

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
TEACHING PERSPECTIVES AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
AMONG FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development

by

David M. Deggs

B.G.S., Northwestern State University, 1999

M.Ed., Northwestern State University, 2000

August 2005

© Copyright 2005
David Maxwell Deggs
All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my parents, Dale and Evelyn Deggs, for encouraging me to pursue my dreams and supporting me throughout this process. I am grateful to my grandmother, Ruth O'Quinn Deggs, for reminding me that learning is a lifelong venture. To Dennis, John, Jennifer, Sarah and Kaylee, I truly appreciate your encouragement and support throughout this process.

Much gratitude and appreciation goes to Dr. Krisanna Machtmes for keeping me on schedule through routine meetings and for providing much needed career advice and mentoring. Thank you to Dr. Geraldine Johnson for guiding me through my program and for helping me to become a stronger and more effective teacher. To my other committee members, thank you to Dr. Michael Burnett for teaching me the research methodologies necessary to complete this project, Dr. Earl Johnson for providing feedback and insight to strengthen this work, and Dr. Amelia Lee for bringing another perspective to this project.

A very special thank you goes to Dr. Sue Weaver, a long time career mentor, for encouraging me to start this degree program about four years ago. I am also grateful to my colleagues, Dr. Priscilla Kilcrease, Steve Hicks, Martha Bryant, and Debi Faucette for their support.

In closing, thank you to Dr. Dan Pratt and Dr. John Collins of the University of British Columbia, for allowing me to use the *Teaching Perspectives Inventory* via the internet, which allowed me to work with an electronic data collection instrument, an emerging trend in research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER ONE. INTRODUCTION	1
Teaching Perspectives	2
Actions, Intensions and Beliefs	4
Statement of the Problem	5
Research Study Objectives	6
Significance of the Study	9
Definitions and Operational Terms	10
Limitations of the Study	11
CHAPTER TWO. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Teaching Practices in Adult and Higher Education	12
Demographic Characteristics and Development of Higher Education Faculty	17
Teaching Style vs. Teaching Perspective	24
Effective Higher Education Teaching	26
Faculty Development Programs	36
Teaching Perspectives Inventory	44
CHAPTER THREE. METHODOLOGY	52
Population and Sample	52
Ethical Considerations and Study Approval	54
Research Study Variables	55
Development of the Teaching Perspectives Inventory	56
Data Collection Procedures	57
Procedures to Address Non-Response Error	59
Use of Electronic Surveys in Research	60
Data Analysis by Objectives	62
CHAPTER FOUR. FINDINGS	67
Objective One	67
A. Age	68
B. Gender	69
C. Highest Academic Degree Earned	69
D. Academic Rank	70
E. Tenure Status	71
F. Academic College or School	72

G. Years Teaching Experience at Study Institution.....	74
H. Actual Percentage of Time Spent Teaching.....	75
I. Percentage of Time Assigned to Teaching	76
Objective Two.....	77
Objective Three.....	78
A. Dominance of Teaching Perspectives.....	81
B. Comparison of Dominant Teaching Perspective by Academic College or School	82
Objective Four	84
A. Teaching Preparation Course or Training Session.....	85
B. Previous Teaching Experience.....	86
Objective Five.....	91
A. On-Campus and Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities	91
B. Relationship Between Faculty Development and Teaching Perspectives.....	102
C. Other Faculty Development Activities	103
CHAPTER FIVE. DISCUSSION.....	105
Results and Conclusions	107
Recommendations.....	112
REFERENCES	115
APPENDIX	
A. APPROVED INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION	120
B. APPROVAL MEMORANDUM FROM ACADEMIC AFFAIRS ...	122
C. E-MAILS REGARDING THE USE OF THE TEACHING PERSPECTIVE INVENTORY (TPI).....	124
D. DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY INSTRUMENT	127
E. FIRST LETTER SENT TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS	130
F. REMINDER POSTCARD SENT TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS.....	132
G. THIRD LETTER SENT TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS.....	134
VITA.....	136

LIST OF TABLES

1. Number of Doctorate Recipients in Broad Fields by Gender in the United States and Puerto Rico from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003	18
2. Median Age of Earned Doctorates by Broad Field in the United States and Puerto Rico from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003.....	19
3. Number by Age Groupings of Doctorates by Field in the United States and Puerto Rico from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003.....	20
4. Response Rates by Wave of Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	59
5. Current Age of Faculty as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	68
6. Highest Academic Degree Earned as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	70
7. Academic Rank as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	71
8. Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	73
9. Years of Higher Education Teaching Experience at Institution Where Study Was Conducted as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	74
10. Actual Percentage of Time Spent Teaching at Institution Where Study Was Conducted as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	75
11. Percentage of Time Spent Teaching at Institution Where Study Was Conducted as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	76
12. Dominance of Teaching Perspective as Measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory Among Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the United States	78
13. Dominant Teaching Perspective Among Faculty in Academic Colleges and Schools as Measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	79

14. Means and Standard Deviations of Total Teaching Perspective Scores by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment Among Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	83
15. Analysis of Variance for Dominant Teaching Perspective as Measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	84
16. Faculty Reporting the Completion of Teaching Preparation Activities by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	85
17. Faculty Reporting Serving as a Teaching Assistant During Graduate Study by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	87
18. Faculty Reporting Having Taught a Laboratory Course During Graduate Study by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	88
19. Faculty Reporting Teaching a Course Without Assistance from a Faculty Member During Graduate Study by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	89
20. Faculty Reporting Having Teaching Experience at Another Higher Education Institution by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	90
21. Faculty Reporting Having Utilized the Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund Service by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	92
22. Faculty Reporting Having Participated in Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	93
23. Faculty Reporting Having Utilized Professional Development Resources by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	94

24. Faculty Reporting Having Utilized Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	95
25. Faculty Reporting Having Utilized Portfolio Development Assistance by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	96
26. Faculty Reporting Participation in New Faculty Orientation by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States.....	97
27. Faculty Reporting Participation in Chancellor’s Distinguished Lecture Series by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	98
28. Faculty Reporting Participation in Teaching in Higher Education Forum by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	99
29. Faculty Reporting Participation in Professional Conferences in Their Field by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	100
30. Faculty Reporting Participation in Teaching Conferences or Institutes by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States	101
31. Other Faculty Development Activities by Categorical Type as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States...	103

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to examine the teaching perspectives, teaching preparation, previous teaching experiences and involvement in faculty development activities among faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States. A simple random sample of 536 was drawn from the institution's faculty and total of $n=131$ (24.4%) responded to the survey.

Respondents were asked to complete the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI) via the internet and complete a survey which included questions regarding demographic variables, teaching preparation, previous teaching experience, and involvement in faculty development activities.

The majority of respondents were male ($n=91$, 70.0%), held a doctoral degree ($n=119$, 91.5%) and had earned tenure ($n=82$, 62.6%). A majority of study respondents ($n=95$, 72.5%) had one dominant teaching perspective. Five (3.8%) had two or more dominant teaching perspectives and 31 (23.7%) had no dominant teaching perspectives, as measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory.

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedure was used to determine if dominant teaching perspectives were discipline-specific, using the academic college or school of the faculty member's teaching appointment for grouping purposes. The results of this analysis concluded that a significant difference existed among respondents with "Apprenticeship" as a dominant teaching perspective ($F=2.036$, (12, 118), $p=.027$).

A majority of the respondents ($n=91$, 69.5%) reported that they had completed a course or training session on teaching, while about three-fourths ($n=98$, 74.8%) had served as teaching assistant during graduate study. The Pearson's r correlation

coefficient was calculated to determine if a relationship existed between the dominant teaching perspectives of the faculty and their participation in on-campus and off-campus faculty development activities. Results of this test indicated no statistically significant difference between the two variables.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

“Everyone who teaches in higher education should be, or be becoming, an expert in teaching” (Smith, 2001, p. 76). Most higher education faculty strive to be effective teachers so that students can learn better, and many explore methods to improve their teaching practice. Not all higher education faculty are trained to be *teachers* by tradition, which is often attributed to the fact that graduate programs have not traditionally trained graduate students to lead a classroom. Graduate programs have focused on the advancement of content knowledge and have not allowed for the synthesis between content knowledge and pedagogy. The issue is further perplexed in practice that academic departments do not always focus on questions related to improving pedagogy or learning, but rather focus on the improvement of undergraduate curriculum for specific disciplines and appropriate disciplinary epistemologies (Bartlett, 2005; Cambridge, 1999; Kreber, 2001).

The study of student learning has been traditionally separate from the study of teaching, and it has been widely accepted that good teaching practices were universals. A greater understanding of the teaching-learning process now exists due to the developments in educational and cognitive psychology (Watson, 2003). However, ask for a definition of *teaching* from a cadre of educators and one would likely receive many answers such as “guiding, facilitating, telling, showing, planning, helping, and directing” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. xii). Smith (2001) offered a similar, yet more expanded definition of teaching:

The term *teaching* refers to the design and implementation of activities to promote student learning. It certainly goes beyond what teachers do in the classroom. Teaching includes course design and the development of instructional materials, the out-of-class interactions between faculty members and students, as well as the formative and summative assessment of student learning. (Smith, 2001, p. 69)

There are now greater demands to focus on pedagogy-related training in areas such as test development, lecturing, grading, and questioning for higher education faculty. Consumers and stakeholders of higher education institutions often scrutinize the actions of institutions and are demanding efforts to improve the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. In light of these demands, higher education institutions must redefine themselves and focus on faculty teaching practices. Among the issues fueling the demands for higher accountability are the changes in knowledge, technology, and quality of academic work (Camblin & Steger, 2000; Dotolo, 1999).

Teaching Perspectives

Given the limited preparation of some higher education faculty in teaching and pedagogy and the higher levels of accountability for higher education institutions, colleges and universities are being called upon to examine the teaching effectiveness of the faculty. Although other studies focused on teaching and learning styles, this study focused on the teaching perspectives that exist among higher education faculty. This study centered on the innate forces that frame the role that the faculty member assumes in the classroom.

Teaching perspective is defined by Pratt and Associates (1998) as what we “do as teachers and why we think such actions are worthy and justified” (Pratt & Associates,

1998, p.10). Teaching perspectives are not synonymous with teaching styles. Teaching perspectives are more innate as Pratt stated:

Each perspective on teaching is a complex web of actions, intentions and beliefs; each, in turn, creates its own criteria for judging or evaluating right and wrong, true and false, effective and ineffective. Perspectives determine our roles and idealized self-images as teachers as well as the basis for reflecting on practice. (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. 35)

The five Perspectives on Teaching are *Transmission*, *Apprenticeship*, *Developmental*, *Nurturing*, and *Social Reform* (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. xiii). Each is further defined as:

- *Transmission* is perhaps the “most traditional and long-standing perspective on teaching,” with the focus “on efficient and accurate delivery of that body of knowledge to learners” (pp. 39-40).
- *Apprenticeship* is the perspective that “represents a long-standing view of teaching outside classrooms” where learning occurs by “enculturating learners into a specific community” (p. 43).
- *Developmental* perspective is “based on a view of learning derived from cognitive psychology wherein each learner is assumed to have developed a personal cognitive map to guide his or her interpretation of the world.” In this model, “prior knowledge and ways of thinking form the basis of each learner’s approach to any new content and provide a window into their thinking” (pp. 45-46).
- *Nurturing* perspective is based on the “belief that learning is most affected by a learner’s self-concept and self-efficacy.” In order for learning to occur,

“learners must be confident that they can learn the material and that learning the material will be useful and relevant to their lives” (p. 49). Finally, the

- *Social Reform* perspective is based on “ideals emerge from an ambiguous and covert position of influence to occupy a clear and prominent place of significance in thinking about one’s role and responsibility in teaching.”

These positions become the “focal point of a teacher’s beliefs and commitment” (pp. 50-51).

Actions, Intentions and Beliefs

A greater understanding of *teaching perspectives* is embedded in the understanding of the indicators of commitment, or the *actions, intentions, and beliefs* that frame each teaching perspective. *Actions* are described as the “routines and techniques we use to engage people in content” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. 17). Actions are the most concrete and accessible aspect of a perspective on teaching and are the means through which we activate intentions and beliefs to help people learn.

“*Intentions* are general statements that point toward an overall agenda of purpose” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. 18). The intention of the teacher is the “teacher’s statement of purpose, responsibility, and commitment directed toward learners, content, context, ideals, or some combination of these” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. 18). The field of adult and higher education relies heavily upon instructional content, which is not the same as objectives. Objectives are precise statements that indicate specific learner outcomes and intentions and are more general descriptions of what the instructor wishes to accomplish.

The final aspect of understanding teaching perspectives is *beliefs*. As the most abstract aspect, *beliefs* represent underlying values which are held to varying degrees of meaning among people. *Beliefs* about knowledge determine what is to be taught and what evidence will be accepted that the knowledge has been taught. There are two distinct beliefs of knowledge, including subjectivism and objectivism. Beliefs represent the most stable and least flexible aspect of a person's perspective on teaching (Pratt & Associates, 1998).

Statement of the Problem

It has long been assumed in higher education, "If you know it, you can teach it" (Weimer, 1990, p. 117). Teaching goes much further than a function subsumed in the knowledge of the content, and in recognition of the nature of learning about teaching emphasizes that instructional skills cannot be "canned." Furthermore, "as faculty work with students to foster a commitment to learning and a recognition that formal education begins (not ends) the quest for knowledge, faculty members themselves must heed the lessons they are teaching" (Weimer, 1990, p. 117).

In reiterating Pratt's definition of *teaching perspectives*, the following research questions are raised:

- What are the things that higher education faculty do, which they feel are worthy and justified, which are exemplified through their teaching perspective(s)?
- What is the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty in different disciplines?

- What types of preparation and previous teaching experiences did higher education faculty have prior to their current teaching appointment?
- How does participation in faculty development activities, designed to improve teaching practice, correlate with teaching perspectives?

This study was designed to gain a greater understanding of the teaching perspectives of faculty and the faculty development activities which faculty engage in to examine and improve instructional practices.

Research Study Objectives

This study surveyed faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States, regarding their teaching perspectives and involvement in faculty development activities. For the purposes of this study, faculty were defined as assistant professors, associate professors and professors who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position. Data collected from a simple random sample were used to meet the following research objectives.

1.) Objective one of this study was to describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States on the following selected demographic variables:

- Age,
- Gender,
- Highest academic degree earned,
- Academic rank,
- Tenure status,

- Academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment,
- Years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted,
- Actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and
- Percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

2.) Objective two of this study was to describe the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty as measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI), as developed by Pratt and Collins (2001), in the following categories:

- Transmission,
- Apprenticeship,
- Developmental,
- Nurturing, and
- Social Reform.

3.) Objective three of this study was to compare the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty by the academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment. The colleges and schools of the institution where this study was conducted include:

- Agriculture,
- Art & Design,
- Arts & Sciences,
- Basic Sciences,
- Business Administration,

- School of the Coast and Environment,
- Education,
- Engineering,
- Library & Information Science,
- Mass Communication,
- Music & Dramatic Arts,
- Social Work, and
- Veterinary Medicine.

4.) Objective four of this study was to describe the teaching preparation and previous teaching experiences of higher education faculty prior to their current teaching appointment.

5.) Objective five of this study was to investigate the existence of a relationship between the dominant teaching perspective of faculty and involvement in the following faculty development activities:

- Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund,
- Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars,
- Access to Professional Development Resources,
- Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations,
- Portfolio Development Assistance,
- New Faculty Orientation,
- Chancellor's Distinguished Lecture Series,
- Teaching in Higher Education (THE) Forum, and

- Off-campus activities including professional conferences specific to one's field and/or participation in interdisciplinary teaching conferences or institutes.

Significance of the Study

This study involved the investigation of the teaching perspective and involvement in faculty development activities among faculty from a research extensive university. Menges (2000) identified four areas of educational research, which are substantial, but not as useful as they could and should be. These areas include faculty intentions and beliefs, technology-mediated instruction, effective evaluation decisions, and context-specific research.

In relation to faculty behaviors and intentions, Menges stated that we know much about what faculty members do as teachers, including how time is spent, teaching goals and instructional methods including how they are influenced by other variables and their consistency over time. However, some questions remain about higher education faculty, including: "How do they derive personal theories of teaching and learning?" (Menges, 2000, p. 7).

The goal of this study was to identify personal theories of teaching and learning among higher education faculty. Results of the Teaching Perspective Inventory were used in assisting the researcher in identifying personal theories of teaching among the faculty. This study also sought to describe teaching preparation among higher education faculty, previous higher education teaching experiences, and participation in faculty development activities designed to improve teaching practice. The aforementioned higher levels of accountability have required higher education institutions to become

more cognizant of personal theories of teaching and learning among faculty, which are exemplified through their teaching perspectives. Higher education institutions should begin to examine the effects of faculty development on teaching practice. It is hopeful that the results of this study will be of interest to faculty who are interested in improving their teaching practice and to the administrative offices of the campus which support the academic mission of the institution through faculty development and other initiatives.

Definitions and Operational Terms

The following definitions and operational terms will assist the reader in understanding the terminology related to this study:

- Research Extensive Univeristy: As defined by the Carnegie Classification system, an institution which offers baccalaureate programs with substantial commitment to graduate education including the doctoral level, awarding 50 or more doctoral degrees each year across at least 15 disciplines (Category Definitions, n.d.).
- Faculty: Assistant professors, associate professors and professors who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position.
- Faculty Development: As defined by the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education, as programs which focus on the individual faculty member, (Faculty Development Definitions, n.d.).
- Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI): Instrument developed by Daniel Pratt and John Collins which defines what teachers do and why they think such actions are worthy and justified. Results indicate the dominant teaching

perspective of faculty as *Transmission, Apprenticeship, Developmental, Nurturing*, and *Social Reform* (Pratt & Collins, 2001).

