiggins, R. J. (2002). Assessment crisis: The absence of assessment for learning. *Phi Delta Kappan* 83(10), 758–765.
- Stiggins, R. J. and Conklin, N. F. (1992) *In Teachers' Hands: Investigating the Practices of Classroom Assessment*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Stoddart, T., Connell, M., Stofflett, R., & Peck, D. (1993) Reconstructing Elementary Teacher Candidates' Understanding of Mathematics and Science Content. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9(3): 229–241.
- Taylor, P. & Maor, D. (2000). Assessing the efficacy of online teaching with the Constructivist On-Line Learning Environment Survey. In A. Herrmann and M.M. Kulski (Eds.), *Flexible futures in tertiary teaching*. Proceedings 9th Annual Teaching Learning Forum, 2-4 February 2000. Perth: Curtin University of Technology. www.lsn.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2000/taylor.html

- Teh, G. P. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1995) Development and validation of an instrument for assessing the psychosocial environment of computer-assisted learning classrooms. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 12(2), 177-193.
- Tiene, D. & Ingram, A. (2001) Exploring current issues in educational technology. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Trinidad, S., Macnish, J., Aldridge, J., Fraser, B. & Wood, D. (2001) Integrating ICT into the learning environment at Sevenoaks Senior College: How teachers and students use educational technology in teaching and learning. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Perth, December. www.aare.edu.au/01pap/aldo1027.htm
- Van D. Vleuten CPM, Dolmans DHJM, Scherpbier AJJA. (2000) The need for evidence in education. *Med Teach*. 22(3), 246-50.
- Vannatta, R.A. and Beyerbach, B. (2000) Facilitating a constructivist vision of technology integration among education faculty and preservice teachers. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education* 33(2), 132-148.
- Villa, R.A., Thousand, J.S. and Chapple, J.W. (1996) Preparing teachers to support inclusion: Pre-service and in-service programs. *Theory into Practice* 35(1), 42-50.
- Walker, S. (2002) *Insight: Distance Education Learning Environments Survey* [viewed 10 Jan 2003, verified 15 Jan 2005] <http://insight.southcentralrtec.org/ilib/delesa/delesainfo.html>
- Wild, M. and Stoney, S. (1998) Motivation and interface design: maximizing learning opportunities. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* 14(1), 40-50.
- Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2002). Teacher preparation research: An insider's view from the outside. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(3), 190-204
- Wilson, T. D. (1994) Information needs and uses: fifty years of progress? In *Fifty Years Of Information Progress: A Journal Of Documentation Review*, edited by B.C. Vickery. London: Aslib. pp. 15-51
- Wise, A. E., Leibbrand, J. A. and Williams, B. C. (1997) NCATE's response to critical issues in teacher preparation. *Action in Teacher Education* 19, 1-6.
- Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2004) Self-efficacy in college teaching. *Essays on Teaching Excellence: Toward the Best in the Academy* 15, 8-11. Fort Collins, CO: The POD Network.
- Yildirim, S. and Kiraz, E. (1999). Obstacles to integration of on-line communication tools into pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education* 15 (3), 23-28.
- Zandvliet, D. (2003) *Learning environments in Malaysian "Smart School" classrooms*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April, Chicago.

