

EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED  
COMPETENCIES FOR TEACHERS OF STUDENTS WITH EMOTIONAL  
AND BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS  
OF PERSONAL PROFICIENCY

Maureen N. Wanyonyi-Short, B.Ed., M.Ed.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2010

APPROVED:

Lyndal M. Bullock, Major Professor  
Thomas Evenson, Minor Professor  
Lloyd Kinnison, Committee Member  
Abbas Tashakkori, Chair of the Department  
of Educational Psychology  
Jerry Thomas, Dean of the College of  
Education  
James D. Meernik, Acting Dean of the  
Robert B. Toulouse School of  
Graduate Studies

Wanyonyi-Short, Maureen, N. Educators' perceptions of the importance of selected competencies for teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders and their perceptions of personal proficiency. Doctor of Philosophy (Special Education), December 2010, 134 pp., 22 tables, references, 92 titles.

This study investigated educators' perceptions of the importance of competencies for teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders and their own proficiency in the competencies. Participants included educators who had completed university-based coursework on emotional and behavioral disorders. Competencies from the Qualification and Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children study were correlated with CEC's content standards and knowledge skill sets for special education teachers of individuals with emotional and behavioral disorders. Participants ranked 88 competencies on importance and proficiency. Results revealed that educators' proficiency in competencies, their years of experience, and level of education contribute a significant percentage of variance in their ratings of the importance of competencies. Implications for further research are provided.

Copyright 2010

by

Maureen N. Wanyonyi-Short

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I give honor and praise to the Father Almighty for His Grace and enduring love. I am truly blessed and highly favored.

I owe my deepest gratitude to Dr. Bullock, the chairperson of my committee for his dedication, patience, valuable advice, and mentorship. I would also like to sincerely thank my committee, Dr. Evenson, and Dr. Kinnison for their guidance, wisdom, and scholarly expertise. I am grateful to Dr. Combes for her continued support and Dr. Estes for giving the opportunity to gain valuable experience working with her. To Jeanie and Fred, my sincere thanks for technical support and advice that helped me through the program. Thanks to Beatrice, Jerry, Mickie, Gina, Cathy, and Kelly for their support and friendship through the program. I extend my sincere gratitude to all the participants who took the time to complete the survey and to Celia McCall and Forest Lane for guiding me through the statistics.

I want to extend my heartfelt thank you to my dearest friend Lindiwe for her love and support. Thank you to my immediate and extended family and friends for their prayers and for helping me in any way they could. To my husband Rollin thank you for taking care of Daniel and for your patience. To my parents the late Mary H. Wanyonyi and William Wanyonyi Wambwa, thank you for serving as exemplary public educators, for your love, and for instilling in me a love of learning. Through your personal example, you taught me the value of integrity and hard work. To my son Daniel, may this work inspire you to value hard work and fulfill your dreams.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
Chapters	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purpose of the Study	
Research Questions	
Significance of the Study	
Limitations	
Definition of Terms	
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	10
Quality Teaching	
Measuring Teacher Quality	
Competencies for Teachers of Students with EBD	
Factors Influencing Teacher Competence	
Summary	
3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES .....	34
Purpose of the Study	
Research Questions	
Research Design	
Instrument	
Participants	
Data Collection	
Data Analysis	
4. RESULTS .....	41
Demographic Data	
Analysis of the Data, by Research Questions	

Professional Preparation Experiences

Summary

5.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS .....	71
	Summary	
	Implications	
	Recommendations	
	APPENDICES .....	77
	REFERENCES .....	129

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Data Analysis Categories and Thematic Codes .....	39
2. Current Role of Educator .....	43
3. Participants by Highest Level of Education Attained.....	44
4. Educators' Years of Experience.....	45
5. Geographic Work Location.....	45
6. Ranking and Mean Ratings of Importance of Top Ten Competencies in Current Study .....	47
7. Distribution of Mean Ratings of Importance .....	48
8. Ranking and Mean Ratings of Proficiency of Top Ten Competencies in Current Study .....	50
9. Distribution of Mean Ratings of Proficiency.....	52
10. Correlation Coefficients of Items Rated Very Important .....	53
11. ANOVA Summary for Foundations .....	54
12. ANOVA Summary for Development and Characteristics of Learners .....	55
13. ANOVA Summary for Individual Learning Differences .....	57
14. ANOVA Summary for Instructional Strategies.....	58
15. ANOVA Summary for Learning Environments/ Social Interactions .....	59
16. ANOVA Summary for Instructional Planning .....	60
17. ANOVA Summary for Educational Assessment of Students.....	61
18. ANOVA Summary for Professional and Ethical Practice .....	62
19. ANOVA Summary for Collaboration among Stakeholders .....	63
20. Difference between the Mean Ratings of Importance of Competencies among the Three Studies.....	65
21. Standardized Mean Ratings of Proficiency in Competencies among the Three Studies .....	66

22.	Professional Preparation Experiences.....	69
E.1	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 1-10 on Importance and Proficiency .....	117
E.2	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 11-20 on Importance and Proficiency .....	118
E.3	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 21-30 on Importance and Proficiency .....	119
E.4	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 31-40 on Importance and Proficiency .....	120
E.5	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 41-50 on Importance and Proficiency .....	121
E.6	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 51-60 on Importance and Proficiency .....	122
E.7	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 61-70 on Importance and Proficiency .....	123
E.8	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 71-80 on Importance and Proficiency .....	124
E.9	Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 81-88 on Importance and Proficiency .....	125



## CHAPTER 1

### EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED COMPETENCIES FOR TEACHERS OF STUDENTS WITH EMOTIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS AND THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF PERSONAL PROFICIENCY