Limitations of the Study

This study provided information about the teaching perspectives and involvement in faculty development programs among the faculty of a research extensive university in the southern United States. Faculty surveyed in this study included assistant professors, associate professors and professors who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position. Results of the study are not generalizable to instructors, adjunct, and visiting professors who have not earned tenure or who are not in a tenure track position. Additionally, results from the study are not generalizable to other types of institutions such as community colleges, liberal arts institutions, and comprehensive or regional universities.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature on adult and higher education, higher education faculty, teaching perspectives and styles, and faculty development is plentiful. This chapter will explore some of the noteworthy literature in these areas in order to delineate, conceptualize, and understand the variables of this study. The chapter will address adult and higher education, the demographic characteristics of higher education faculty, the dichotomy between teaching style and perspective, effective teaching strategies, faculty development programs, and the development of the *Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI)*.

Teaching Practices in Adult and Higher Education

Higher education has placed more emphasis on teaching and learning in recent years, which is out of a sense of responsibility to and genuine concern for students. Various faculty development and improvement models have been implemented at all types of institutions in the United States. Common faculty development models include rewards and public recognition of exemplary teaching, resource centers that promote instructional development, credit for research and publication of findings on teaching issues, and initiatives to prepare graduate students for college-level teaching. It is hopeful that the end result of these types of initiatives will be a faculty with a renewed commitment to lifelong learning and excitement of discovery regarding the teaching-learning process. In order for faculty to improve their teaching practice, there should be access to resources that promote innovative teaching and learning techniques. There must also be a means to gather feedback from students, share thoughts and strategies

about teaching with peers, and disseminate findings to other interested faculty (Travis, n.d.).

There are seven principles of good undergraduate education, which were derived from the research findings of the past few decades. These principles were published originally in 1987 and are based on the underlying view of education as active, cooperative, and demanding. The seven principles include:

- Encouragement of student-faculty contact,
- Encouragement of cooperation among students,
- Encouragement of active learning,
- Giving of prompt feedback,
- Emphasis of time on task,
- Communication of high expectations, and
- Respect for diverse talents and ways of learning.

Two self-assessment inventories have been developed for the seven principles, including a faculty form and an institutional form, which were published in 1989. The faculty form of the inventory is divided into seven areas, one for each principle. The institutional form of the inventory includes six areas, which include climate, academic practices, curriculum, faculty, academic and students support services, and facilities (Gamson, 1991).

There are four Technologies of Knowledge Transmission which are related to skills and psychological dispositions which are needed to facilitate the transfer of knowledge during the teaching process. These four technologies include research, pedagogy, delivery, and evaluation. To engage in the first technology, research, the

faculty member must be committed to seeking new knowledge in their discipline by combining ideas in order to add to the present knowledge. Pedagogy, the second technology, is concerned with the arrangement of knowledge into forms so that students may learn. This requires the faculty member to focus on both the knowledge and student, or the abstract data and the persona. The third technology is the delivery of knowledge, which for simplicity includes either lecturing or discussion in the classroom. To lecture, faculty must be skilled in presentation, and to lead discussion, they must be skilled in managing the dynamics of the group process. The lecturing faculty member is often skilled in sensing audience cues, understanding visual and auditory dynamics, and other skills like those like an actor which lead to knowledge retention and foster conditions of greater curiosity, motivation, and commitment to quality performance. The discussion faculty member judges his/her effectiveness based upon the feedback loop which reveals the degree to which the knowledge has been transmitted. The fourth and final technology, evaluation, involves assessing student learning and providing written and oral feedback which requires skills in observation, analysis and measurement of deficiencies to provide useful feedback to foster learning (Bess, 1998).

Schraw and Brooks (n.d.) presented the Interactive Compensatory Model of Learning (ICML) as a framework for understanding and improving classroom learning. In relating to science faculty, they acknowledged that these faculty have little or no training in education and feel that use of the model's five main components – cognitive abilities, knowledge, strategies, metacognition, and motivation – can improve classroom practice. The ICML model is an empirically-based model that provides a comprehensive approach to learning. The five components of the ICML are described as:

- Cognitive ability – the many theories presented over the past 100 years which include psychometric, modular, and componential theories, of which the debate for the best theory still continues,
- Knowledge – the basis for every task is dependent upon knowledge, which is synthesized into broader conceptual structures such as schemata which enable us to think and reason at a more sophisticated level of understanding,
- Strategies – the mental tactics used to make a cognitive task easier to understand or perform,
- Metacognition – the knowledge and regulatory skills people have about their own learning, and
- Motivation – as used in the ICML model, the beliefs and attitudes that affect learning.

The ICML model compensates for the relationship between the five areas, and the model offers a systemic level that helps teachers deliver well-integrated instruction. In presenting the model, Schraw and Brooks noted that effective learning is dependent upon the dynamic interrelationship among a variety of learning skills and that no single skill can totally support or interfere with self-regulated classroom instruction. It is possible for instructors to improve their teaching skills through classroom instruction, and the five components of the model can be adjusted, given a supportive environment and the will of the teacher to improve the skills of themselves and the learner (Schraw & Brooks, n.d.).

In further exploration of higher education learning, Richlin and Cox (1994) discussed the interaction of teaching and learning, which they described as the heart of the learning process. Five important elements are present at this interaction and changes

in any of these five elements can affect the quality of the learning experience. These five elements include the nature and characteristics of the subject, the student, physical learning environment, the professor, and approach taken to learning. The subject being taught, its content and ways of thinking about that content often influence teaching practices and learning outcomes. Differences in student (learning) types and the physical elements of the learning environment also affect the outcomes of the learning process. It is important to understand that role that professors have in affecting the quality of learning experience. As professors develop as scholars, it often becomes their goal to improve teaching in order to enhance the teaching and learning interaction. The professor's personal approach to improving the teaching and learning interaction is imperative, as the professor must be well-grounded in the scholarship of teaching.

The dominate teaching in college classrooms is the traditional lecture method. Professors talk. Students listen. Questions have been raised about the use of *active learning* in the classroom, types of interactive instruction techniques, and how faculty, faculty developers and administrators can promote active learning. Some faculty members believe that because students constantly listen during lectures that students are engaging in active learning. Active learning is recognizable when students engage in higher-order thinking tasks such as analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Modification of the traditional lectures is the primary effort for engaging in active learning, with the use of discussion and visual instruction as strategies to enhance learning. In order for active learning to occur, the faculty member must make efforts to change teaching strategies. Faculty developers and academic administrators can support the use of active learning

strategies through different institutional activities to foster faculty development (Richlin & Cox, 1994).

Demographic Characteristics and Development of Higher Education Faculty

Faculty members believe that the faculty is the core of a college or university. While this may reflect vanity more than considered judgment, there is little doubt that the quality of the faculty is a major determinant of the quality of a college or university. (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 159)

Changes in the faculty have influenced academia over the past few years. The 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) found that between 1992 and 1998, the number of faculty employed in postsecondary institutions rose 25% from less than 1 million to approximately 1.1 million. It was also reported that 44% of the institutions surveyed had an increase in the number of faculty members (American Council on Education, 2001).

The NSOPF report indicated that research and doctoral institutions employed 36% of all faculty and that 57% of faculty were in full-time positions. Full-time faculty members taught 71% of undergraduate courses and part-time faculty taught 27% of undergraduate courses. Teaching assistants and instructional staff taught approximately 1% of undergraduate courses (American Council on Education, 2001).

The Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED) is an annual census of the research doctorates awarded by universities in the United States. The results for the 2003 survey were published in *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2003*, which included data on the 40,710 research doctorate recipients from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003, for doctorates awarded from 423 universities in the United States and Puerto Rico. The 2003 report indicated an increase of 1.9% from the 39,964

doctorates awarded in 2002. Historical SED data indicated that the current results are a 4.5% decline from the all-time high for earned doctorates, which occurred in 1998 when 42,645 doctorates were awarded by United States universities (Hoffer et al., 2004).

Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2003, indicated that 22,188 doctorates or 54.7% were earned by men and that 18,402 or 45.3% were earned by women. These numbers exclude the 120 individuals who did not report gender on the 2003 SED. The following table, which is adapted from the report indicates the number of doctorates earned in broad academic fields by gender for 2003.

Table 1

Number of Doctorate Recipients in Broad Fields by Gender in the United States and Puerto Rico from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003

Field	Gender		Total
	Male	Female	
Physical Sciences	4360	1589	5949
Engineering	4346	896	5242
Life Sciences	4309	4036	8345
Social Sciences	3018	3745	6763
Humanities	2656	2745	5401
Education	2239	4363	6602
Professional/other fields	1260	1028	2288
Total	22,188	18,402	40,590

(Hoffer et al., 2004).

Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2003, indicated that the median age of doctorate recipients for all fields was 33.3. The average

age of male doctorate recipients was 32.9 and female doctorate recipients was 34.0. The average age by broad field is illustrated in the following table, which was also adapted from the report.

Table 2

Median Age of Earned Doctorates by Broad Field in the United States and Puerto Rico from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003

<u>Field</u>	<u>Median Age at Doctorate</u>
Physical Sciences	30.6
Engineering	31.4
Life Sciences	31.8
Social Sciences	33.1
Humanities	34.6
Education	43.5
Professional/other fields	37.5
<u>All fields</u>	<u>33.3</u>

(Hoffer et al., 2004).

The number in each age grouping by broad field is illustrated in the following table, which was adapted from *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2003*.

Table 3

Number by Age Groupings of Doctorates by Broad Field in the United States and Puerto Rico from July 1, 2002, to June 30, 2003

Field	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-45	Over 45
Physical Sciences	89	2937	1676	548	206	192
Engineering	59	2234	1700	625	237	151
Life Sciences	43	3270	2625	893	505	558
Social Sciences	28	1987	2243	945	464	693
Humanities	9	991	1992	922	508	700
Education	11	472	1185	976	899	2622
Professional/other fields	4	301	596	408	288	507
<u>All fields</u>	<u>243</u>	<u>12,192</u>	<u>12,017</u>	<u>5,317</u>	<u>3,107</u>	<u>5,423</u>

(Hoffer et al., 2004).

Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2003, included data from the 2003 SED questionnaire regarding post-graduate plans. Results indicated that 71% of doctorate recipients had definite plans for employment or postsecondary study or research. Of the 71% of doctorates with definite plans, 55% had commitments for employment in higher education, 21% had commitments for employment in industry or some form of self-employment, and 7% had commitments for employment in U.S. Federal, state, or local government. Seventeen percent of doctorates with definite plans had plans categorized as “other” to include public and private elementary and secondary educational institutions, non-profit organizations not affiliated

with universities, foreign governments, and non-governmental organizations (Hoffer et al., 2004).

Pratt (1989) discussed the development of postsecondary faculty in terms of the competence that teachers exhibit in their careers. Pratt identified three stages of teacher competence, which included (1) mastery of skills and procedures, (2) clinical problem solving, and (3) critical reflection on knowledge and values. In the first stage, mastery of skills and procedures, teacher competence is exhibited by the skills which are correlated to learner achievement. This stage focuses too much on the teacher, and the steps taken by the teacher to initiate learning and the skills and knowledge contained within the framework are not linked to a conceptual framework. The second stage, clinical problem solving, allows the teacher to adapt when working with different situations in the learning environment. At this stage, teachers “construct new knowledge about teaching and learning based on their experience, existing knowledge, and what the situation demands” (Pratt, 1989, p. 80). The final and third stage, critical reflection on knowledge and values, allows the teacher to recognize and apply the need for flexible approaches to problem solving while adhering to cultural values. At this stage, teachers use the “increased ability and willingness to reflect upon each of the elements within the teaching situation and to see them as part of larger systems of meaning” (Pratt, 1989, p. 81). Competence is the common thread in the three stages identified by Pratt in which teachers move from a structured method of categorizing teaching to a stage where there is a reconsideration of earlier learning (Pratt, 1989).

A longitudinal study was conducted by Perry et al. (1997) to assess the adjustment of new faculty during their first three years of employment, with the focus on one major

aspect of faculty responsibilities, teaching. Recognizing that adjustment of new faculty has both individual and situational origins, four variables of direct relevance were selected, including perceived personal control, teaching experience, gender, and type of institution, along with time as the longitudinal variable. Data were collected over a three-year period of recently appointed, full-time tenure track faculty during their first three years of employment. Two liberal arts college, one multi-campus community college, one comprehensive I university, and one research I university were included in the study in which 259 individuals responded.

Perry et al. (1997) found that perceived personal control influenced the adjustment of new faculty in the teaching domain and more broadly in their careers. This was reflected in self-reported measures, which ranged from negative teaching-related emotions to willingness to quit their job. The researchers found that adjustment was easier for new faculty at community colleges and research I universities than at liberal arts colleges or comprehensive I institutions. It was also found that the first year of employment was the most difficult for faculty in terms of adjustment for new faculty, with perceived personal control having a pronounced impact on adjustment for new hires to their institutions. “Assuming that postsecondary institutions are taking a more proactive stance generally in supporting faculty nowadays, and that perceptions of low control can be modified, institutions may need to consider how best to assist faculty in their career development” (Perry et al., 1997, p. 550). Many faculty experience a honeymoon effect and receive special considerations from colleagues and the institution during their first year of appointment, but this support is less forthcoming during subsequent years. Ultimately Perry et al. concluded that faculty with moderate-to-high

personal control have a much better start to their careers and that the availability of institutional support systems during the adjustment process assists in the adjustment process (Perry et al., 1997).

The Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools sponsors the Preparing Future Faculty program which addresses issues related to the development of faculty members. In a recent paper through the Preparing Future Faculty project, Adams (2002) addressed the needs of new faculty. The impetus of the project is found in the statement, “While the world of academe has changed dramatically over the last two decades, most graduate programs that prepare new faculty for their first academic positions have not” (Adams, 2002, p. 1). In *What Colleges and Universities Want in New Faculty*, Adams identified five areas that need attention in the preparation of new faculty by graduate programs: teaching, research, academic life, job search, and academic options (Adams, 2002).

Of particular interest is the lack of teaching experience of newly appointed faculty members as discussed by Adams (2002). Teaching requires more attention from new faculty than any other activity. As graduate students, faculty had differing degrees of teaching experience, including those with no teaching experience, those who served as teaching assistants, those who taught labs or discussion sections, and those who taught as a single course. Few have independently taught several courses, which suggests that graduate programs are not adequately addressing a major composition of faculty work: teaching. This coupled with the expectation of faculty to teach undergraduate general education curriculum at differing levels enforces the need for more preparation on teaching in graduate programs (Adams, 2002).

Teaching Style vs. Teaching Perspective

A dichotomy exists between *teaching style* and *teaching perspective* among theorists which is evidenced in the literature. “Our teaching style represents those enduring personal qualities and behaviors that appear in how we conduct our classes” (Grasha, 2002, p. 1). Pratt and Associates (1998) defined *teaching perspectives* as what teachers do and why those actions are considered worthy and justified (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p.10). The five teaching perspectives, according to Pratt and Associates, are *Transmission, Apprenticeship, Developmental, Nurturing, and Social Reform* (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. xiii), and each represents a “complex web of actions, intentions and beliefs” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p. 35).

One of the most recognized works on *teaching style* is Grasha’s (2002) work, *Teaching With Style*, where he stated that “identifying the elements of our styles as teachers has proved to be difficult” (Grasha, 2002, p. 1) and that “no clear consensus about the common components of style” exists (Grasha, 2002, p. 1). Grasha outlined themes and variations which are indicators of teaching style. Among the themes and variations offered by Grasha include the general modes of classroom behavior, characteristics of popular teachers, behaviors common to all faculty, various roles that teachers play, and personality traits (Grasha, 2002, pp. 38-39). Grasha rightfully stated that “information about teaching style is only one-half the teacher-student interaction” (Grasha, 2002, p. 41). Learning styles, the preferences in which students learn, can “influence the student’s ability to acquire information, to interact with peers and the teacher,” but are often unaddressed by faculty who recognize learning differences, but fail to act upon them (Grasha, 2002, pp. 41-42).

Felder (1996) also discussed the importance of teaching style, specifically related to the task of teaching to all learning types in his article, *Matters of Style*. Felder, a professor of chemical engineering, stated that in order to be effective in any professional capacity, it requires the individual to work with all learning styles. By teaching in a manner that is consistent with the student's preferred learning style, the teacher can assist students in meeting their potential as students and as professionals. Felder offered the following as methods to ensure that course content appeals to all learning styles:

- Teach theoretical material by first presenting phenomena and problems that relate to the theory,
- Balance conceptual information with concrete information,
- Make extensive use of sketches, plots, schematics, vector diagrams, computer graphics and physical demonstrations in addition to oral and written explanations and derivations in lectures and readings,
- To illustrate an abstract concept or problem solving algorithm, use at least numerical example to supplement the usual algebraic example,
- Use physical analogies and demonstrations to illustrate the magnitude of calculated quantities,
- Occasionally give some experimental observations before presenting the general principle and have the students (preferably working in groups) see how far they can get toward inferring the latter,
- Provide class time for students to think about the material being presented and for active student participation,
- Encourage or mandate cooperation on homework,

- Demonstrate the logical flow of individual course topics but also point out connections between the current material and other relevant material in the same course, in other courses in the same discipline, in other disciplines, and in everyday experience (Felder, 1996).

Probably the most important aspects of understanding and developing teaching style are the abilities to articulate beliefs, assumptions, and values about teaching; to be conscious of one's own nature and personal preferences; and to be aware of the congruence or lack of congruence between self as a teacher and self as a person. (Cranton, 1994, p. 2)

Teachers often adopt teaching styles, or roles in the classroom, that feel right in a given teaching situation. Although there are many natural or born teachers that fill the classrooms and provide instruction, there is not one best way to be a teacher.

Furthermore, Cranton defined teaching style as “a product of our vision or philosophy of education and our practical responses to contexts and students” (Cranton, 1994, p. 1).

The beliefs, values and assumptions about teaching which teachers hold are revealed in their teaching style which may be influenced by the content taught. Cranton offered the example of teaching statistics and adult education, where the teaching philosophy is the same, but different methods and techniques are employed to teach the two different respondents, in a somewhat different style (Cranton, 1994).

