

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONAL SELF-ESTEEM OF
TEXAS TEACHER EDUCATORS

by

BENESHA BHOLAN

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2013

Copyright © by Benesha Bholan 2013

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincerest appreciation to my dissertation committee, Dr. Jim Hardy, Dr. John Smith, and Dr. Lewis Wasserman. Your time, input, and support helped me make it through this tedious, yet immensely rewarding journey. I especially want to express my gratitude to Dr. Jim Hardy, my committee chairperson. If not for your guidance, continuous assistance, and words of encouragement, I would have never finished what I started. Thank you Dr. Hardy for helping me to believe in myself and my abilities.

I would also like to thank my many friends and family members for their unwavering support. I will always remember cohort one and the times we spent getting to know each other. Thanks for challenging me to be better every day. I want to thank Tricia Alford for her time and technological expertise which made so many time consuming tasks much easier for me. Thank you to my parents, Jean and Deoram, and my sister Sharon for your love, never ending prayers, encouragement, and belief in me. I would like to thank my sister Ruth and her family for showing me what strength and perseverance really mean. The time and effort it took to make it through this process was nothing compared to what my beautiful ten year old niece, Faith Rose Lautzenheiser, went through in her fight against cancer. Thank you Faith for living up to your name and for changing my outlook on life for the better. We all miss you and love you so much.

I want to make a special thank you to my wife Kirsten and our two daughters, Isabella and Lilliana, for their patience and understanding throughout this journey. Thank you Kirsten for always being my number one supporter and best friend. I am so thankful for you and would never have been able to do this without you. Thank you Isabella and Lilliana for making me feel so loved with your hugs and kisses. It is such a blessing to be your Dad. Please don't be in a

hurry to grow up! Thank you for the sacrifices all three of you have made. I love you more than you could ever know.

Finally, thank you to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. You know the struggles I have had and the prayers I have made. Thank you for teaching me to have patience, humility and faith. I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.

November 18, 2013

Abstract

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONAL SELF-ESTEEM OF
TEXAS TEACHER EDUCATORS

Benesha Bholan, PhD

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2013

Supervising Professor: James Hardy

Increased pressures from a multitude of sources have directly impacted all educational institutions. A predicted shortage of qualified teachers over the next decade means it is crucial that new teachers remain in the profession and are well prepared to deal with the challenges that await them. Although teacher educators play a vital role in preparing future teachers to enter and remain in our schools, research over time has shown that they have been historically held in low esteem by faculty at colleges and universities. Self-esteem can impact job performance as well as one's own feeling of self-worth.

The purpose of this study was to gain insights into the professional image teacher educators in Texas have of themselves as well as the professional esteem they perceive from their academic colleagues in other departments. This study also investigated whether or not levels of esteem may be impacted by the size, type, and accreditation of an institution and if these beliefs are consistent over time.

This study used a survey initially developed by Richard Reynolds in 1992 and fine-tuned by Ron Tinsley in 2002. The survey was distributed electronically to teacher educators throughout Texas in order to attain data that was analyzed using SPSS software. The study calculated factor sums in order to test three hypotheses using paired-sample *t* tests, a one-way ANOVA, and independent sample *t* tests. Paired-sample *t* tests were used to determine if significant differences existed between levels of professional self-esteem of teacher educators and their perceived professional esteem from colleagues in other departments. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if the classification of an educational institution impacts levels of professional self-esteem. Independent sample *t* tests established if accreditation or non-accreditation impacts professional self-esteem.

The research from this study discovered there are significant differences between how teacher educators in Texas regard themselves professionally and how they feel they are perceived professionally by their academic colleagues in other departments. The study found that the classification of an institution has minimal impact on professional self-esteem between Texas teacher educators. The results of the study also suggest that NCATE accreditation may have a negative impact on those surveyed. Results from this study show similarities and differences exist over time regarding both the perceptions teacher educators have of themselves and the perceptions they have regarding how they are viewed by their academic colleagues.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	v
List of Tables	x
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	8
Purposes of the Study.....	8
Hypotheses	9
Research Question	10
Orientating Theoretical Framework.....	10
Significance of the Study	11
Method	12
Description of the Research Instrument.....	12
Selection of Participants	14
Distribution of the Survey.....	14
Data Collection	15
Data Analysis	15
Definition of Terms.....	16
Limitations and Delimitations.....	17
Assumptions.....	18
Summary	19
Chapter 2: Review of Related Literature	20
The Self.....	20

Self-Esteem	23
Teacher Educators.....	28
Attitudes Towards Teacher Educators	30
Carnegie Classifications.....	32
NCATE	33
Summary	35
Chapter 3: Method of Procedure.....	37
General Procedures	38
Design of the Study.....	38
The Survey Instrument.....	39
Development.....	42
Content Validity and Reliability.....	42
Selection of the Participants.....	43
Collection of the Data	46
Treatment of the Data.....	46
Summary	49
Chapter 4: Data Analysis	50
Description of the Participants.....	50
Item Response Means	57
Factors	62
Hypothesis One	66
Hypothesis Two	69
Hypothesis Three	82

Research Question	88
Summary	103
Chapter 5: Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Implications for Practice and Recommendations for Further Study	105
Summary of Findings.....	105
Conclusions.....	108
Implications for Practice	109
Recommendations for Further Study	110
Appendix A: Survey Instrument as Used.....	112
Appendix B: Reynolds' Consent Letter.....	129
Appendix C: Tinsley's Consent Letter.....	131
Appendix D: Email Explaining Study.....	133
Appendix E: Reminder Email Explaining Study.....	135
References.....	137
Biographical Information.....	146

List of Tables

Table 3-1 Texas Teacher Educator Totals by Carnegie Classification.....	44
Table 3-2 Texas Teacher Educator Totals by NCATE Status	45
Table 3-3 Texas Teacher Educator Totals by NCATE Accreditation Status Carnegie Classification	45
Table 4-1 Participant General Demographics	52
Table 4-2 Participant Highest Degree Earned by Sex	53
Table 4-3 Participant Ethnicity by Sex	54
Table 4-4 Participant Faculty Rank by Sex	54
Table 4-5 Participant Age and Experience by Sex	55
Table 4-6 Participant Carnegie Classification by Sex	55
Table 4-7 Participant NCATE Accreditation by Sex	56
Table 4-8 Previous Occupation by Sex.....	56
Table 4-9 Survey Response Means	58
Table 4-10 Paired Sample Statistics	67
Table 4-11 Paired Samples <i>t</i> Test	68
Table 4-12 Factor Descriptive Statistics for Carnegie Classifications	70
Table 4-13 Homogeneity of Factor Variances	74
Table 4-14 ANOVA-Carnegie Classifications	75
Table 4-15 Post Hoc Tests for Factors A3, B3, and A5-Tukey HSD.....	80
Table 4-16 Group Statistics-NCATE/Non-NCATE	83
Table 4-17 Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances	85
Table 4-18 Equality of Means <i>t</i> Test-NCATE/Non-NCATE	86

Table 4-19 Tinsley’s (2002) Paired Samples <i>t</i> Test Results for Hypothesis One	89
Table 4-20 Current Study’s Paired Samples <i>t</i> Test Results for Hypothesis One	90
Table 4-21 Tinsley’s (2002) ANOVA (Carnegie Classifications) Results for Hypothesis Two	91
Table 4-22 Tinsley’s (2002) Post Hoc Tests for Factor A7-Tukey HSD Results for Hypothesis Two	94
Table 4-23 Current Study’s ANOVA (Carnegie Classifications) Results for Hypothesis Two	95
Table 4-24 Current Study’s Post Hoc Tests for Factors A3, B3, and A4- Tukey HSD Results for Hypothesis Two	99
Table 4-25 Tinsley’s (2002) Equality of Means <i>t</i> Test Results for Hypothesis 3-NCATE/Non-NCATE	101
Table 4-26 Current Study’s Equality of Means <i>t</i> Test Results for Hypothesis 3-NCATE/Non-NCATE	102

Chapter 1

Introduction

Public schools and teacher educators have been impacted by the many changes to education over the last several years. According to Smyth and Shacklock (1998), global conditions are reaching down directly into schools, determining what goes on there. Schools will be transformed from agents striving for the betterment of society to servants for economic growth. Coupled with this is a worldwide move towards recentralizing control over education through national curricula, testing, appraisal, policy formulation, profiling, auditing and the like while giving the impression of decentralization and handling control down locally. The image of education is also revamped by reconfiguring the work of teaching so that teachers appear more as deliverers of knowledge, testers of learning and pedagogical technicians. (p. 20).

Researchers have articulated how the multidimensional issues occurring in schools, classrooms, and social contexts can impact teacher attrition (Stockard & Lehman, 2004). Roughly 20% of teachers will leave the profession by the end of their third year and nearly 50% will leave by the end of their fifth year (Olsen & Anderson, 2007).

When analyzing the reasons for such high teacher attrition rates, it is important to include teacher education programs since they are the starting point for most teachers. Teacher educator institutions have evolved into the colleges and departments of education that are now common across the country (Kerr, 1994). While teacher education was once the only mission of teacher educators' institutions, by the 1950's, teacher educators had to help fulfill the many missions of universities (Kerr, 1994). There can be contradictory demands concerning teacher education,

including legislative mandates for curriculum coverage, restrictive university regulations, and the consumer orientations of students in higher education (Sindelar & Rosenberg, 2000). In addition, professional standards are in danger of being ignored because of extreme teacher shortages, which may lead to a teaching workforce that lacks the necessary competencies for dealing with the demands of the profession (Ben-Peretz, 2001).

Higher standards in current teacher educator programs should validate the mission of teacher educators and their profession as a whole however, a closer analysis of the available research shows that this may not be true. According to Tinsley (2002), teacher educators, who had once maintained their own institutions strictly devoted to the training of future teachers, moved into larger institutions only to be looked down upon by academic colleagues who assumed that teachers were born and not made. Labaree (2004) stated that teacher education has long suffered from low status. This status problem is a legacy of market pressures that shaped the history of the normal school; in part it is a side effect of the bad company that teacher education is seen as keeping; and in part it is a result of the kind of work that teachers and teacher educators do.

Sizer and Powell (1969), the former dean and former associate dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, wrote,

Few academic stereotypes are as pathetic as that of the professor of education. He (or she) is gentle, unintellectual, saccharine, and well-meaning, the bumbling doctor of undiagnosable ills, harmless if morosely defensive. He is either a mechanic (or cook, as the picture usually paints him purveying “cook-book recipes” of pedagogy), or he is the flatulent promoter of irrelevant trivia. From Abraham Flexner to Hyman Rickover, the sill jargon and Grotesque excesses of the “educationist professoriate” have been

proclaimed. A good many contemporary critics find the breed so inept as to suggest the cruelest form of genocide: ignoring the professors altogether. The professor's image, to say the least, is a low ebb. (pp. 61-76)

Braden (1969) defined self-esteem as the experience of being competent to cope with the basic challenges of life and being worthy of happiness. Braden stated that self-worth and our own evaluation of ourselves is what primarily constitutes self-esteem. The need for self-esteem plays an important role in psychologist Abraham Maslow's (1943) "hierarchy of needs", who depicts self-esteem as one of the basic human motivations. Maslow suggested that people need both esteem from other people as well as inner self-respect and both must be fulfilled in order for an individual to grow as a person. James (1983) stated that feelings of self-worth or self-esteem are derived from self-perceptions in relation to others whose skills and abilities are similar. He also observed that personal expectations are affected by extrinsic factors. Although self-esteem begins with meeting one's own expectations, it can be modified by extrinsic forces, more specifically the opinions of others. The transition from schools of education to universities would appear to allow teacher educators to achieve an improved view of self-worth gained from working with other academic colleagues. Unfortunately, many of their colleagues do not believe in the importance of teacher education which makes building a sense of professional self-esteem extremely difficult. Those who hold the title 'education professor' putatively are held to a lesser standard than faculty colleagues from the liberal arts departments and professional schools across the campus (Ducharme, 1993).

Teachers often have to adapt to changing requirements and demands placed on them for a variety of reasons and from many different sources. The same is true for teacher educators. As reported by Goodlad (1990), there has been a severe loss of teacher education identity in the

process of evolving from normal school to the present setting. The price that teacher education pays for its affiliation with the university is the potential loss of its professional mission. According to Labaree (2008), this is the Faustian bargain identified by critics of the university school of education like Herbst (1989) and Clifford and Guthrie (1988), in which the education school accepts university status in exchange for its professional soul. This bargain took form early in the history of the normal school — when normal schools agreed to expand beyond their ability to preserve high quality professional programs, and when they adapted to consumer pressure by increasing academic programs and marginalizing teacher education. By the time normal schools became universities in the mid-twentieth century, the terms of the deal were already in place. The last stage in this evolutionary path simply formalized the situation, making education just one school among many and assigning it a supporting role in the larger university enterprise (Labaree, 2008). Teacher preparation programs in universities became one of many programs at schools of higher education. While teacher educators brought a core of values and beliefs with them, many of their colleagues emphasized research and publishing as the most important missions of a university professor. This resulted in the adoption by schools, departments, and colleges of education (SCDEs) of a two-tiered system consisting of researchers and clinicians.

Faculty members who are part of an SCDE have a complex and often multidimensional mission. The SCDE faculty members' mission is reinforced by a reward structure which, as many studies suggest, places paramount importance on research (Fairweather, 1993). Therefore, there is a discrepancy between presumed, multidimensional expectations for faculty members in SCDEs and the unidimensional reward structure. In essence, there is a tension between what is expected and what is rewarded (Shen, 1995). What complicates the situation in the SCDE is the

changing context of the infrastructure of higher education, of which the SCDE is a part. With the evolution of many higher education institutions from normal schools to teachers' colleges and then to regional state universities, research is increasingly emphasized and the original identity of the SCDE is gradually lost (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988). Educational research and teacher education as currently practiced is viewed as a doomed enterprise because it has embraced unsound epistemologies, neglected what is regarded as the palpable need for education in a traditional framework of knowledge with its Platonic and medieval origins, and complicated the teaching task with illusions of technique based on science, rather than accepting it as a task of initiating children into the life of the mind and developing wisdom and virtue through knowledge of content (Sedlak, 2008).

According to Tinsley (2002), recent studies have shown that nearly 30% of SCDE faculty members have little or no direct involvement in the preparation of school teachers, while 70% have moderate to heavy involvement. With nearly one-third of teacher educator's turning their backs on teacher preparation to focus on research and publishing for tenure acquisition, difficulties will persist. Researchers maintain that the two-tier system in SCDE's has proven to erode the effectiveness of teacher education programs (Goodlad, 1990). According to many scholars (Burch, 1989; Clark, 1987; Lanier & Little, 1986), it is the practitioner tier within SCDE's that gives teacher educators a lowered status in the eyes of their academic colleagues because practitioners tend to spend more time working in public schools and less time conducting research and publishing results. A teacher educator who devotes 100% to training teachers will find him or herself lacking respect from colleagues and, perhaps, lacking a job (Lanier & Little, 1986).

Over the last three decades, teacher education programs have been heavily impacted by state government regulations. An early 1980's report titled, *A Nation at Risk*, published by The National Commission on Educational Excellence (1983) opened the door for a myriad of criticisms, proposals, and plans from government agencies such as The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Certification (AACTE, 1983), The National Education Association (NEA, 1986), and the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (CFEE, 1986). While professional educators offered widely varying plans for teacher preparation reform, the professional community was neither unified nor willing to change itself (Hawley, 1992; Popkewitz, 1993). Progressive reform became more of a political issue with decisions made by those not directly involved in education.

The reform movement beginning in the 1980's with *A Nation at Risk* evolved into even greater attempts to standardize the American education system. The 2002 *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Act further expanded the role of federal government in education. NCLB shifted the power of schools from local control to national agencies. While the federal government's role in education had been primarily financial, NCLB went above and beyond to impact many areas of teaching and teacher preparation. According to Labaree (2005), NCLB made the federal government a major player in regulating the core of K-12 instruction, controlling teacher quality, and dictating teacher education curriculum in institutions of higher education. The *No Child Left Behind* law included a provision to guarantee a highly qualified teacher in every classroom. States have created numerous ways to determine what makes a teacher "highly qualified", such as passing subject area exams, obtaining certain degrees, or completing other alternatives defined by the states and approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

In order to analyze the impact of NCLB, policymakers and decision makers required data on student progress which often came in the form of increased standardized testing. In Texas, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) was developed to evaluate student and school performance. The exams established a passing standard for students to meet in order to be promoted to the next grade level or to acquire a diploma and schools were given a performance rating based on student passing rates. These performance ratings impacted campus funding, student population, and various jobs within each district. The No Child Left Behind Act (2002) directly impacted SCDE's by changing their requirements for educator programs and in turn increasing the pressures on teacher educators.

In an effort to increase the standardization of teacher education, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was founded in 1954. It includes a peer review process of a teacher certification program based on national standards developed by teaching professionals. In order to be a NCATE accredited institution, organizations must undergo a costly and extensive five-year review cycle. According to NCATE (2012), a poll conducted by Penn and Schoen states that 82% of the public favors requiring teachers to graduate from nationally accredited professional schools. Patricia McGinnis president and CEO of The Council for Excellence in Government, is also quoted on the website stating, "NCATE does important work to improve the quality of education, which is an urgent priority of the American people. Its accreditation process, based on rigorous national professional standards, helps ensure that teachers who graduate from accredited schools are well prepared to help increase student achievement. Our children deserve no less and we must work to ensure that all teachers meet these rigorous professional standards." According to an earlier study, graduates of NCATE accredited colleges of education pass educational testing service (ETS) subject matter

and pedagogy examinations at a higher than do graduates of unaccredited colleges of education and those who did not prepare (ETS, 1999). There are currently 656 colleges of education that hold NCATE accreditation. Fourteen of those institutions are located in Texas (NCATE, 2012). It should be noted that as of July 1, 2013, NCATE consolidated and became a subsidiary of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Since merging into colleges and universities as SCDE's, the literature maintains that teacher educators have suffered low self-esteem as academic professionals. There is however, limited data documenting the professional image teacher educators have of themselves or how they are regarded by their colleagues in academia. There have been many reforms enacted throughout the decades without reference to how they may affect the teacher educators responsible for implementing them. Pressures such as changing demographics, alternative certification programs, and governmental sanctions have altered the approaches of teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, 2010). In Texas, where the size and graduation rates of baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral level institutions vary significantly, reform has been extensive and challenging. As of 2012, fourteen institutions in Texas have chosen to acquire NCATE accreditation in order to achieve a level of prestige and separate themselves from the others. The data we have regarding the effect of the NCATE accreditation on the professional self-esteem of teacher educators is extremely limited.