The goal of teacher education is to prepare as many highly qualified educators as are needed to serve students with disabilities in our nation's schools (Sindelar, Bishop, Brownell, Rosenberg, & Connelly, 2005). The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 states that a highly qualified teacher (HQT) should hold at least a bachelor's degree, have full State certification, and demonstrate knowledge in the core academic subjects he or she teaches (U. S. Department of Education, 2005). The NCLB Act definition of a HQT prompted the U.S. Department of Education's promotion of emphasis in content knowledge and professional development in teacher preparation (Boe, Shin, & Cook, 2007). There are some discrepancies among federal policymakers' definitions of what constitutes a HQT. Brownell, Hirsh, and Seo (2004) point out that some federal policymakers define qualified secondary teachers as those who have content expertise to teach their subjects and as teachers who apply scientifically based practices in the classroom. Similarly, Boe et al. (2007) point out that the U.S. Department of Education's emphasis on verbal ability and content knowledge in the preparation of HQTs ignores the NCLB Act requirement for full certification which implies a need for extensive coursework in pedagogy and teaching practicum. Hence, the question: What comprises teacher quality and how is it measured? In the 2002 Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education (SPeNSE) study, experience, credentials, tested ability, self-efficacy, professional activities, and classroom practices were used as measures of teacher quality. However, "it is difficult to separate discussions of teacher quality from discussions of teacher quantity because, as numeric shortages worsen, administrators are forced to hire less qualified applicants" (Carlson, Brauen,

Klein, Shroll, & Willig, 2002, p. 1). Furthermore, the decreasing number of traditionally prepared teachers in special education means fewer HQTs are available to meet the demand (Cook & Boe, 2007). The ongoing shortage of special education teachers and the inadequate preparation of general education teachers need to be addressed by stakeholders before attempts are made to improve special education teacher quality and preparation (Brownell, Sindelar, Kiely, & Danielson, 2010).

Despite lack of consensus on the definition of a HQT, the NCLB Act of 2001 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 seek to promote the education of children with disabilities, children from low socioeconomic backgrounds, American Indian children, children with limited English proficiency, and migratory children by requiring that states, school districts, and schools find ways to ensure that these students achieve proficiency on grade level academic content (NCLB Act of 2001; U. S. Department of Education, 2004). To meet these requirements, states and school districts are to ensure that all students are taught by HQTs. These regulations place new responsibilities on agencies and institutions responsible for teacher education to ensure that their graduates acquire the competencies needed to prepare students, especially those with disabilities, to successfully learn and meet state academic standards (Thompson, Lazarus, Clapper, & Thurlow, 2006).

Researchers have been investigating competencies educators need to be effective for a number of years. Periodic reviews of standards for teachers are necessary to ensure compliance with new legislation and to implement new research-based strategies in a field that is dynamic. In 1957, Mackie, Kvaraceus, and Williams carried out an extensive study of competencies needed by teachers of students with emotional/ behavioral disorders (EBD). In the 1970s, several seminal studies on the competencies and professional attributes of teachers of students with EBD

followed this initial study (e.g., Bullock, Dykes, & Kelly, 1974; Bullock & Whelan, 1971; Shores, Cegelka, & Nelson, 1973). These studies were undertaken to identify competencies needed for specific tasks and to develop competency-based teacher preparation programs. New legislative mandates contained in IDEA 1997, and NCLB have led to renewed efforts to ascertain competencies that teachers of students with disabilities need to assist their students achieve academic goals in this era of standards-based education (Thompson et al., 2006). A clear understanding of the teacher's role is critical in determining what knowledge and skills teachers will need to meet the new requirements. Then, how teachers employ the knowledge and skills to meet the individual needs of students verifies the teacher's competence (Mackie & Williams, 1959).

Both teacher educators and experienced teachers have vital information to provide when determining essential competencies for working with children and youth with EBD (Fink & Janssen, 1993). Some of the earliest competency-based teacher education studies were criticized for relying heavily on expert opinion (i.e., teacher educators, state department officials, and researchers) and having very little contribution from teachers. However, a few studies (e.g., Bullock & Whelan, 1971; Dorward, 1963; Mackie et al., 1957) validated the competencies by including input from classroom teachers (Shores et al., 1973). Research has shown that teachers' responses to students' behavior has an effect on student behavior (e.g., Anderson & Hendrickson, 2007) just as a teachers' competence influence student achievement (Blanton, Sindelar, & Correa, 2006; McLesky & Ross, 2004). Establishing competencies that foster better student achievement for students with disabilities and ensuring that teachers employ research-validated strategies in the classroom is vital to ensure better educational outcomes for all students.

## Statement of the Problem

The controversy over which teacher preparation approach produces HQTs necessitates further research on teacher qualification outcomes (Boe et al., 2007) and in particular on the specific competencies that lead to improved student outcomes. While all parties agree on the need for HQTs, the debate on the definition of a HQT and the characteristics of exemplary education programs which produce HQTs endures. There is little doubt that there have been successes from the field which underscores the need to include practicing teachers in corroborating the competencies that have resulted in improved student outcomes. By providing information about competencies that have assisted in promoting positive student outcomes, teacher preparation programs may gain insight into competencies that should be emphasized to ensure success for students with disabilities.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was (a) to identify competencies perceived as important by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on preparing teachers to serve students with EBD and (b) to examine ratings of educators' perceived proficiency on each of the competencies. A third purpose was to compare ratings of importance on competencies rated in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study, 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the current study.

## Research Questions

The following research questions were used to guide this study:

Research Question 1: What competencies do educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD perceive as important for success in teaching students with EBD?