Effective Higher Education Teaching

Is there such a thing as *bad teaching*? Eble, in speaking of the merit of faculty development, offered the following ideas on *bad teaching*:

By bad teaching, I mean much the same as one easily finds in college and university classrooms: too much talking to and not enough talking with; too much asserting of authority and not of intelligence and compassion; too much theorizing and not enough enlightened practice; too much that is comprised by the

need of fit packaging and grading and teaching requirements. (Eble, 1983, p. 135)

“To determine whether teaching is effective, we must, ultimately see whether students are learning. Anything that helps students learn is good, effective teaching” (Brookfield, 1990, p. 193). Effectiveness, in terms of skillful teaching, is irredeemably value-laden and the decision rests on certain judgments and interruptions. What a teacher may deem as an effective teaching effort, a student may deem as demeaning. Brookfield outlined truths about skillful teaching, which summarize the chapters of his book, *The Skillful Teacher: On Technique, Trust, and Responsiveness in the Classroom*. According to Brookfield, these “truths are applicable to varied contexts in which college teachers teach and college students learn” (Brookfield, 1990, p. 195). These truths, along with a brief explanation are as follows:

- Be clear about the purpose of your teaching by developing a philosophy of practice or a critical rationale for why you’re doing what you’re doing,
- Reflect on your own learning by remembering what it feels like to learn something, especially something new and different,
- Be wary of standardized models and approaches because teaching and learning are complex processes and teachers and learners are complex beings; no model of practice or pedagogical approach will apply to all settings,
- Expect ambiguity and realize the teaching is often a journey into uncertainty where teachers unlearn their reliance on standardized models and curricula,

- Remember that perfection is impossible and that to pursue perfection endlessly will lead to forgetting about the real reason for teaching – to help students learn,
- Research your students' backgrounds before beginning any educational effort, if possible,
- Attend to how students experience learning, which should be a concerted effort by teachers,
- Talk to your colleagues to share teaching experiences and avoid crises and dilemmas,
- Trust your instincts and do not rely too heavily on the knowledge and insights contained within textbooks or the teachings from teacher-training programs, but rather have great legitimacy on responses from your own situations,
- Create diversity by using varied materials and methods in practice of teaching,
- Take risks in the classroom, knowing fully that some risks will not always work, but it is important to depart from the planned curricula and methods should the moment dictate,
- Recognize the emotionality of learning to students and understand that learning sometimes involves threats to student self-esteem, which the teacher can support,
- Acknowledge your personality and teach in a way that belies fundamental aspects of your personality,
- Don't evaluate only by students' satisfaction, given that often students greet a teacher's desire to help with anger and resentment,

- Balance support and challenge students by seeking an equilibrium between the two forces,
- Recognize the significance of your actions and realize that your actions will imbue with enormous symbolic significance by students, and
- View yourself as a helper of learning, which is perhaps the most simplest but most profound, but the fundamental reason for teaching is to help someone learn something (Brookfield, 1990).

In closing, Brookfield warned that the one thing to “expect with certainty is surprise” (Brookfield, 1990, p. 210) and that these insights as stated above are not quintessential truths about college teachings. “Listen to your nagging, inner voice. Be prepared to admit the possibility that your inner voice is right, even when all professional wisdom is to the contrary” (Brookfield, 1990, p. 211).

The process of developing and reforming teaching perspectives among faculty is still not a well-grounded theory, despite the fact that faculty development programs have existed for nearly 30 years. In their research, Cranton and Carusetta (2002) explored how faculty change their assumptions about teaching when moved to a different context. Their research was conducted at Renaissance College, part of the University of New Brunswick, in New Brunswick, Canada. A case study approach was used where eight faculty were interviewed over the course of a year about their teaching experiences, specifically in the college context. Cranton and Carusetta found that faculty were looking for a place to belong away from the traditional university structure and that faculty were engaged when working as a team, despite the fact that most faculty work in isolation. Discussion of teaching experiences among peers allowed teachers to learn from others

and to impact their own methods and strategies. Four types of methods and strategies included intuition versus planning, integrative teaching, problem-based learning, and student-centeredness. Finally, Cranton and Carusetta found that teachers were concerned with and often focused on the growth and development of the students to discover more about the students' backgrounds and abilities. The goal of this research was to describe how faculty experience change in teaching context, how that change leads to reflection on practice, and how beliefs and assumptions about teaching are changed. Although the structure and culture at Renaissance College is different from traditional campuses, the findings have great use on the impact on teaching. The culture of the college was one that promotes growth among both the faculty and the learner (Cranton & Carusetta, 2002).

There exists a lack of broadly acceptable definitions for *scholarship of teaching*, *scholarly teaching*, *excellence in teaching*, *expert teacher*, and *research on teaching and learning* (Smith, 2001). To be a scholarly teacher refers to the knowledge that faculty have and the approaches, including preparation, methodology, and reflective critique, that are undertaken in the teaching process. Knowledge from one's own field or discipline or simply knowing the latest stuff is not enough. Scholarly teaching encompasses a greater understanding of "teaching and learning, pedagogy and andragogy, instructional design, teaching and learning styles, methods of assessment, and adequate preparation for teaching" (Smith, 2001, p. 70). Through continued practice, faculty members move from novice to expert and in turn become more *scholarly*. Thus the faculty become experts in teaching, possessing not only knowledge of theories and technical skills, but by also engaging in analysis and reflective practice (Smith, 2001).

“To date, teaching, to the extent that it is being taught in university graduate programs, tends to be treated as an add-on to the knowledge of the discipline” (Kreber, 2001, p. 80). The emphasis on content knowledge and education of researchers often places little importance on pedagogy knowledge which would be of assistance in helping future faculty help students learn. Kreber (2001) offered five recommendations for improving graduate education to promote the scholarship of teaching. Those recommendations were as follows:

- Change the doctoral program curriculum to include at least two courses on pedagogy in the discipline,
- Allow dissertations to focus on pedagogy in the disciplines,
- Provide opportunity for graduate students to teach and receive feedback on their teaching by those who practice the scholarship of teaching,
- Base workshops and seminars, such as teaching assistant training programs, on educational theory and research,
- Identify professors who practice the scholarship of teaching, and have them act as mentors for graduate students.

In addition to the proposed changes to graduate education, Kreber offered five additional recommendations for improving the scholarship of teaching in relation to faculty development activities. Kreber’s recommendations for faculty development included:

- Introduce department-wide collaborative action research programs in which professors and faculty developers explore teaching and learning in the discipline,

- Allow faculty to contract for and focus on the scholarship of teaching for a given number of years, and allow for sabbaticals to be dedicated to the scholarship of teaching,
- Base workshops and seminars on educational theory and research,
- Establish department reading circles on teaching and learning in the discipline, and encourage team teaching, and
- Base courses on postsecondary teaching and learning on a model of the scholarship of teaching.

Furthermore, Kreber stated that “the scholarship of teaching, as seems to be the consensus, is knowledge that can be shared with and reviewed by a community of peers, and be built on by members of this community” (Kreber, 2001, p. 79).

Multiple answers exist about the perspectives from each discipline which influence the practice of scholarship in teaching and challenges the assumptions about where teaching ranks among teaching, research, and service (Cambridge, 1999). Faculty committed to student success are often challenged to examine and question “what they teach, how they teach, and what information about learners need learning will help them to teach in more effective ways” (Sperling, 2003, p. 594). Through networking with other colleagues, teaching wisdom is often passed along in the community college setting like folklore. Further exploration of the scholarship of teaching and learning holds promises of richer and deeper understanding of student learning that allows faculty to connect the dots between theory and practice and between different teaching strategies. The goal of the scholarship of teaching and learning is to improve student learning and

provide more effective education. Through engagement in lifelong learning, teachers can engage in ongoing scholarship and improve student learning (Sperling, 2003).

“Too often, the teacher tends to view the classroom as one bifurcated between teaching and learning” (Sutliff & Baldwin, 2001, Teacher/Learner Relationship section, para. 5). At times, students fail to learn the material because the teacher’s style of teaching does not match the learner’s style of learning. Kolb’s Learning Style Inventory (LSI) was administered by Sutliff to a computer-aided drafting class as a means to develop a teaching style to accommodate various learning styles. Optimal effectiveness for instructors comes through working through Kolb’s learning-style types, which include accommodators, divergers, convergers, and assimilators. Application of the knowledge of learner types allows students to learn independently and well while reducing boredom and alienation. College curriculum often lends itself to use of all four of Kolb’s learning-style types; however, it may not always be possible to achieve a balanced lesson, course or program. Nonetheless, a mixture of teaching styles to accommodate different learning types is one step in maximizing student achievement (Sutliff & Baldwin, 2001).

Buskist (2002) surveyed teaching award winners from two-year and four-year institutions to investigate qualities and attributes of effective teachers. In the study, Buskist surveyed 36 faculty from both types of institutions, and 22 awardees responded to the survey which addressed a number of issues, and among them were advice on how to become a better teacher. Among the responses on how to become a better teacher, as reported by Buskist, include know the content, study the science of teaching, observe someone with a good teaching reputation, associate yourself with those who value teaching, and enjoy the teaching experience. Other recommendations on becoming a

better teacher were to be willing to experiment, participate in faculty workshops, be aware that time and personal problems prevent faculty from doing the best job at teaching, and keep the focus on student learning. Finally Buskist, outlined three lessons from the data collected in his survey:

- There is no single way to be an effective teacher,
- Effective teachers are proactive in striving to become even better teachers, and
- An emphasis on the importance of the interaction between students and teachers (Buskist, 2002).

Colbeck (2002) reviewed a multi-institutional reform in the field of engineering education through a two-step process to develop and test a conceptual model that considers the combined impact of regulative, normative, and cognitive institutional processes. The two steps in the study included an exploratory qualitative research of institutionalization process from the actual experiences of multi-institutional curricular and teaching reform efforts, and the assessment of the impact of institutionalization processes on diffusions of curricular and teaching reforms among faculty. Included in the study were faculty from seven schools which were members of the Engineering Coalition for Excellence in Education and Leadership (ECSEL), funded by the National Science Foundation from 1999-2000 in an effort to “increase active and collaborative learning in the form of team-based design projects and to increase the participation of women and under-represented minorities in engineering” (Colbeck, 2002, p. 401).

Three types of processes were explored in the study: (1) regulative institutionalization processes, (2) normative institutionalization processes, and (3) cognitive institutionalization process. Regulative institutionalization processes provide

guidelines for organizational and individual behavior, that if violated result in sanctions by administrative and governance entities. Normative institutionalization processes involve communication of values (what has worth) and norms (how things should be done) under a social framework for appropriate involvement and action. Finally, cognitive institutionalization processes occur as more individuals assume that an activity is naturally the way things are done and act accordingly, such as faculty beliefs about learning, which are consistent with reform, and use teaching practices similar to those advocated by the reform.

Colbeck's study found that 63% of survey respondents increased the use of design projects in undergraduate courses from 1990 to 1997 and that 64% increased the use of group projects in undergraduate courses in the same time period. Fifty percent increased their sensitivity toward the needs of women and their sensitivity toward the needs of underrepresented minority students. These findings suggested that cognitive institutionalization indicators had a stronger influence than regulative and normative indicators in faculty acceptance of teaching practice inherent to ECSEL's design goal. When controlling for ECSEL's involvement, the use of student-centered practices predicated increased use of design and group projects in classrooms. The implications for theory included that socialization and institutionalization theories suggest that faculty members would be quite likely to be influenced by their perceptions of the beliefs and behaviors of their peers and that cognitive institutionalization process, which involve faculty members' own beliefs and behaviors, have a direct effect on changes in course content and teaching method. Furthermore, most faculty comply with cognitive institutionalization processes because they find it hard to conceive of the alternatives of

not following the reform efforts, and in this study those of ECSEL, which emphasize teaching methods as well as the needs of diverse students (Colbeck, 2002).

Louie, Drevdahl, Purdy and Stackman (2003) presented a collaborative model that can be implemented to establish self-study research as an accepted model of inquiry and further discussion on teaching in higher education. Self-study research is described as a mode of scholarly inquiry in which teachers examine their beliefs and actions with the context of their work as educators. The model presented by Louie et al. included three steps: assessment, implementation, and dissemination. The assessment phase includes three levels – individual, group, academic community – to determine if favorable conditions exist to engage in self-study. The second phase, implementation includes both data collection and data analysis to address clearly defined research questions, examine theoretical bases of inquiry, and consider the existing research stream. Finally, the dissemination phase allows for the sharing of knowledge which may impact the beliefs and practices of the researcher, colleagues, others in the discipline, and perhaps create new directions for research. As stated previously, Louie et al. asserted that the lack of doctoral programs to emphasize teaching practice and pedagogy requires the recognition that teaching is a subject of inquiry that requires the examination of the beliefs, assumptions, and teaching experiences. The collaborative self-study research model proposed by Louie et al. advances the theoretical knowledge in order to connect work with existing knowledge and theory in the field (Louie et al., 2003).

Faculty Development Programs

“Faith in a connection between faculty development and improving teaching has not yet reached a point where faculty development receives a clearly

defined and substantial amount of institutional support” (Eble, 1983, p. 121).

Growth in the popularity of faculty development activities can be traced to student protests of the late 1960’s about the neglect of undergraduate education and continue today in a time where there a public outcry for higher levels of accountability in higher education. Few universities budget funds for improving instructors and instruction, and so it becomes hopeful that graduate programs would accept responsibility for developing the character and style of a prospective teacher. However, it is well known that many Ph.D. candidates have not had formal course work or experience on how to teach prior to assuming a faculty position. However, most have learned about teaching in conventional ways through reading books, an occasional psychology class, through discussions with colleagues or professors, through observations, or actual teaching experiences.

The matter of not having course work in pedagogy, therefore, may not be as limiting as it first appears. Formal education probably places more confidence in course work than is justified, for a tight connection between course work and specific competencies in any activity is difficult to establish. As regards, formal course work in education, such courses have been, fairly and unfairly, so little respected within the university’s general climate that their absence from a college teacher’s dossier may be no great loss. (Eble, 1983, p. 124)

For the new professor, the development of teaching skills is often left to an individual’s inclination, self-interest, and natural aptitudes. However, greater demands on the new professor’s time may be against learning to teach or against valuing teaching sufficiently to learn. Thus the major difficulty in faculty development programs is getting the faculty who are most in need to participate in development activities (Eble, 1983).

The Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education offers three major areas in the arena of faculty development: (1) faculty

development programs, which focus on the development of the individual, (2) instructional development programs, which focus on the overall improvement of the institution, and (3) organizational development which focus on maximizing institutional effectiveness. Faculty development programs focus on the improvement of teaching by the individual and are often facilitated by specialists who focus on teaching to include class organization, development of students, in-class presentation skills, and other elements of design. Instructional development programs focus on the course, the curriculum and student learning where faculty may be part of an instructional design team. These teams may often identify appropriate course structures and teaching strategies to meet the goals of instruction. Organizational development programs are focused on the organizational structure of the institution and its subcomponents with the goal of building an organizational structure that is efficient and effective support of faculty and students. The reality is that many programs operate as a combination of all three types of programs and are designed to meet the goals of the institution (Faculty Development Definitions, n.d.).

In her book, *Learning and Motivation in the Postsecondary Classroom*, Svinicki (2004) made a case for faculty to understand the theories and research on learning and motivation, which she felt should undergird decision-making in teaching. She asserted that an understanding of teaching and learning among the faculty alleviates the need to spend several semesters to perfect a class. She prevails among the faculty, as experts in their fields, to develop pedagogical content knowledge that can be used to understanding what students experience in the classroom and to design instruction to help get the students around the blocks. Svinicki's most prevailing point was that there is little

argument why postsecondary faculty should not be working to become more effective teachers (Svinicki, 2004).

Fletcher and Patrick (1998) discussed five themes which have affected higher education in the United States throughout the 1980's and 1990's. These themes included:

- Accountability in higher education to get the most out of tax dollars,
- Academic culture that supports more time spent among faculty on teaching-related activities,
- Student needs to meet demographic and technological awareness of the student population,
- Importance of community outreach in light of the role that colleges and universities are expected to assume in promoting economic development, and
- Technology as a new tool for transforming the nature of the learning experience.

In their article, Fletcher and Patrick spoke of the role of faculty developers to provide models for student-centered learning, involvement in research on faculty development, promotion of collaboration among different offices which support instruction, and promotion of interdisciplinary collaborations among academic disciplines. Ultimately Fletcher and Patrick stated that the future of higher education will be dependent upon the creation of an environment that includes flexibility, interdisciplinary and inter-unit collaboration, technological literacy, and a service-oriented mindset (Fletcher & Patrick, 1998).

In a similar voice, Dotolo (1999) wrote that a consortium approach to faculty development could “enhance college teaching and learning” because a majority of the

faculty have “little or no training in the basics of teaching.” Dotolo’s article, *Faculty Development: Working Together to Improve Teaching and Learning*, described the work of the Virginia Tidewater Consortium for Higher Education in offering faculty development programs when most member institutions had no formal faculty development programs. Participants in the program came from all disciplines and types of institutions with the desire to improve their teaching and to learn more about how their students learn. A majority of the participants in the consortium have little or no training in the basics of teaching, including test development and grading systems. Therefore, workshop topics include testing, lecturing, and questioning skills, with the focus on changing the atmosphere of teaching and learning on the campus. In some cases, this is the only pedagogy-related program that newly hired faculty have an opportunity to attend. Dotolo stated that “institutions need to respond by indicating that teaching is important and that there is a mechanism whereby colleges and universities are striving to enhance teaching and learning” (Dotolo, 1999, p. 55). The consortium allows faculty the opportunity to meet and discuss important issues which can have a positive effect on the institutions, faculty, and students (Dotolo, 1999).

No matter how effective a particular teaching method, it can be enhanced.

Teaching is an action performed by all college faculty, often with commonness, but rarely operates in the highest level of competence. “Professors who take painstaking care for method within their discipline of chemistry, history, or psychology, for example, all too often are unreflective when it comes to teaching” (Seldin, n.d., para. 2). The notion of improving teaching in college classrooms is being taken more seriously as professional organizations such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the

American Association for Higher Education, as well as other stakeholders have demanded improvements among the faculty. Since teaching is an art and not a science, the act of improving teaching is more difficult. College faculty, like artists need grounding in technique before they can improve their skills. With such, identification of opportunities to improve teaching is essential for faculty development (Seldin, n.d.).