Purposes of the Study

This study explored the beliefs of teacher educators in Texas and described their levels of professional self-esteem and the levels of professional esteem that they believe non-professional education faculty hold for them. Specifically, the study was designed for the following purposes:

1. To determine whether there was a significant difference between the levels of professional self-esteem of teacher educators and their perceived professional esteem from colleagues in other departments;
2. To determine whether there was a significant difference in the levels of professional self-esteem among and between teacher educators from different Carnegie classifications of educational institutions;
3. To determine whether there was a significant difference in the levels of professional self-esteem between faculty members from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions: and,
4. To compare the results with Tinsley's (2002) findings using the same population.

Hypotheses

The study examined the responses of 242 teacher educators from 68 colleges and universities that have teacher certification programs. Statistical differences were reported at the .05 level of significance. Appropriate effect size measures were reported. Specifically, the study tested the following hypotheses, stated in the null:

Hypothesis 1: No significant differences exist between the levels of teacher educators' professional self-esteem and their perceived professional esteem from non-professional education faculty.

Hypothesis 2: No significant differences exist in the levels of professional self-esteem among teacher educators from different types of institutions, as determined by the Carnegie Classification System.

Hypotheses 3: No significant differences exist in the levels of professional self-esteem between teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions.

Research Question

The study also attempted to answer the following research question:

In a comparison of the results of the current study and the results of Tinsley's 2002 study on Texas Teacher Educators, do any differences exist?

Orientating Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was based on Korman's (1976) Self-Consistency Theory which states that an individual's self-esteem is an important determinant of effective job performance and satisfaction. According to Korman (1976), individuals will be motivated to perform in a manner consistent with their self images. To the extent that their self-concepts concerning job or task require effective performance in order to result in "consistent" cognitions, then to that extent they will be motivated to engage in effective performance, and furthermore, to the extent that one will choose and find most satisfying those situations which are in balance with these self-perceptions. Maslow also emphasized the importance of self-esteem as it relates to one's self-worth. Maslow (1954) claimed that,

all people in our society have a need or desire for a stable, firmly based, usually high evaluation of themselves, for self-respect or self-esteem, and for the esteem of others. We have what we may call the desire for reputation or prestige, status, fame and glory, dominance, recognition, attention, importance, dignity, or appreciation. Satisfaction of the self-esteem need leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth, strength, capability, and adequacy; of being useful and necessary in the world. But thwarting of these needs produces feelings of inferiority, of weakness, and of helplessness. (p.21)

Significance of the Study

According to Reynolds (1992), a stratified random sample of 255 teacher educators in Ohio consistently regarded themselves well as professionals, but did not believe their academic colleagues from other areas of academia regarded them equally as well. Reynolds found that these two trends were common among teacher educators regardless of selected biographical or institutional data. Reynolds' study presented the most complete statistical data on teacher educators' professional self-esteem and perceptions of how they are regarded by their academic colleagues. Reynolds stated, "Further studies of the professional self-esteem of teacher educators may lead to a fuller understanding of their position on campus and help break the cycle of low status and low expectations" (1995, p. 225). Tinsley (2002) conducted a similar study pertaining to teacher educators in the state of Texas. Tinsley found that teacher educators maintained a low level of professional esteem when compared to faculty members in other departments across all Carnegie Classifications of institutions, with or without NCATE accreditation. Tinsley stated, "This study found that teacher educators in Texas faced difficulties similar to those faced by teacher educators in Ohio a decade earlier. Little seems to have changed in regard to the professional esteem teacher educators perceived from their academic colleagues" (2002, p. 91). There is need for more studies and literature relating to the professional self-esteem of teacher educators and how it influences the profession. Reynolds wrote, "Further studies of the professional self-esteem of teacher educators may lead to a fuller understanding of their position on campus and help break the cycle of low status and low expectations" (1995, p.225). There have been many different requirements placed on teacher educators in Texas over the last decade affecting their job performance and attitudes and more research is needed to fully understand its impact. The last decade has also resulted in different

faculty entering the profession with a variety of backgrounds and experiences. Strong support for further analysis relating to the self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas was recommended by Tinsley when he stated: “Repeating this study in Texas in 2012 would yield a sample reflecting a somewhat different population and, perhaps also yield differing results” (2002, p. 93).

Method

The purpose of this study was to gain a more complete understanding of how teacher educators feel about themselves as academic professionals as well as their perceptions of how they are accepted by their academic colleagues. It followed the standard methodology for emailed questionnaire survey research (Borg & Gall, 2003) and was conducted according to the guidelines established by Reynolds (1992).

Description of the Research Instrument

Reynolds’ 1992 study on teacher educators in Ohio was the original research work that gathered pertinent data relating to the issues central to the current study. According to Tinsley (2002), it was deemed appropriate to continue to follow the conceptual and methodological framework of Reynolds’ (1992) study in order to develop more data from a similar population in a different geographic region of the country. Due to continuously changing requirements related to teacher education and differing populations, Tinsley (2002) recommended repeating his study in 2012 to analyze possible differing results. Reynolds’ original survey instrument was utilized in conducting Tinsley’s study with the author’s consent. Reynolds and Tinsley gave permission for their survey instruments to be replicated for the purposes of this study.

The instrument consists of two parts. Part One contains 40 belief statements. The belief statements present ideas such as: “teacher education admits students who would never be

admitted to other programs;” or “teacher educators are committed to scholarship.” Each required responses in two ways. Response Set A presented each statement as: “I believe that...,” and Response B presented each belief statement as “I believe my academic colleagues would say that...” The responses to each belief statement were recorded on a Likert type scale of 1-6, ranging from “very strongly disagree” to “very strongly agree”. Part Two of the instrument contains 19 biographical questions, such as participant’s sex, age, academic rank, and professional organization affiliations. The survey took about 25 minutes for each respondent to complete.

Reynolds creation of the survey instrument occurred in several stages. First, Reynolds reviewed a vast amount of literature on self-esteem and teacher educators, creating a lengthy list of pertinent ideas. Secondly, 15 teacher educators at Ohio State University were interviewed, asking each: “What factors do you believe affect how you feel about yourself in your work as a teacher educator?” The interviews were taped and reviewed to isolate common themes among the interviewees’ thoughts. By combining what was found in the literature review and the common themes of the interviews, Reynolds created a series of belief statements.

According to Tinsley (2002), Reynolds, with help from professors and members of his dissertation seminar, constructed the instrument and established validity through factor analysis, proving the items’ homogeneity and that the variables of each factor grouping do indeed test the same underlying construct. The instrument’s reliability was established through the split-half method. After one pilot test, the instrument was refined from comments of the participants and the analyses of descriptive data for measures of frequency, mean, mode, skewness, standard deviation, and variance. The instrument was tested again and, after examination of the data, deemed valid and reliable (Reynolds, 1992).

Selection of Participants

Officials at the 68 four-year colleges and universities with certification programs were contacted by email to inquire if they would agree to provide the names and contact information of each of their teacher educators who were qualified to participate in the study. The initial contact email included details briefly identifying the researcher, explaining the project, and defining in specifics the desired information. Reynolds defined a teacher educator as someone who holds a full time tenured or tenure track position and spends at least 50% of his or her time on the preparation of future teachers-defined as either teaching foundations or methods classes or in supervising student teachers in the field.

The number of teacher educators in Texas, as defined by this study, totaled 610. The required number of completed surveys for a representative data set was set at 234 according to standards established by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The electronic surveys were sent via email to all identified Texas teacher educators in the spring semester 2013. The 242 completed surveys comprised the data set that was used for the study. The electronic survey and all components of this study were approved by the Institutional Review Board at The University of Texas at Arlington.

Distribution of the Survey

Each teacher educator was emailed information regarding completion of the electronic survey. The email included information identifying and explaining the study along with a link to the electronic survey conducted through the online survey program, Survey Monkey (Survey Monkey, 2013). The email explaining the study, including the survey link, is included in Appendix D of this study.

Data Collection

Emails were sent out monthly reminding subjects to complete their electronic surveys. Email also allowed participants to communicate any necessary information needed for clarification or to ask questions.

Data Analysis

All data analyses were conducted using the SPSS statistical package. Each hypothesis was tested using an appropriate parametric statistical test. Seven factors were identified by Reynolds (1992). Factor sums were calculated and used in testing each hypothesis. The following statistical procedures were used:

Hypothesis 1: Paired sample *t* tests were used to compare the means of each pair of factor sums from Response Sets A and B of Part 1 of the instrument in order to compare the means of the “I believe...” responses to the means of the “I believe my academic colleagues would say that...”

Hypothesis 2: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to find any significant differences among the responses of teacher educators from three different Carnegie types of institutions—baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral—to each of the factor sum means from both Response Sets A and B. The ANOVA procedure is appropriate for comparing independent samples from more than two groups. If a significant difference was indicated and equal variances could be assumed, the Tukey post hoc procedure was used to determine any differences between pairs and the mean sums were reexamined to determine the direction of the differences.

Hypothesis 3: Independent sample *t* tests were applied to each of the factor sum means from both Response Sets A and B of Part 1 of the instrument to test for any significant

differences that may exist between the responses of teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions.

Research Question: Descriptive statistics were applied to compare the results of Tinsley's 2002 study to the current study.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions were used:

Academic Colleagues - academic faculty in the same institution of the participant working in areas other than professional education.

Carnegies Classification – The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Higher Education currently classifies all degree-granting, accredited colleges and universities in the United States of America based on their degree-granting activities from 2008-2010. The 2012 Carnegie Classification makes use of the following general categories: doctorate-granting universities; master's colleges and universities; baccalaureate colleges; associate's colleges; special focus institutions; associate's colleges; and tribal colleges (Carnegie Foundation; 2012). In this study, only the applicable general categories, those with teacher certification programs in Texas, will be utilized: doctoral universities; master's colleges and universities; and baccalaureate colleges.

Teacher Educator – one who provides required college and university course work for prospective teachers (Lanier and Little, 1986). The definition that will be used in this study was refined to include the a status of full time, tenured or tenure tracked position with at least 50% commitment to the teaching of methods courses, foundations courses, and/or the field supervision of future teachers.

Self-esteem – a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitude the individual holds towards himself or herself (Coopersmith, 1967). Self-esteem rises from the combined

senses of personal efficacy and personal worthiness and is the sum of self-confidence and self-respect (Branden, 1969; Mruk, 1995).

Professional Self-Esteem – Professional self-esteem is an individual's self-esteem specifically in regard to his or her professional position and acceptance in that professional role (Tinsley, 2002).

Limitations and Delimitations

There were several confining factors in this study.

1. The study was only concerned with teacher educators in the state of Texas.
2. Data were gathered through the use of self-reports, so only what an individual was willing to disclose on the survey instrument entered the data. However, the self-report is virtually the only available method to measure self-concept and self-esteem (Burns, 1979). Thus the reliability of information contained in a self-report is considered to be at least as high as that of any other standard form of human communication.
3. Participants had to meet requirements as defined to be a teacher educator, excluding part time adjunct faculty, education faculty who teach over 50% graduate courses or other courses not germane to future teachers' training, and faculty members who spend over 50% of their time on administrative matters.
4. Participants were required to report the Carnegie Classification of their institutions and whether or not their institutions were NCATE accredited. In order to maintain anonymity, these points could not be verified by the researcher.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made about this study:

1. Reynolds' (1992) study was a meaningful work of research.
2. Tinsley's (2002) study was a meaningful work of research.
3. The survey instrument created by Reynolds (1992) and altered by Tinsley (2002) was valid, reliable, and useful for measuring the professional self-esteem of teacher educators.
4. Teacher educators in Texas are educated individuals who would respond well to the survey instrument, fill it out honestly and correctly, in good faith, and submit it as asked.
5. Self-esteem is a generally understood concept and could be quantified to a sufficient degree in a survey format.
6. Teacher educators' reports on how they believe they are perceived by academic colleagues bear a meaningful resemblance to actuality and are findings worthy of scholarly research.

Summary

This study analyzed the beliefs of teacher educators in Texas. It determined if significant differences exist between the levels of professional self-esteem of teacher educators and the levels of professional esteem that they believe non-professional education faculty hold for them. It determined if there is a significant difference in the levels of professional self-esteem among and between teacher educators from different Carnegie classifications of educational institutions and among educational faculty members from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions. Finally, the results of this study were compared to the results of Tinsley's 2002

study to determine if any differing results exist. Chapter 2 of this study contains a review of the related literature. Chapter 3 includes detailed descriptions of the participant selection, data collection procedures, and descriptive data pertaining to the participants in the study. A presentation and analyses of the data collected during the study comprise Chapter 4. Chapter 5 entails a summary of the study, the findings, conclusions, implications for practice from the study, and recommendations for further study.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

A review of psychological literature regarding the nature of the self and self-esteem was conducted in order to gain a better understanding of the dependent variable measured in this study. An extensive review of literature relating to the population under investigation, teacher educators, was also conducted. Finally, it was essential to have a clear understanding of the organizations and processes behind the agencies of the two independent variables under investigation, the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

This chapter reviews the main constructs that were relevant to the proposed study. It is organized in multiple sections: The Self; Self-Esteem; Teacher Educators; Attitudes Towards Teacher Educators; Carnegie Classifications; and NCATE. Each section offers background information and outlines sources most pertinent to the study. This chapter concludes with a summary.

The Self

More than a century ago, James (1890) examined the definition of “the Self”. He introduced the distinction between the *I* and the *Me*. He stated that the Self is a duality: it consists of the *I*, a conscious and knowing subject, and the *Me* which is known to the *I*. James went on to subdivide the *Me* into three subcategories, including the social *Me*. The social *Me* is comprised of the recognition a person gets from his or her social acquaintances. James (1983) wrote that “a man has as many social selves as there are individuals who recognize him and carry an image of him in their mind. To wound any one of these images is to wound him” (p. 294). James assertion relays the implicit motivation behind Reynolds’ (1992) study, Tinsley’s (2002)

study, and the current study, to document the effects of the perceptions and attitudes of others on self-perceptions.

Cooley (1922) claimed that “self and other do not exist as mutually exclusive social facts” (p. 126). Mead (1934) further clarified this line of thinking and viewed the self as the product of a social process in which the self is not experienced directly, “but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group, or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs” (p. 138). It has become common in reviews of the sociological self to argue that the self is both a social product and a social force (Rosenberg, 1981). In the first instance, the self is examined as a bounded, structured object – Mead’s “me” – whereas in the second instance, the self is examined as a fluid, agentic, and creative response – Mead’s “I”. The distinction captures the core principle of a socially constructed self, namely that the self is a joint accomplishment, neither completely determined by the social world nor pre-given at birth (Callero, 2003). Early theories agree that the self is a product of an individual’s interactions and experiences with others and that some representation of the group or society is a key component created within the individual’s mind (Onorato & Turner, 2001).

Contemporary literature on the nature of self contains many diverse perspectives, yet certain assumptions remain widely shared (Onorato & Turner, 1999). Psychologists have used new terminology to further theorize the nature of self, including self-concept and self-schema. Self-schema theory maintains that the core self comprises our self schema – ‘knowledge structures developed by individuals to understand and explain their own social experiences’ (Markus & Sertis, 1982, p. 45). For one person independence may be a centrally-defining attribute, while for another creativity or extroversion may be central (Markus, 1977; Markus &

Sentis, 1982). Self-schemas are stable self-representations; they facilitate information-processing such that individuals quickly accept congruent information and reject incongruent information (Markus, 1977). Self-schema theorists later sought to render their model more dynamic by introducing the concept of a *working self-concept* (Markus & Wurf, 1987). The malleability of the self-system was attributed to the varying accessibility of self-aspects that surround the core elements (Markus & Kunda, 1986). “The working self-concept thus consists of the core self-conceptions embedded in a context of more tentative self-conceptions that are tied to the prevailing circumstances” (Markus & Wurf, 1987, p. 306).

Self-categorization theory postulates that “the self should not be equated with enduring personality structure because the self is not always experienced in terms of personality or individual differences” (Onorato & Turner, 2004, p. 259). Generally, this theory allows for the existence of core self-schemata that is very resistant to change as well as the cognitive free-will to join or submit to a shared social context (Tinsley, 2002). Self-categorization theorists argue that individuals rely heavily on self-in-group comparisons for the development of self-concepts; however, they have developed a more complex system for analyzing the nature of the self (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994; Onorato & Turner, 1999). In short, the self-concept, or one’s current self-category, is conceived as a context-dependent cognitive representation (Onorato & Turner, 2004). The survey instrument utilized in the present study adheres to the principles of self-categorization and the traditional views of James and Cooley by measuring aspects of both the “I” selves and the “me” selves of teacher educators.