Research Question 2: In what category (ies) of knowledge and skills do educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD feel most proficient?

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between educators' ratings of importance and their ratings of proficiency in the competencies?

Research Question 4: In what ways do educators' ratings of importance of competencies in the current study differ based on their education, the geographic location where they work, and years of experience?

Research Question 5: What are the differences among the ratings of importance of the competencies or categories of competencies by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study, the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the current study?

Research Question 6: Utilizing data from the 1957, 1971, and current study, what are the similarities and differences among the ratings of proficiency of competencies or categories of competencies by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD?

### Significance of the Study

There has been a chronic shortage of fully certified educators in the field of special education for a number of years (e.g., Billingsley, Fall, & Williams, 2006; Blanton et al., 2006; Brownell et al., 2004; Henderson, Klein, Gonzalez, & Bradley, 2005; Katsiyannis, Zhang, & Conroy, 2003). This shortage has been attributed to high rates of attrition (Henderson et al., 2005) especially of teachers of students with EBD as well as increasing school enrollment (Katsiyannis et al., 2003). Teacher attrition has been attributed to many factors including inadequate preparation of teachers.

The 1957 study on the qualification and preparation of teachers of exceptional children drew on a sample of well-qualified teachers who had received specialized preparation. Educators who have extensive experience in the field have useful knowledge of teacher competencies. This

study focuses on input from experienced teachers as “their domain-specific expertise motivates them to continue learning and solving problems within their discipline” (Brownell et al., 2009, p. 394). Furthermore, individuals with an extensive knowledge base are able to perceive the relatedness among diverse domains and use that relatedness to guide their performance, whereas, novices rely on less efficient strategies (Alexander & Judy, 1988). A foundation of domain-specific knowledge is a prerequisite for effective job performance.

Investigating competencies that promote teacher effectiveness may promote better teacher preparation, in turn, influencing rates of teacher retention and eventually bringing about improved student outcomes. Moreover, “given this shortage, teacher educators have increasing responsibility to ascertain not only whether or not their graduates are employed, but how they are faring” (Anderson & Hendrickson, 2007, p. 44).

### Limitations

This investigation focuses on teachers who have self-reported completing a university-based teacher preparation program with a focus on teachers serving students with EBD. The sample, therefore, limits generalizability of the findings.

Using a self-report format, the current study used a sample of educators who completed a university-based teacher preparation program for teachers of students with EBD and as such may not be representative of all teachers of students with EBD. The sample of 75 educators who completed all parts of the survey is small but not surprising because the study targeted only educators who had completed a university-based teacher preparation program focusing on serving students with EBD. Billingsley et al. (2006) found that a higher percentage of teachers of

students with EBD entered teaching through alternative certification programs than other special education teachers.

Additionally, a survey that relies on the perceptions of individuals has inherent limitations and the assumption that the respondents' answers are accurate. Caution must, therefore, be used when interpreting the results and generalizing the findings.

### Definition of Terms

- *Academic content standards*: Refers to standards that provide curricular and instructional guidance (Thompson et al., 2006, p. 142)
- *Achievement standards*: Refers to the curriculum standards that are assessed (Thompson et al., 2006, p. 142)
- *Core competence*: Refers to a set of learning outcomes which each individual should attain during or demonstrate at the end of a learning cycle (Holmes & Hooper, 2000)
- *Good teaching*: Refers to enhancing a learner's competence through teaching standards-based content using age-appropriate methods (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005)
- *Emotional disturbance*:
  - i. The term means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a child's educational performance: (A) An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors; (B) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers; (C) Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances; (D) A

general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; (E) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.

ii. The term includes schizophrenia. The term does not apply to children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined that they have an emotional disturbance (IDEA, 2004)

- *Experienced educator*: The median years of special education teaching experience for EBD and other special educators is 7 years (Billingsley et al. (2006, p. 254)
- *Highly qualified teacher (HQT)*: NCLB defines a highly qualified teacher as one with (a) a bachelor's degree, (b) full certification, and (c) demonstrated expertise in the subject matter of each core subject taught (Boe, 2006)
- *Quality demand*: The demand for teachers with specific qualifications such as certification level, certification field, amount of teacher preparation, and degree major field (Cook & Boe, 2007)
- *Quantity demand*: The number of teachers needed to fill all teaching positions that have been created and funded at the district level (Cook & Boe, 2007)
- *Quantity shortage*: Refers to the number of positions for which there was an insufficient supply of eligible individuals who were available and willing to accept positions under the terms of appointment established by hiring school districts (Boe, 2006 p. 139)
- *Successful teaching*: Refers to teaching that results in learners acquiring acceptable levels of proficiency in the content (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005)
- *Teacher of students with EBD*: Refers to any individual who is employed at a public school with a main assignment in any Grade(s) k-12. Excluded from this definition is any



individual whose main assignment is pre-kindergarten teacher, substitute, student teacher, or non-teaching specialist of any kind (Cook & Boe, 2007)

- *University-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD*: Refers to programs in four to five year institutions of higher education that prepare teachers to serve students with EBD.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature examines relevant research pertaining to the competencies needed by teachers of students with Emotional/ Behavioral Disorders (EBD). The historical study by Mackie, Kvaraceus, and Williams (1957) forms the theoretical foundation of the review in terms of establishing competencies needed by teachers of students with EBD. In addition, a discussion about teacher quality and factors influencing teacher competency (i.e., students needs and/ characteristics, teacher preparation, and teacher shortage) is included.