College faculty are hired with the expectation to provide effective teaching, and thus it seems logical that institutions should provide assistance for the faculty. Various types of programs exist which are aimed at improving teaching. Examples of these types of programs are those that develop the repertoire of teaching skills needed by the professor to be effective for different kinds of students, programs to build bridges between what the teacher knows and the student is trying to grasp, programs to develop skills and understanding having to do with interpersonal relationships with students, and programs to help teachers gain greater understanding of how their disciplines' organizational structure facilitate or inhibit student learning. Other types of programs are those that assist teachers in finding greater intrinsic satisfaction with teaching, programs that help teachers learn how to continue learning from their experiences as teachers, programs that support, critique and assist teaching, and programs that provide feedback to instructors on their teaching performance (Seldin, n.d.).

It is the “cardinal responsibility of faculty to be the primary innovators and initiators of change in academe” (Camblin & Steger, 2000, p. 1). As most recently mentioned, accountability issues abound and the “mystique of the *ivory tower* has largely been replaced with an insistence for practical credibility” (Camblin & Steger, 2000, p. 2). Although faculty development activities are not new to academe, they remain an integral

strategy for self-renewal for the faculty that can expand personal awareness. To address these needs, the faculty development program at the University of Cincinnati has offered specialized projects that began in the 1980's such as Writing Across the Curriculum, Learning Across the Curriculum, and the Project to Improve and Reward Teaching. In 1994, the University of Cincinnati began to offer the Faculty Summer Institute which was supplemented with sessions throughout the year. The focus of the institute was on an interdisciplinary approach to implementing technological tools. The Faculty Development Committee at the University of Cincinnati also funded a number of projects such as individual, collaborative and department grants. The model initiated at the University of Cincinnati was intended to change the way in which the institution functions and has impacted many faculty. One faculty member from the University of Cincinnati College of Medicine noted that the aggregate knowledge obtained from other activities is not equal to the positive impact of the Faculty Summer Institute (Camblin & Steger, 2000).

Lopater (1990) described his experiences in a multidisciplinary course in British Colleges of Further Education called the Certificate of Education. As a faculty member, Lopater participated in the course at two different institutions which was designed to prepare him for the professional position of teaching. The Certificate of Education course includes many aspects of the teaching process, including psychological, sociological, philosophical, and technical (audiovisual materials, computers, etc.). As a team-taught course, faculty members attend the course one full day each week for two years to study curriculum that extends beyond teaching and learning. Student characteristics (learning styles), gender,

age, and preferred learning modality (visual, auditory, tactile) are some of the more specific curriculum topics addressed. The lack of formal academic experience drives the design of the course and requires assigned psychological readings and essays related to those reading assignments which encourage independent scholarship and critical thinking. There are also teaching practice visits and residential weekends to discuss course content in an informal setting which link the curriculum to professional practice (Lopater, 1990).

Administrators can support the development of more effective teaching by faculty through various methods. Faculty are typically hired for their knowledge of the discipline, not for their expertise of the discipline of college teaching. As a result, the teaching skills of new faculty are immature compared to their research skills. Hubbell, Hudson, and Muir (1995) offered 10 methods for administrators to promote more effective teaching through faculty development activities. Although these methods are geared toward veterinary science programs, their utility extends to other postsecondary disciplines. The 10 methods include:

- Creation of an academic climate that values excellence in teaching,
- Assignment of time to develop educational methods and materials,
- Relief of faculty from menial teaching tasks such as development of production of audiovisual materials,
- Development of workshops or seminar series about teaching,
- Identify faculty to serve as mentors to young faculty members,
- Personal evaluation by administrators and assistance in improving teaching,
- Promotion of faculty retreats on teaching and learning,

- Involvement in college, university, and national committees on education, and
- Series of teaching awards.

Through these types of activities, administrators create an environment to develop and nurture an atmosphere that values excellence in teaching, when implemented on a continuous basis (Hubbell et al., 1995).

Teaching Perspectives Inventory

The other side of the dichotomy of *teaching style* is *teaching perspective*. Pratt and Associates (1998) defined *teaching perspectives* as what we “do as teachers and why we think such actions are worthy and justified” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p 10). Pratt also stated that:

Each perspective on teaching is a complex web of actions, intentions and beliefs; each, in turn, creates its own criteria for judging or evaluating right and wrong, true and false, effective and ineffective. Perspectives determine our roles and idealized self-images as teachers as well as the basis for reflecting on practice. (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p 35)

Pratt’s five perspectives on teaching include *Transmission*, the effective delivery of content; *Apprenticeship*, the modeling ways of being; *Developmental*, cultivating ways of thinking; *Nurturing*, facilitating self-efficacy, and *Social Reform*, seeking a better society. There are other models on teaching perspectives, other than the ones developed by Pratt and Collins (2001), which were derived from research over several years, in five different countries through empirical means by practitioners rather than intuitively from scholars. Pratt and Collins’ perspectives are examined theoretically as a combination of actions, intentions and beliefs and are described in the voices of several educators. Finally, rather than presenting the Teaching Perspectives in a hierarchy from simple to more complex

means, Pratt and Collins offered five perspectives that are each within themselves a legitimate view of each perspective (Pratt & Associates, 1998).

Teachers who exemplify the *Transmission* teaching perspective are assumed to have a high degree of mastery of subject matter. Effective *Transmission* teachers “make efficient use of class time, clarify misunderstandings, answer questions, provide timely feedback, correct errors, provide reviews, summarize what has been presented, direct students to appropriate resources, set high standards for achievement and develop objective means of assessing learning” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 1).

Teachers who subscribe to the *Apprenticeship* teaching perspective “must reveal the inner workings of skilled performance and must now translate it into accessible language and an ordered set of tasks” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 2). Through the learning process, teachers start with simple and move to complex tasks. The role of the Apprenticeship teacher changes as the learner masters content so that the learner assumes more responsibility.

The *Developmental* teaching perspective is founded in the notion that teaching is planned and focused from the learner’s point of view. Effective *Developmental* teachers “understand how their learners think and reason about the content” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 3) and teach with the primary goal of “helping learners develop increasingly complex and sophisticated cognitive structures for comprehending the content” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 3). This is done by questioning learners in simple to more complex content and offering meaningful examples for the learner.

Teachers with the *Nurturing* teaching perspective make “long-term, hard, persistent effort to achieve comes from the heart, as well as the head” (Pratt & Collins,

n.d., para. 4). *Nurturing* teachers feel that they can affect learners because “they can succeed at learning if they give it a good try; their achievement is a product of their own effort and ability, rather than the benevolence of a teacher; and their efforts to learn will be supported by their teacher and their peers” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 4).

Finally, the *Social Reform* teaching perspective is focused on “Effective teaching seeks to change society in substantive ways” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 5). *Social Reform* teachers are concerned with the “awakening of students to values and ideologies that are embedded in texts and common practices within their discipline” (Pratt & Collins, n.d., para. 5).

Dall’Alba (1991) conducted a pilot study in which 20 faculty members from higher education were interviewed to determine their “conceptions of teaching.” The 20 faculty interviewed in this qualitative study taught courses in economics, English, medicine, and physics. The teachers’ conceptions of teaching or ways of understanding was the object of the phenomenographic analysis in the study. Dall’Alba identified seven preliminary conceptions of teaching from the results of the study:

- Teaching as presenting information,
- Teaching as transmitting information (from teacher to student),
- Teaching as illustrating the application of theory to practice,
- Teaching as developing concepts/principles and their interrelations,
- Teaching as developing the capacity to be expert,
- Teaching as exploring ways of understanding from particular perspectives,
and
- Teaching as bringing about conceptual change.

The seven preliminary conceptions identified by Dall'Alba are ordered from "less to more complete understanding of teaching" (Dall'Alba, 1991, p. 296). The conceptions are ordered in this list from those that involve only the teacher to those that involve the teacher, student, and content (Dall'Alba, 1991).

In 1992, Pratt published an article, "Conceptions of Teaching" in *Adult Education Quarterly* which was the result of research into a phenomenography, a method for describing qualitatively different ways in which people understand an aspect of their world. In developing the Conceptions of Teaching, Pratt and his research associates interviewed 253 people from five different countries in interview sessions that lasted from 45 to 90 minutes. The proceedings of the interviews were tape recorded and where appropriate translated into English. The interview protocol included three sets of questions in aspects of conceptions: actions, intentions, and beliefs.

The five Conceptions of Teaching that Pratt observed, included *Engineering Conception: Delivering Content*, *Apprenticeship Conception: Modeling Ways of Being*, *Developmental Conception: Cultivating the Intellect*, *Nurturing Conception: Facilitating Personal Agency*, and *Social Reform Conception: Seeking A Better Society*. Each is further described as follows:

- *Engineering Conception: Delivering Content* - teaching is framed in terms of the content with the dominant elements being the teacher and content, the dominant relationship between elements was that of teacher-to-content, and the teacher's concern for and authority over that which is to be learned,
- *Apprenticeship Conception: Modeling Ways of Being* – where the dominant elements were also the teacher and the content, but based upon the belief that

a body of established wisdom and knowledge exists, in the form of expert practitioners, and is to be handed down from those who know to those who don't know,

- *Developmental Conception: Cultivating the Intellect* – where the dominant elements are the learners (intellect) and the teacher, where a dominant relationship is signified by teaching functions that promote particular forms of inquiry and thought about the content in a more learner-centered environment with focus on the learner's cognitive development,
- *Nurturing Conception: Facilitating Personal Agency* – another learner-centered conception, but focus is placed on the learner's self-concept and sense of being in control of life's events, where the dominant elements are learners (self concept) and the teacher with a dominant relationship signified by a close relationship between the learner and the teacher,
- *Social Reform Conception: Seeking A Better Society* – where a distinctive, explicitly stated ideal or set of principles which were linked to a vision for a better social order and guided teaching, where each ideal was based on a particular system of beliefs, usually derived from some ethical code.

Pratt carefully acknowledged when he published these findings that they were tentative and in need of further elaboration, but did illuminate several issues related to the teaching of adults including that students experience all aspects of a teacher's conceptions of teaching, that teaching conceptions are impregnated with values and assumptions which inform actions and guide judgments and decisions regarding effectiveness, and that the five conceptions are not mutually exclusive. Other issues were that the conceptions of

teaching are dynamic and evolve with experience of the teacher, it would be easy to associate specific methods and techniques with particular conceptions of teaching, and each conception has “philosophical and epistemological roots which are consonant with particular people, purposes, and contexts” (Pratt, 1992, p. 218).

Collins, Selinger, and Pratt (n.d.) surveyed a total of 356 students seeking secondary teaching certification who completed an early on-line version of the *Teaching Perspective Inventory*. Dominant perspectives were defined by Collins et al. as the perspective associated with a score on one or more of the TPI scales that is one standard deviation or more above the mean of the individual’s score. The results of survey conducted by Collins et al. was that 70.5% had one dominant perspective, 25.8% had two dominant perspectives and 3.4% showed no perspective that clearly stood out as a dominant or preferred view of their teaching role.

Collins et al. (n.d.) found that *nurturing* was the most dominant and *social reform* was the least dominant perspective among those seeking secondary teaching certification. The researchers stated that this is consistent with the need to acquire and master knowledge before attempting to reform the social structures of which it is a part. The researchers also found some consistency between students’ perspectives on teaching role and the content they are to teach. Content areas such as math, sciences, life sciences, etc., where the content is well-defined and there is an assumption of single right or wrong answers yielded more responses with a *transmission* perspective. However, content areas such as language arts and social studies were dominated by a *developmental* perspective, which was attributed by the researchers as areas that required deeper understanding and promoting of social skills.

Although teaching styles and other rubrics exist to support educational practice, an examination of *teaching perspectives* can inform students about “more subtle, underlying dimensions, and enable them to test assumptions which may be implicit concerning their teaching” (Collins et al., n.d., Implications section, para. 2). Although the researchers acknowledged that their results will unlikely result in redesign of teacher training programs, it is hopeful that students will be encouraged to “amalgamate the various features of the program together with their unique profiles and go in search of their own personal philosophy of teaching” (Collins et al., n.d., Implications section, para. 5).

Other scholars have sought to explore conceptions and perceptions of teachers in postsecondary education. In 1997, Kember synthesized the work of 13 qualitative research studies on the topic. Of the studies reviewed by Kember were the aforementioned works by Pratt (1992) and Dall’Alba (1991). Kember affirmed that Pratt’s conceptions of teaching are the “most widely used term in the papers” (Kember, 1997, p. 256) and that *belief* is used less commonly and is usually synonymous with conceptions. Kember placed conceptions of teaching into two broad categories, which include the teacher-centered orientation that “focuses on communication of defined bodies of content or knowledge” (Kember, 1997, p. 264) and student-centered orientation that “focuses toward the students’ learning” (p. 264). Kember stated that “a need for future investigation of the relationship between categories” (Kember, 1997, p. 273) still exists to determine if the conceptions exists in discrete categories or if a continuum exists between the different conceptions. Issues of quality in higher education are related to the conceptions of teaching as Kember further stated,

An understanding of teaching conceptions then becomes important if measures to enhance the quality of teaching are to have any impact. If teaching approaches are strongly influenced by the underlying beliefs of the teacher, quality assurance measures should take into account conceptions rather than concentrate exclusively upon approaches. Real changes in teaching quality are only likely to be brought about by changes in the beliefs about teaching of faculty. (Kember, 1997, p. 273)

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This study surveyed faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States, regarding their teaching perspectives and involvement in faculty development activities. In addition to the principle factors of this research study, the participants were also surveyed regarding their teaching preparation and previous higher education teaching experience. This chapter presents information on the procedures used to conduct this study, including the population, sampling strategy, ethical considerations for conducting research, instrumentation, and data analysis.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was higher education faculty at a research extensive university. For the purposes of this study, faculty were defined as assistant professors, associate professors and professors who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position. The accessible population for this study was faculty members that met this criteria, who were employed at the institution where this study was conducted during the spring 2005 semester with at least a 10 percent or higher teaching load.

Data collected for this study were analyzed to meet the objectives of this study using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) software program. Throughout the process of data collection, no personal identification information (i.e. name, social security number) was collected from survey participants. Each subject was assigned an identification number for the purposes of data entry and follow-up with non-responders.

The frame for this study included assistant professors, associate professors and professors who have been granted tenure or who are in a tenure-track position at the institution where this study was conducted during the spring 2005 semester with at least a 10 percent or higher teaching load. The frame of the accessible population was identified through personnel records at the institution where this study was conducted. The colleges and schools of the institution where this study was conducted include Agriculture, Art & Design, Arts & Sciences, Basic Sciences, Business Administration, School of the Coast and Environment, Education, Engineering, Library & Information Science, Mass Communication, Music & Dramatic Arts, Social Work, and Veterinary Medicine. Personnel from other academic units, such as University College, Honors College, and Continuing Education, were not included in the sample frame, as individuals in these academic units are not generally considered faculty members. A simple random sample of $n=536$ was drawn from the population of $N=890$ faculty at the institution where this study was conducted.

Cochran's sample size determination Formula for n With Continuous Data (Cochran, 1977) was used to determine the minimum the sample size. The sample size was calculated as follows:

$$n_o = \frac{t^2 s^2}{d^2} \quad n_o = \frac{(1.96)^2 (1)^2}{(.01)^2} \quad n_o = 384$$

$$n = \frac{n_o}{1 + \frac{n_o}{N}} \quad n = \frac{384}{1 + \frac{384}{890}} \quad n = 268$$

Application of Cochran's formula determined that a minimum sample size of 268 should be delivered. However in order to ensure that adequate data was collected, the researcher elected to double the sample size to 536, as noted below:

$$n @ 50\% \text{ response rate} = 268 + 268 = 536.$$

The legend for Cochran's sample size determination Formula for n With Continuous Data includes:

d^2 = acceptable margin of error of +/- 2% (.02 x 5 Likert-type scale).

s^2 = estimated variance (1).

t^2 = acceptable risk (t at .05 for N=700 is about 2.0).

N = population size.

n_o = unadjusted sample size.

n = adjusted sample size.

Ethical Considerations and Study Approval

The researcher submitted an application for exemption from institutional oversight to the Institutional Review Board at the institution where the study was conducted on December 7, 2004. Approval was obtained on January 27, 2005, and a copy of the approved application is included in Appendix A. The IRB reference number for this research study is 2853. The researcher also received approval from the institution's Office of Academic Affairs to commence this study and survey the faculty. A copy of the approval memorandum from the institution's Office of Academic Affairs is included in Appendix B.

Research Study Variables

The primary variable for this study was the teaching perspectives among faculty at a research extensive university. Pratt and Associates (1998) defined teaching perspective as what we “do as teachers and why we think such actions are worthy and justified” (Pratt & Associates, 1998, p.10). Teaching perspectives were measured using the Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI), which was developed by Pratt and Collins (2001). The instrument measures teaching perspective in five areas: *Transmission*, *Apprenticeship*, *Developmental*, *Nurturing*, and *Social Reform* (Pratt & Collins, 2001).

Other variables of the study included involvement in faculty development activities, teaching preparation experiences, and previous higher education teaching experience. Demographic data were also gathered from survey participants to include:

- Age,
- Gender,
- Highest academic degree earned,
- Academic rank,
- Tenure status,
- Academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment,
- Years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted,
- Actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and
- Percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

Survey participants were also asked questions regarding their teaching preparation and previous teaching experiences of higher education faculty prior to their current teaching appointment. They were also asked about their participation in on-campus and off-campus faculty development activities. Participants were also allowed to list any other activities, which were not listed on the instrument.

Development of the Teaching Perspectives Inventory

The Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) was developed “through successive stages of operationalizing Pratt’s five perspectives into five separate scales concerning actions, intentions and beliefs related to teaching” (Pratt, Collins & Selinger, 2001, Instrument Development section, para 1). The most recent version of the TPI included 45 items which were tested on more than 25 groups, totaling 1000-plus respondents including teachers of adults in law, pharmacy, dietetics, workforce training, nursing, industry, fitness, as well as on adult education graduate students in the United States, Canada and Singapore. High internal consistencies of the instrument’s five scales were found, including: Transmission .81, Apprenticeship .88, Developmental .85, Nurturance .92 and Social Reform .82. The overall consistency of the instrument was found to be .80.

TPI instrument developers stated that teaching perspectives are different from teaching styles and teaching methods. Teaching perspectives “are more fundamental and penetrating. It is important to note that no perspective is either good or bad, and that excellent forms of teaching can occur within each of them – as can poor teaching” (Pratt et al., 2001, Instrument Development section, para. 4). Furthermore, the results of the TPI have multiple uses among educators, including the evaluation of personal teaching

skills and styles, evaluating teaching performance, examination of personal values about teaching, assisting with reflection, and affirming that there is more than one right way to be a good teacher.

The Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) provides respondents with one and sometimes two dominant teaching perspectives. A dominant perspective is considered one standard deviation or more above an individual's personal mean, which is the mean of all five of their TPI scores (Pratt et al., 2001). The researcher agreed not to place the TPI instrument in the dissertation appendix and Dr. Collins encouraged the use the electronic version of the data so that they could capture the data. The link to the TPI website is <http://www.teachingperspectives.com>

Data Collection Procedures

The primary survey instrument used in this research study was the Teaching Perspective Inventory, as described above and developed by Pratt and Collins (2001). The researcher obtained approval to use the TPI prior to commencing this research study. The e-mail from instrument developers which gave the researcher permission to use the TPI is included in Appendix C. The researcher also developed a demographic survey instrument to collect data regarding other variables under investigation in this study, which is included in Appendix D.

Respondents were asked to return the demographic survey instrument in a self-addressed return envelope, which was included in the survey packet. The envelopes were returned to the researcher at the School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development, Room 142 Old Forestry Building, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70804. The researcher collected demographic survey instruments, assigned

identification numbers for the purposes of data entry and follow-up with non-responders, entered data into the SPSS software program, and completed data analysis for each objective of the research study.

The researcher arranged for the electronic delivery of data collected through the web-based version of the Teaching Perspective Inventory. The developers of the TPI placed a button on the instrument's webpage so that data collected from this study could be separated from other data collected on the website. Data collected from participants in this research study were sent to the researcher by instrument developers in an unprocessed format in a timely fashion throughout the data collection process.

Instructions to complete the Teaching Perspective Inventory via the internet were included on the demographic survey instrument, which was sent to the simple random sample of 536 for this study. Upon completion of the TPI via the internet, respondents were asked to record their results and TPI identification number on the demographic survey instrument. A copy of the first letter sent to study participants on February 14, 2005, is included in Appendix E.

In accordance with the procedures developed by Dillman and Salant (1994), a follow-up postcard was sent to those who did not respond in order to request a response. Dillman and Salant recommended sending this postcard four to eight days after the first questionnaire has been mailed to the survey sample. The researcher elected to send the follow-up postcard to non-respondents two weeks after the first survey questionnaire had been sent. This was done in order to accommodate the holiday schedule for the state and the institution where the study was conducted. A copy of the postcard which was sent to survey participants on February 28, 2005, is included in Appendix F.

Dillman and Salant also recommended that a new personalized cover letter along with a replacement questionnaire and return self-addressed envelope be sent to the non-respondents three weeks after the first questionnaire was sent. The researcher elected to send this follow-up letter on March 14, 2005, one month after the initial survey questionnaire was sent along with a replacement questionnaire and return self-addressed envelope. A copy of the third letter is included in Appendix G. The decision was made to not include any survey received after April 1, 2005, six weeks after the initial survey was sent, in the data analysis.

A total of $n=$ 131 (24.4%) respondents out of a sample of 536 responded to this survey throughout the aforementioned three (3) waves of data collection. The response by wave is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Response Rates by Wave of Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Wave	Number	Percent
First mailing	73	55.7
Second mailing	14	10.7
Final mailing	44	33.6
Total	131	100.0

Procedures to Address Non-Response Error

Lindner, Murphy, and Briers (2001) stated that statistically sound and acceptable methods exist to ensure that non-response error does not decrease the external validity of research findings. They proposed three methods for handling non-response error as

threat to the external validity of the study, which included (1) comparison of early to late respondents, (2) use of the “days to respond” as a regression variable, and (3) compare respondents with non-respondents. The researcher elected to use the third method, compare respondents with non-respondents, as Lindner et al. stated that it is historically the most acceptable method of addressing non-response bias.

To minimize non-response error, the researcher followed the procedures established by Lindner et al. (2001). The researcher identified a random sample of 20 of the non-respondents for inclusion in a follow-up survey, which included 10 randomly selected items from the demographic survey instrument. The data collected from these non-responders was statistically compared to the data from the responders for these 10 items.

The researcher decided *a priori* that if statistically significant differences were found in more than two scale items, it would be concluded that responders differed from non-responders. Statistically significant differences were not found in any of the 10 items from the demographic survey instrument; therefore, the researcher concluded that there was no statistically significant difference between the responders and non-responders.

Use of Electronic Surveys in Research

Electronic surveys have grown in popularity in recent years due to lower costs to administer, allowance for faster response time, and quicker methods of data entry. There are two types of electronic surveys used in research. The first type is sent via e-mail and the survey is included in the body of the message or as an attachment to the e-mail message. The second type of electronic survey is one that is accessible via the internet on

a webpage in an HTML form (Porter, 2004). The Teaching Perspective Inventory would be the latter of the two types of electronic surveys.

Shannon and Bradshaw (2002) surveyed 377 college faculty in the southeastern United States, who were members of the Mid-South Education Association. The sample was randomly divided into four groups to receive survey materials in two different forms, including mail and electronic formats. The four groups created by Shannon and Bradshaw were group 1 (n=95), which received an initial survey and follow-up survey by mail; group 2 (n=94), which received an initial survey and follow-up survey electronically; group 3 (n=94), which received the initial survey by mail and the follow-up survey electronically; and group 4 (n=94), which received the initial survey electronically and the follow-up survey by mail. Shannon and Bradshaw allowed participants to return surveys by either mail or electronic means for either wave of the survey.

A total of 126 faculty members from the southeastern United States responded to the study conducted by Shannon and Bradshaw, including 84 (66.7%) via mail and 42 (33.3%) via electronic means. Response time varied for mail and electronic surveys, with 15.58 days for mail surveys and 10.95 days for electronic surveys. Responders who submitted the survey electronically indicated that this method was quicker and more convenient and that they had more experience using the Internet. Shannon and Bradshaw had results consistent with other studies, which found that electronic surveys resulted in lower response rates than mail surveys. In conclusion, they caution researchers to seek methods to increase response rate with electronic surveys and anticipate that the quality

of electronic surveys will improve so that response rates become comparable with mail and telephone surveys in the future (Shannon & Bradshaw, 2002).

Data Analysis by Objectives

The alpha level for this study was set at *.05 a priori*. Following are the methods used to analyze data collected through this research study.

1.) Objective one of this study was to describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States on the following selected demographic variables. The variables of this objective included:

- Age,
- Gender,
- Highest academic degree earned,
- Academic rank,
- Tenure status,
- Academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment,
- Years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted,
- Actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and
- Percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

Frequencies and percentages were used to summarize data measured on a categorical scale of measurement (nominal and ordinal). These variables included age, gender, highest academic degree, academic rank, tenure status, and academic college or school of teaching appointment. Means and standard deviations were used to summarize

variables measured on a continuous scale of measurement (interval scale of measurement). These variables included years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted, the actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

2.) Objective two of this study was to describe the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty as measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) developed by Pratt and Collins (2001). Teaching perspective is an interval variable and therefore frequencies and percentages were calculated in order to summarize data for this objective. Frequencies and percentages were calculated among the faculty for each academic college and school of the institution for each of the five teaching perspectives:

- Transmission,
- Apprenticeship,
- Developmental,
- Nurturing, and
- Social Reform.

3.) Objective three of this study was to compare the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty by the academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was used to compare the dominant teaching perspective by the academic college or school where the faculty member holds their teaching appointment. The colleges and schools of the institution where this study was conducted include:

- Agriculture,

- Art & Design,
- Arts & Sciences,
- Basic Sciences,
- Business Administration,
- School of the Coast and Environment,
- Education,
- Engineering,
- Library & Information Science,
- Mass Communication,
- Music & Dramatic Arts,
- Social Work, and
- Veterinary Medicine.

4.) Objective four of this study was to describe the teaching preparation and previous teaching experiences of higher education faculty prior to their current teaching appointment.

- Teaching preparation was defined and measured as completion of a course or training session that addressed topics such as teaching strategies, facilitating/leading classroom learning, student assessment and evaluation, or other topics related to improving teaching in higher education.
- Previous teaching experience, included the following activities during graduate study:
 - Teaching assistant position,
 - Teaching of a laboratory course, and/or

- Teaching a course without assistance from a faculty member.
- Other previous teaching experience included teaching experiences at another higher education institution.

All variables in objective four are at the nominal level of measurement, so therefore frequencies and percentages were calculated in order to summarize data for this objective. The data for this objective was reported by academic college or school of teaching appointment.

5.) Objective five of this study was to investigate the existence of a relationship between the dominant teaching perspective of faculty and involvement in faculty development activities. Survey respondents were asked to include if they had participated in any of the following campus faculty development activities:

- Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund,
- Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars,
- Access to Professional Development Resources,
- Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations,
- Portfolio Development Assistance,
- New Faculty Orientation,
- Chancellor's Distinguished Lecture Series,
- Teaching in Higher Education (THE) Forum, and
- Off-campus activities including professional conferences specific to one's field and/or participation in interdisciplinary teaching conferences or institutes.

The variables under in objective five are at the interval and nominal levels of measurement. Pearson's r correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if a relationship existed between the dominant teaching perspectives (interval variable) of the faculty and their participation in faculty development activities (nominal-dichotomous variable). Under the conditions of a dichotomous variable, a Pearson's r correlation coefficient approximates the Point-biserial correlation coefficient. Respondents were also allowed to write in other faculty development activities, which were not specifically listed on the demographic survey instrument. These responses were recorded verbatim from the completed demographic survey instruments, categorized by topic and reported by the researcher. Davis' (1971) scale was used to interpret and evaluate the strength of the correlations and includes the following values: $\pm .01$ to $.09$ - negligible association; $\pm .10$ to $.29$ - low association; $\pm .30$ to $.49$ - moderate association; $\pm .50$ to $.69$ - substantial association; and $\pm .70$ or higher - very strong association (Davis, 1971).

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

This goal of this study was to describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States, regarding their teaching perspectives and involvement in faculty development activities. Survey participants were also surveyed regarding their teaching preparation and previous higher education teaching experience. The findings of this research study are presented by objective in this chapter.

The simple random sample for this study included 536 faculty members that were either assistant professors, associate professors and professors and who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position during the spring 2005 semester with at least a 10 percent or more teaching load. The response rate for this study was 24.4% ($n=131$).

Objective One

Objective one of this study was to describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States on the following selected demographic variables:

- Age,
- Gender,
- Highest academic degree earned,
- Academic rank,
- Tenure status,
- Academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment,

- Years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted,
- Actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and
- Percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

A. Age

The first variable on which respondents were described was current age.

Respondents were asked to identify the category which included their current age. Years of age categories included “Under 25,” “26 to 30,” “31 to 35,” “36 to 40,” “41 to 45,” “46 to 50,” “51 to 55,” “56 to 60,” and “61 and older.”

The age category with the largest number of respondents was “51 to 55” years of age ($n=22$, 16.8%), which was followed by “46 to 50” years of age ($n=20$, 15.3%). The category with the smallest response was “26 to 30” years of age ($n=4$, 3.1%) and no respondent reported that their age was “under 25” years of age (see Table 5).

Table 5

Current Age of Faculty as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Age Category	Number	Percent
Under 25	0	0
26 to 30	4	3.1
31 to 35	15	11.5
36 to 40	19	14.5

(table cont.)

41 to 45	15	11.5
46 to 50	20	15.3
51 to 55	22	16.8
56 to 60	19	14.5
61 and older	17	13.0
<hr/>		
Total	131	100.0 ^a
<hr/>		

^aTotal is rounded to 100%.

B. Gender

The second variable on which respondents were described was gender. A majority of study respondents reported that their gender was male ($n=91$, 70.0%). Thirty-nine respondents ($n=39$, 30.0%) indicated that their gender was female. One ($n=1$) of the 131 respondents who participated in this study chose not to disclose their gender on the survey instrument.

C. Highest Academic Degree Earned

The next variable on which respondents were described was highest academic degree earned. Data for this variable was collected on the Teaching Perspective Inventory via the internet and included the following: “high school diploma,” “bachelor’s,” “master’s,” “doctorate,” and “other,” which was to be specified on the website.

A majority of the respondents reported “doctorate” as their highest academic degree earned ($n=119$, 91.5%). Eleven ($n=11$, 8.5%) respondents indicated that their highest academic degree earned as a “master’s.” One of the 131 respondents who

participated in this study chose not to disclose their highest academic degree earned (see Table 6).

Table 6

Highest Academic Degree Earned as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Degree	Number	Percent
Master's degree	11	8.5
Doctoral degree	119	91.5
Total	130	100.0

Note. One subject (n=1) chose not to disclose their highest academic degree earned. Data was collected through the web-based Teaching Perspective Inventory and also included the categories of “high school diploma,” “bachelor’s degree,” and “other.” The categories selected by respondents are reflected in the above table.

D. Academic Rank

Respondents were also described on their current academic rank at the institution where this study was conducted. The levels of academic rank for faculty at the institution where this study was conducted were “instructor,” “assistant professor,” “associate professor,” and “professor.” The frame of this study included only those faculty members at the ranks of “assistant professor,” “associate professor,” and “professor.”

The academic rank category with the highest number of respondents responding was “professor,” (n=56, 42.7%). Forty-eight (n=48, 36.6%) reported that their current academic rank was “assistant professor” and 27 (n=27, 20.6%) reported that their current academic rank was “associate professor.” The fact that no subject reported that their

academic rank was that of instructor, led the researcher to conclude that there were no frame errors in the delivered sample for this study (see Table 7).

Table 7

Academic Rank as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<u>Academic Rank</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Assistant Professor	48	36.6
Associate Professor	27	20.6
Professor	56	42.8
Total	131	100.0^a

^aTotal is rounded to 100%.

E. Tenure Status

Respondents were also asked to report whether or not they had earned tenure or if they were in a tenure-track position. This study was also designed so that the frame included the aforementioned faculty members at the ranks “assistant professor,” “associate professor,” and “professor” and those who had “earned tenure” or who have “been appointed to a tenure-track position.” A majority of the respondents ($n=82$, 62.6%) indicated that they had “earned tenure,” and forty-nine ($n=49$, 37.4%) respondents indicated that they had “been appointed to a tenure-track position.” Because all responders indicated that they had “earned tenure” or that they “been appointed to a tenure-track position,” the researcher again concluded that there were no frame errors in the delivered sample.

F. Academic College or School

Study respondents were also asked to report the academic college or school at the institution where this study was conducted where they held their current academic appointment. The thirteen academic colleges or schools at the institution where this study was conducted include:

- Agriculture,
- Art & Design,
- Arts & Sciences,
- Basic Sciences,
- Business Administration,
- School of the Coast and Environment,
- Education,
- Engineering,
- Library & Information Science,
- Mass Communication,
- Music & Dramatic Arts,
- Social Work, and
- Veterinary Medicine.

The academic college with the largest number of respondents was the “College of Arts and Sciences,” ($n=25$, 19.1%). The second largest group ($n=24$, 18.3%) reported that they held their academic appointment in the “College of Agriculture.” The smallest group ($n=2$, 1.5%) indicated that they held their academic appointment in the “School of Mass Communications.” Both the “School of the Coast and Environment” and “School

of Library and Information Sciences” had three ($n=3$, 2.3%) respondents included in the delivered sample of this study (see Table 8).

Table 8

Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<u>Academic College or School</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Arts & Sciences	25	19.1
Agriculture	24	18.3
Basic Sciences	17	13.0
Engineering	12	9.2
Music & Dramatic Arts	10	7.6
Business Administration	9	6.9
Art & Design	8	6.1
Education	7	5.3
Veterinary Medicine	7	5.3
Social Work	4	3.1
Coast & Environment	3	2.3
Library & Information Science	3	2.3
Mass Communication	2	1.5
Total	131	100.0

Means and standard deviations were used to summarize variables measured on a continuous scale of measurement (interval scale of measurement). These variables

included years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted, the actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

G. Years Teaching Experience at Study Institution

The first variable measured on a continuous scale of measurement on which respondents were described was the number of years teaching experience respondents reported having at the institution where this study was conducted. The mean years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where this study was conducted was 13.46 years, (SD = 10.99). The minimum number of years teaching experience at the institution where this study was conducted was two months, as reported by one subject. This response was equated to .16 year by the researcher. The highest number of years teaching experience at the institution where this study was conducted was 39 years, as reported by one subject. All respondents (n=131) responded to this survey question.

The largest years of teaching experience grouping at the institution where this study was conducted was 1 to 5 years (n=52, 39.7%). The smallest years of teaching experience grouping at the institution where this study was conducted was 36 to 40 years (see Table 9).

Table 9

Years of Higher Education Teaching Experience at Institution Where Study Was Conducted as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<u>Year of Experience Groupings</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
^a 1-5	52	39.7

(table cont.)

6-10	12	9.2
11-15	9	6.9
16-20	17	13.0
21-25	18	13.7
26-30	14	10.7
31-35	5	3.8
36-40	4	3.0
<hr/>		
Total	131	100.0
<hr/>		

^a Category includes one responder, which indicated less than one year of experience.

H. Actual Percentage of Time Spent Teaching

Respondents were described on the actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities. The mean actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities reported by respondents was 49.4% (SD=18.0). The largest actual percentage of time spent teaching grouping was “26% to 50%” (n=78, 60.9%). Three (n=3) respondents did not respond to this question on the survey instrument (see Table 10).

Table 10

Actual Percentage of Time Spent Teaching at Institution Where Study Was Conducted as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<u>Actual Percentage of Time Groupings</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 25%	12	9.4

(table cont.)

26% to 50%	78	60.9
51% to 75%	25	19.5
76% or more	13	10.2
Total	128	100.0

Note. Three subjects (n=3) chose not to respond to survey question regarding the actual percentage of time spent teaching.

I. Percentage of Time Assigned to Teaching

Respondents were also described on the percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities. The mean percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities reported by respondents was 47.2% (SD=18.3). Six respondents did not respond to this question on the survey instrument (see Table 11).

