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INTRODUCTION

• Self-efficacy is defined as a belief in own self about the ability to produce the designate level of performance which has influences life (Bandura, 1994)

• Teaching self-efficacy has a direct impact on teaching performance

• The study was designed to examine teaching background and self-efficacy in relation to demographic characteristics.

• Understanding the role of preparation can have large scale impacts on how faculty professional development is handled
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

- Chapman’s (1984) model of influences associated with teacher attrition
- Teaching self-efficacy is a factor in job security, retention, and quality
METHODS

• Descriptive survey

• Population was a census of all teaching faculty in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at the University of Idaho (N = 53)
  • Included those who taught at least one class in their academic career at the university
  • 94% had taught a class in the last two academic years

• 83% response rate (n = 44)

• Instrument
  • Online delivery
  • Section 1: Teaching Characteristic Questions
    • Length of time teaching
    • Delivery methods used
    • Teaching related training/preparation

• Section 2: Short-form of the Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (Hoy & Wollfolk, 1990)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>( f )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Personal Characteristics of CALS Faculty (n = 44)*
FINDINGS - TEACHING CHARACTERISTICS

TEACHING CHARACTERISTICS OF CALS FACULTY

- Type of Courses Taught
  - Lower Division UG
  - Upper Division UG
  - Graduate Classes

- Delivery Methods Used
  - Face-to-Face
  - Distance (synchronously)
  - Distance (asynchronously)
  - Online

- Years Higher Ed Teaching
  - 0-5
  - 6-10
  - 10-20
  - 20+

- Membership in Professional Teaching Organization
  - Yes
  - No
FINDINGS - TEACHING PREPARATION

**Teaching Related Preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Served as TA Before Instructor of Record</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Teaching Related Professional Development</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Types of Teaching Professional Development Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Teaching Professional Development</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Initiated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-sponsored</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-sponsored</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-sponsored</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field-sponsored</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Respondents may have indicated multiple professional development options*
FINDINGS- TEACHING SELF-EFFICACY

**Mean CDSE Scores and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS - RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Yrs. Teaching</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.65*</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructional Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66*</td>
<td>0.88*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TSES Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Significant correlations flagged at $p = 0.01$. Correlation magnitude scale: weak = 0.30, moderate = 0.50, strong = 0.70 (Davis, 1971)*
CONCLUSIONS

- Many CALS faculty members had little or no formal training before becoming an instructor and 25% had not attended professional development training
  - Additional professional development should be offered to strengthen confidence and skill in teaching

- Many faculty members are not participating in professional organizations related to teaching
  - How can we increase participation in organizations (like NACTA)?

- Teaching self efficacy was slightly higher than the reported normative baseline
  - Those who had taught longer showed lower teaching self-efficacy related to using instructional strategies
TAKE HOME MESSAGES

• We cannot assume that faculty in a teaching role feel comfortable or have a background in teaching, continued professional development is key
  • To consider:
    • How can we increase participation in professional development?
    • Which level of professional development is most effective?

• Training on new/innovative instructional methods may be exceptionally helpful for “seasoned” faculty members
  • To consider:
    • Do seasoned faculty members have the desire to update instructional strategies?
    • What is the cause of the disconnect between self-efficacy related to instructional strategies and those who have been in their roles longer?

• Results can frame discussion for improving teaching performance and efficiency in higher education
  • We cannot overlook the impact of a quality teacher on students
  • We cannot overlook the impact of professional development on teacher quality
TAKE HOME MESSAGE #1

• We cannot assume that faculty in a teaching role feel comfortable or have a background in teaching, continued professional development is key
  • To consider:
    • How can we increase participation in professional development?
    • Which level of professional development is most effective?
TAKE HOME MESSAGE #2

• Training on new/innovative instructional methods may be exceptionally helpful for “seasoned” faculty members
  • To consider:
    • Do seasoned faculty members have the desire to update instructional strategies?
    • What is the cause of the disconnect between self-efficacy related to instructional strategies and those who have been in their roles longer?
TAKE HOME MESSAGES #3

• Results can frame discussion for improving teaching performance and efficiency in higher education
  • We cannot overlook the impact of a quality teacher on students
  • We cannot overlook the impact of professional development on teacher quality
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