#### Quality Teaching

Teaching refers to an activity in which “a person, who possesses some content, conveys the content to a person, who initially lacks content, to some acceptable or appropriate level” (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005, p. 187). According to this definition of teaching, learning has to take place for teaching to be said to have occurred.

Defining teacher quality is difficult and the meaning changes depending on how the definition is used (Berliner, 2005). According to Blanton, Sindelar, and Correa (2006) teacher quality refers to the actions of a teacher, the knowledge a teacher possesses, and the teacher’s creativity. For example a competent teacher of students with EBD should be able to apply a problem-solving approach to develop an individualized educational program to meet each child’s unique medical, psychological, social, and educational needs (Mackie & Williams, 1959). Effective teachers may also be defined as those skilled at promoting the academic achievement of their students (Murnane & Steele, 2007; Nougaret, Scruggs, & Mastropieri, 2005). Classroom practice that reflects effective instruction and classroom management of students with disabilities

is another dimension of beginning special education teacher quality (Brownell et al., 2009). Moreover, with the current emphasis on accountability, special education teachers have additional responsibility to ensure that their students make adequate progress as measured by state level standardized assessments. Sindelar and colleagues (2005) point out that an expert teacher provides intensive, explicit instruction and practice in small groups accompanied by scaffolding and emotional support, which is good teaching. Therefore, a teacher demonstrates competence by practicing good teaching frequently and also has evidence of student learning (e.g., Berliner, 2005; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005). Experience in the classroom is therefore a key factor in teacher quality. However, “increased domain knowledge or relevant experiences alone cannot make a novice an expert” (Alexander & Judy, 1988, p. 10). According to Darling-Hammond (2000b), subject matter knowledge does not directly translate into teacher effectiveness as evidenced by data from 50 state educational policies, the 1993-94 schools and staffing surveys (SASS), and the National Assessment of Educational Progress. In quality teaching, a learner should acquire an acceptable level of proficiency in content taught according to disciplinary standards of adequacy using age appropriate, morally defensible methods (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005). The skills a teacher uses in quality teaching are related to the teacher’s role which differs depending on the teacher’s assignment. The role of a special educator is complex (Brownell et al., 2009) and more so in the area of EBD as many are non-educational agencies and other professionals are involved in the delivery of services. Teachers and other specialists need to work in concert to develop programs for students with EBD who exhibit serious adjustment problems (Mackie et al., 1957). Furthermore, challenging behaviors exhibited by students with EBD make skills in classroom management vital if teachers are to successfully address problem behaviors and alleviate academic deficits (Oliver & Reschly,

2010). In addition to classroom management skills, an elementary special educator should know how to instruct students in reading, writing, and math in addition to having an understanding of disabilities, strategies to assist struggling readers, student motivation, and social skill development (Brownell et al., 2009). Moreover, instruction in core academic subjects for all students is mandated by law (Lane, Wehby, & Barton-Arwood, 2005).

Teacher quality is multifaceted. While researchers need frameworks to conduct comprehensive studies (Carlson, Lee, & Schroll, 2004), teacher educators need an understanding of key aspects of beginning teacher quality to guide teacher preparation and evaluate the efficacy of the programs (Brownell et al., 2009). Quality has been a part of efforts to prepare special educators therefore, mandates such as IDEA and NCLB will undoubtedly change the content of teacher preparation programs (Smith, 2006).

### Measuring Teacher Quality

A primary responsibility of policymakers and administrators in education is to ensure that teachers in public schools are qualified (Boe, 2006). There is however, divergency about what constitutes teacher quality and how it should be measured (Sindelar et al., 2005). Stakeholders, therefore, use different measures including (a) process-product research, (b) teacher evaluation checklists, (c) standards, (d) large-scale surveys, and (e) commercial observation systems of classroom teachers (Blanton et al., 2006) to assess teacher quality depending on their purposes (Anderson & Hendrickson, 2007; Blanton et al., 2006). Policymakers and education professionals also make use of students' standardized achievement test scores as a measure of teacher quality.

Sindelar et al. (2005) point out that defining teacher quality on the basis of practices that teachers use is ineffectual because classroom observations are rare. Furthermore, special educators serve children with varying disabilities across age levels and in various settings; therefore, assessment of classroom practice has to take into account students' ages, cognitive and behavioral needs as well as the setting (i.e. resource, self-contained, or co-teaching). Brownell et al. (2009) argue that due to the fact that a qualified elementary special educator should know how to teach students to read, it is fair to expect that elementary special educators' knowledge for beginning reading instruction should play a key role in assessing their quality. However, Brownell et al. (2009) concede that teachers' knowledge of reading instruction only occasionally correlates to a student's improvement in reading. These findings are reflected in Darling-Hammond's (2000a) study of ways in which teacher qualifications and other school inputs are related to student achievement across states which showed that teacher preparation (i.e., degree in the field to be taught and full certification) had significant effects on student achievement in reading and mathematics. Licensure examinations should be aligned with teacher preparation program curriculum and, although licensure examinations vary from state to state, the examinations can be used to determine those qualified to teach if the exams accurately measure the skills, abilities, and knowledge needed for beginning teachers to successfully perform their jobs (Thompson, Lazarus & Thurlow, 2003).