Table 11

Percentage of Time Assigned to Teaching at Institution Where Study Was Conducted as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Percentage of Time Assigned to Teaching Groupings	Number	Percent
Less than 25%	18	14.4
26% to 50%	90	72.0
51% to 75%	7	5.6
76% or more	10	8.0
Total	125	100.0

Note. Six subjects (n=6) chose not to respond to survey question regarding the percentage of time assigned to teaching.

Objective Two

Objective two of this study was to describe the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty at the institution where this study was conducted using the results of the Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) as developed by Pratt and Collins (Pratt and Collins, 2001). Teaching perspective is an interval variable and therefore frequencies and percentages were calculated to summarize data for this objective. The results of the TPI provided respondents with one and sometimes two dominant teaching perspectives. A dominant perspective is considered one standard deviation or more above an individual's personal mean, which is the mean of all five of their TPI scores (Pratt et al., 2001). Frequencies and percentages of dominant perspectives were calculated among the respondents for each academic college and school of the institution where this study was conducted for each of the five teaching perspectives:

- Transmission,
- Apprenticeship,
- Developmental,
- Nurturing, and
- Social Reform.

Frequencies and percentages were also calculated for respondents with no dominant teaching perspective and for respondents with two or more dominant perspectives.

A majority of study respondents ($n=95$, 72.5%) had one dominant teaching perspective. Five ($n=5$, 3.8%) had two or more dominant teaching perspectives and thirty-one ($n=31$, 23.7%) had no dominant teaching perspectives (see Table 12).

Table 12

Dominance of Teaching Perspective as Measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory
Among Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Dominance of Teaching Perspectives	Number	Percent
One Dominant Perspective	95	72.5
Two or More Dominant Teaching Perspectives	5	3.8
No Dominant Teaching Perspectives	31	23.7
Total	131	100.0

Of those respondents with a dominant teaching perspective, 26 (19.8%) had Transmission as their dominant teaching perspective and 34 (26.0%) had Apprenticeship as their dominant teaching perspective. Twenty-seven (20.6%) had Developmental as their dominant teaching perspective and eight (6.1%) had Nurturing as their dominant teaching perspective. No respondent had Social Reform as their dominant teaching perspective (see Table 13).

Objective Three

The third objective of this study was to compare the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty by the academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment at the institution where this study was conducted.

Table 13

Dominant Teaching Perspective Among Faculty in Academic Colleges and Schools as Measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

<u>Academic College</u>	<u>Transmission</u>	<u>Apprenticeship</u>	<u>Developmental</u>	<u>Nurturing</u>
Agriculture	4	8	5	1
Art & Design	1	4	2	0
Arts & Sciences	9	1	8	2
Basic Sciences	4	2	4	1
Business Administration	1	3	2	0
Coast & Environment	2	1	0	0
Education	1	1	1	1
Engineering	3	4	1	1
Library & Information Science	0	0	2	0
Mass Communication	0	0	0	1
Music & Dramatic Arts	0	5	2	0
Social Work	0	1	0	1
Veterinary Medicine	1	4	0	0
Total	26	34	27	8

(table cont.)

Academic College	Two or more Dominant Teaching Perspectives	No Dominant Teaching Perspective	Total
Agriculture	2	4	24
Art & Design	0	1	8
Arts & Sciences	1	4	25
Basic Sciences	0	6	17
Business Administration	1	2	9
Coast & Environment	0	0	3
Education	0	3	7
Engineering	0	3	12
Library & Information Science	0	1	3
Mass Communication	0	1	2
Music & Dramatic Arts	0	3	10
Social Work	1	1	4
Veterinary Medicine	0	2	7
Total	5	31	131

The academic colleges and schools at the institution where this study was conducted include:

- Agriculture,
- Art & Design,
- Arts & Sciences,
- Basic Sciences,
- Business Administration,
- School of the Coast and Environment,
- Education,
- Engineering,
- Library & Information Science,
- Mass Communication,
- Music & Dramatic Arts,
- Social Work, and
- Veterinary Medicine.

A. Dominance of Teaching Perspectives

The academic college or school with the highest number of respondents with “Transmission” as a dominant teaching perspective was the “College of Arts and Sciences,” (n=9) and the academic college or school with the highest number of respondents with “Apprenticeship” as a dominant teaching perspective was the “College of Agriculture,” (n=8). The academic college or school with “Developmental” as a

dominant teaching perspective was the “College of Arts and Sciences,” ($n=8$) and the college or academic school with “Nurturing” as a dominant teaching perspective was also the “College of Arts and Sciences,” ($n=2$).

The “College of Agriculture,” ($n=2$) had the highest number of respondents with two or more dominant teaching perspectives. The “College of Basic Sciences,” ($n=6$) had the highest number of respondents with no dominant teaching perspectives.

B. Comparison of Dominant Teaching Perspective by Academic College or School

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was used to compare the dominant teaching perspective by the academic college or school where the faculty member holds their teaching appointment. A significant F value, $F = 2.036 (12, 118)$ $p = .027$, was found among the colleges and schools, indicating that there was a statistically significant difference among the colleges and schools on the dominant teaching perspectives of the faculty.

Tukey’s Post-hoc Multiple Comparison test was used to determine specifically what colleges or schools were different. Results indicated that faculty with “Apprenticeship” as a dominant teaching perspective were statistically different among the colleges and schools of the institution where this study was conducted. Table 14 presents the means and standard deviations of the total teaching perspective scores by academic college or school. Table 15 presents the analysis of variance information (see Tables 14 & 15).

Table 14

Means and Standard Deviations of Total Teaching Perspective Scores by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment Among Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	n	M	SD
Agriculture	24	32.3	3.1
Art & Design	8	34.7	4.8
Arts & Sciences	25	30.8	3.5
Basic Sciences	17	31.6	3.3
Business Administration	9	31.3	2.4
Coast & Environment	3	30.0	3.0
Education	7	31.1	3.5
Engineering	12	31.7	5.6
Library & Information Science	3	33.5	1.7
Mass Communication	2	35.0	1.4
Music & Dramatic Arts	10	34.4	3.4
Social Work	4	36.2	1.8
Veterinary Medicine	7	29.7	2.4
Total ^a	131	32.0	3.7

^a Reported as overall mean and standard deviation.

Table 15

Analysis of Variance for Dominant Teaching Perspective as Measured by the Teaching Perspective Inventory by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Source	df	MS	F ^a	p ^b
Between Groups	12	25.785	2.036	.027
Within Groups	118	12.662		
Total	130			

Note. Groups were the academic colleges and schools of the institution where this study was conducted for the sample ($n=131$).

^a One-Way Analysis of Variance.

^b .05 Alpha Level for the 2 Tailed Test of Significance.

Objective Four

Objective four of this study was to describe the teaching preparation and previous teaching experiences of higher education faculty at the institution where this study was conducted prior to their current teaching appointment.

- Teaching preparation was defined and measured as completion of a course or training session that addressed topics such as teaching strategies, facilitating/leading classroom learning, student assessment and evaluation, or other topics related to improving teaching in higher education.
- Previous teaching experience, included the following activities during graduate study:
 - “Teaching assistant position,”
 - “Teaching of a laboratory course,” and/or

- “Teaching a course without assistance from a faculty member.”
- Other previous teaching experience included teaching experiences at another higher education institution.

A. Teaching Preparation Course or Training Session

A majority of the respondents ($n=91$, 69.5%) reported that they had completed a course or training session that addressed topics such as teaching strategies, facilitating/leading classroom learning, student assessment and evaluation, or other topics related to improving teaching in higher education. All respondents who responded to the survey in the “College of Agriculture,” “College of Art & Design,” “School of Library and Information Sciences,” “School of Mass Communication,” and “School of Social Work,” had completed teacher preparation activities (see Table 16).

Table 16

Faculty Reporting the Completion of Teaching Preparation Activities by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	24	100.0
Art & Design	8	100.0
Arts & Sciences	11	44.0
Basic Sciences	8	47.1
Business Administration	7	77.8

(table cont.)

Coast & Environment	1	33.3
Education	5	71.4
Engineering	9	75.0
Library & Information Science	3	100.0
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	4	40.0
Social Work	4	100.0
Veterinary Medicine	5	71.4
Total	91	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who indicated the completion of teaching preparation activities on the survey instrument.

B. Previous Teaching Experience

Respondents were also asked to report if they had a previous teaching experience during graduate study or if they had any previous teaching experiences at another higher education institution. Previous teaching during graduate study included serving as a “teaching assistant,” “teaching a laboratory course,” or “teaching a course without assistance from a faculty member.”

A majority ($n=98$, 74.8%) of study respondents served as “teaching assistant” during graduate study, including all respondents from the “College of Business Administration” and the “School of Mass Communication” (see Table 17).

Table 17

Faculty Reporting Serving as a Teaching Assistant During Graduate Study by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	17	70.8
Art & Design	6	75.0
Arts & Sciences	23	92.0
Basic Sciences	15	88.2
Business Administration	9	100.0
Coast & Environment	2	66.6
Education	6	85.7
Engineering	7	58.3
Library & Information Science	1	33.3
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	6	60.0
Social Work	1	25.0
Veterinary Medicine	3	42.8
Total	98	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who indicated serving as a teaching assistant during graduate study.

A total of 58 (44.3%) indicated that had experience “teaching a laboratory course” during graduate study (see Table 18).

Table 18

Faculty Reporting Having Taught a Laboratory Course During Graduate Study by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	16	66.6
Art & Design	1	12.5
Arts & Sciences	4	16.0
Basic Sciences	13	76.4
Business Administration	1	11.1
Coast & Environment	2	66.6
Education	4	57.1
Engineering	7	58.3
Library & Information Science	0	0.0
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	3	30.0
Social Work	1	25.0
Veterinary Medicine	4	57.1
Total	58	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who indicated teaching a laboratory course during graduate study on the survey instrument.

Nearly one-half (n=65, 49.6%) indicated having taught a course without assistance from a faculty member during graduate study (see Table 19).

Table 19

Faculty Reporting Teaching a Course Without Assistance from a Faculty Member During Graduate Study by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	12	50.0
Art & Design	2	25.0
Arts & Sciences	17	68.0
Basic Sciences	4	23.5
Business Administration	7	77.7
Coast & Environment	1	33.3
Education	3	42.8
Engineering	5	41.6
Library & Information Science	1	33.3
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	6	60.0
Social Work	2	75.0
Veterinary Medicine	3	42.8
Total	65	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who indicated teaching a course without the assistance of a faculty member during graduate study on the survey instrument.

Survey respondents were also surveyed to determine if they had “teaching experiences at another higher education institution” or “no previous higher education teaching experience prior to their current teaching appointment.” A total of 62 ($n=62$, 47.3%) of study respondents indicated that they had teaching experiences at another higher education institution (see Table 20).

Table 20

Faculty Reporting Having Teaching Experience at Another Higher Education Institution by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	8	33.3
Art & Design	2	25.0
Arts & Sciences	17	68.0
Basic Sciences	6	35.2
Business Administration	5	55.5
Coast & Environment	2	66.6
Education	1	14.2
Engineering	7	58.3
Library & Information Science	2	66.6
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	7	70.0

(table cont.)

Social Work	3	75.0
Veterinary Medicine	2	28.6
<hr/>		
Total	62	
<hr/>		

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who indicated having teaching experience at another higher education institution on the survey instrument.

Objective Five

Objective five of this study was to investigate the existence of a relationship between the dominant teaching perspective of faculty and involvement in faculty development activities.

A. On-Campus and Off-Campus Faculty Development Activities

Survey respondents were asked to indicate if they had participated in any of the following “on-campus faculty development activities:”

- Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund,
- Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars,
- Access to Professional Development Resources,
- Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations,
- Portfolio Development Assistance,
- New Faculty Orientation,
- Chancellor’s Distinguished Lecture Series,
- Teaching in Higher Education (THE) Forum, and

Survey respondents were also asked to indicate their involvement in off-campus activities, which included professional conferences specific to one’s field and participation in interdisciplinary teaching conferences or institutes.

A total of 15 (11.4%) indicated that they had utilized the “Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund” service (see Table 21).

Table 21

Faculty Reporting Having Utilized the Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund Service by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	2	8.3
Art & Design	5	62.5
Arts & Sciences	1	4.0
Basic Sciences	1	5.8
Business Administration	0	0.0
Coast & Environment	0	0.0
Education	3	42.8
Engineering	0	00.0
Library & Information Science	1	33.3
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	1	10.0
Social Work	1	25.0
Veterinary Medicine	0	0.0
Total	15	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported having utilized the “Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund” service.

A total of 59 (45%) indicated that they had participated in “Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars” (see Table 22).

Table 22

Faculty Reporting Having Participated in Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	17	70.8
Art & Design	6	75.0
Arts & Sciences	8	32.0
Basic Sciences	8	47.0
Business Administration	1	11.1
Coast & Environment	0	0.0
Education	4	57.1
Engineering	5	41.6
Library & Information Science	1	33.3
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	3	30.0
Social Work	0	0.0
Veterinary Medicine	4	57.1
Total	59	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported participated in Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars.

A total of 15 (11.4%) indicated that they had utilized “Professional Development Resources” resources (see Table 23).

Table 23

Faculty Reporting Having Utilized Professional Development Resources by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	3	12.5
Art & Design	2	25.0
Arts & Sciences	2	8.0
Basic Sciences	2	11.7
Business Administration	1	11.1
Coast & Environment	0	0.0
Education	1	14.2
Engineering	3	25.0
Library & Information Science	0	0.0
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	1	10.0
Social Work	0	0.0
Veterinary Medicine	0	0.0
Total	15	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported utilized Professional Development Resources.

A total of 22 (16.8%) indicated that they had utilized “Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations” (see Table 24).

Table 24

Faculty Reporting Having Utilized Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	2	8.3
Art & Design	1	12.5
Arts & Sciences	5	20.0
Basic Sciences	2	11.7
Business Administration	3	33.3
Coast & Environment	1	33.3
Education	1	14.2
Engineering	1	8.3
Library & Information Science	0	0.0
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	2	20.0
Social Work	1	25.0
Veterinary Medicine	3	42.8
Total	22	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported utilizing Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations.

A total of 2 (1.5%) indicated that they had utilized “Portfolio Development Assistance” service (see Table 25).

Table 25

Faculty Reporting Having Utilized Portfolio Development Assistance by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	1	4.2
Art & Design	0	0.0
Arts & Sciences	0	0.0
Basic Sciences	1	5.8
Business Administration	0	0.0
Coast & Environment	0	0.0
Education	0	0.0
Engineering	0	0.0
Library & Information Science	0	0.0
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	0	0.0
Social Work	0	0.0
Veterinary Medicine	0	0.0
Total	2	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported utilizing Portfolio Development Assistance service.

A total of 59 (45.0%) indicated that they had participated in “New Faculty Orientation” (see Table 26).

Table 26

Faculty Reporting Participation in New Faculty Orientation by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	8	33.3
Art & Design	4	50.0
Arts & Sciences	9	36.0
Basic Sciences	7	41.1
Business Administration	4	44.4
Coast & Environment	0	0.0
Education	4	57.1
Engineering	8	66.6
Library & Information Science	2	66.6
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	7	70.0
Social Work	3	75.0
Veterinary Medicine	1	14.3
Total	59	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported participating in New Faculty Orientation.

A total of 58 (44.2%) indicated that they had participated in “Chancellor’s Distinguished Lecture Series” (see Table 27).

Table 27

Faculty Reporting Participation in Chancellor’s Distinguished Lecture Series by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	7	29.1
Art & Design	5	62.5
Arts & Sciences	14	56.0
Basic Sciences	10	58.8
Business Administration	3	33.3
Coast & Environment	2	66.6
Education	3	42.8
Engineering	4	33.3
Library & Information Science	1	33.3
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	4	40.0
Social Work	2	50.0
Veterinary Medicine	3	42.8
Total	58	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported participating in Chancellor’s Distinguished Lecture Series.

A total of 27 (20.6%) indicated that they had participated in “Teaching in Higher Education Forum” (see Table 28).

Table 28

Faculty Reporting Participation in Teaching in Higher Education Forum by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	7	29.1
Art & Design	5	62.5
Arts & Sciences	2	8.0
Basic Sciences	4	23.5
Business Administration	0	0.0
Coast & Environment	1	33.3
Education	2	28.6
Engineering	3	25.0
Library & Information Science	1	33.3
Mass Communication	0	0.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	1	10.0
Social Work	0	0.0
Veterinary Medicine	1	14.3
Total	27	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported participating in Teaching in Higher Education Forum.

A total of 97 (74.0%) indicated that they had participated in “Professional Conferences in One’s Field” (see Table 29).

Table 29

Faculty Reporting Participation in Professional Conferences in Their Field by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	17	70.8
Art & Design	7	87.5
Arts & Sciences	19	76.0
Basic Sciences	12	70.6
Business Administration	6	66.6
Coast & Environment	2	66.6
Education	4	57.1
Engineering	9	75.0
Library & Information Science	2	66.6
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	10	100.0
Social Work	2	50.0
Veterinary Medicine	5	71.4
Total	97	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported participating in Professional Conferences in One’s Field.

A total of 37 (28.2%) indicated that they had participated in “Professional Conferences in One’s Field” (see Table 30).

Table 30

Faculty Reporting Participation in Teaching Conferences or Institutes by Academic College or School of Teaching Appointment at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Academic College or School	Number	Percent ^a
Agriculture	9	37.5
Art & Design	5	62.5
Arts & Sciences	2	8.0
Basic Sciences	4	23.5
Business Administration	2	22.2
Coast & Environment	0	0.0
Education	3	42.8
Engineering	4	33.3
Library & Information Science	0	0.0
Mass Communication	2	100.0
Music & Dramatic Arts	1	10.0
Social Work	2	50.0
Veterinary Medicine	3	42.8
Total	37	

^a Percentages based upon those in each college or school who reported participating in Professional Conferences in One’s Field.

B. Relationship Between Faculty Development and Teaching Perspectives

The variables under in objective five are at the interval and nominal levels of measurement. Pearson's r correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if a relationship existed between the dominant teaching perspectives (interval variable) of the faculty and their participation in faculty development activities (nominal-dichotomous variable). Under the conditions of a dichotomous variable, a Pearson's r correlation coefficient approximates the Point-biserial correlation coefficient.