Self-Esteem

Past research has shown that self-esteem is a strong predictor of life satisfaction (Diener & Diener, 2009). In a large nationwide study, Campbell (1981) found that self-esteem was the strongest predictor of life satisfaction in a national sample of adults in the United States. Rodewalt and Tragakis (2003) identify that self-esteem to be one of the “top three covariates in personality and social psychology research,” following negative affectivity and gender (p.66). Today there are several sets of reasons that self-esteem deserves continuing attention. One of them is that self-esteem appears to be among those relatively few dimensions of human life that stretches across the full spectrum of behavior, much like the topics of development, low self-esteem is often mentioned in regard to various clinical phenomena, such as depression or anxiety (Mruk, 2013). Leary and MacDonald (2003) noted that studies overwhelmingly show that when compared to people with high self-esteem, those with low self-esteem experience more negative emotions, affect, or states across the board (pp. 404-405). While many experts recognize the importance of self-esteem, an examination of the literature reveals a lack of consensus on exactly what self-esteem is, how it is developed, and it fits into the relationships between the self and others. Mruk (2013) stated that in one sense, we all know something about what self-esteem “really is” because it is a human phenomenon (p. 7). However, as Smelser (1989) observed, “We have a fairly firm grasp of what is meant by self-esteem, as revealed by our own introspection and observation of the behavior of others. But it is hard to put that understanding into precise words (P. 9). He went on to say that researchers are still attempting to unravel the “definitional maze” of self-esteem (Smelser, 1989).

Early definitions of self-esteem tended to stress either self-evaluation, a cognitive process, or self-affection, feelings (Wells & Marwell, 1976). James (1950) stated that our self-

feeling in this world is determined by the ratio of our actualities to our supposed potentialities; a fraction of which our pretensions are the denominator and the numerator our success: thus, Self-esteem is equal to Successes divided by Pretensions. In other words, self-esteem is the relationship between our performance and our ideal, or between our perceived-self and our ideal-self (Mruk, 1999). Mruk (2006) emphasized that in James' ratio, like in all ratios, the number of successes or failures one has can change as well, which means that self-esteem is also a dynamic phenomenon and must be maintained, especially during times of challenge or threat.

In the early 20th century, theorists examined the various mental processes and their influence on personality, behavior, and attitudes. Adler (1927) emphasized the importance of success for building a positive sense of self, particularly in terms of overcoming feelings of "basic inferiority" that are seen as playing a large role in determining human behavior. Horney (1937) focused on the difference between real and idealized selves as the central variable in developing and maintaining self-esteem. In the 1960's, White (1963) summed up the concept of self-esteem as a person's experience of efficacy, almost solely related to the success or failures of an individual's efforts. He argued that, "It is necessary to make competence a motivational concept; there is a *competence motivation* as well as competence in its more familiar sense of achieved capacity" (White, 1959, p.318). Satisfying this need through the mastery of developmental tasks and experiencing other successes in childhood results in feelings of "effectance" and a sense of self-respect. In other words, "self-esteem has its taproot in the experience of efficacy" (White, 1963, p.134). Rosenberg (1965) viewed self-esteem as more tied to the environment and one's feeling that he or she is good or worthy in the views of others. However, Coopersmith (1967) tied the cognitive process of self-evaluation to the individual's experience of the world, defining self-esteem as a personal judgment of worthiness which the

individual conveys to the world through verbal reports and expressive behaviors. Both Coopersmith and Rosenberg attempted to measure self-esteem as a variable in psychological studies (Tinsley, 2002). Coopersmith's Self Esteem Inventory (SEI) (Coopersmith, 1975) has become the most widely used assessment instrument in the field of self-esteem investigation because of its regard for both cognitive and affective aspect of self-esteem (Mruk, 2006).

Fortunately, one central definition of self-esteem seems to have withstood the test of time as indicated by the fact that a distinct body of work has developed around it: Defining self-esteem in terms of competence and worth or worthiness (Mruk, 2006). Branden (1969) first offered such a definition when he said that self-esteem "has two interrelated aspects: it entails a sense of personal efficacy and a sense of personal worth. It is the integrated sum of self-confidence and self-respect. It is the conviction that one is competent to live and worth of living" (p.110). Mruk (2006) stated that "competence, in this case, means facing reality directly and then making rational decisions, which are those that allow an individual to solve problems realistically. Self-esteem, then, is a precious psychological resource that must be won, can be lost, and needs to be maintained at all times. Tying competence to worth in this fashion distinguishes this view of self-esteem from mere competence. In this new sense, competence must be behavior that in some way reflects or involves worth or worthiness to matter for self-esteem" (p. 19). Branden, who stands as the leading popular author on the subject of self-esteem, revealed self-esteem to be both cognitive and affective, as well as dynamic (Mruk, 1999). Branden (2011) characterized self-esteem as "an evaluation of my mind, my consciousness, and, in a profound sense, my person. Self-esteem is an orientation toward the self. Self-esteem is the ultimate ground of consciousness, ground to all particular experience; this is the single most important thing to be understood about its role in human psychology" (p.

5). The present study views self-esteem as a matter of competence and worthiness developed both cognitively and affectively. A keyword search on self-esteem using the standard education and psychology databases yielded thousands of hits for both popular articles and academic studies. A number of studies relating to self-esteem and educators were examined, and several are worthy of note.

Visscher (1988) found that the measured self-esteem of nursing faculty members in Florida remained consistently high across institutions and programs. Orczyk (1990) found that publication rates of higher education faculty rose in direct correlation with their measured levels of self-esteem. Curran (1991) wrote that public school teachers in California displayed low levels of self-esteem and were limited in achieving higher levels of self-esteem by negative feedback from external sources, such as administrators and members of the public, which caused an ensuing sense of isolation in the teachers' professional lives. Badali's (2011) study of teacher educators concluded that their self-esteem was negatively impacted by the fact that they were not always adequately rewarded for their professional contributions and that they experienced high levels of fatigue and anxiety associated with teaching greater numbers of students.

Schafer and Keith (1999) reported from a thirteen-year longitudinal study that self-esteem tends to decline over time in individuals who start out with higher than average levels. Results showed that individuals starting the study with lower assessments of self-esteem tended to maintain more consistent levels. The authors attributed their findings to the higher demands that higher self-esteem individuals put on themselves to achieve, and not to the aging process. Kling, Hyde, Showers, and Buswell (1999) found through meta-analysis on statistics from 48,000 Americans that men tended to have slightly higher measured levels of self-esteem than

women, at levels of significance ranging from .04 - .24. However, their conclusions stated that neither gender nor age was a strong determining factor in self-esteem levels. Foels and Tomcho (2005) found similar results from their study concluding that women and men reported equivalent levels of self-esteem from both relational and collective groups.

Reynolds (1992) measured the levels of self-esteem, specifically as it related to life in academe, among teacher educators in Ohio and found no significant differences between the reports of males and females, but did find that older faculty members tended to have higher levels of self-esteem than younger faculty members. Reynolds also found that faculty from smaller colleges tended to have higher levels of self-esteem than faculty from larger institutions and that 80% of teacher educators surveyed published regularly (Tinsley, 2002). However, he found that teacher educators perceived themselves as looked upon negatively by their faculty colleagues in other departments, reflecting the attitude that teacher education is not worthy of status as a field of study in higher education and that teacher educators are not, as such, worthy of positions among the professoriate.

Tinsley's (2002) study investigated the professional self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas and its relationship to the Carnegie Classification and NCATE accreditation status of participants' institutions. His study adhered to the procedural and methodological framework of Reynolds' 1992 study on teacher educators in Ohio in order to develop further data from a similar population in a different geographic region a decade later. Tinsley (2002) found that Texas teacher educators' levels of professional self-esteem were significantly higher than the levels of professional esteem they perceived from academic colleagues in other departments. Tinsley (2002) also found that there was almost no difference in levels of professional self-esteem or levels of perceived professional esteem from academic colleagues between teacher

educators from different Carnegie Classifications of Institutions. Tinsley's study determined that teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions revealed no significant difference in levels of professional self-esteem or perceived professional esteem from academic colleagues in nearly all comparison categories. He determined that NCATE accreditation did not boost professional self-esteem or perceived professional esteem from academic colleagues. The present study is an attempt to determine if teacher educators' perceptions are comparable to the perceptions of teacher educators in Texas eleven years ago.

Teacher Educators

Reynolds (1992, 1995) published the first data directly related to the professional self-esteem of teacher educators. There is, however, other pertinent information on teacher educators that can be found. The AACTE's Research About Teacher Education (RATE) Series, installments I-III (1987-1989), compiled by Ducharme and Kluender (1990) and The National Center for Education Statistics National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) compiled by Heuer et. al (2006), document and describe the demographics of the population of teacher educators in the United States. RATE Series installments IV-VIII (1991-1995) and the NSOPF also document other aspects of teacher education in the US, such as changes in field experience programs, leadership policies, program reforms, and other practices. Wolf-Wendel, Baker, Twombly, Tollefson, and Mahlios (2006) also researched similar descriptors related to teacher educators. The present study examined data from the previously referenced studies in order to gain a better understanding of the population.

A number of statistical studies have measured the job satisfaction of education faculty members (Ambros, 2002; Connolly, 2007; Fiorentino, 1999; Wimsatt, 2002; Xu, 2008). An

overall analysis indicates that education faculty have been shown to be relatively satisfied with their jobs, yet generally not so satisfied with the support of their institution or decisions made by legislators that affected them (Ambros, Huston, & Norman, 2005; Connolly, 2007). This coincides with Reynolds' (1992) and Tinsley's (2002) findings. A state-wide survey of Texas teacher educators conducted by Miller, Miller, and Gwaltney (1998) investigated the cultural attitudes and behaviors of teacher educators in Texas and found that the population could benefit from multicultural training. As a study on Texas teacher educators, this study was examined for its procedure in determining its population size (Tinsley, 2002). However, Miller, Miller, and Gwaltney (1998) defined "teacher educator" in much broader terms than Reynolds (1992) and Tinsley (2002).

Shen (1995) examined data collected from 1217 SCDE faculty members and found a great deal of fragmentation within SCDE faculties. Almost 30% of the sample had little or no direct dealings with undergraduate teacher preparation, reflecting the emergence of a two-tier system in which education practitioners work with future teachers and education scholars do research and teach graduate students (Lanier & Little, 1986). The two-tier system has been shown to erode the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs by lowering the perceived status of teacher educators and undercutting its own academic credibility, even within SCDEs (Labaree, 2008). Shen's (1995) and Labaree's (2008) findings hold implications for the conclusions and recommendations of the present study.

A handful of qualitative studies have also documented varied aspects of the lives of teacher educators. Gassner (1993) looked into the dynamics of teacher educators to help determine ways in which future teachers might be more fully empowered while Kemp (1997) examined aspects of the lives of women as teacher educators. Ambrose, Huston, and Norman

(2005) studied the impact of family structure on teacher educators. Loughran and Russell (2012) documented the impact self-studies and self-examination can have on improving the practice of teacher educators and on the profession as a whole. The afore mentioned studies help offer a more encompassing understanding of teacher educators both as professionals and as human beings and, as such, hold further implications for the conclusions and recommendations of the present study.

Attitudes Towards Teacher Educators

A study conducted by Ducharme and Agne (1982) utilized questionnaires and interviews to determine that, in spite of their long hours and steady publication rates, education professors “and, indeed, the field of professional education, are alien to higher education as conventionally defined” (p. 33). Ducharme (1993) attributes some of the difficulty in identifying teacher educators as a community to the fact that few academics actually consider themselves as such, because of their low status. ‘I once described them’, he writes, ‘as “being among the least welcome guests at the educational lawn party of the establishment of higher education”’ (p. 3). Woodring (1987) stated that professional education departments have long been targets of ridicule due to low standards for both students and faculty members. Despite its long history in the US academy and the ambiguity of its position, its low status as the ‘Cinderella’s of academia’ (Ham and Kane, 2004, p. 134) has apparently continued into the new century (Labaree, 2008). Such a documented sense of alienation and rejection in academe reflects long-standing lore that teacher education is both socially and academically beneath other higher education departments (Tinsley, 2002). Whatever the causes may be for the lowered status of teacher educators in academe, the perception remains and continues to cloud issues on campus (Reynolds, 1995). The present study examines if there have been changes in perceptions in the decades since

Reynolds' (1992) and Tinsley's (2002) research.

Over several decades, an analysis of the literature documents adverse attitudes towards professional education from scholars outside the field. Briggs (1932) wrote that “by any reasonable audit secondary education for the masses is bankrupt” (p. 756), and Horn (1933) stated that the educational philosophy of that generation was marked by “superficiality, fickleness, and instability” (p. 39). According to Labaree (2006),

it is common knowledge that professors in the arts and sciences risk a loss of academic respect, including promotion and tenure, if they assume clear interest in or responsibility for teacher education. Professors holding academic rank in education units are in even greater jeopardy of losing the respect of their academic counterparts in the university, because their close proximity makes association with teacher education more possible. And, finally, those education professors who actually supervise prospective or practicing teachers in elementary and secondary schools are indeed at the bottom of the stratification ladder. The message seems to be that if teacher education fails to become more efficient in cranking out teachers, the state or the market will find other ways to fill classroom vacancies. (pp. 34-35)

Negativity towards teacher education has been directly related to the national criticism of education in general (Davey, 2013).

Carnegie Classifications

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education was established by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1967 to study and make recommendations regarding the major issues facing U.S. higher education (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). According

to McCormick and Zhao (2005), in response to no existing classification system differentiating colleges and universities along the dimensions that were most relevant to its work, the commission developed a new classification scheme in 1970 to meet its analytic needs. The categories were defined by both the functions of the institutions and by the characteristics of the students and faculties. The Classification was published in 1973 to assist the many individuals and organizations engaged in research on higher education (McCormick & Zhao, 2005). While the Carnegie Classification was not created to confer status on or to rank institutions, it has been widely interpreted that way (Tinsley, 2002). Created only as a reference tool for information and research, the Classification has undergone several revisions to help strengthen it as a tool, including the latest revision in 2010.

Under the 2010 edition, the Carnegie Foundation has substantially revised its Basic Classification system, which allows researchers to organize institutions by degree level and specialization (Carnegie, 2012). The Classification has deemphasized institutional resources, reorganized the presentation of institutional types based on enrollment rather than perceived prestige, and searching for alternative sources of information about institutional differences, the developers of the Carnegie Classification system have attempted to make the information less vulnerable to interpretation as a ranking system and more amenable to wide use and to promoting an understanding of American higher education in the future (Schuh, Jones, & Harper, 2010). According to the Carnegie (2012) Foundation's website, the Basic Classification categorizes institutions into six major types: associate's institutions, doctorate-granting universities, master's colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, special focus institutions, and tribal colleges. In addition to the Basic Classification, other all-inclusive classifications include undergraduate instructional programs, graduate instructional programs, enrollment

profile, undergraduate profile, and size and setting (Carnegie, 2012). There is also an elective classification which details community engagement. All of the included classifications contain multiple categories delineated by detailed criteria. The present study made use of the 2012 edition. It should be noted that in order to maintain consistency with data collected from Reynolds' (1992) and Tinsley's (2002) studies, the survey instrument required respondents to identify their institution according to the following Carnegie Classifications: baccalaureate, masters, doctoral, or specialized focus institution.

NCATE

NCATE was founded in 1954 through the joint efforts of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), the National Education Association (NEA), the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) to be an independent accrediting body for SCDE's in the United States (Tinsley, 2002). The US Secretary of Education and the Council of Higher Education Accreditation officially recognizes NCATE as the national professional accrediting agency for SCDE's that prepare teachers, administrators, and other professional school personnel (NCATE, 2012).

NCATE morphed into a coalition of 33 professional associations of teachers, teacher educators, content specialists, and local and state policy makers committed to quality teaching representing millions of individuals (NCATE, 2012). According to the NCATE (2012) website, a public opinion poll conducted by Penn and Schoen concluded that 82% of the public favors requiring teachers graduate from nationally accredited professional schools. NCATE's goal is to

improve student learning by improving the quality of teacher education. They do this by establishing high and rigorous standards for teacher education programs, holding accredited institutions accountable for meeting these standards, and by encouraging unaccredited schools to prove the quality of their programs by working for and achieving professional accreditations (NCATE, 2012). In order to acquire voluntary accreditation, SCDE's must put their own programs into compliance with extensive NCATE standards through the cooperation and compliance of all faculty and administrators of all their professional education programs in order to receive accreditation and submit to periodic reviews in order to retain accreditation (Tinsley, 2002). NCATE views itself as changing the culture of higher education and Pre K-12 schools (Wise, 2001). As of 2012, NCATE accredits 670 institutions and another 70 are candidates or pre-candidates for accreditation (NCATE, 2012). It should be noted that as of July 1, 2013, NCATE and TEAC (Teacher Education Accreditation Council) officially consolidated into the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation or CAEP (NCATE, 2013). According to their website, CAEP is now the sole accreditor for educator preparation in the United States (CAEP, 2013). CAEP claims to advance excellence in educator preparation through evidence-based accreditation that assures quality and supports continuous improvement to strengthen P-12 student learning (CAEP, 2013).

The extensive standards set by NCATE, and now CAEP, directly impact teacher educators. In addition to other pressures of the profession, teacher educators at many U.S. higher education institutions are responsible for developing the outcomes-based documentation now required by professional accrediting agencies (Cochran-Smith, 2003). Signs of constriction on teacher educators include the shift of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) toward performance outcomes as the basis for making accreditation

decisions (Bullough, Clark, & Patterson, 2003). Teacher and teacher education are inherently unavoidably political, in that they involve the negotiation of conflicting values about the purposes, roles, and contents of schooling (Cochran-Smith, 2005). NCATE's rubrics are used to normalize judgment about what is acceptable and unacceptable in teacher education. The rubrics invoke NCATE's power to mark with a scarlet letter those institutions that are not up to standard, that are not of "high quality" (Kappler, 2004). "NCATE is also a tool of a large industry deliberately attempting to brand its product and increase its values. It has also had the effect of helping the more major SoEs control the more minor ones, and even close them" (Varenne, 2007, p. 21). This study examines the effects NCATE accreditation has on the professional self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas.