The purpose of measuring teacher quality and how the results will be used should determine the use of one model or measure of teacher quality over another; however, Blanton et al. (2006) encourage the use of multiple measures to assess teacher quality in addition to linking teacher quality to student outcomes in special education teacher research. Nevertheless, researchers (e.g., Brownell et al., 2009; Carlson et al., 2004; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005)

acknowledge the difficulties involved in linking teachers' competence to student achievement due to the nature of service delivery in special education. For example, special education teachers often co-teach with general education teachers, so both general and special education teachers have an effect on student achievement (Carlson et al., 2004). Lack of a universal definition of teacher quality notwithstanding, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC, 2009) contends that with regard to student achievement, a teacher is the single most influential variable and, therefore, a qualified beginning special educator should possess pedagogical knowledge and skills to practice effectively, hold at least a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, and demonstrate mastery of appropriate core academic subject matter content. "The ability of the teacher to integrate all competencies in relation to each child's needs at any time, may be the ultimate test of his or her real competence as a teacher" (Mackie et al., 1957, p. 49).

Although standardized achievement test scores may be a close approximation of student learning, the scores only depict a minute percentage of overall student learning. Furthermore, as Blanton et al. (2006) point out, several factors affect students' performance on standardized tests (e.g., prior knowledge, poor test taking); therefore, reliance on standardized test scores as the sole measure of teacher quality would be misleading. On the other hand, classroom practices such as employing appropriate instructional techniques, managing behavior, monitoring student progress, differentiating instruction and collaboration, may be used as specific measures in evaluating effectiveness of specific interventions such as a district-wide professional development and are better than a broad measure as they are more sensitive to change (Carlson et al., 2004).

Blanton et al. (2006) opine that standards have limited potential as outcome measures in special education teacher education research except as a guide to survey or interview

development in follow-up or longitudinal research because they do not offer an empirically validated assessment process for students. Teacher education coursework or subject matter knowledge has a positive influence on teachers' effectiveness including student achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2000a). Researchers may use an aggregate measure of teacher quality to establish the effects of teacher quality on student achievement if separate aspects of teacher quality have a statistically insignificant or minimal effect on student achievement while an aggregate measure of teacher quality for the same teacher accounts for more variance in student achievement Carlson et al. (2004).

While high-quality educators and scientifically based interventions are important to promote student success, they are not enough to off-set the impact family strife, crime, substance abuse, physical and sexual abuse, neglect, and homelessness have on student achievement and school success. (Bullock & Gable, 2004, p. 83)

### Competencies for Teachers of Students with EBD

Expertise in teaching, as in any other field, requires a foundation of domain-specific knowledge that facilitates efficient and effective utilization of strategic knowledge. Although competencies on their own do not ensure effective teaching, they may be used to enlighten students about skills required to be a good teacher (Reynolds, 1999). The 1957 study on the qualification and preparation of teachers of exceptional children, funded by the office of education, initiated investigations into teacher competencies that contributed to successful teaching of students with various disabilities (Mackie & Williams, 1959). Part of that study involved identification of distinctive competencies required of teachers of students with EBD. The competencies identified addressed two domain areas of teaching: (a) knowledge and understanding and (b) abilities, skills, and techniques. The competencies in the knowledge and understanding domain area relate to “(a) growth, development, and emotional disturbances; (b)

learning problems and abilities; (c) social and cultural factors; and (d) agencies and legal framework” (p. 10). Competencies related to the abilities, skills, and techniques domain were those that enabled the teacher to work with colleagues, parents, and students (Mackie et al., 1957). The 1957 nationwide study confirmed that special educators’ preparation should contain distinctive knowledge, skills, and abilities in each disability category for which they may be assigned (Mackie & Williams, 1959).

Since the 1957 study, several investigators have endeavored to establish the specific competencies that teachers of students with various disabilities would need (e.g., knowledge and skills for teaching reading to students with LD [Brownell et al., 2009]; knowledge and skills in classroom organization and behavior management for teachers of students with EBD [Oliver & Reschly, 2010]; knowledge and skills for teaching students with hearing impairments in self-contained or resource settings [Roberson, Woosley, Seabrooks, & Williams, 2004]. Historical studies related to determining competencies needed by teachers of students with EBD have been reported (e.g., Bullock & Whelan, 1971; Dorward, 1963; Shores et al., 1973).

In 1966, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) adopted standards for the preparation of personnel designed to guide the preparation of special education teachers. In 1981, the CEC issued and added certifications to the standards for beginning teachers. Changes in the field of special education resulted in a review of the original CEC standards and culminated in the development and adoption of new standards (CEC, 1983). The original CEC standards have since been reviewed periodically and changes made to accommodate developments in the field. In that light, the current CEC standards now include two levels (a) initial level for beginning special educators and (b) advanced levels for continuing special educators to provide opportunities for career advancement. The knowledge and skill sets are contained in ten content



domains: foundations, development and characteristics of learners, individual learning differences, instructional strategies, learning environments/social interactions, language, instructional planning, assessment, professional and ethical practice, and collaboration (CEC, 2009). In addition to CEC, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) develop standards that are used as benchmarks for developing courses and curricula, revising policy and procedures for program accreditation, licensure, and continuing practice in majority of the states (Blanton et al., 2006; CEC, 2003). According to Darling-Hammond (2000a), teaching standards have the potential to raise the quality of teacher preparation, but if school districts continue to employ teachers who are unprepared then the HQT will have no effect on students with disabilities. The CEC content standards inform teacher preparation curriculum, and represent the knowledge and skills that special education professionals should have to be considered effective (CEC, 2009).

Students with EBD exhibit complex and challenging behaviors that place them at increased risk for school failure, drug and alcohol abuse, and multiple arrests (Wehby, Lane & Falk, 2003). As a result of concerns regarding poor educational outcomes of students with EBD, IDEA 1990 included a specific federal initiative to achieve better educational results for students with EBD (Cheney & Barringer, 1995). One way to accomplish positive educational outcomes was to provide and maintain an adequate number of qualified personnel. Teachers of students with EBD, regardless of the setting (i.e., self-contained classroom, hospital, or detention facility), need competencies beyond those needed by other special education and general education teachers (Mackie et al., 1957).