The Pearson's r correlation coefficient was calculated to determine if a relationship existed between the dominant teaching perspectives of the faculty and their participation in faculty development activities. For interpretation of correlation coefficients, Davis' proposed set of descriptors was used (Davis, 1971). The coefficients and their descriptions are as follows:

<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>Description</u>
.70 or higher	Very strong association
.50 to .69	Substantial association
.30 to .49	Moderate association
.10 to .29	Low association
.01 to .09	Negligible association

Results of the Pearson's r correlation coefficient indicated that no statistically significant relationship existed between the variables dominant teaching perspective of the respondents and involvement in faculty development activities ($r=.12$, $p=.14$).

C. Other Faculty Development Activities

Respondents were also asked to write in “other faculty development activities,” which were not specifically listed on the demographic survey instrument. These responses were recorded verbatim from the completed demographic survey instruments, categorized by topic and reported by the researcher. A total of fourteen (10.7%) respondents listed “other faculty development activities.” Responses were separated into four categories, including “other on-campus activities,” “self-directed learning activities,” “other workshops (unspecified),” and “other non-faculty development activities.” The largest category was the other non-faculty development activities (see Table 31).

Table 31

Other Faculty Development Activities by Categorical Type as Reported by Faculty at a Research Extensive University in the Southern United States

Category	Number	Percent
Other On-Campus Activities	4	28.6
Self-Directed Learning Activities	1	7.1
Other Workshops (Unspecified)	3	21.4
Other, Non-Faculty Development	6	42.9
Total	14	100.0

Note. Percent based upon those who reported other faculty development activities on the survey instrument, ($n=14$).

Four ($n=4$, 28.6%) respondents indicated that they participated in “other on-campus activities,” which included the institution’s newly implemented “TigerTrek” program, participation in the teaching conference for their academic college, and

participation in a technology training workshop. One (7.1%) respondent indicated that they engaged in “self-directed learning activities” by reading books about teaching at the university level. Three ($n=3$, 21.4%) respondents indicated that they had either participated in “other workshops (unspecified),” which were held either off-campus or at undisclosed locations, and one respondent in this group stated that they had participated in a national organization for college teachers.

Six ($n=6$, 42.9%) respondents listed faculty development activities, which were categorized as “other, non-faculty development activities.” These activities were placed in the other category, because they are not considered faculty development activities as according to the commonly accepted definitions provided in chapter two of this study. Examples of self-reported items in this category included teaching courses in continuing education or at other institutions, facilitating workshops, presenting lectures to community organizations, and completing campus service as a mentor for a student retention program.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States, regarding their teaching perspectives and involvement in faculty development activities. Respondents were surveyed regarding their teaching preparation and previous higher education teaching experience. The major objectives of this study were:

- 1.) To describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States on selected demographic variables.
- 2.) To describe the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty using the results of Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) developed by Pratt and Collins (2001).
- 3.) To compare the dominant teaching perspective, as measured by the TPI, of higher education faculty and the academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment.
- 4.) To describe the teaching preparation and previous teaching experiences of higher education faculty prior to their current teaching appointment.
- 5.) To investigate the existence of a correlation between the dominant teaching perspective of faculty and involvement in on-campus and off-campus faculty development activities.

A simple random sample of 536 was drawn from the population, which consisted of N=890 faculty at the institution where this study was conducted. For the purposes of this

study, faculty members were defined as assistant professors, associate professors and professors and who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position during the spring 2005 semester with at least a 10 percent or more teaching load. The response rate for this study was 24.4% ($n=131$). Names and campus addresses of faculty members were provided to the researcher through campus employment records. The researcher used the Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) as developed by Pratt and Collins (2001) and an investigator-constructed instrument to gather data regarding the variables under investigation in this study. The cover letter sent to the sample asked them to complete the TPI via the internet and complete the hardcopy of the investigator-constructed instrument and return it to the researcher. An initial cover letter with an enclosed copy of the instrument, a follow-up postcard and a new personalized cover letter with a replacement instrument were sent to the sample over a six-week time period. The initial and newly personalized cover letters were sent, as well as a return self-addressed envelope.

The researcher used follow-up procedures recommended by Dillman and Salant (1994) in order to increase response. The initial cover letter, instrument and return envelope were sent to the sample on February 14, 2005. A follow-up postcard was sent to those who did not respond in order to request a response on February 28, 2005. A new personalized cover letter, a replacement instrument, and a return self-addressed envelope was sent to those who did not respond on March 14, 2005. It was decided that surveys returned after April 1, 2005, would not be included in the data analysis.

This study could be considered a hybrid in that it used both electronic and paper version survey instruments. Respondents were asked to record the results of the TPI, which was taken via the internet, on the hardcopy survey that was included in the survey mail-out and return it to the researcher. The response of this study is similar to those experienced by Shannon and Bradshaw (2002), who also surveyed college faculty in the southeastern United States. Shannon and Bradshaw randomly divided their sample into four groups to receive survey materials in two different forms, including mail and electronic formats. Shannon and Bradshaw's response included 126 faculty from the southeastern United States, including $n=84$ (66.7%) via mail and $n=42$ (33.3%) via electronic means. Like Shannon and Bradshaw, this study also experienced the lower response rate with electronic surveys.

Results and Conclusions

The first objective of this study was to describe the faculty on selected demographic variables. The demographic variables of the faculty at the institution where this study was conducted were identified through responses to items on the investigator-constructed instrument and the TPI. The following demographic information was identified: age, gender, highest academic degree earned, academic rank, tenure status, academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment, years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where the study was conducted, actual percentage of time spent teaching and other related activities, and percentage of time assigned to teaching and other related activities.

The age category with the largest number of respondents was “51 to 55” years of age ($n=22$, 16.8%) and the majority of respondents were male ($n=91$, 70.0%). The mean years of higher education teaching experience at the institution where this study was conducted was 13.46 years ($SD=10.99$). A majority of respondents held a doctoral degree ($n=119$, 91.5%) and the largest number of respondents held the academic rank of professor ($n=56$, 42.7%). A majority of respondents had earned tenure ($n=82$, 62.6%) at the institution where the study was conducted. The average actual percentage of time spent on teaching and other related activities was 49.4% ($SD=18.0$), and the time assigned to teaching and other related activities was 47.2% ($SD=18.3$). The academic college or school that had the largest number of respondents in this sample was the College of Arts and Sciences ($n=25$, 19.1%), followed by the College of Agriculture ($n=24$, 18.3%).

The second objective of this study was to describe the dominant teaching perspectives of higher education faculty using the Teaching Perspective Inventory (TPI) as developed by Pratt and Collins (2001). Dominant teaching perspectives were reported by the academic college or school in which the faculty member held his or her teaching appointment. A majority of study respondents ($n=95$, 72.5%) had one dominant teaching perspective. Five ($n=5$, 3.8%) study respondents had two or more dominant teaching perspectives, and a total of 31 (23.7%) faculty had no dominant teaching perspective.

Results of this study are similar to the aforementioned study conducted by Collins et al. (n.d.), where a total of 356 students seeking secondary teaching certification completed an earlier on-line version of the Teaching Perspective Inventory. The results

of their study found that 70.5% of the respondents had one dominant teaching perspective. Their finding was similar to the results of this study. This study found that 3.8% of respondents had two or more dominant teaching perspectives; however, Collins et al. found that 25.8% of the respondents in their sample had two or more dominant teaching perspectives. This study found that 23.7% of respondents had no dominant teaching perspective. Collins et al. found that 3.4% of their respondents had no dominant teaching perspective.

The third objective of this study was to compare the dominant teaching perspective of higher education faculty and the academic college or school in which the faculty member holds his or her teaching appointment. This objective was directly tied to the research questions in chapter one regarding the dominance of teaching perspectives among different disciplines. The results of this analysis concluded that a statistically significant difference existed among faculty with “Apprenticeship” as a dominant teaching perspective ($F=2.036$, (12, 118), $p = .027$). However, this finding should be applied judiciously given the small delivered sample size ($n=131$, 24.4%).

Pratt and Associates (1998) stated that faculty have personal epistemologies, which represent beliefs of knowledge, learning and evaluation of learning. These personal epistemologies serve as a basis for validating one’s personal truth. The teaching process requires the faculty member to constantly consider their personal epistemology (Pratt & Associates, 1998). Again, this study found only a significant difference among faculty with the “Apprenticeship” perspective. This finding addresses some of the conflicting points of view that exist in the literature.

Dinham (1996) suggested that teaching perspectives might be related to the academic field. Dinham stated, “The field not only represents an academic specialization, it also provides the lens through which the academic views life itself. The discipline thus influences teaching not only in selection of course content but in the teacher’s very thinking” (Dinham, 1996, p. 303). This statement is somewhat confirmed by this study. In a dissenting view, McKeachie (1999) stated that teaching values might be derived from other sources.

We develop values by observing and modeling ourselves after others and testing out our values in thought and words and action. Teachers are significant models, and teacher behavior is important, both as it models values and as teachers create situations in which the expression of values becomes salient. (McKeachie, 1999, p. 344)

Should the findings of this study be confirmed in future studies, it could be argued that discipline-specific epistemologies and curriculum content *affect* the teaching practices of faculty in different fields. It might also be stated that the actions, intentions and beliefs, are reflective the field of practice.

The fourth objective of this study was to describe the teaching preparation and previous teaching experiences of higher education faculty prior to their current teaching appointment. A majority of the respondents ($n=91$, 69.5%) reported that they had completed a course or training session that addressed topics such as teaching strategies, facilitating/leading classroom learning, student assessment and evaluation, or other topics related to improving teaching in higher education. A majority ($n=98$, 74.8%) of study respondents served as teaching assistant during graduate study and 58 ($n=58$, 44.3%) had taught a laboratory course during graduate study. Nearly one-half of study respondents

($n=65$, 49.6%) indicated that they had taught a course without assistance from a faculty member during graduate study. A total of 62 ($n=62$, 47.3%) of study respondents indicated that they had teaching experiences at another higher education institution.

According to this study, a majority of respondents had some level of teacher training. This finding does not support the aforementioned lack of teaching preparation and pedagogical knowledge among higher education faculty. A recent article in the February 11, 2005, edition of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* stated that the lack of adequately prepared faculty to provide effective teaching in higher education has been a common complaint in academia (Bartlett, 2005). As the majority of respondents of this study have had some level of teaching preparation, there is reason to conclude that some level of pedagogical knowledge exists among study respondents.

These results are also somewhat contradictory to the statements made by Adams (2002), who stated that few graduate programs have allowed students to independently teach courses, which suggests that graduate programs are not adequately addressing a major composition of faculty work: teaching. Because nearly one-half of respondents to this study had taught a course without assistance from a faculty member during graduate study, it is possible that graduate programs have begun to address some of the teaching preparation needs of future faculty within disciplinary epistemologies.

The fifth objective of this study was to investigate the existence of a correlation between the dominant teaching perspective of faculty and involvement in faculty development activities. The results of this analysis revealed that no statistically significant relationship existed between dominant teaching perspective of the faculty and

involvement in faculty development activities ($r=.12$, $p=.14$). Given that this sample included an older faculty cohort at the professor level ($n=56$, 42.7%), with a mean of 13.46 years ($SD=10.99$) experience, and with a majority of the respondents above 41 years of age, it is possible to conclude that the teaching perspectives have been developed and refined through the course of their academic career. This theory is supported by adult psychologists, who state that between the ages of 40 to 65, adults reach peak levels of assertiveness, cognitive commitment and achievement in order to reach a level of autonomy. This is also the age bracket where individuals “maintain” their career status and no longer seek advancement and serve as mentors. High elements of job satisfaction exist at this level, and there tends to be a greater emphasis on extrinsic values (Bee, 1992).

A review of other faculty development activities, as reported by respondents, revealed that some respondents listed other non-faculty development activities. Again, like other variables of this study, the response rate on this item is small. Should there have been a larger response rate, the researcher might be able to conclude that there is a theoretical difference of what constitutes faculty development between the faculty and other stakeholders in higher education. Examples of non-faculty development activities, which were reported on the survey, included service to the campus and community and additional teaching responsibilities not related to their current faculty teaching appointment.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the findings of this study:

- 1.) Further research should be conducted to explore personal theories of teaching and learning among higher education faculty, as the results of this study have not yielded a complete response to the question posed by Menges (2000), on how faculty derive personal theories of teaching and learning.
- 2.) Additional research should be conducted to explore how teaching perspectives are affected during the academic career of the faculty. Perhaps a qualitative study could yield information about how faculty members conceptualize their teaching perspectives or values and how those perspectives are affected through job responsibilities, in addition to teaching.
- 3.) Expanded efforts to utilize electronic data collection methods should be embraced in the social sciences, as electronic data collection is becoming more readily accessible with today's technological advances. Perhaps research should be conducted about why respondents tend to prefer to respond to a paper-based instrument over an electronic instrument. Such research could assist in improving electronic surveys so that such instruments yield higher response rates.
- 4.) The impact and outcome of faculty development should be further explored among higher education institutions. The results of this study were not conclusive enough to determine how faculty development activities have been embraced by faculty participants to address needs of the individual's personal teaching perspectives of disciplinary epistemologies. Given the aforementioned higher levels of accountability in higher education and the significant resources

dedicated to faculty development, further research needs to explore how and if faculty development initiatives affect teaching perspectives and values.

5.) Greater strides should be made to expand the study of teaching perspectives in higher education to include student perspectives of teaching. A comparison study, which could compare how faculty perceive their teaching practice to how students perceive their ability to learn, would contribute to the efforts to improve the quality of instruction and enhance the teaching and learning process in higher education classrooms.

This descriptive-correlational study sought to describe higher education faculty from a research extensive university in the southern United States, regarding their teaching perspectives and involvement in faculty development activities. As previously stated, findings from this study should be applied judiciously, given the low response rate of $n=131$ (24.4%). It is hopeful that faculty and higher education administrators will continue their commitment to improve instruction and that the Teaching Perspective Inventory and other similar instruments will be used by faculty to identify their personal values of teaching and articulate those values to students, faculty peers, administrators, and other stakeholders of higher education.

REFERENCES

- Adams, K.A. (2002). *What colleges and universities want in new faculty*. American Association of Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.
- American Council on Education. (2001, October 22). Facts in brief: ED study focuses on faculty evaluation, transitions, and tenure. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=InfoCenter&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=6361>
- Bartlett, T. (2005, February 11). Please take my advice: 5 books for professors who want to improve their teaching. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* LI (23), p. A14.
- Bee, H.L. (1992). *The Journey of adulthood* (2nd ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Bess, J.L. (1998). Teaching well: Do you have to be schizophrenic? *The Review of Higher Education* 22(1), 1-15.
- Brookfield, S.D. (1990). *The skillful teacher: On technique, trust, and responsiveness in the classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Buskist, W. (2002). Effective teaching: Perspectives and insights from division two's 2- and 4-year awardees. *Teaching of Psychology* 29(3), 188-193.
- Camblin, L.D. & Steger, J.A. (2000). Rethinking faculty development. *Higher Education* 39, 1-18.
- Cambridge, B. (1999). The scholarship of teaching and learning: Questions and answers from the field. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin*.
- Category Definitions. (n.d.) Retrieved May 14, 2005, from www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/CIHE2000/defNotes/Definitions.htm
- Colbeck, C.L. (2002). Assessing institutionalization of curricular and pedagogical reforms. *Research in Higher Education* 43(4), 397-421.
- Cochran, W.G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Collins, J.B., Selinger, S.J., & Pratt, D.D. (n.d.). How do perspectives on teaching vary across disciplinary majors for students enrolled in teacher preparation? Retrieved October 10, 2004 from <http://www.teachingperspectives.com>

- Cranton, P. (1994). Personal empowerment through type: Teaching style and type. *Psychological Type Press* 25.
- Cranton, P. & Carusetta, E. (2002). Reflecting on teaching: The influence of context. *The International Journal for Academic Development* 7(2), 167-176.
- Dall'Alba, G. (1991). Foreshadowing conceptions of teaching. *Research and Development in Higher Education* 13, 293-297.
- Davis, J.A. (1971). *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dillman, D.A. & Salant, P. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dinham, S.D. (1996). What college teachers need to know. In R. J. Menges, M. Weimer & Associates (Eds.). *Teaching on solid ground*. (pp. 297-313). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dotolo, L.G. (1999). Faculty development: Working together to improve teaching and learning. *New Directions for Higher Education* 106, 51-57.
- Eble, K.E. (1983). *The aims of college teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Eble, K.E. & McKeachie, W.J. (1985). *Improving undergraduate education through faculty development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Faculty Development Definitions. (n.d.) Retrieved May 14, 2005, from www.podnetwork.org/development/definitions.htm
- Felder, R.M. (1996). Matters of style. *ASEE Prism* 6(4), 18-23.
- Fletcher, J.J. & Patrick, S.K. (1998). Not just workshops anymore: The role of faculty development in reframing academic priorities. *International Journal of Academic Development* 98(3), 39-46.
- Gamson, Z.F. (1991). A brief history of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 47, 5-12.
- Grasha, A. F. (2002). *Teaching with style*. San Bernadino, CA: Alliance Publishers.

- Hoffer, T.B., Selfa, L., Welch, V., Williams, K., Hess, M., Friedman, J., et al. (2004). Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2003. University of Chicago, National Opinion Research Center. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/issues/sed-2003.pdf>
- Hubbell, J.A.E., Hudson, W.A., & Muir, W.W. (1995). Ten methods for administrators to promote effective teaching through faculty development. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education* 20(3). Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.utpjournals.com/jour.ihtml?lp=jvme/jvme203/TenMethodsForAdministrators.html>
- Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. *Learning and Instruction* 7(3), 255-275.
- Kreber, C. (2001). The scholarship of teaching and its implementation in faculty development and graduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 86, 79-88.
- Lindner, J.R., Murphy, T.H., & Briers, G.E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education Research* 42(4), 43-53.
- Lopater, S. (1990). Postsecondary teaching training in Britain. *Faculty Forum* 17(3), 193-194.
- Louie, B.Y., Drevdahl, D.J., Purdy, J.M., & Stackman, R.W. (2003). Advancing the scholarship of teaching through collaborative self-study. *The Journal of Higher Education* 74(2), 151-167.
- McKeachie, W. J. (1999). *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. (10th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Menges, R. (2000). Shortcomings of research on evaluating and improving teaching in higher education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 83, 5-11.
- Perry, R.P., Menec, V.H., Struthers, W., Hechter, F.J., Schönwetter, D.J., & Menges, R.J. (1997). Faculty in transition: A longitudinal analysis of the role of perceived control and type of institution in adjustment to postsecondary institutions. *Research in Higher Education* 38(5), 519-556.
- Porter, S. R. (2004). Pros and cons of paper and electronic surveys. *New Directions for Institutional Research* 121, 91-97.