Summary

The preceding review of literature pertinent to the current study examined texts relating to the self, self-esteem, the Carnegie Classification System, and the NCATE organization. In regards to the first two topics, the literature revealed that, over time, some general consensus has emerged in regards to the nature of the self as well as the nature and importance of self-esteem in examining human life. Both academic and popular publications on self-esteem have resulted in the general population having an understanding and appreciation for the concept and its implications. In analyzing the history of the Carnegie Classification system, the literature pointed out that the classifications were not intended to bestow status on institutions. However, the Carnegie Classification System has impacted the perceptions of the professionals in higher education and given them a basis for discriminating and categorizing differences among colleges and universities in the United States. The possibility exists that the classification of an institution may have implications for the professional self-esteem of its faculty members. A review of the

literature pertaining to the history and purpose of NCATE accreditation revealed NCATE to be a growing organization supported by both powerful and influential professional and governmental agencies. Acquiring NCATE accreditation is a demanding and costly process, but one that claims to drive continuous improvement in SCDEs while developing better teachers prepared to enter the profession. An increasing number of institutions are seeking and maintaining the nationally recognized status of NCATE accreditation which may have an impact on the professional self-esteem of its faculty members.

Chapter 3

Method of Procedure

The current study investigated the professional self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas by utilizing the survey instrument and methodological framework of Reynolds' 1992 study on teacher educators in Ohio and Tinsley's subsequent 2002 study on teacher educators in Texas. A total of 242 teacher educators from 67 SCDE's in Texas completed the electronic survey questionnaire as requested. Data were utilized to examine how participants feel about themselves as professionals as well as how they feel they are viewed by their academic colleagues. Using a thorough statistical comparison of raw data means and factor sum means, the study specifically examined the following hypotheses and research question:

1. No significant differences exist between the levels of teacher educators' professional self-esteem and their perceived professional esteem from non –professional education faculty.
2. No significant differences exist in the levels of professional self-esteem among teacher educators from different types of institutions, as determined by the Carnegie Classification System.
3. No significant differences exist in the levels of professional self-esteem between teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions.

Research Question

In a comparison of the results of the current study and the results of Tinsley's 2002 study on Texas Teacher Educators, do any differences exist?

General Procedures

The participants in the study were teacher educators in Texas'68 four year college and university teacher certification programs. An electronic survey was used to collect data. Surveys have become a widely used and acknowledged research tool in most of the developed countries of the world (Rea & Parker, 2012). Surveys are one of the most important research methods in the social sciences and an important tool in applied work (Marsden & Wright, 2010). Historically, the three types of survey instruments most often used are the mailed questionnaire, the face-to-face interview, and the telephone interview (Borg & Gall, 2003). The Web-based survey is an alternative to the traditional mail-out technique whereby individuals are contacted by e-mail and asked to participate in a survey that is designed to be completed and submitted by computer (Rea & Parker, 2012). The current study made use of a Web-based survey utilizing e-mailed invitations for participation.

Reynolds' 1992 study on teacher educators in Ohio was the original research work that established the framework for Tinsley's 2002 study. Both studies aimed to gather meaningful data on the professional self-esteem of teacher educators. The current study followed Reynolds' and Tinsley's recommendations by using a similar methodology to develop data on teacher educators in Texas. As such, Reynolds' original survey instrument was utilized in conducting this study.

Design of the Study

The current study followed a typical design for an emailed research project in order to investigate and quantify the beliefs of teacher educators in Texas. The study was carried out in six stages:

1. Selection of the instrument;
2. Selection of the participants;
3. Email out of the invitation and survey link;
4. Collection of data;
5. Treatment of data; and,
6. Conclusions and recommendations.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument utilized in this study was originally created by Reynolds for his 1992 study of teacher educators in Ohio. Tinsley used Reynolds' survey instrument for his 2002 study of teacher educators in Texas. The survey instrument consists of two parts. Part one contains 40 belief statements that are to be responded to in two ways. Response Set A asks each statement as: "I believe that....," and Response Set B asks each belief statement as "I believe my academic colleagues would say that..." The responses to each belief statement are registered on a Likert-type scale of 1-6, ranging from "very strongly disagree" to "very strongly agree." The following are the 40 belief statements from Reynolds' (1992) survey instrument.

Questionnaire Belief Statements:

1. Teacher educators are scholarly.
2. The quality of teacher educators' research is equal to that found in other academic units.
3. Teacher education has a second-rate status in the university.
4. Teacher education admits many students who would never be admitted to other programs.
5. Teacher educators are fully accepted in the academic community.

6. Teacher educators have a strong formative influence on preservice teacher candidates.
7. Only those education faculties whose research and scholarly publications help elevate the status of the department should receive tenure.
8. Teacher educators make good professors because of their work with K-12 schools.
9. Teacher education has enough faculty lacking in scholarly productivity to warrant criticism.
10. The campus image of teacher education is often reflected in meager financial support.
11. The knowledge base for professional education is well developed.
12. Teacher educators live in an impossible world serving “two masters”; the teaching profession and the academic community.
13. The research of teacher educators leads to improvement in educational practice.
14. Teacher education is tolerated rather than accepted in the university.
15. Teacher educators are among the best teachers on campus.
16. Teacher educators are committed to scholarship.
17. Studies in teacher education are more demanding than studies in other disciplines.
18. Classroom teacher regard the academic work of teacher educators as irrelevant.
19. The reward system of this institution fairly recognizes good teaching.
20. Teacher educators are viewed as marginal people at the periphery of the academic community.
21. The practical vision of teacher preparation and the university’s norms of scholarship are compatible.
22. The practical, school-oriented responsibilities of teacher educators lead to lowered status on campus.

23. Teacher aspirants are more intellectually able than the average college bound high school graduate.
24. Education as a discipline has yet to develop a body of knowledge and technique of sufficient scope to be given full academic status.
25. Teacher education programs are held in high esteem on campus.
26. Teacher educators have low rates of publication.
27. Some students choose education as a last resort after failing in other majors.
28. Being part of an academic community enhances the teacher educator's ability to be effective with the schools.
29. Teacher educators have traditionally had a difficult time defining their role in higher education.
30. Teacher educators are weak in research skills.
31. Teacher educators are lacking in the very teaching skills that they should epitomize.
32. Teacher educators are first-rate academic colleagues.
33. Education professors have been tarnished in the eyes of their peers by the quality of students admitted to the field.
34. Teacher educators have a positive impact on students.
35. Teacher educators have distanced themselves from the concerns of teachers and the problems of schools.
36. Conducting research is a high priority for teacher educators.
37. Teacher educators are respected in the academic community.
38. Teacher education is a legitimate academic field of study.
39. Teacher education is a haven for less able academics.

40. On this campus teacher education does not have a prestige problem.

Part two of the instrument consisted of 18 demographic items pertaining to the participant's sex, age, academic rank, professional affiliations, and institutional classification. Tinsley (2002) added one item, NCATE accreditation, to Part Two of the instrument. This item was also included for the purposes of this study. Reynolds (1992) states the survey can be completed in about 25 minutes. A copy of the survey instrument used in this study is included in Appendix A. Letters of consent for using the survey instrument are included in Appendices B and C.

Development

The original survey instrument was created in several stages (Reynolds, 1992). First, Reynolds reviewed a vast amount of literature on self-esteem and teacher educators, creating a lengthy list of pertinent ideas (Tinsley, 2002). Second, 15 teacher educators at The Ohio State University were interviewed and asked: "What factors do you believe affect how you feel about yourself in your work as a teacher educator?" The interviews were taped and reviewed to isolate common themes among the subjects' thoughts. By combining what was found in the literature review and the common themes of interviews, Reynolds created a series of belief statements for a prototype questionnaire (Tinsley, 2002). A pilot test was conducted using the prototype questionnaires. Twenty four education faculty members from Ohio State University, two of its regional campuses, and two liberal arts colleges completed and returned surveys (Reynolds, 1992).

Content Validity and Reliability

Following Reynolds' administration of the pilot test, the instrument's reliability was established using split-half procedures. The split-half correlation was transformed into an

appropriate reliability estimate for the entire test using the equal length Spearman-Brown prophecy formula which yielded acceptable results between forms of 0.08399 and a correlation of 0.9130 (Reynolds, 1992). Reliability coefficients were established for groups of items dealing with various hypothesized factors using the Pearson Product Moment procedure. Based upon the process, one factor grouping dealing with field work was eliminated, and other items were rearranged and reworded. The instrument was then fine-tuned further from subjects' constructive comments, input from advisors, and the analyses of descriptive data for measures of frequency, mean, mode, skewness, standard deviation, and variance. The instrument was tested again and, after examination of the data, deemed valid and reliable (Tinsley, 2002). Content validity was established through factor analysis, proving the items' homogeneity and that the variables of each of the seven factor groupings do indeed test the same underlying construct (Reynolds, 1992).

Selection of the Participants

According to Tinsley (2002), the number of Texas teacher educators as specifically defined for the purposes of his study totaled 549. Procedures were taken in order to define the number of Texas teacher educators as specifically defined for the purposes of this study. An official or designated contact person at each SCDE in Texas was contacted by email requesting the names and email addresses of the teacher educators who qualified for participation in the study. The contact email included information briefly identifying the researcher, explaining the project, and specifically defining the desired information. This study, similar to Tinsley's 2002 study, adhered to Reynolds (1992) definition of a teacher educator. According to Reynolds (1992), a teacher educator is one who holds a full-time tenured or tenure track position and spends at least 50% of his or her time on the preparation of future teachers by teaching

foundations or methods courses or by supervising student teachers in the field.

Of the 68 institutions contacted, 48 replied by email with the information. Nineteen institutions' teacher educator faculty members had to be identified by available electronic catalog information. Cataloged information used for identification included, employment status (full-time or part-time), teaching syllabi, professional rank, and job descriptions specific to each institution. The number of teacher educators identified in Texas totaled 610. The fourteen NCATE institutions accounted for 224 of the teacher educators in Texas. Seven master's institutions are NCATE accredited and have a total of 121 teacher educators, while another seven doctoral institutions are NCATE accredited and have a total of 103 teacher educators. None of the twelve baccalaureate institutions is accredited. Tables 3-1 to 3-3 break down all teacher educators in Texas by Carnegie Classifications and NCATE accreditation status.

Table 3-1

Texas Teacher Educator Totals by Carnegie Classification

Carnegie Classification	Number of Institutions	Number of Teacher Educators	Percentage of Total
Baccalaureate	12	43	7.05%
Master's	37	309	50.66%
Doctoral	19	258	42.30%

Table 3-2

Texas Teacher Educator Totals by NCATE Status

NCATE Status	Number of Institutions	Number of Teacher Educators	Percentage of Total
Accredited	14	224	36.72%
Not Accredited	54	386	63.28%

Table 3-3

Texas Teacher Educator Totals by NCATE Accreditation Status and Carnegie Classification

Classification and NCATE Status	Number of Institutions	Number of Teacher Educators	Percentage of Total
Baccalaureate Accredited	0	0	0
Baccalaureate Non-Accredited	12	43	7.05%
Master's Accredited	7	121	19.84%
Master's Non-Accredited	30	188	30.82%
Doctoral Accredited	7	103	16.89%
Doctoral Non-Accredited	12	155	25.41%

The required number of surveys for an acceptable, representative data set from of a population sample size of 610 was set at 234 by the standards of Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Invitations explaining the purpose of the study, including a link to the web-based survey, were emailed during the spring semester of 2013 to all 610 teacher educators with the goal of receiving a return of a minimum of 234 completed surveys by the end of the semester.

Collection of the Data

Each Texas teacher educator was emailed the information necessary for their participation in the study. Each email contained:

1. A letter explaining the purpose of the study;
2. An electronic link to the survey instrument.

A copy of the letter emailed to all Texas teacher educators, including the electronic link to the survey instrument, is included in Appendix D.

Email messages were sent out monthly reminding participants to complete the survey. A copy of the reminder letter emailed to all Texas teacher educators is included in Appendix E. Email allowed for a number of participants to ask questions for clarification or communicate other pertinent information as needed. At the end of May 2013, a total of 242 usable responses were completed and constituted the data used for this study.

Treatment of the Data

Data from completed surveys were transferred electronically from Survey Monkey into SPSS software. The entries were checked to be certain the original data were reflected accurately. Each survey questionnaire contained 40 belief statements in Part 1. Each participant

was to respond to each statement in two ways. Response Set A, consisting of the even numbered survey questions 2 through 80, begins each statement with, “I believe that...,” while Response Set B, consisting of the odd numbered survey questions 3 through 81, begins each statement with, “I believe my academic colleagues would say that” The data in Response Set A for each questionnaire were entered into the computer as a1-a40, and the data in Response Set B for each questionnaire were entered into the computer as b1-b40.

Reynolds (1992) determined that seven factors were measured by his instrument. According to Kim and Mueller (1978), factor analysis is a process that includes “a variety of statistical techniques whose common objective is to represent a set of variables in terms of a smaller number of hypothetical variables” (p. 9). Reynolds (1992) used oblique rotation factor analyses to produce matrices from five to ten factors. Reynolds' examination revealed that a seven factor solution was the most rewarding in terms of factor differentiation, and it produced factors with acceptable Eigen values all above 1.0. Furthermore, the individual survey items that loaded onto each factor of these factors held together logically. Reynolds’ (1992) seven factors are as follows;

- F1 general factor-legitimacy of teacher education;
- F2 acceptance of teacher educators in the academic community;
- F3 the acceptance of teacher education on campus;
- F4 the research and publication activities of teacher educators;
- F5 the quality of education students;
- F6 teacher educators’ influence on education students and educational practice;

F7 the perception of rigor (or lack of it) in teacher education.

In order to analyze the data with regard to the seven factors, the responses to the items loading into each factor had to be summed. First, however, responses to items stated negatively had to be transformed by reversing their values on the Likert-type scale. Transformation allowed for the direct comparison of factor sums – the higher the sum, the higher the level of esteem. The seven factors were labeled fa1-fa7 for factor sums from items in Response Set A and fb1-fb7 for factor sums from items in Response Set B. Factor sums were used in testing four hypotheses.

All analyses of the data were compiled using the SPSS statistical package. The following statistical procedures were used to test the hypotheses:

Hypotheses 1: Paired-sample t-tests were used to compare the means of each pair of factor sums from Response Sets A and B of Part 1 of the instrument in order to compare the means of the “I believe...” responses to the means of the “I believe my academic colleagues would say that”

Hypotheses 2: One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to find any significant differences among the responses of teacher educators from three different Carnegie types of institutions – baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral – in each of the seven factors in both Response Sets A and B. The ANOVA procedure is appropriate for comparing independent samples from more than two groups (Gelman, 2005). Where a significant difference was indicated and equal variances assumed, the Tukey HSD post hoc procedure was used to determine the differences between specific pairs, and then factor sum means were reexamined to determine the direction of difference.

Hypothesis 3: Independent samples t-tests were applied to each of the seven factors from both Response Sets A and B of Part 1 of the instrument to test for any significant differences between the responses of teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions. If a significant difference was found, the factor sum means were reexamined to determine the direction of difference.

Research Question: Descriptive statistics were applied to compare the results of Tinsley's 2002 study to the current study.

Summary

The procedures of this study were based upon the procedures of Reynolds' 1992 study on teacher educators in Ohio and Tinsley's 2002 study on teacher educators in Texas. Teacher educators in Texas were identified institution by institution and the total number was found to be 610. This study made use of the original instrument developed by Reynolds in an emailed questionnaire survey data gathering methodology used commonly by researchers in the social sciences. Surveys were successfully completed by 242 participants, exceeding the statistically necessary minimum number of 234 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). The data from these surveys were quantitatively analyzed using standard parametric statistical procedures to test the hypotheses. The findings and analyses of these procedures are presented in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The results of the study are presented in Chapter 4. This chapter presents the results in several sections. A detailed description of the participants is presented in section one. The means of the responses to each of the forty survey items for both Response Set A and Response Set B are presented in section two. The third section presents the seven factors and details how factor sums were calculated. Section four presents the analyses of the factor sums to test Hypothesis 1. Section five presents the analyses of the factor sums to test Hypothesis 2. The sixth section presents the analyses of factor sums to test Hypothesis 3. Section seven presents descriptive statistics to answer the research question from this study. Chapter 4 concludes with a summary.

Description of the Participants

The 242 participants for this study were teacher educators in Texas SCDEs. A teacher educator, as defined for this study, is an individual holding a full time, tenured or tenure tracked position with at least 50% commitment to the teaching of methods courses, foundations courses, and/or the field supervision of future teachers.

The average age of the participants was 51.92 with a range from 30-72. The participants divided by gender included 73.1% females and 26.9% males. Only 6 or 2.5% of the participants listed master's degree as the highest degree held while 97.5% held doctorates. The majority, 84.3%, of the participants were white or Caucasian, with the remainder made up of 8.7% Hispanics, 4.5% African Americans, and 2.5% Asian/Pacific Islander. The participants were well distributed among the various tenured or tenure track ranks within their institutions, with

36% assistant professors, 37.2% associate professors, and 26% professors. Only two participants listed “instructor” as rank. The participants were from three Carnegie Classifications of institutions: 18.2% from baccalaureate, 26.9% from masters, and 55% from doctoral institutions. 45% of the participants were from NCATE accredited institutions, and 55% were from non-NCATE accredited institutions. The average length of time in teacher education for the participants was 15.05 years, and the average length of time in their current institutions was 9.35 years. Tables 4-1 to 4-8 clarify and further breakdown the demographics of the participants.