IDEA 1997 mandated the participation of students with disabilities in state assessments. NCLB broadened this requirement by including provisions that states and school districts show evidence that students with disabilities are making progress on grade-level academic content (Thompson et al., 2006). Therefore, states, school districts, and schools must ensure that their teachers have the required competencies to assist their students meet the goals of adequate yearly progress (AYP).

### Factors Influencing Teacher Competence

Student characteristics and needs, the nature of teacher preparation, and teacher shortage are examples of factors that can influence a teacher's ability to demonstrate proficiency in teaching.

#### *Academic and Social Needs of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders*

Students with EBD qualify for special education and other services under the U.S. Department of Education category of serious emotional disturbance. The students with disabilities served under the EBD category are a heterogeneous group who exhibit social, academic, and behavior problems (Rutherford, Quinn, & Mathur, 1996). The challenging behaviors exhibited by students with EBD disrupts young children's school readiness (Joseph & Strain, 2003; Kendziora, 2004), interferes with the learning of others (Kendziora, 2004; Wehby et al., 2003), stresses teachers (Joseph & Strain, 2003; Sutherland, Lewis-Palmer, Stichter, & Morgan, 2008), and without intervention can become a lifelong concern (Joseph & Strain, 2003). Research has proved that early intervention and positive behavior supports for students with

challenging behavior leads to positive behavior outcomes (e.g., Duda, Dunlap, Fox, Lentini, & Clark, 2004; Kendziora, 2004).

The needs and services of students with EBD vary greatly (Lane et al., 2005). Some students' needs are met successfully with few adjustments in the general education classroom while other students require extensive residential care, clinical therapy or even hospitalization (Mackie et al., 1957). A combination of academic deficits and behavior problems increases the challenges that educators face in providing quality instruction to students with EBD (Sutherland et al., 2008). Moreover, one child having a "bad" day among a group of children can lead to a "chain of reactive behavior" (Kendziora, 2004, p. 331). Although most educators endeavor to meet the academic and behavioral needs of students with EBD, they often become discouraged by the lack of sustainable effective intervention programs (Eber, Sugai, Smith, & Scott, 2002). However, some educators may be unable to address disruptive student behavior due to inadequate preparation.

Persistent exposure to extremely challenging behavior may result in early burnout, frustration, feelings of inadequacy, exhaustion, stress, anger, embarrassment, and disappointment among teachers of students with EBD (Kendziora, 2004). Although students with EBD in public schools represent a small percentage of the total student population, they account for more than fifty percent of the behavioral incidents handled by school personnel, taking up significant amounts of teachers and administrators' time and resources (Eber et al., 2002).

Research has shown that behavioral interventions, social skills instruction, and effective academic instruction can be used to address disruptive behaviors in the classroom (e.g., Lane, Gresham, & O'Shaughnessy, 2002; Wehby et al., 2003). Teacher praise, scaffolding, direct instruction, instructional accommodations and modifications, and student choice applied

consistently (Lewis, Hudson, Richter, & Johnson, 2004; Niesyn, 2009), in addition to positive behavior supports and functional behavioral assessment-based interventions, are effective instructional strategies that increase on task behavior and decrease disruptive behavior in the classroom (Lewis et al., 2004). Too often evidence-based practices are not applied consistently in classrooms serving students with EBD. Lack of skills, knowledge, time, fear of change, and current dissemination practices have been cited as some of the reasons behind the research-to-practice gap. Process-product studies have shown that when students with disabilities receive intensive, explicit instruction, they make significant gains. Unfortunately, not many students receiving special education services receive adequate intensive explicit instruction (e.g., Brownell et al., 2009; Niesyn, 2009). In a review of textbooks used in the preparation of teachers of students with EBD, Lane and colleagues (2002) found that most contained insufficient content on instruction in academic areas. For example, Brownell et al. (2009) found that elementary and middle school special education teachers, when teaching reading, rely more on generic teaching practices than on instructional strategies specific to reading instruction. Teacher preparation for teachers of students with EBD should focus on preparing teachers to use best practices to ensure that students are adequately served.

The existing literature highlights the complex relationship between learning and behavior problems. Behavioral problems and academic deficits are correlated although the causal relation is still indeterminate (Oliver & Reschly, 2010). Therefore, to ensure desirable outcomes for students with EBD, classroom-based interventions should target both behavior and academic needs (Sutherland et al., 2008).

### *Teacher Preparation*

Federal policies such as NCLB underscore the significance of the role of teachers in student achievement by requiring that all students with disabilities be taught by a HQT (Rosenberg, Sindelar, & Hardman, 2004). This requirement for HQTs, in addition to the move towards greater accountability for student achievement, signifies that all teachers need to become knowledgeable about standards, assessments, and accountability systems thus changing the nature of teacher preparation and certification. The requirement for teachers who are more knowledgeable about standards and assessments places increasing responsibility on institutions of higher education (IHEs) and state departments of education to ensure that beginning teachers are equipped with the knowledge and skills they need to be effective (e.g., Thompson et al., 2003; Zions, Shellady, & Zions, 2006). Most teacher educators recognize that their programs influence the quality of their graduates (McLesky & Ross, 2004) and, therefore, periodically review their programs to meet changing needs and standards.