- Pratt, D.D. (1989). Three stages of teacher competence: A developmental perspective. In E. Hayes (Ed.) *Effective Teaching Styles* (New Directions for Continuing Education), (pp. 78-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pratt, D.D. (1992). Conceptions of teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly* 42(4), 203-220.
- Pratt, D.D. & Associates (1998). *Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education*. Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Pratt, D.D. & Collins, J.B. (2001). Teaching perspectives inventory. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.teachingperspectives.com/>
- Pratt, D.D., Collins, J.B., & Selinger, S.J. (2001). Development and use of the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI). Paper presented at the 2001 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.teachingperspectives.com/PDF/development1.pdf>
- Pratt, D.D. & Collins, J.B. (n.d.) Summaries of five teaching perspectives. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.teachingperspectives.com/PDF/summaries.pdf>
- Richlin, L. & Cox, M.D. (1994). Improving the teaching > < learning connection. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 5(1), 1-6.
- Schraw, G. & Brooks, D. (n.d.) Improving college teaching using an interactive, compensatory model of learning. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://dwb.unl.edu/Chau/CompMod.html>
- Seldin, P. (n.d.). Improving college teaching. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from http://www.olemiss.edu/depts/vc_academic_affairs/improve.html
- Shannon, D. M. & Bradshaw, C. C. (2002). A comparison of response rate, response time, and costs of mail and electronic surveys. *The Journal of Experimental Education* 70(2), 179-192.
- Smith, R. (2001). Expertise and the scholarship of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 86, 69-78.
- Sperling, C.B. (2003). How community colleges understand the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* (27), 593-601.

- Sutliff, R.I. & Baldwin, V. (2001). Learning styles: Teaching technology students can be more effective. *The Journal of Technology Studies* 27(1). Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JTS/Winter-Spring-2001/sutliff.html>
- Svinicki, M.D. (2004). *Learning and Motivation in the Postsecondary Classroom*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Travis, J.E. (n.d.). Models for improving college teaching: A faculty resource. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://www.ntlf.com/html/lib/bib/95-6dig.htm>
- Watson, S. A. (2003). Implementing learning styles into the design classroom. *Journal of Design Communication* 5. Retrieved May 14, 2005, from <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JDC/Spring-2003/learningstyles.html>
- Weimer, M. (1990). "Study" your way to better teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 42, 117-130.

APPENDIX A

APPROVED INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION

IRB #: 2853 LSU Proposal #: _____ Revised: 03/24/2004

LSU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) for 578-8692 FAX 6792
HUMAN RESEARCH SUBJECT PROTECTION Office: 203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
Study exempted by
Louisiana State University
Institutional Review Board
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall

Unless they are qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research using living humans as subjects, or samples or data obtained from humans, directed or supervised without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

Instructions: Complete this form.

Exemption Applicant: If it appears that your study qualifies for exemption send:

- (A) Two copies of this completed form,
- (B) a brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts A & B),
- (C) copies of all instruments to be used. If this proposal is part of a grant proposal include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
- (D) the consent form that you will use in the study

to: ONE screening committee member (listed at the end of this form) in the most closely related department/discipline or to IRB office.

If exemption seems likely, submit it. If not, submit regular IRB application. Help is available from Dr. Robert Mathews, 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu or any screening committee member.

Principal Investigator David M. Deggs Student? Yes

Ph: 225-241-1004 E-mail ddeggs1@lsu.edu Dept/Unit Human Resource Education

If Student, name supervising professor Dr. Krisanna Machtmes Ph: 578-7844
Dr. Geraldine Johnson Ph: 578-2464

Mailing Address 1100 S. Foster Drive, Apt #67, Baton Rouge, LA 70806

Project Title An Investigation of the Relationship Between Teaching Perspectives and Faculty Development Activities Among Faculty in Higher Education

Agency expected to fund project N/A

Subject pool (e.g. Psychology Students) LSU Faculty

Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changed I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted.

PI Signature David Deggs Date 12/1/04 (no per signatures)

Screening Committee Action: Exempted Not Exempted Category/Paragraph _____

Reviewer Michael Keenan Signature Michael Keenan Date 1-18-05

APPENDIX B

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM FROM ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Post-it® Fax Note	7671	Date	2/1/05	# of pages	1/6
To	David Deggs	From	Frank Cartledge		
Co./Dept.		Co.			
Phone #		Phone #			
Fax #	219-4439	Fax #			

MEMORANDUM

TO: James P. Fernandez, Vice Provost
Academics and Planning, Office of Academic Affairs

FROM: David M. Deggs, Doctoral Candidate
School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development

THROUGH: Krisanna Madhines, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development

DATE: January 26, 2005

RE: Proposed Research Study

I am seeking approval to survey Louisiana State University faculty regarding their teaching perspectives, teaching preparation, previous teaching experiences and involvement in faculty development activities. This study has been designed to include assistant, associate, and full professors who have been granted tenure or who have been appointed to a tenure-track position at LSU.


Faculty selected for inclusion in this study will be drawn from a simple random sample using records from the Office of Budget and Planning and Office of Human Resource Management. Surveys will be sent to faculty at their campus addresses. Faculty may choose to not participate or withdraw from the study at any time and anonymity will be ensured.

It is my hope to share results of this study with the LSU Centers for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Office of Academic Affairs, and any other requesting department. Copies of the study survey instruments and approved LSU Institutional Review Board Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight are enclosed for your review.

If you have any questions regarding this research study, please feel free to contact me via telephone at (225) 342-6338 (work) or (225) 241-1004 (home). I may also be reached via email at ddeggs1@lsu.edu. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Enclosures

Approved:



James P. Fernandez.



Date

APPENDIX C

**E-MAILS REGARDING THE USE OF THE
TEACHING PERSPECTIVE INVENTORY (TPI)**

----- Original Message -----

From: "Dan Pratt" <pratt@interchange.ubc.ca>

To: "David Deggs" <daviddeggs@bellsouth.net>

Cc: <John.Collins@ubc.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2004 8:06 PM

Subject: Re: Teaching Perspectives Inventory

> David,

>

> John Collins (Colleague and co-author of TPI) and I are at the University of Kentucky working with faculty there on the same issues. We are delighted that you are interested in using the TPI. We wonder what your research question(s) might be and what you would link the TPI to in your analysis. In any case, go for it!! Art Crawley knows well that we are willing to cooperate and help to the extent that we can. We have NO FUNDING and simply do this because we are interested. Let us know how we might be of further help. Dan

>

> -----Original Message-----

>

>> Date: Tue May 11 19:17:33 PDT 2004

>> From: "David Deggs" <daviddeggs@bellsouth.net>

>> Subject: Teaching Perspectives Inventory

>> To: dan.pratt@ubc.ca

>>

>> Greetings from Louisiana, Dr. Pratt!

>>

>> My name is David Deggs and I am a doctoral student in Human Resource Education at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge.

>>

>> I am interested in exploring the possibility of using your "Teaching Perspective Inventory" in my dissertation study. I learned about the TPI in a course with Dr. Art Crawley at LSU. He and I met this semester to discuss the instrument and some strategies for its possible use in my study.

>>

>> I anticipate that I would collect data during January or February 2005. My tentative plans are to sample faculty from two postsecondary institutions in the Baton Rouge area. I am still in the formative stages of developing my methodology. I am copying Dr. Krisanna Machtmes on this email, who is assisting me in developing my proposal.

>>

>> At your convenience, I would like to learn more about your research activities and begin discussions about the possible use of the TPI. I have gathered much information from your website and your latest book, Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education.

>>

>> I hope to hear from you soon so that we might make arrangements to correspond at your convenience.

>>

>> Best,

>>

>> David Deggs

>> ddeggs1@lsu.edu

----- Original Message -----

From: Dan Pratt

To: ddeggs1 ; Dan Pratt ; John B. Collins

Cc: Krisanna Machtmes

Sent: Wednesday, September 01, 2004 8:22 PM

Subject: Re: TPI Instrument

Greetings David,

No problem attaching a copy of the TPI to your proposal. Just copy and paste it into a word file and you can share that with your committee. As for collecting your respondents' data, John will give you details but it's easier than you might think. We have to put a 'button' on the front end and you have to convince your respondents to LOOK for their button and check it off when entering the instrument. As John will tell you, all too many people miss their appropriate button and therefore are not caught in the data screen for sorting respondents by their institutional or research project affiliation. It will be up to you to make it absolutely clear that they need to check off that button. The specifics about the button can be negotiated with John. He's on his way home from a long day at work, but will likely see your message (and mine) this evening. Dan

At 05:00 PM 9/1/04 , ddeggs1 wrote:

Drs. Pratt and Collins:

Thank you both for granting me permission to use the TPI in my dissertation study. Would it be possible to include a copy of the TPI in my proposal for my committee to review? I have no intentions of placing it in the final document.

In a previous email, Dr. Collins encouraged me to use the web-based version of the TPI in lieu of a paper version. After much consideration and discussion with Dr. Krisanna Machtmes, my co-chair at LSU, I feel that this would be the most advantageous approach for me. Would it be possible to place a link on the TPI website for my respondents so that their responses might be separated from other data collected through the web-based version of the instrument? I am willing to cover any financial costs associated with doing this.

I hope to hold my committee meeting in November and collect data in early spring 2005. Thank you both again for allowing me to use the TPI and for your support of my research interests. I look forward to hearing from you both soon.

Sincerely,
David Deggs, Doctoral Student
Human Resource Education
Louisiana State University
ddeggs1@lsu.edu

APPENDIX D
DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Teaching Perspectives Demographic Survey Instrument

Part 1 Teaching Perspective Inventory

Please complete the Teaching Perspectives Inventory on the internet at www.teachingperspectives.com. Follow the directions on the website and indicate that you are a **faculty member at Louisiana State University**. Upon completion of the TPI, you may wish to print a copy of your results for personal use. Please provide the following information, which is available at the top of your **Teaching Perspective Profile**.

- Please indicate the **values** from your **Teaching Perspective Profile**:
Transmission _____ Nurturing _____
Apprenticeship _____ Social Reform _____
Developmental _____

- What is your **Teaching Perspective ID Number**? _____
(This information is being collected for data reconciliation purposes only. It will remain confidential and will not be used to personally identify you on any demographic variable.)

Part 2 Demographic Information

- What is your **age**?
___ Under 25
___ 26 to 30
___ 31 to 35
___ 36 to 40
___ 41 to 45
___ 46 to 50
___ 51 to 55
___ 56 to 60
___ 61 and older

- What is your **academic rank**?
___ Assistant Professor
___ Associate Professor
___ Professor

- Are you **tenured** in your current position?
___ Yes ___ No

- If no, are you in a **tenure-track** position?
___ Yes ___ No

- How many years have you been **teaching at LSU**?

- What is the **actual percentage of time that you spend in teaching** and related activities (i.e. course preparation, grading, advising students)? _____

- What **percentage of time you are assigned to teaching** and other related activities, according to your appointment at LSU? _____

- In what **Academic College or School** do you teach at LSU?
___ Agriculture
___ Art & Design
___ Arts & Sciences
___ Basic Sciences
___ Business Administration
___ School of the Coast & Environment
___ Education
___ Engineering
___ Library & Information Science
___ Mass Communication
___ Music & Dramatic Arts
___ Social Work
___ Veterinary Medicine

Part 3 Teaching Preparation and Previous Teaching Experiences

- Have you ever taken a **course for credit** or **attended a training session/workshop** that addressed topics such as teaching strategies, facilitating/leading classroom learning, student assessment and evaluation, or other topics related to improving teaching in higher education?

Yes No

- What type(s) of **higher education teaching experiences** did you have prior to your current appointment? *(Please check all that apply).*

Activities during graduate study:

- Teaching assistant
- Taught laboratory courses
- Taught a course without assistance from a faculty member

Other:

- Was a faculty member at another higher education institution
- No previous higher education teaching experiences prior to current appointment

Part 4 Faculty Development Activities

- What **Faculty Development Programs and Services** have you participated in at LSU? *(Please check all that apply.)*

Faculty Development Programs and Services

- Campus Federal Credit Union Teaching Enhancement Fund
- Teaching Related Workshops and Seminars (i.e. Teaching & Learning in Large Classes and University Teaching ⇔ Learning Series)
- Access Professional Development Resources
- Individual and/or Departmental Teaching Consultations
- Portfolio Development Assistance
- New Faculty Orientation
- Chancellor's Distinguished Lecture Series
- Teaching in Higher Education (THE) Forum

Off-campus activities:

- Professional conferences for your field
- Teaching conferences or institutes
- (Other) Please specify: _____

Part 5 Follow-up Interview

- Are you willing to be contacted for a follow-up telephone interview regarding your Teaching Perspectives?

Yes No

APPENDIX E
FIRST LETTER SENT TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS



February 14, 2005

Dear LSU Faculty Member:

The study of teaching perspectives and styles and other elements related to instructional practice in the higher education teaching environment has increased in recent years. At the same time, there has been growth in the number and types of faculty development programs on campuses that support the instructional practices of the faculty. Both have allowed higher education institutions to increase the quality and rigor of the higher education experience.

This study is being conducted to examine the teaching perspectives, teaching preparation, previous teaching experiences and involvement in faculty development activities among faculty at Louisiana State University. You have been selected for participation in this study from a random sample of LSU faculty who are currently tenured or who are in a tenure-track position.

Enclosed you will find the **demographic survey instrument**. The survey requires the completion of a web-based inventory. Upon completion of the web-based survey, record the results at the top of the survey. Directions for completing the web-based inventory are included in the first section of the survey.

Participation in this study is voluntary and responses will remain confidential. The code number on the enclosed survey will be used only for follow-up purposes with non-responders. After your completed instrument is received and your name is removed from the non-respondent list, your instrument will be assigned a random identification number that will have no association with your name.

Should you desire to be informed of the results of this study, please put your name and address on the back of the return envelope. If you will be unable to participate in this study, please return the enclosed instrument, uncompleted, in the self-addressed envelope so that an alternate may be selected for participation in the study.

Thank you for your time and participation in this study.

Sincerely,

David Deggs
Doctoral Candidate
Phone: 241-1004

Krisanna Machtmes, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Phone: 578-7844

Enclosure

APPENDIX F

REMINDER POSTCARD SENT TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS

February 28, 2005

Dear LSU Faculty Member:

A survey was sent to you two weeks ago regarding your teaching perspectives, teaching preparation, previous teaching experiences and involvement in faculty development activities.

If you have not completed the survey, please take a few minutes to do so and return it via campus mail in the self-addressed return envelope. If you have misplaced your survey, please contact us so that we may provide you with another copy.

Please disregard this note if you have already returned the survey and our correspondence has crossed in the mail. Thank you for your participation in this important study of higher education faculty.

David Deggs
Doctoral Candidate
Phone: 241-1004

Krisanna Machtmes, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Phone: 578-7844

APPENDIX G
THIRD LETTER SENT TO STUDY PARTICIPANTS



March 14, 2005

Dear LSU Faculty Member:

A survey was sent to you one month ago regarding your teaching perspectives, teaching preparation, previous teaching experiences and involvement in faculty development activities as a faculty member at Louisiana State University. As of today, we have not received a completed survey from you and are enclosing a replacement survey.

The survey requires completion of the Teaching Perspectives Inventory (TPI) on the internet at www.teachingperspectives.com. Please follow the directions on the website and indicate that you are a **faculty member at Louisiana State University**. Upon completion of the TPI, provide your values for each of the five perspectives and your TPI ID number in Part 1 of the survey. Then please complete the rest of the survey which contains general demographic questions and return it via campus mail in the enclosed self-addressed return envelope.

Participation in this study is voluntary and responses will remain confidential. **The four-digit code number on bottom-right corner of the enclosed survey will be used only for follow-up purposes with non-responders. Please note that this four-digit code number is not the same as your TPI ID number, which is generated on the TPI website upon completion of the survey.** After your completed survey is received, your name will be removed from the non-respondent list and your survey will be assigned a random identification number that will have no association with your name.

Should you desire to be informed of the results of this study, please put your name and address on the back of the return envelope. If you are unable to participate in this study, please return the enclosed survey, uncompleted, in the return envelope so that an alternate may be selected for participation in the study.

If you have already returned the survey and our correspondence has crossed in the mail, please disregard this letter. Thank you for your participation in this important study of higher education faculty.

Sincerely,

David Deggs
Doctoral Candidate
Phone: 241-1004

Krisanna Machtmes, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Phone: 578-7844

VITA

David M. Deggs is a native of Rosepine, Louisiana, and is the oldest son of Dale Lee Deggs and Evelyn Hickman Deggs. He began work on his Doctor of Philosophy degree in human resource education at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, in 2002 and graduated in August 2005.

David earned his Bachelor of General Studies degree in social sciences in 1999 and his Master of Education degree in adult and continuing education in 2000 from Northwestern State University in Natchitoches, Louisiana. As an undergraduate, David was active in the Northwestern State University Student Activities Board, Theta Chi Fraternity and Interfraternity Council. He was elected “Mr. Northwestern State University” in 1998 by the student body and was named “NSU Greek Man of the Year” in 1997.

He began his career in 1999 at Kennesaw State University in Kennesaw, Georgia, as Greek affairs advisor. In 2000, David returned to his alma mater in the capacity of Assistant Director of Student Activities for Greek Life and Leadership Development. After his tenure in student affairs, David transferred to University College at NSU in the capacities of grant coordinator, academic advisor, and instructor until 2003.

David currently resides in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where he is employed by the Louisiana Department of Education as an Educational Program Consultant in the Adult and Family Literacy Services section. In this capacity David coordinates statewide adult education, GED testing, and other special projects. In his spare time, David enjoys golf, weight lifting and serving as a volunteer Regional Counselor for Theta Chi Fraternity.