Table 4-1

Participant General Demographics

Characteristic	Total Number	Percentage of Participants
TOTAL	242	100
Female	177	75.6
Male	65	24.4
Master's Degree	6	2.5
Doctoral Degree	236	97.5
Instructor	2	0.8
Assistant Professor	87	36
Associate Professor	90	37.2
Professor	63	26
African American	11	4.5
Hispanic	21	8.7
White/Caucasian	204	84.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	2.5
Other	0	0

Table 4-1 (continued)

Characteristic	Total Number	Percentage of Participants
Baccalaureate Institution	44	18.2
Master's Institution	65	26.9
Doctoral Institution	133	55
NCATE Accredited	109	45
Non-NCATE Accredited	133	55

Table 4-2

Participant Highest Degree Earned by Sex

Highest Degree Earned	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
Master's Degree	5	2.07	1	.41
Doctoral Degree	172	71.07	64	26.45

Table 4-3

Participant Ethnicity by Sex

Ethnicity	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
African American	7	2.89	4	1.65
Hispanic	13	5.37	8	3.31
White/Caucasian	153	63.22	51	21.07
Asian/Pacific Islander	4	1.65	2	.83
Other	0	0	0	0

Table 4-4

Participant Faculty Rank by Sex

Rank	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
Instructor	1	.41	1	.41
Assistant Professor	75	30.99	12	4.96
Associate Professor	64	26.45	26	10.74
Professor	37	15.29	26	10.74

Table 4-5

Participant Age and Experience by Sex

Sex	Average Age	Average Years in Teacher Education	Average Years in Current Institution
Female	50.91	12.94	8.52
Male	53.85	19.28	10.52

Table 4-6

Participant Carnegie Classification by Sex

Carnegie Classification	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
Baccalaureate	36	14.88	8	3.31
Master's	50	20.66	15	6.20
Doctoral	91	37.60	42	17.36

Table 4-7

Participant NCATE Accreditation by Sex

NCATE	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
Accredited	83	34.30	26	10.74
Non-Accredited	94	38.84	39	16.12

Table 4-8

Previous Occupation by Sex

Previous Occupation	Female		Male	
	#	%	#	%
Elementary Teacher	42	17.36	17	7.02
Middle School Teacher	37	15.29	19	7.86
High School Teacher	33	13.64	16	6.61
Community School Teacher	4	1.65	0	0
School Administrator	49	20.25	13	5.37
Other	12	4.96	0	0

Item Response Means

The questionnaire used in this study presented each teacher educator with 40 items to respond to in two ways. Response Set A, consisting of the even numbered questions 2 through 80, elicited responses from the point of view of “I believe...,” and Response Set B, consisting of the odd numbered questions 3 through 81, elicited responses from the point of view of “I believe my academic colleagues outside of professional education would say that...” The responses to each item for both Set A and Set B were recorded on a Likert-type scale of 1-6, with designated values ranging from 1=very strongly disagree to 6=very strongly agree. Table 4-9 presents the means of the responses to each belief statement for both Response Set A (I believe ...) and Response Set B (I believe my academic colleagues would say that ...).

Table 4-9
Survey Response Means

Belief Statement	Mean A	Mean B
1. Teacher educators are scholarly.	4.58	3.60
2. The quality of teacher educators' research is equal to that found in other academic units.	4.42	3.30
3. Teacher education has a second-rate status in the university.	3.98	4.08
4. Teacher education admits many students who would never be admitted to other programs.	3.38	4.07
5. Teacher educators are fully accepted in the academic community.	3.64	3.62
6. Teacher educators have a strong formative influence on preservice teacher candidates.	5.01	4.39
7. Only those education faculties whose research and scholarly publications help elevate the status of the department should receive tenure.	3.49	4.26
8. Teacher educators make good professors because of their work with K-12 schools.	4.77	3.93
9. Teacher education has enough faculty lacking in scholarly productivity to warrant criticism.	3.28	3.86

Table 4-9 (continued)

Belief Statement	Mean A	Mean B
10. The campus image of teacher education is often reflected in meager financial support.	4.38	3.72
11. The knowledge base for professional education is well developed.	4.37	3.71
12. Teacher educators live in an impossible world serving “two masters”; the teaching profession and the academic community.	3.75	3.09
13. The research of teacher educators leads to improvement in educational practice.	4.48	3.81
14. Teacher education is tolerated rather than accepted in the university.	3.41	3.36
15. Teacher educators are among the best teachers on campus.	4.92	3.65
16. Teacher educators are committed to scholarship.	4.27	3.45
17. Studies in teacher education are more demanding than studies in other disciplines.	3.36	2.64
18. Classroom teacher regard the academic work of teacher educators as irrelevant.	3.38	3.45
19. The reward system of this institution fairly recognizes good teaching.	3.42	3.60

Table 4-9 (continued)

Belief Statement	Mean A	Mean B
20. Teacher educators are viewed as marginal people at the periphery of the academic community.	3.53	3.42
21. The practical vision of teacher preparation and the university's norms of scholarship are compatible.	3.93	3.85
22. The practical, school-oriented responsibilities of teacher educators lead to lowered status on campus.	3.50	3.41
23. Teacher aspirants are more intellectually able than the average college bound high school graduate.	3.45	2.99
24. Education as a discipline has yet to develop a body of knowledge and technique of sufficient scope to be given full academic status.	2.66	3.42
25. Teacher education programs are held in high esteem on campus.	3.23	3.13
26. Teacher educators have low rates of publication.	3.37	3.86
27. Some students choose education as a last resort after failing in other majors.	3.57	4.11
28. Being part of an academic community enhances the teacher educator's ability to be effective with the schools.	4.67	4.17
29. Teacher educators have traditionally had a difficult time defining their role in higher education.	3.83	3.83

Table 4-9 (continued)

Belief Statement	Mean A	Mean B
30. Teacher educators are weak in research skills.	2.98	3.82
31. Teacher educators are lacking in the very teaching skills that they should epitomize.	2.55	2.88
32. Teacher educators are first-rate academic colleagues.	4.50	3.59
33. Education professors have been tarnished in the eyes of their peers by the quality of students admitted to the field.	3.43	3.60
34. Teacher educators have a positive impact on students.	5.08	4.47
35. Teacher educators have distanced themselves from the concerns of teachers and the problems of schools.	2.64	3.01
36. Conducting research is a high priority for teacher educators.	3.99	3.47
37. Teacher educators are respected in the academic community.	3.66	3.48
38. Teacher education is a legitimate academic field of study.	5.42	3.95
39. Teacher education is a haven for less able academics.	2.45	3.61
40. On this campus teacher education does not have a prestige problem.	3.57	3.79

Factors

Each factor sum was the sum of a number of item responses from Response Set A or Response Set B. The following details the seven factors and the items loaded onto each factor.

- Factor 1 Legitimacy of teacher education
- 16. and 17. Teacher educators make good professors because of their work with K-12 schools.
 - 22. and 23. The knowledge base for professional education is well developed.
 - 30. and 31. Teacher educators are among the best teachers on campus.
 - *48. and *49. Education as a discipline has yet to develop a body of knowledge and technique of sufficient scope to be given full academic status.
 - *62. and *63. Teacher educators are weak in research skills.
 - 64. and 65. Teacher educators are first-rate academic colleagues.
 - 70. and 71. Teacher educators have distanced themselves from the concerns of teachers and the problems of schools.
- Factor 2 Acceptance of teacher educators in the academic community
- 10. and 11. Teacher educators are fully accepted in the academic community.
 - *40. and *41. Teacher educators are viewed as marginal people at the periphery of the academic community.
 - *44. and *45. The practical, school-oriented responsibilities of teacher educators lead to lowered status on campus.
 - *58. and *59. Teacher educators have traditionally had a difficult time defining their role in higher education.

74. and 75. Teacher educators are respected in the academic community.

Factor 3 Acceptance of teacher education on campus

*6. and *7. Teacher education has second-rate status on campus.

*20. and *21. The campus image of teacher education is often reflected in
meager financial support.

*28. and *29. Teacher education is tolerated rather than accepted in the
university.

42. and 43. The practical vision of teacher preparation and the university's
norms of scholarship are compatible.

50. and 51. Teacher education programs are held in high esteem on campus.

80. and 81. On this campus, teacher education does not have a prestige
problem.

Factor 4 Research and publication activities of teacher educators

4. and 5. The quality of teacher educators' research is equal to that found
in other academic units.

32. and 33. Teacher educators are committed to scholarship.

*52. and *53. Some students choose education as a last resort after failing in

other majors.

*60. and *61. Teacher educators are weak in research skills.

72. and 73. Conducting research is a high priority for teacher educators.

Factor 5 Quality of education students

*8. and *9. Teacher education admits many students who would never be admitted to other programs.

46. and 47. Teacher aspirants are more intellectually able than the average college bound high school graduate.

*54. and *55. Some students choose education as a last resort after failing in other majors.

*66. and *67. Education professors have been tarnished in the eyes of their peers by the quality of students admitted to the field.

Factor 6 Teacher educators' influence on education students and educational practice

12. and 13. Teacher educators have a strong formative influence on preservice teacher candidates.

26. and 27. The research of teacher educators leads to improvement in educational practice.

56. and 57. Being part of an academic community enhances the teacher educator's ability to be effective with the schools.

68. and 69. Teacher educators have a positive impact on students.

Factor 7 The perception of rigor (or lack of it) in teacher education

*14. and *15. Only those education faculty whose research and scholarly publications help elevate the status of the department should receive tenure.

*18. and *19. Teacher education has enough faculty lacking in scholarly productivity to warrant criticism.

*78. and *79. Teacher education is a haven for less able academics.

*Negatively stated item

In order to calculate factor sums that would reflect comparable magnitudes, the values of negatively stated items were reversed in scale so that 1=6, 2=5, and 3=4. Negatively stated items include: 48, 49, 62, 63, 70, 71, 40, 41, 44, 45, 58, 59, 6, 7, 20, 21, 28, 29, 52, 53, 60, 61, 8, 9, 54, 55, 66, 67, 14, 15, 18, 19, 78, and 79. The factor sums were identified for Response Set A as A1-A7 and as B1-B7 for Response Set B.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis states: There are no significant differences between the levels of teacher educators' professional self-esteem and their perceived professional esteem from non-professional education faculty. Paired-samples *t* tests were used to test each pair of factor sums from Response Sets A and B. The paired-samples statistics are given in Table 4-10, followed by the results of the paired samples tests in Table 4-11.

Table 4-10

Paired Samples Statistics

<u>Pair</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Std. Deviation</u>	<u>Std. Error Mean</u>
1	A1	31.71	242	5.27	.34
	B1	26.58	242	4.78	.31
2	A2	17.43	242	4.04	.26
	B2	17.45	242	3.46	.22
3	A3	19.95	242	5.07	.33
	B3	20.60	242	4.00	.26
4	A4	20.32	242	3.90	.25
	B4	16.55	242	3.52	.23
5	A4	14.07	242	3.46	.22
	B5	12.21	242	3.04	.20
6	A6	19.24	242	2.95	.19
	B6	16.84	242	2.68	.17
7	A7	11.79	242	2.80	.18
	B7	9.27	242	2.48	.16

Table 4-11

Paired Samples t Test

<u>Pair</u>	<u>Mean Diff.</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig. (2-tailed)</u>
1	5.13	5.12	15.61	241	.000
2	-.017	1.96	-.131	241	.896
3	-.65	2.74	-3.679	241	.000
4	3.77	3.60	16.295	241	.000
5	1.86	2.29	12.657	241	.000
6	2.39	2.46	15.154	241	.000
7	2.52	2.77	14.136	241	.000

The *t* test results (Table 4-11) indicate that there is a significant difference between how teacher educators in Texas view themselves professionally and how they feel they are viewed by their academic colleagues in all factors with the exception of factor 2. Factor 2 analyzes the acceptance of teacher educators in the academic community. The null hypothesis should be rejected for the other six factors.

Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis states: There are no significant differences in levels of professional self-esteem among teacher educators from different types of institutions, as determined by the Carnegie Classification System. Using factor sums (Reynolds, 1992) as dependent variables, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were used to test for any significant differences among participants from the three classifications of institutions under investigation, baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral. Table 15 entails the factor descriptive statistics and Table 16 entails the homogeneity of factor variances. The results of the ANOVA procedures testing hypothesis 2 are provided in Table 4-12.

Table 4-12

Factor Descriptive Statistics for Carnegie Classifications

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classification</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
A1	Baccalaureate	44	32	6.52	.98
	Master's	65	32.06	4.97	.62
	Doctoral	133	31.44	4.98	.43
	Total	242	31.71	5.27	.34
B1	Baccalaureate	44	26.16	4.57	.69
	Master's	65	27.42	5.02	.62
	Doctoral	133	26.31	4.72	.41
	Total	242	26.58	4.78	.31
A2	Baccalaureate	44	17.41	3.29	.50
	Master's	65	18.12	4.37	.54
	Doctoral	133	17.10	4.08	.35
	Total	242	17.43	4.04	.26
B2	Baccalaureate	44	17.36	2.48	.37
	Master's	65	18.17	3.67	.45
	Doctoral	133	17.12	3.60	.31
	Total	242	17.45	3.46	.22

Table 4-12 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classification</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
A3	Baccalaureate	44	20.02	5.28	.80
	Master's	65	21.48	5.73	.71
	Doctoral	133	19.19	4.49	.39
	Total	242	19.95	5.07	.33
B3	Baccalaureate	44	20.73	3.84	.58
	Master's	65	21.63	4.63	.57
	Doctoral	133	20.06	3.63	.31
	Total	242	20.60	4.00	.26
A4	Baccalaureate	44	20.25	3.33	.50
	Master's	65	20.42	3.30	.41
	Doctoral	133	20.29	4.34	.38
	Total	242	20.32	3.90	.25
B4	Baccalaureate	44	16.77	2.68	.40
	Master's	65	16.77	3.63	.45
	Doctoral	133	16.36	3.71	.32
	Total	242	16.55	3.52	.23

Table 4-12 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classification</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
A5	Baccalaureate	44	13.55	3.99	.60
	Master's	65	15.02	3.61	.45
	Doctoral	133	13.79	3.13	.27
	Total	242	14.07	3.46	.22
B5	Baccalaureate	44	11.98	3.19	.48
	Master's	65	12.71	3.23	.40
	Doctoral	133	12.05	2.89	.25
	Total	242	12.21	3.04	.20
A6	Baccalaureate	44	19.14	3.26	.49
	Master's	65	19.75	2.86	.35
	Doctoral	133	19.02	2.88	.25
	Total	242	19.24	2.95	.19
B6	Baccalaureate	44	17.16	2.68	.40
	Master's	65	17.15	2.76	.34
	Doctoral	133	16.59	2.63	.23
	Total	242	16.84	2.68	.17

Table 4-12 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classification</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error</u>
A7	Baccalaureate	44	11.66	2.15	.32
	Master's	65	12.37	2.52	.31
	Doctoral	133	11.55	3.09	.27
	Total	242	11.79	2.80	.18
B7	Baccalaureate	44	9.32	2.58	.39
	Master's	65	9.74	2.41	.30
	Doctoral	133	9.03	2.47	.21
	Total	242	9.27	2.48	.16

Table 4-13

Homogeneity of Factor Variances

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Levene Statistic</u>	<u>df1</u>	<u>df2</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A1	4.52	2	239	.012
B1	.003	2	239	.997
A2	2.108	2	239	.124
B2	2.365	2	239	.096
A3	2.865	2	239	.059
B3	1.754	2	239	.175
A4	1.826	2	239	.163
B4	1.600	2	239	.204
A5	1.317	2	239	.270
B5	.934	2	239	.394
A6	1.571	2	239	.210
B6	.058	2	239	.944
A7	2.161	2	239	.117
B7	.156	2	239	.856

Table 4-14

ANOVA-Carnegie Classifications

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A1 Between Groups	21.171	2	10.586	.378	.685
Within Groups	6684.581	239	27.969		
Total	6705.752	241			
B1 Between Groups	62.976	2	31.488	1.380	.253
Within Groups	5452.032	239	22.812		
Total	5515.008	241			
A2 Between Groups	45.925	2	22.962	1.415	.245
Within Groups	3879.381	239	16.232		
Total	3925.306	241			
B2 Between Groups	48.406	2	24.203	2.037	.133
Within Groups	2839.395	239	11.880		
Total	2887.802	241			

Table 4-14 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A3 Between Groups	229.007	2	114.503	4.591	.011
Within Groups	5961.493	239	24.943		
Total	6190.500	241			
B3 Between Groups	108.533	2	54.266	3.465	.033
Within Groups	3743.385	239	15.663		
Total	3851.917	241			
A4 Between Groups	.901	2	.451	.029	.971
Within Groups	3657.599	239	15.304		
Total	3658.500	241			
B4 Between Groups	10.058	2	5.029	.405	.668
Within Groups	2969.942	239	12.427		
Total	2980.000	241			

Table 4-14 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A5 Between Groups	80.662	2	40.331	3.428	.034
Within Groups	2811.999	239	11.766		
Total	2892.661	241			
B5 Between Groups	22.099	2	11.050	1.196	.304
Within Groups	2208.153	239	9.239		
Total	2230.252	241			
A6 Between Groups	24.361	2	12.181	1.401	.248
Within Groups	2077.213	239	8.691		
Total	2101.574	241			
B6 Between Groups	19.430	2	9.715	1.360	.259
Within Groups	1706.604	239	7.141		
Total	1726.033	241			

Table 4-14 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A7 Between Groups	30.295	2	15.147	1.946	.145
Within Groups	1859.957	239	7.782		
Total	1890.252	241			
B7 Between Groups	22.021	2	11.011	1.795	.168
Within Groups	1465.979	239	6.134		
Total	1488.000	241			

According to the data presented in Table 4-14, the null hypothesis could not be rejected for 11 out of the 14 factor sums which yielded values of p (significance) greater than .05. Factors A3, B3, and A5 were the only factors showing significant difference among the three Carnegie Classifications with p values of .011, .033, and .034 respectively. Post hoc tests were conducted in order to determine which specific groups had significant differences between their mean responses. Since the Levene's test (Table 4-13) showed that equal variances could be assumed for factor A3 (significance level of .059), factor B3 (significance level of .175), and factor A5 (significance level of .270), the Tukey HSD test was applied (Table 4-15). The test revealed a significant difference at a level of .008 between the responses from master's and doctoral institutions for Factor A3. Similarly, the test also revealed significant differences at a level of .025 between the responses from master's and doctoral institutions for Factor B3 and at a level of .048 between the responses from master's and doctoral institutions for Factor A5.