In the late 1950s the role of the federal government in the preparation of personnel to work with students with disabilities began to be in evidence. For example, the passage of the Training of Professional Personnel Act of 1959 (Public Law 85-926), supported the development of university programs to prepare educators to serve children with mental retardation (i.e., intellectual disabilities; Burke, 1976; Smith, 2006). It was followed in 1961 by the Teachers of the Deaf Act, a law making provision for the training of teachers of students who were deaf (McLesky & Ross, 2004). The passage of Public Law 88-164, the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act in 1963 expanded the scope of educator training to include professionals working with children with speech impairment, visual impairment, serious emotional disturbance, physical and mental health impairments (Burke,

1976). This law led to an increase in teacher education programs for students with EBD owing to the provision of funds for teacher preparation and student stipends (Whelan & Kauffman, 1999). Additional amendments affecting personnel preparation programs for professionals serving children with disabilities followed sparking a growth of personnel preparation programs from fewer than 40 to over 400 during the period from 1958 to 1976 (Burke, 1976). The increase in teachers and other professionals working in special education and the expansion in teacher preparation programs in special education would probably not have occurred without federal funding and is probably the rationale behind ongoing federal involvement in teacher preparation (Smith, 2006).

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the emphasis of IHE personnel preparation programs was on increasing the number of special educators to curb the growing shortage in school districts around the country (Kleinhammer-Tramill & Fiore, 2003). An educational reform movement begun in the 1980s with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), followed by several legislative mandates (e.g., Goals 2000: Educate America Act [2000]; Improving America's Schools Act [1994]; NCLB [2004]; Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act [IDEA] 2004). Around 2004, the U.S. Department of Education began to shift the focus from personnel quantity to personnel quality (Brownell et al., 2005; Rosenberg et al., 2004; Swanson & Stevenson, 2002). Teacher educators have the responsibility of generating highly qualified special education professionals who are able to apply evidence-based strategies in the classroom to ensure improved student achievement (Smith, 2006). Therefore, the focus of teacher preparation during the current standards era is on preparing quality personnel who are going to be held accountable for increasing student performance (Boe et al., 2007; Brownell et al., 2010; Rosenberg et al., 2004).

There is an ongoing nationwide shortage of qualified teachers in the sciences and special education. This shortage has been attributed to growing school enrollment, rising rates of teacher retirements, teacher turnover, and a decreasing number of trained graduates from teacher education programs (Boe et al., 2008; Brown & Wynn, 2009; Katsiyannis et al., 2003). The inability of traditional teacher education programs to meet the demand for teachers, in addition to criticism about the quality of traditional teacher preparation has led to the proliferation of alternative teacher certification routes (Brownell et al., 2005; Rosenberg et al., 2007).

Both general and special education lack objective, comprehensive measures of teacher quality and consequently cannot adequately evaluate the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs (Carlson et al., 2004). The best measure of a teacher education program's effectiveness is the extent to which its graduates promote student success (Brownell et al., 2010; Sindelar et al., 2005).

One of the outstanding leaders in the field of EBD, Richard Whelan, described ideal future teacher preparation programs for students with EBD as providing didactic experiences in the classrooms while integrating field experiences that use research-based practices. Graduates of these programs would function as classroom teachers, consultants to general education teachers, clinicians in home and community settings as well as case managers who coordinate services from other agencies (Whelan & Kauffman, 1999).

Most of the interactions between teachers and students with EBD involve instances of inappropriate student behavior (Wehby et al., 2003). Therefore, personnel preparation programs should prepare graduates to respond effectively to the inappropriate behavior and violence that may encounter as teachers in schools (Whelan & Kauffman, 1999). Findings of the 2007-2008 crime, violence, discipline, and safety survey revealed that the rate of violent incidents was 41

per 1,000 students in middle school, 26 and 22 per 1,000 students in elementary and high school respectively (Neiman & Devoe, 2009). These statistics underscore the need for training in and application of evidence-based behavior management strategies in today's classrooms. Research has also shown a correlation between teachers' actions and student behavior (Anderson & Hendrickson, 2007; Sutherland et al., 2008) as well as teacher competence and student achievement (Blanton et al., 2006). The ability of teachers to implement effective instruction leads to improved academic and behavioral outcomes for students with EBD (Lewis et al., 2004; Sutherland et al., 2008). Without empirically validated intervention, students with EBD are likely to experience poor social and academic outcomes (Lane et al., 2005; Oliver & Reschly, 2010).

Often personnel preparation programs for teachers of students with EBD emphasize classroom student behavior management and place less emphasis on academic instruction, producing teachers who are poorly trained in implementation of effective instructional strategies (e.g., Lane et al., 2002; Wehby et al., 2003). Comparably, in a review of 26 university special education teacher preparation course syllabi, Oliver and Reschly (2010) found that universities assigned less preparation time to developing structured environments, active supervision and student engagement, school-wide behavioral expectations, and classroom routines than individual behavior management intervention. Well-trained teachers are more likely to implement effective instructional and behavioral strategies that eventually decrease disruptive student behavior (Wehby et al.).

Credentials, experience, self-efficacy, professional activities, and selected classroom practices may be used individually or as an aggregate measure of teacher quality. These measures can be applied to evaluate outcomes of personnel policies, teacher preparation



programs, professional staff development, and inform stakeholders on how to improve policies and programs in order to prepare and retain HQTs (Carlson et al., 2004).