Table 4-15

Post Hoc Tests for Factors A3, B3, and A5 – Tukey HSD

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classifications</u>	<u>Mean Dif.</u>	<u>Std. Error</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A3	Baccalaureate—Master’s	-1.454	.975	.297
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	.835	.868	.602
	Master’s--Doctoral	2.289	.755	.008
B3	Baccalaureate—Master’s	-.904	.772	.473
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	.667	.688	.597
	Master’s—Doctoral	1.571	.598	.025
A5	Baccalaureate—Master’s	-1.470	.669	.074
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	-.244	.596	.912
	Master’s--Doctoral	1.226	.519	.048

Factor A3 contains items concerning the acceptance of teacher education on campus from the “I believe ...” point of view. Teacher educators at master’s institutions have significantly higher responses to items within this factor, with a mean response sum of 21.48, than teacher educators at doctoral institutions, who had a mean response sum of 19.19. Factor B3 contains items concerning the acceptance of teacher education on campus from the “I believe that my colleagues outside professional education would say that ...” point of view. Teacher educators at master’s institutions have significantly higher responses to items within this factor, with a mean response sum of 21.63, than teacher educators at doctoral institutions, who had a mean response sum of 20.06. Factor A5 contains items concerning the quality of education students from the “I believe ...” point of view. Teacher educators at master’s institutions have

significantly higher responses to items within this factor, with a mean response sum of 15.02, than teacher educators at doctoral institutions, who had a mean response sum of 13.79.

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis of this study stated: There are no significant differences in levels of professional self-esteem between teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions. Independent sample *t* tests were used to test this hypothesis. Tables 4-16 and 4-17 provide group statistics and variances, and Table 4-18 provides the *t* test results.

Table 4-16

Group Statistics—NCATE/Non-NCATE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>NCATE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error Mean</u>
A1	Yes	109	30.99	5.16	.49
	No	133	32.30	5.31	.46
B1	Yes	109	26.10	4.28	.41
	No	133	26.97	5.14	.45
A2	Yes	109	17.14	3.86	.37
	No	133	17.67	4.17	.36
B2	Yes	109	17.04	3.45	.33
	No	133	17.78	3.45	.30
A3	Yes	109	19.83	4.70	.45
	No	133	20.06	5.37	.47
B3	Yes	109	20.36	3.98	.38
	No	133	20.80	4.01	.35
A4	Yes	109	19.94	4.55	.44
	No	133	20.63	3.25	.28
B4	Yes	109	16.17	3.65	.35
	No	133	16.86	3.39	.29

Table 4-16 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>NCATE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>	<u>Standard Error Mean</u>
A5	Yes	109	13.49	3.33	.32
	No	133	14.56	3.51	.30
B5	Yes	109	11.79	3.21	.31
	No	133	12.56	2.86	.25
A6	Yes	109	18.65	2.99	.29
	No	133	19.71	2.84	.25
B6	Yes	109	16.43	2.42	.23
	No	133	17.18	2.83	.25
A7	Yes	109	11.14	2.87	.27
	No	133	12.32	2.64	.23
B7	Yes	109	8.72	2.54	.24
	No	133	9.73	2.35	.20

Table 4-17

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<u>Factor</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A1	.431	.512
B1	4.680	.032
A2	2.074	.151
B2	.014	.906
A3	1.937	.165
B3	.172	.679
A4	7.633	.006
B4	.057	.811
A5	.294	.588
B5	1.043	.308
A6	.135	.713
B6	4.386	.037
A7	.145	.704
B7	.702	.403

Table 4-18

Equality of Means t Test—NCATE/Non-NCATE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig.</u> <u>(2-tailed)</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Dif.</u>	<u>Std. Error</u> <u>Dif.</u>
A1	-1.933	240	.054	-1.310	.67
B1	-1.409	240	.160	-.869	.62
A2	-1.020	240	.309	-.532	.52
B2	-1.673	240	.096	-.745	.45
A3	-.357	240	.721	-.234	.66
B3	-.864	240	.388	-.447	.52
A4	-1.385	240	.167	-.696	.50
B4	-1.527	240	.128	-.692	.45
A5	-2.415	240	.017	-1.070	.44
B5	-1.964	240	.051	-.767	.39
A6	-2.826	240	.005	-1.063	.38
B6	-2.184	240	.030	-.749	.34
A7	-3.345	240	.001	-1.186	.35
B7	-3.218	240	.001	-1.014	.32

The null could not be rejected for 9 out of 14 factor sum comparisons (Table 4-18).

There were significant differences, at levels of less than .05, between the responses from teacher educators in NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions on factor sums A5, A6,

B6, A7, and B7. Factor A5 dealt with the quality of education students from the “I believe ...” point of view. The mean factor sum of NCATE accredited responses was 13.49 while the mean factor sum of non-NCATE accredited responses was 14.56, showing that teacher educators at non-NCATE accredited institutions gave significantly higher responses to items within the factor than teacher educators at NCATE accredited institutions. Factor 6 dealt with teacher educators’ influence on education students and educational practice. From both the “I believe ...” point of view and the “I believe my colleagues outside professional education would say that...” points of view, teacher educators from non-NCATE accredited institutions gave significantly higher responses to items within the factor than teacher educators from NCATE accredited institutions. The A6 factor sum mean for non-NCATE responses was 19.71 while the factor sum mean for NCATE responses was 18.65. The B6 factor sum mean for non-NCATE responses was 17.18 while the factor sum mean for NCATE responses was 16.43. Factor 7 measures the perception of rigor (or lack of it) in teacher education. From both the “I believe ...” point of view and the “I believe my colleagues outside professional education would say that...” points of view, teacher educators from non-NCATE accredited institutions gave significantly higher responses to items within the factor than teacher educators from NCATE accredited institutions. The A7 factor sum mean for non-NCATE responses was 12.32 while the factor sum mean for NCATE responses was 11.14. The B6 factor sum mean for non-NCATE responses was 9.73 while the factor sum mean for NCATE responses was 8.72.

Research Question

The research question for this study stated: Are there any differences between the results of Tinsley's 2002 study on Texas Teacher Educators and the results of the current study? Table 4-19 provides the paired samples t test results for hypothesis one from Tinsley's (2002) study. For comparison purposes, Table 4-20 again provides the paired samples t test results for hypothesis one from the current study. Tables 4-21 and 4-22 provide the results of the ANOVA procedure and the Tukey HSD test on hypothesis two from Tinsley's (2002) study. For comparison purposes, Tables 4-23 and 4-24 again provide the ANOVA procedure and Tukey HSD test results on hypothesis two from the current study. Table 4-25 provides the Equality of Means t test results for hypothesis three from Tinsley's (2002) study. For comparison purposes, Table 4-26 again provides the equality of means t test results for hypothesis three from the current study.

Table 4-19

Tinsley's (2002) Paired Samples *t* Test Results for Hypothesis One

<u>Pair</u>	<u>Mean Diff.</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u><i>t</i></u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig. (2-tailed)</u>
1	6.80	5.04	20.249	224	.000
2	.50	3.23	2.387	233	.018
3	-.79	3.74	-3.242	234	.001
4	5.65	4.63	18.560	230	.000
5	3.54	3.19	16.968	232	.000
6	3.27	3.02	16.444	229	.000
7	4.30	3.01	21.918	235	.000

Table 4-20

Current Study's Paired Samples *t* Test Results for Hypothesis One

<u>Pair</u>	<u>Mean Diff.</u>	<u>Std. Dev.</u>	<u><i>t</i></u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig. (2-tailed)</u>
1	5.13	5.12	15.61	241	.000
2	-.017	1.96	-.131	241	.896
3	-.65	2.74	-3.679	241	.000
4	3.77	3.60	16.295	241	.000
5	1.86	2.29	12.657	241	.000
6	2.39	2.46	15.154	241	.000
7	2.52	2.77	14.136	241	.000

A comparison of the *t* test results for hypothesis one indicates a difference exists between the two studies. According to Tinsley's (2002) study, significant differences existed between how teacher educators viewed themselves professionally and how they felt they were viewed by their academic colleagues. The null hypothesis was rejected for all seven factors. According to the current study, significant differences exist between how teacher educators in Texas view themselves professionally and how they feel they are viewed by their academic colleagues in all

factors with the exception of factor 2. Factor 2 analyzes the acceptance of teacher educators in the academic community. The null hypothesis should be rejected for the other six factors.

Table 4-21

Tinsley's (2002) ANOVA (Carnegie Classifications) Results for Hypothesis Two

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A1 Between Groups	29.506	2	14.753	1.126	.326
Within Groups	2987.854	228	13.105		
Total	3017.359	230			
B1 Between Groups	10.620	2	5.310	.289	.749
Within Groups	4116.067	224	18.375		
Total	4126.687	226			
A2 Between Groups	7.621	2	3.810	.214	.807
Within Groups	4103.918	231	17.766		
Total	4111.538	233			
B2 Between Groups	4.980	2	2.490	.172	.842
Within Groups	3323.467	230	14.450		
Total	3328.446	232			

Table 4-21 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A3 Between Groups	22.987	2	11.493	.429	.652
Within Groups	6221.584	232	26.817		
Total	6244.570	234			
B3 Between Groups	3.625	2	1.1813	.098	.907
Within Groups	4295.337	232	18.514		
Total	4298.962	234			
A4 Between Groups	20.562	2	10.281	.769	.464
Within Groups	3086.434	231	13.361		
Total	3106.996	233			
B4 Between Groups	6.230	2	3.115	.217	.805
Within Groups	3301.161	230	14.353		
Total	3307.391	232			

Table 4-21 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A5 Between Groups	33.242	2	16.621	1.790	.169
Within Groups	2135.823	230	9.286		
Total	2169.064	232			
B5 Between Groups	37.973	2	18.487	1.762	.174
Within Groups	2423.459	231	10.491		
Total	2460.432	233			
A6 Between Groups	18.606	2	9.303	1.560	.212
Within Groups	1383.250	232	5.962		
Total	1401.855	234			
B6 Between Groups	4.157	2	2.078	.248	.781
Within Groups	1897.660	226	8.397		
Total	1901.817	228			

Table 4-21 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A7 Between Groups	104.407	2	52.203	7.516	.001
Within Groups	1618.339	233	6.946		
Total	1722.746	235			
B7 Between Groups	22.723	2	11.362	1.493	.227
Within Groups	1765.005	232	7.608		
Total	1787.728	234			

Table 4-22

Tinsley's (2002) Post Hoc Tests for Factor A7– Tukey HSD Results for Hypothesis Two

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classifications</u>	<u>Mean Dif.</u>	<u>Std. Error</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A3	Baccalaureate—Master's	-1.454	.975	.297
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	.835	.868	.602
	Master's--Doctoral	2.289	.755	.008

Table 4-23

Current Study's ANOVA (Carnegie Classifications) Results for Hypothesis Two

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A1 Between Groups	21.171	2	10.586	.378	.685
Within Groups	6684.581	239	27.969		
Total	6705.752	241			
B1 Between Groups	62.976	2	31.488	1.380	.253
Within Groups	5452.032	239	22.812		
Total	5515.008	241			
A2 Between Groups	45.925	2	22.962	1.415	.245
Within Groups	3879.381	239	16.232		
Total	3925.306	241			
B2 Between Groups	48.406	2	24.203	2.037	.133
Within Groups	2839.395	239	11.880		
Total	2887.802	241			

Table 4-23 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A3 Between Groups	229.007	2	114.503	4.591	.011
Within Groups	5961.493	239	24.943		
Total	6190.500	241			
B3 Between Groups	108.533	2	54.266	3.465	.033
Within Groups	3743.385	239	15.663		
Total	3851.917	241			
A4 Between Groups	.901	2	.451	.029	.971
Within Groups	3657.599	239	15.304		
Total	3658.500	241			
B4 Between Groups	10.058	2	5.029	.405	.668
Within Groups	2969.942	239	12.427		
Total	2980.000	241			

Table 4-23 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A5 Between Groups	80.662	2	40.331	3.428	.034
Within Groups	2811.999	239	11.766		
Total	2892.661	241			
B5 Between Groups	22.099	2	11.050	1.196	.304
Within Groups	2208.153	239	9.239		
Total	2230.252	241			
A6 Between Groups	24.361	2	12.181	1.401	.248
Within Groups	2077.213	239	8.691		
Total	2101.574	241			
B6 Between Groups	19.430	2	9.715	1.360	.259
Within Groups	1706.604	239	7.141		
Total	1726.033	241			

Table 4-23 (continued)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A7 Between Groups	30.295	2	15.147	1.946	.145
Within Groups	1859.957	239	7.782		
Total	1890.252	241			
B7 Between Groups	22.021	2	11.011	1.795	.168
Within Groups	1465.979	239	6.134		
Total	1488.000	241			

Table 4-24

Current Study's Post Hoc Tests for Factors A3, B3, and A4 – Tukey HSD Results for

<u>Hypothesis Two</u>				
<u>Factor</u>	<u>Carnegie Classifications</u>	<u>Mean Dif.</u>	<u>Std. Error</u>	<u>Sig.</u>
A3	Baccalaureate—Master's	-1.454	.975	.297
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	.835	.868	.602
	Master's--Doctoral	2.289	.755	.008
B3	Baccalaureate—Master's	-.904	.772	.473
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	.667	.688	.597
	Master's—Doctoral	1.571	.598	.025
A5	Baccalaureate—Master's	-1.470	.669	.074
	Baccalaureate—Doctoral	-.244	.596	.912
	Master's--Doctoral	1.226	.519	.051

A comparison of the ANOVA procedure and Tukey HSD test results for hypothesis two indicates differences exists between the two studies. According to Tinsley's (2002) study, factor A7 was the only factor that showed a significant difference among the three Carnegie Classifications with a p value of .001 (Table 4-21). In order to determine which specific groups had significant differences between their mean responses, post hoc tests were done. Since Tinsley's (2002) study revealed that equal variances could be assumed for factor A7, the Tukey HSD test was applied (Table 4-22). The test revealed a significant difference at a level of .001 existed between the responses from the master's and doctoral institutions. According to the current study, factors A3, B3, and A5 showed significant differences among the three Carnegie

Classifications with p values of .011, .033, and .034 respectively. Since tests show that equal variances can be assumed for factors A3, B3, and A5, the Tukey HSD test was applied (Table 4-23). The test revealed a significant difference at a level of .008 between the responses from the master's and doctoral institutions for factor A3. The test also revealed significant differences at a level of .025 between the master's and doctoral institutions for factor B3 and at a level of .048 for factor A5.

Table 4-25

Tinsley's (2002) Equality of Means *t* Test Results for Hypothesis 3—NCATE/Non-NCATE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig.</u> <u>(2-tailed)</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Dif.</u>	<u>Std. Error</u> <u>Dif.</u>
A1	-1.508	230	.133	-.76	.51
B1	-.512	226	.609	-.31	-1.50
A2	-1.034	233	.302	-.60	.56
B2	-.178	232	.859	-.0939	.53
A3*	-1.818	174.592	.071	-1.23	.68
B3	-1.474	234	.142	-.87	.59
A4	-.627	233	.531	-.32	.51
B4	.953	231	.342	.50	.53
A5	-3.095	232	.002	-1.31	.42
B5	-1.813	233	.071	-.82	.45
A6	-1.494	234	.136	-.51	.34
B6	.733	228	.465	.30	.41
A7*	-3.501	122.752	.001	-1.39	.40
B7	-2.766	234	.006	-1.05	.38

*Equal variances not assumed

Table 4-26

Current Study's Equality of Means *t* Test Results for Hypothesis 3—NCATE/Non-NCATE

<u>Factor</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Sig.</u> <u>(2-tailed)</u>	<u>Mean</u> <u>Dif.</u>	<u>Std. Error</u> <u>Dif.</u>
A1	-1.933	240	.054	-1.310	.67
B1	-1.409	240	.160	-.869	.62
A2	-1.020	240	.309	-.532	.52
B2	-1.673	240	.096	-.745	.45
A3	-.357	240	.721	-.234	.66
B3	-.864	240	.388	-.447	.52
A4	-1.385	240	.167	-.696	.50
B4	-1.527	240	.128	-.692	.45
A5	-2.415	240	.017	-1.070	.44
B5	-1.964	240	.051	-.767	.39
A6	-2.826	240	.005	-1.063	.38
B6	-2.184	240	.030	-.749	.34
A7	-3.345	240	.001	-1.186	.35
B7	-3.218	240	.001	-1.014	.32

A comparison of the Equality of Means t tests for hypothesis 3 indicates that differences exist between the two studies. According to Tinsley's (2002) results, the null hypothesis could not be rejected for 11 out of the 14 factor sum comparisons (Table 4-25). Tinsley's (2002) data showed that there were significant differences between the responses from teacher educators in NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions on factor sums A5, A7, and B7. The current study shows that the null hypothesis could not be rejected for 9 out of the 14 factor sum comparisons (Table 4-26). Similar to Tinsley's (2002) study, significant differences exist between the responses of teacher educators in NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions on factor sums A5, A7, and B7. In addition to these areas, the current study shows differences also exist between the responses of teacher educators in NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions on factor sums A6 and B6.

Summary

This chapter provided data, analyses, and comparisons in several sections. The first section presented the response means for all 40 items for both Response Sets A and B of Part 1 of the survey instrument. Hypothesis 1 was then tested using paired samples t tests, which revealed that the null hypothesis should be rejected for all factor comparisons with the exception of factor two. ANOVA procedures were used to test hypothesis 2 and revealed that the null hypothesis could not be rejected for 11 out of 14 comparisons. The null hypothesis could be rejected for factor comparison of factors A3, B3, and A5. Hypothesis 3 was tested using independent samples t tests which showed that the null hypothesis could not be rejected for 9 out of 14 factors in which there were no significant differences between the mean factor sums from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions. The null for the third hypothesis could be rejected in five of the independent samples t tests for factors A5, A6, B6, A7, and B7.

Finally, in order to address the research question stated in this study, Tinsley's (2002) results for hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were presented. A comparison between Tinsley's (2002) results and the current study's results revealed differences exist between all three hypotheses tested. It should be noted that differences in the levels of statistical significance were determined at the same value, .05, as Reynolds' (1992) and Tinsley's (2002) studies in order to maintain statistical consistency.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Implications for Practice, and Recommendations

for Further Study

Summary of Findings

The present study investigated and analyzed the professional self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas and its relationship to the Carnegie Classification and NCATE accreditation status of participants' institutions. A comparison was also made between the results of the current study and Tinsley's 2002 study to identify any differences that may exist. A review of the literature suggested that from the time that independent teacher preparation institutions evolved into schools, departments, and colleges of education, teacher educators have maintained low professional status according to their academic colleagues in other departments. The literature also suggested that the size, type, and accreditations of an institution may also affect levels of professional esteem. The theoretical framework for this study was based on Korman's (1976) Self-Consistency Theory which states that an individual's self-esteem is an important determinant of effective job performance and satisfaction. The study adhered to the methodological and procedural framework of Reynolds' 1992 study on teacher educators in Ohio as well as Tinsley's 2002 study on Texas teacher educators. The frameworks were followed in order to develop further longitudinal data from a similar population over a span of two decades. As Reynolds (1992, 1995) and Tinsley (2002) have published the only previous research specifically on the professional self-esteem of teacher educators, this study was an attempt to help fill a gap in the literature.

Reynolds (1992) and Tinsley's (2002) survey instrument was sent to 610 teacher educators in Texas' 68 four-year college and university teacher preparation programs. A data set

consisting of the responses from 242 completed survey instruments was statistically analyzed to determine any significant differences between the levels of teacher educators' professional self-esteem and their levels of perceived esteem from academic colleagues in other departments. Data related to the levels of professional esteem for participants from different Carnegie Classifications of Institutions, as well as participants from NCATE and non-NCATE accredited institutions, was also analyzed and tested for statistical significance. Descriptive statistics were used to denote any differences between the results of the current study and Tinsley's 2002 study. Chapter 4 presented the statistical findings of these procedures in detail and a summarized examination of those findings follow.

Hypothesis one stated there are no significant differences between the levels of teacher educators' professional self-esteem and their perceived professional esteem from non-professional education faculty. According to the study, teacher educators' levels of professional self-esteem were significantly higher than the levels of professional esteem they perceived from academic colleagues in six out of seven factors. There was no significant difference in the factor concerned with teacher educator's acceptance in the academic community.

Hypothesis two stated there are no significant differences in levels of professional self-esteem among teacher educators from different types of institutions, as determined by the Carnegie Classification System. According to the study, teacher educators from different Carnegie Classifications of institutions maintained minimal differences in levels of professional self-esteem and levels of perceived professional esteem from academic colleagues. There was a significant difference in only three of the fourteen factor sum comparisons between teacher educators from master's institutions and teacher educators from doctoral institutions. Participants from master's institutions gave significantly higher responses than participants from

doctoral institutions when responding to the factor that concerned the acceptance of teacher education on campus from both the “I believe...” and the “I believe that my colleagues outside professional education would say that...” points of view. Participants from master’s institutions also gave significantly higher responses than participants from doctoral institutions when responding to the factor that concerned the quality of education students from the “I believe...” point of view.

Hypothesis three stated there are no significant differences in levels of professional self-esteem between teacher educators from NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions. According to the study, no significant difference in levels of professional self-esteem or perceived professional esteem exists in 9 out of the 14 factor sum comparisons. On each of the five points of significant difference, the responses of the non-NCATE accredited teacher educators displayed higher levels of esteem than the responses of the NCATE accredited teacher educators. One factor with a significant difference between the two groups concerned the quality of education students from the “I believe...” point of view. Two factors with significant differences concerned teacher educators’ influence on education students and educational practice from both the “I believe...” and the “I believe my colleagues outside professional education would say that...” points of view. The last two factors with significant differences concerned the perception of rigor (or lack of it) in teacher education from both the “I believe...” and the “I believe my colleagues outside professional education would say that...” points of view.

The research question for this study analyzed if there are there any differences between the results of Tinsley’s 2002 study on Texas Teacher Educators and the results of the current study. According to a comparison of descriptive statistics between Tinsley’s 2002 study and the

current study, comparative differences exist between all three hypotheses. In regards to hypothesis one, Tinsley's results rejected all seven factor comparisons while the current study rejected six of the seven. In a comparison of results for hypothesis two, Tinsley's results showed a significant difference in only one factor sum comparison while the current study showed significant differences among three factor sum comparisons. No commonality was found between the significantly different factor sum comparisons. Hypothesis three resulted in three significantly different factor sum comparisons according to Tinsley's results while the current study resulted in five significantly different factor sum comparisons. There was commonality between three of the significantly different factor sum comparisons.

Conclusions

Based on findings from this study, teacher educators in Texas maintain significantly higher levels of professional self-esteem than the levels of professional esteem they perceive from their academic colleagues in other departments. The findings also showed that Carnegie Classification of an institution has minimal impact on teacher educators' levels of professional self-esteem or on the levels of their perceived professional esteem from academic colleagues. In regards to NCATE accreditation, the findings suggest that NCATE accreditation may have a negative impact on teacher educators' levels of professional self-esteem as well as on their levels of perceived esteem from academic colleagues. The findings also suggest that NCATE accreditation may not boost professional self-esteem or perceived professional esteem from academic colleagues. The findings suggest that over time, the professional self-esteem of teacher educators has increased in certain areas while remaining low in others.

Implications for Practice

The professional esteem of teacher educators has been negatively impacted by a variety of measures. This study found that teacher educators in Texas faced difficulties similar to those faced by teacher educators in previous studies. Over the last two decades, there appears to be minimal change in regards to the overall professional esteem teacher educators perceive from academic colleagues. However, teacher educators in Texas reported that they believe they are becoming more accepted as a part of the academic community. Teacher educators in Texas are also able to maintain a positive outlook despite of enduring a history of adversity from academic colleagues as well as increased pressures from national, state, and institutional reforms.

According to the study, the findings document a lack of significant difference between responses from teacher educators at different Carnegie Classifications of Institutions. The results show that in regards to gaining a higher level of professional esteem from academic colleagues, the move from baccalaureate to master's to doctoral institutions might prove to be inconsequential.

The acquisition of NCATE accreditation may be viewed as an elevation in status for an institution, however, the results of this study show that it has a negative impact on the levels of professional esteem of teacher educators. This may be a result of teacher educators' roles in bearing the responsibility for much of the work involved in gaining and maintaining NCATE accreditation.

The results of this study demonstrate that teacher educators in Texas are open to sharing their professional beliefs about themselves and how they believe they are perceived. Further examination of these beliefs will provide more clarity to the challenges that teacher educators

face as members of academic institutions. The results of this study may reveal that the difficulties faced by teacher educators may be common to other faculty in higher education and could, in turn, lead to attempts at system-wide improvements. This may result in opening a dialogue between faculty from all departments in order to increase awareness and establish common goals. Administrative decisions in regards to accreditation could analyze the results of the study to gain more insight into the processes' immediate and long term impact on teacher educators.

Recommendations for Further Study

The researcher makes the following recommendations for further study, based upon the results of this study:

1. Expanding the study to different states to determine if Texas teacher educator's belief that they are accepted in the academic community is consistent among colleagues in different geographic locations.
2. Repeating the study to determine if significant differences exist between teacher educators at public and private institutions.
3. Changing the targeted audience to higher education faculty outside of teacher education to determine if professional esteem discrepancies exist in other departments.
4. Alter the survey to include all of the current Carnegie Classification categories in order to analyze if these changes result in differences in levels of teacher educators professional esteem when compared to the results of respondents from previous Carnegie Classification categories.

5. A future study could look at the impact of CAEP (formerly NCATE) accreditation on the self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas as well as nationwide. Specifically, a more in depth analysis could be conducted to explore the differences in professional esteem between teacher educators from accredited and non-accredited institutions.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument as Used

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

ONLINE SURVEY CONSENT FORM

***1. ONLINE SURVEY CONSENT FORM**

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

Dear Texas Teacher Educator,

You are being invited to take part in a research study on the professional self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas. This study will be conducted by Benesha Bholan, College of Education and Health Professions doctoral student, from the University of Texas at Arlington.

This survey will take approximately 20 to 25 minutes to complete. You will be asked to complete an online survey to determine both what you believe about the value of your work as a teacher educator and the value you believe is placed on your work by academic colleagues outside of teacher education.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary and you have the right to terminate your participation at any time without penalty. If you do not wish to complete this survey you can close your browser. Participation or non-participation will have no effect on your current university employment status or any future relations with the University of Texas at Arlington.

Your participation and data record will be completely confidential and data will be averaged and reported in aggregate. All the information you provide will be used responsibly and will be protected against release to unauthorized persons. Although your participation in this research survey may not benefit you personally, it will help us understand whether or not there is a significant difference between the levels of professional self-esteem of teacher educators in Texas and their perceived professional esteem from colleagues in other departments.

This investigational procedure does not pose any more risk than those you experience in normal daily living.

If you have questions about this project, you may contact me at 817-703-4506 or email me at benesha.bholan@mavs.uta.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

research participant in this study, please contact the University of Texas at Arlington Institutional Review Board at 817-272-3723 or via email at regulatoryservices@uta.edu.

Please print a copy of this consent form for your records, if you so desire.

You have read and understand the above consent form, you certify that you are 18 years old or older and, by selecting the "Accept and Next" button to enter the survey, you indicate your willingness voluntarily to take part in this study.

Thank you for participating.

Accept and Next

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

PART ONE

The intention of this questionnaire is to determine both what you believe as a teacher educator and the value you believe is placed on your work by academic colleagues outside of teacher education.

For each statement in PART ONE, select the value that best denotes what you believe to be true and how you believe your academic colleagues in other areas at your institution would respond.

***2. I believe that teacher educators are scholarly.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***3. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are scholarly.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***4. I believe that the quality of teacher educators' research is equal to that found in other academic units.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***5. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the quality of teacher educators' research is equal to that found in other academic units.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***6. I believe that teacher education has second-rate status in the university.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***7. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education has a second-rate status in the university.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***8. I believe that teacher education admits many students who would never be admitted to other programs.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***9. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education admits many students who would never be admitted to other programs.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***10. I believe that teacher educators are fully accepted in the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***11. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are fully accepted in the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***12. I believe that teacher educators have a strong formative influence on preservice teacher candidates.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***13. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators have a strong formative influence on preservice teacher candidates.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***14. I believe that only those education faculty whose research and scholarly publications help elevate the status of the department should receive tenure.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***15. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that only those education faculty whose research and scholarly publications help elevate the status of the department should receive tenure.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***16. I believe that teacher educators make good professors because of their work with K-12 schools.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***17. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators make good professors because of their work with K-12 schools.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***18. I believe that teacher education has enough faculty lacking in scholarly productivity to warrant criticism.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***19. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education has enough faculty lacking in scholarly productivity to warrant criticism.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***20. I believe that the campus image of teacher education is often reflected in meager financial support.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***21. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the campus image of teacher education is often reflected in meager financial support.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***22. I believe that the knowledge base for professional education is well developed.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***23. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the knowledge base for professional education is well developed.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***24. I believe that teacher educators live in an impossible world serving "two masters"; the teaching profession and the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***25. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators live in an impossible world serving "two masters"; the teaching profession and the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***26. I believe that the research of teacher educators leads to improvement in educational practice.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***27. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the research of teacher educators leads to improvement in educational practice.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***28. I believe that teacher education is tolerated rather than accepted in the university.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***29. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education is tolerated rather than accepted in the university.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***30. I believe that teacher educators are among the best teachers on campus.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***31. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are among the best teachers on campus.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***32. I believe that teacher educators are committed to scholarship.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***33. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are committed to scholarship.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***34. I believe that studies in teacher education are more demanding than studies in other disciplines.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***35. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that studies in teacher education are more demanding than studies in other disciplines.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***36. I believe that classroom teachers regard the academic work of teacher educators as irrelevant.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***37. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that classroom teachers regard the academic work of teacher educators as irrelevant.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***38. I believe that the reward system of this institution fairly recognizes good teaching.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***39. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the reward system of this institution fairly recognizes good teaching.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***40. I believe that teacher educators are viewed as marginal people at the periphery of the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***41. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are viewed as marginal people at the periphery of the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***42. I believe that the practical vision of teacher preparation and the university's norms of scholarship are compatible.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***43. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the practical vision of teacher preparation and the university's norms of scholarship are compatible.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***44. I believe that the practical, school-oriented responsibilities of teacher educators lead to lowered status on campus.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***45. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that the practical, school-oriented responsibilities of teacher educators lead to lowered status on campus.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***46. I believe that teacher aspirants are more intellectually able than the average college bound high school graduate.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***47. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher aspirants are more intellectually able than the average college bound high school graduate.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***48. I believe that education as a discipline has yet to develop a body of knowledge and technique of sufficient scope to be given full academic status.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***49. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that education as a discipline has yet to develop a body of knowledge and technique of sufficient scope to be given full academic status.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***50. I believe that teacher education programs are held in high esteem on campus.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***51. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education programs are held in high esteem on campus.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***52. I believe that teacher educators have low rates of scholarly publication.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***53. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators have low rates of scholarly publication.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***54. I believe that some students choose education as a last resort after failing in other majors.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***55. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that some students choose education as a last resort after failing in other majors.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***56. I believe that being part of an academic community enhances the teacher educator's ability to be effective with the schools.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***57. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that being part of an academic community enhances the teacher educator's ability to be effective with the schools.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***58. I believe that teacher educators have traditionally had a difficult time defining their role in higher education.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***59. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators have traditionally had a difficult time defining their role in higher education.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***60. I believe that teacher educators are weak in research skills.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***61. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are weak in research skills.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***62. I believe that teacher educators are lacking in the very teaching skills that they should epitomize.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***63. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are lacking in the very teaching skills that they should epitomize.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***64. I believe that teacher educators are first-rate academic colleagues.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***65. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are first-rate academic colleagues.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***66. I believe that education professors have been tarnished in the eyes of their peers by the quality of students admitted to the field.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***67. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that education professors have been tarnished in the eyes of their peers by the quality of students admitted to the field.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***68. I believe that teacher educators have a positive impact on students.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***69. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators have a positive impact on students.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***70. I believe that teacher educators have distanced themselves from the concerns of teachers and the problems of the schools.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***71. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators have distanced themselves from the concerns of teachers and the problems of the schools.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***72. I believe that conducting research is a high priority for teacher educators.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***73. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that conducting research is a high priority for teacher educators.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***74. I believe that teacher educators are respected in the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***75. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher educators are respected in the academic community.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***76. I believe that teacher education is a legitimate academic field of study.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***77. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education is a legitimate academic field of study.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***78. I believe that teacher education is a haven for less able academics.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***79. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that teacher education is a haven for less able academics.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***80. I believe that on this campus teacher education does not have a prestige problem.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

***81. I believe that my academic colleagues (outside of professional education) would say that on this campus teacher education does not have a prestige problem.**

Very Strongly Disagree Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree Very Strongly Agree

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

PART TWO

Biographical questions.

***82. What is your present age?**

***83. What was your occupation immediately before becoming a teacher educator?**

- Elementary School Teacher
- Middle/Junior High School Teacher
- High School Teacher
- Community School Teacher
- School Administrator or Supervisor

Other (please specify)

***84. How many years have you been a teacher educator?**

***85. How many years have you worked in your present institution?**

***86. What is your academic rank?**

- Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor

Other (please specify)

***87. What is your gender?**

- Female
- Male

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***88. What is your ethnicity?**

- African American
- Hispanic
- White
- Asian/Pacific Islander

Other (please specify)

***89. What is your highest degree earned?**

- Masters
- Doctorate

Other (please specify)

***90. Have you been the recipient of a college or university teaching award as a teacher educator?**

- Yes
- No

***91. Have you been the recipient of a college, university, or organizational scholarship or research award as a teacher educator?**

- Yes
- No

What other professional honors have you received, if any?

***92. Have you been involved in a service project with schools?**

- Yes
- No

(If yes, please explain briefly below.)

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

93. What is your publication record in the past three years?

Number of articles published in professional journals

Number of books published

Number of monographs published

Number of contributed book chapters

Number of reports

Other (specify)

***94. Which of the following things do you do regularly (select all that apply)?**

- Teach Methods Courses
- Teach Foundations Courses
- Supervise Field Experience
- Advise Undergraduates
- Teach Undergraduates
- Teach Graduate Students
- Masters and Doctoral Committees
- Service at College, Departmental Level
- Service at the Institutional Level
- Community Service
- Research
- Administration
- Work Related Travel
- Grant Writing
- Carrying out Funded Projects
- Executive Member of a Professional Organization
- Editing a Professional Journal
- None of the Above

95. How many times per year do you normally make presentations at:

National or International Meetings

Regional or State Meetings

Local Meetings

A Statewide Survey of Texas Teacher Educators

***96. In which of the professional organizations have you been an active participant locally or nationally?**

- ATE
- AACTE
- AERA
- PDK

Other or None (please specify)

***97. Is your institution currently accredited by NCATE?**

- Yes
- No

***98. Under the current Carnegie classification system, which type is your institution?**

- Baccalaureate
- Masters
- Doctoral
- Specialized Focus Institution

***99. Which is your institution?**

- Public
- Private

***100. Briefly describe what you think most accounts for your feelings about professional self-esteem.**

101. I appreciate your time spent taking this survey. If there are any comments you wish to add, feel free to write them in the space below. Thank you!

Appendix B

Reynolds' Consent Letter

From: **Richard Reynolds** <rreynolds1939@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, May 9, 2012 at 1:18 PM

Subject:

To: bbholan1@gmail.com

Richard Reynolds, Ph.D.

Professor Emeritus

Eastern Connecticut State University

Windham, CT

May 9th, 2012

I give my consent to Ben Bholan to make use of the material contained in my doctoral thesis "The Professional Self-Esteem of Teachers Educators," submitted in 1992 at The Ohio State University, with the usual proviso that due recognition be given.

Richard J. Reynolds

Appendix C

Tinsley's Consent Letter

From: Tinsley, Ron [Ron.Tinsley@stockton.edu]

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2012 7:49 PM

To: Bholan, Benesha D

Subject: RE: Request to use survey instrument from your dissertation

Ben, I would be very happy to see you replicate my 2002 study. You have my consent to use it as you see fit. I look forward to reading your results.

Ron

Ron Tinsley, Ed. D.

Associate Professor

Director MAEL Program

Appendix D

Email Explaining Study

Dear Texas Teacher Educator,

Texas teacher educators play a vital role in preparing teachers to be successful in the classroom. What is frequently overlooked is an inquiry into how teacher educators feel about their own profession or how they feel their peers view them. This study is designed to gain insights into the professional image which Texas teacher educators have of themselves and the value that they believe is placed on their work by academic colleagues in other units of a college or university. As a Texas teacher educator, you can help us gain more valuable knowledge regarding this subject. This survey will take about 20 minutes of your time. Your name and e-mail address will not be connected to your response, ensuring complete anonymity of you and your place of employment. To participate in this survey, please follow the link below. You may withdraw or decide not to participate at any time. Link for participation:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/texasteachereducators>

The survey will remain open until May 21, 2013. Thank you in advance for your assistance. If you have any questions, please contact: Benesha Bholan, Doctoral Candidate in K-16 Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, The University of Texas at Arlington, E-mail: benesha.bholan@mavs.uta.edu or Dr. James Hardy, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, The University of Texas at Arlington, E-mail: jimhardy@uta.edu.

Appendix E

Reminder Email Explaining Study

Dear Texas Teacher Educator,

Texas teacher educators play a vital role in preparing teachers to be successful in the classroom. What is frequently overlooked is an inquiry into how teacher educators feel about their own profession or how they feel their peers view them. This study is designed to gain insights into the professional image which Texas teacher educators have of themselves and the value that they believe is placed on their work by academic colleagues in other units of a college or university. As a Texas teacher educator, you can help us gain more valuable knowledge regarding this subject. This survey will take about 20 minutes of your time. Your name and e-mail address will not be connected to your response, ensuring complete anonymity of you and your place of employment. To participate in this survey, please follow the link below. You may withdraw or decide not to participate at any time. Link for participation:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/texasteachereducators>

This is a reminder that the survey will remain open until May 21, 2013. Thank you in advance for your assistance. If you have any questions, please contact: Benesha Bholan, Doctoral Candidate in K-16 Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, The University of Texas at Arlington, E-mail: benesha.bholan@mavs.uta.edu or Dr. James Hardy, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, The University of Texas at Arlington, E-mail: jimhardy@uta.edu.

References

- Adler, A. (1927). Individual psychology. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 22(2), 116.
- Ambrose, M. L. (2002). Contemporary justice research: A new look at familiar questions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 803-812.
- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(7), 803-830.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). (1983). *Educating a profession: Extended programs for teacher education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Badali, S. J. (2011). Exploring tensions in the lives of professors of teacher education: A Canadian context. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(1).
- Ben-Peretz, M. (2001). The impossible role of teacher educators in a changing world. *Teacher Education*, 52(1), 48-56.
- Borg, W.R., Gall, J.P. & Gall, M.D. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston, USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Branden, N. (1969) *The Psychology of self-esteem: A new concept of man's nature*. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing.
- Branden, N. (2011). *Honoring the Self: The Psychology of Confidence and Respect*. Bantam.
- Briggs, T. (1932). A vision of secondary education. *Teachers College Record*, 34 (7), p. 32.
- Bullough Jr, R. V., Clark, D. C., & Patterson, R. S. (2003). Getting in step: Accountability, accreditation and the standardization of teacher education in the United States. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 29(1), 35-51.
- Burch, B.G. (1989). Perceptions of the role and scholarly reputation of the education professoriate. In R. Wisniewski & E. Ducharme (Eds.), *The professors of teaching: An inquiry* (pp. 87-104). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Burns, R. (1979). *The self concept in theory, measurement, development and behavior*. London: Longman.
- Callero, P. L. (2003). The sociology of the self. *Annual review of sociology*, 115-133.
- Campbell, A., & University of Michigan. Institute for Social Research. (1981). *The sense of well-being in America: Recent patterns and trends*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Author.
- Carnegie Foundation. (2012). *Carnegie Classification 2012*. Retrieved May 10, 2012, from www.carnegiefoundation.org.
- Clark, B. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *ED school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: The education of teacher educators. *Teaching and teacher education*, 19(1), 5-28.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). The new teacher education: For better or for worse?. *Educational Researcher*, 34(7), 3-17.
- Connolly, K. R. H. (2007). *Institutional Commitment and Job Satisfaction: An Investigation of Retained Faculty at Public, Four-year Institutions*. ProQuest.
- Cooley, C. H. (1922). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Scribner's.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Co.
- Coopersmith, S. (1975). *Adult form SEI Coopersmith inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). (2013). *About us*. Electronic document. Retrieved August 30, 2013 from <http://caepnet.org/about/>
- Curran, M. (1991). *Self-esteem in the workplace: A study of teachers*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1/2), 35-47.
- Davey, R. (2013). *The Professional Identity of Teacher Educators: Career on the Cusp?*. Routledge.
- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (2009). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. In *Culture and well-being* (pp. 71-91). Springer Netherlands.
- Ducharme, E. R., & Agne, R. M. (1982). The Education Professoriate: A Research Based Perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(6), 30-36.

- Ducharme, E. R., & Kluender, M. M. (1990). The RATE study: The faculty. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(4), 45-49.
- Ducharme, E. R. (1993). *The lives of teacher educators*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Educational Testing Service (ETS). (1999). *The academic quality of prospective teachers*. Princeton: ETS Teaching and Learning Division.
- Fairweather, J. S. (1993). Academic values and faculty rewards. *Review of Higher Education, 17*(1), 43-68.
- Fiorentino, L.M. (1999). *Job satisfaction among faculty in higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Foels, R., & Tomcho, T. J. (2005). Gender, interdependent self-construals, and collective self-esteem: Women and men are mostly the same. *Self and Identity, 4*(3), 213-225.
- Gassner, V. H. (1993). *Leadership dynamics of teacher educators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland at College Park.
- Gelman, A. (2005). Analysis of variance—why it is more important than ever. *The Annals of Statistics, 33*(1), 1-53.
- Goodlad, J.I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Ham, V., & Kane, R. (2004). Finding A Way Through The Swamp: A Case For Self-Study As Research*. In *International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices* (pp. 103-150). Springer Netherlands.
- Hawley, W.D. (1992). United States. In Leavitt, H.B. (Ed.), *Issues and problems in teacher education: An international handbook* (pp. 267-277). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Herbst, J. (1989). *And sadly teach: teacher education and professionalization in American culture*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Heuer, R., Kuhr, B., Fahimi, M., Curtin, T. R., Hinsdale, M., Carley-Baxter, L., & Green, P. (2006). 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF: 04) Methodology Report. Technical Report. NCES 2006-179. *National Center for Education Statistics*.
- Horn, E. (1933). What new viewpoints in education justify a redirection of teaching? *Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1933*, 756.
- Horney, K. (1937). *The neurotic personality of our time*. WW Norton & Company.
- James, W. (1950). *Principles of psychology*. New York: Dover.

- James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology: Vol.1*. New York: Dover.
- Kappler, K. (2004). NCATE: Wolf in shepherd's clothes. *Critical perspectives on the curriculum of teacher education*, 19-39.
- Kemp, A. W. (1997). *The lives of women as teacher educators: A kaleidoscope of reflections*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University.
- Kerr, C. (1994). *Higher education cannot escape history: Issues for the twenty-first century*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kim, J. O., & Mueller, C. W. (Eds.). (1978). *Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues* (Vol. 14). Sage.
- Kling, K. C., Hyde, J. S., Showers, C. J., & Buswell, B. N. (1999). Gender differences in self-esteem: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 125(4), 470.
- Korman, A. K. (1976). Hypothesis of work behavior revisited and an extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 1, 50-63.
- Krejcie, R. & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining the sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Labaree, D. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press.
- Labaree, D. F. (2005). Life on the margins. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3), 186-191.
- Labaree, D. F. (2006). *The trouble with ed schools*. Yale University Press
- Labaree, David F. (2008). An uneasy relationship: The history of teacher education in the university. In Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, Feiman Nemser, Sharon, & McIntyre, D. John (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts*, 3rd ed. (pp. 290-306). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Lanier, J. & Little, J. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Whittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research and teaching* (3rd ed.) (pp. 527-569). New York: Macmillan.
- Leary, M. R., & MacDonald, G. (2003). Individual differences in self-esteem: A review and theoretical integration. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 401-450). New York: Guilford Press.
- Loughran, J., & Russell, T. (2012). *Improving teacher education practice through self-study*. Routledge.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 35(2), 63.
- Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal of*

- personality and social psychology*, 51(4), 858.
- Markus, H., & Sentic, K. (1982). The self in social information processing. *Psychological perspectives on the self*, 1, 41-70.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual review of psychology*, 38(1), 299-337.
- Marsden, P. V., & Wright, J. D. (2010). *Handbook of survey research*. Emerald Group Publishing.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation, *Psychological Review* 50, 370-96
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- McCormick, A. C., & Zhao, C. M. (2005). Rethinking and reframing the Carnegie classification. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 37(5), 51-57.
- Mead, G. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Miller, S. M., Miller, K. L., & Gwaltney, L. K. (1998). Teacher Educators' Cultural Attitudes and Behaviors. *Teacher Education and Practice*, 14(1), 30-42.
- Mruk, C. (Ed.). (1995). *Self-esteem: Research, theory, and practice*. New York: Springer.
- Mruk, C. (Ed.). (1999). *Self-esteem: Research, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.) New York: Springer.
- Mruk, C. J. (2006). *Self-esteem research, theory, and practice: Toward a positive psychology of self-esteem*. Springer Publishing Company.
- Mruk, C. (2013). *Self-esteem and Positive Psychology: Research, Theory, and Practice*. Springer Publishing Company.
- National Commission on Educational Excellence. (1983). *A nation at risk*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2012). *NCATE accreditation*. Retrieved May 14, 2012 from <http://www.ncate.org/Public/AboutNCATE/tabid/179/Default.aspx2>
- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2012). *NCATE quick facts*. Retrieved May 20, 2012 from <http://www.ncate.org/Public/AboutNCATE/QuickFacts/tabid/343/Default.aspx>

- National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). (2013). *NCATE information*. Retrieved August 30, 2013 from <http://www.ncate.org/>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- National Education Association (NEA). (1986). *Excellence in our schools, teacher education: An action plan*. Washington, DC: Instructional and Professional Development Committee, NEA.
- Olsen, B., & Anderson, L. (2007). Course of action: A qualitative investigation into urban teacher retention and career development. *Urban Education, 42*, 5–29.
- Onorato, R. & Turner, J. (1999). *Social identity, personality, and the self-concept: A self-categorization perspective* (pp. 11-46). TR Tyler, RM Kramer, & OP John (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self*.
- Onorato, R. & Turner, J. (2001). The I, the me, and the us. In C. Sedikides & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Individual self, relational self, collective self* (pp. 147-170). Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis.
- Onorato, R. S., & Turner, J. C. (2004). Fluidity in the self-concept: the shift from personal to social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 34*(3), 257-278.
- Orczyk, C. (1990). *A model of faculty socialization: Critical career events, self-esteem and their effect on self-efficacy and scholarly achievement*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.
- Popkewitz, T.S. (Ed.). (1993). *Changing patterns of power: Social regulation and teacher reform*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- RATE I. (1987). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- RATE II . (1988). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- RATE III. (1989). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- RATE IV. (1991). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- RATE V (1992). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- RATE VI (1992). *Teaching teachers: Facts and figures*. Washington, DC: AACTE.

- RATE VII (1994). Teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- RATE VIII (1995). Teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, DC: AACTE.
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2012). *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. John Wiley & Sons
- Reynolds, R.J. (1992). *The professional self-esteem of teacher educators* (Vols. 1&2). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.
- Reynolds, R.J. (1995). The professional self-esteem of teacher educators. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 46 (3), 216-227.
- Rodewalt, F., & Tragakis, M. W. (2003). Self-esteem and self-regulation: Toward optimal studies of self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry*, 14, 66-70.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). The measurement of self-esteem. *Society and the adolescent self image*, 297, V307.
- Rosenberg, M. (1981). The self-concept: Social product and social force. *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives*, 593-624.
- Schafer, R. B., & Keith, P. M. (1999). Change in adult self-esteem: A longitudinal assessment. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 38(3), 303-314.
- Schuh, J. H., Jones, S. R., & Harper, S. R. (Eds.). (2010). *Student services: A handbook for the profession*. Jossey-Bass.
- Sedlak, M. (2008). Competing visions of purpose, practice, and policy: The history of teacher certification in the United States. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemser, & J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 989-999). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shen, J. (1995). Faculty Fragmentation and Teacher Education in Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 46: 141–149.
- Sindelar, P. T., & Rosenberg, M. S. (2000). Serving too many masters: The proliferation of ill-conceived and contradictory policies and practices in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 188-193.
- Sizer, T., and Powell, A. G. (1969). Changing conceptions of the professor of education. In James Steve Counelis, ed., *To be a phoenix: The education professoriate*, 61-76. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Smelser, N. (1989). Self-esteem and social problems: An introduction. In Mecca, A., Smelser, N. J., & Vasconcellos, J. (Eds.). (1989). *The social importance of self-esteem*. University

of California Pr.

- Smyth, J., & Shacklock, G. (1998). *Re-making teaching: Ideology, policy and practice*, 20. London:Routledge.
- Stockard, J., & Lehman, M. (2004). Influences on the satisfaction and retention of first-year teachers: The importance of effective school management. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 742–771
- Survey Monkey, A statewide survey of texas teacher educators. Retrieved June 6, 2013, from <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/texasteachereducators>
- Tinsley, R. (2002). *The professional self-esteem of teacher educators in texas*. Texas A&M University - Commerce). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 126 p. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/276487687>.
- Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 20, 454-454.
- Varenne, H. (2007). On NCATE Standards and Culture at Work: Conversations, Hegemony, and (Dis-) Abling Consequences. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 38(1), 16-23.
- Visscher, E. (1988). *Self-esteem level, workload factors and selected demographic variables in nurse faculty*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida.
- Wells, R. & Marwell, G. (1976). *Self-esteem its conceptualization and measurement*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- White, R. (1963). Ego and reality in psychoanalytic theory: A proposal regarding independent ego energies. *Psychological Issues*, 3, 125-150.
- White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. *Psychological review*, 66(5), 297.
- Wimsatt, L. A. (2002). *A study of work-related satisfaction and turnover intentions of faculty in higher education*. University of Michigan.
- Wise, A. E. (2001). *Performance-based accreditation: Reform in action*. Retrieved June 24, 2004 from <http://www.ncate.org/newsbrfs/reforminaction.htm>
- Wolf-Wendel, L., Baker, B. D., Twombly, S., Tollefson, N., & Mahlios, M. (2006). Who's teaching the teachers? Evidence from the National Survey of Postsecondary Faculty and the Survey of Earned Doctorates. *American Journal of Education*, 112(2), 273-300.
- Woodring, P. (1987). Too Bright to Be a Teacher?. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68(8), 617-18.
- Xu, Y. J. (2008). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted. *Research in Higher*

Education, 49(1), 40-61.

Biographical Information

Benesha Bholan has worked in public school education for almost 20 years. He received his Bachelor's in Education from Texas Wesleyan University and Master's in Educational Leadership from UTA. He has served as a teacher, adjunct instructor, assistant principal, and principal. He has enjoyed a career of working with students and helping them achieve success through hard work, dedication, and a belief in themselves. He currently resides in Arlington, Texas with his wife of 15 years and their two daughters. He is interested in continuing to research ways to positively impact the preparation of teachers as well as ways to improve the education of students from underserved backgrounds. He eventually plans on exploring employment opportunities as a school district superintendent and transitioning into higher education. Benesha enjoys spending time with his family, traveling, and playing golf.