### *Teacher Shortage*

Increased birth rates, immigration, and lower class sizes have caused changes in student population numbers resulting in a shortage of teachers (Brown & Wynn, 2009; Murnane & Steele, 2007). Retirement and increased attrition, as well as new teachers exiting the classroom to seek employment in other fields, have been cited as additional causes of teacher shortage. Researchers (e.g., Brown & Wynn, 2009; Murnane & Steele, 2007) estimate that about two million new teachers must be hired over the next decade to accommodate the current teacher shortage. New teachers tend to leave during the first five years of service advancing a workforce of less experienced teachers as well as adding to the shortage (Wynn, Carboni, & Patall, 2007). The shortage of teachers across the nation is particularly severe in special education (e.g., Brownell et al., 2004; Katsiyannis et al., 2003; McLeskey, Tyler & Flippin, 2004) especially in the field of EBD (Billingsley et al., 2006). There is every indication that the current shortages will continue to rise (McLesky et al., 2004). According to U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008), the number of unemployed people in 2007 in education, training, and library occupations was 198,000 and this number was expected to rise to 247,000 in 2008. Increasing school enrollment and teacher retirements will further increase the existing teacher shortage. Moreover, the number of new teachers being prepared annually falls short of the number of teachers needed to fill teaching vacancies in special education each year. Some researchers (e.g., Cook & Boe, 2007; Katsiyannis et al., 2003; McLesky et al., 2004; Miller, Brownell, & Smith, 1999) contend that the supply of teachers from traditional teacher preparation programs (i.e., four or five year

university programs) is insufficient to meet the demand for qualified special education teachers since most of the teachers enrolled in graduate teacher preparation programs are already employed. In addition, others complete the programs but do not join the teaching force (Sindelar et al., 2005). The challenge for school districts is not only to fill the vacancies, but to recruit and retain teachers who will have a positive impact on students' achievement (Murnane & Steele, 2007).

According to the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress (2009), the critical shortage of HQTs is attributed to high attrition rates and, therefore, efforts geared toward alleviating the teacher shortage should focus on developing and implementing innovative teacher retention programs. The requirements for teacher certification including degrees, coursework and test scores, is left to individual states (Wayne & Youngs, 2003). Some states have responded to the never ending shortage by relaxing the requirements for obtaining licensure allowing anyone who can pass the state examination and who has a bachelor's degree to be certified (McLesky & Ross, 2004). The practice of hiring unlicensed teachers as well as issuance of emergency, temporary, or provisional licenses to candidates who meet or do not meet the requirements has been on the increase in recent years as the demand for teachers has grown (Darling-Hammond, 2000a).

Researchers have investigated the issue of teacher shortage seeking solutions from different perspectives. For example, Richardson, Alexander, and Castleberry (2008) found that emotive dissonance, emotive effort, and communication symmetry accounted for 26 percent of the variance in teachers' intent to leave. Greenlee and Brown (1998) examined work conditions and strategies of principals who are successful in retaining teachers in challenging schools. Wynn et al. (2007) investigated school climate and the role of principal leadership in beginning teachers' intent to stay.

The problem of teacher attrition affects all schools nationwide, but the impact is particularly severe for schools in low-income communities and special education (Greenlee & Brown, 2009). Children in low-income communities as well as minority children are often disproportionately assigned to the least prepared teachers (Murnane & Steele, 2007). Recruitment and retention of qualified teachers are two critical factors that need to be addressed in solving the teacher shortage. Teacher shortage in special education is greater than in general education (Boe et al., 2009; Cook & Boe, 2007) and considerably higher in the area of EBD than in other areas of special education (Billingsley et al., 2006; Henderson et al., 2005; Center & Stevenson, 2001; Katsiyannis et al., 2003). The field of EBD with its associated stresses and time-consuming paperwork that teachers must complete to comply with federal and state laws make the task of recruiting teachers into the field more difficult (Whelan & Kauffman, 1999). Henderson et al. (2005) revealed that teachers of students with EBD are the least satisfied with their working conditions when compared with special education teachers in other categories. Stress and frustration resulting from work challenges (e.g., inaccurate or incomplete student records, slow student progress, lack of administrative support, unsuitable teaching materials), have been associated with dissatisfaction among special education teachers (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). A fifty-year historical review of stress in teaching dating back to the 1930s by Smith and Milstein (1984), as cited by Wrobel (1993), lists teachers' concerns as rewarding individuals by longevity in the field versus achievement, lack or insufficient support from administrators, isolation, minimal control over decisions affecting them, lack of opportunities for career advancement, inadequate or irrelevant pre-service training, and inadequate training. Two decades later, teachers who participated in the 2002 SPeNSE study reported similar concerns. Teachers cited student disrespect of teachers, lack of motivation, and acts of cruelty by students in addition

to lack of parental involvement, lack of administrative support, overwhelming legal requirements, administrative duties and policies, and a lack of coordination between agencies serving students with disabilities as leading causes of their decision to leave the profession (Carlson et al., 2002).

Job dissatisfaction is another factor in attrition among special education teachers. Challenges that beginning special educators were not prepared for (i.e., inaccurate or incomplete student records, students with multiple disabilities, inconsistent etiologies, slow student progress, individualized support and instruction for a large group of students, behavior problems, and untrained teachers' aides) foster frustration and dissatisfaction (Stempien & Loeb, 2002). These and other factors lead to more special education teachers leaving their teaching positions than their peers in general education (Katsiyannis et al., 2003). Susceptibility to stress significantly impacts a teacher's decision to stay or leave the profession (Center & Stevenson, 2001). Six percent of the special education teachers who participated in the SPeNSE study planned to stop teaching. Seventy-six percent of the teachers who planned to leave teaching indicated that they had too much paperwork that interfered with their ability to teach effectively. Other reasons included excessive workloads, lack of full certification, and serving students with four or more different primary disabilities (Carlson et al., 2002). Many beginning special education teachers who are inadequately prepared for teaching assignments in special education, but adequately trained in general education, tend to switch to teaching assignments in general education during the first three years of teaching (Boe, Cook, & Sunderland, 2008). Careful consideration needs to be given to the match between what a teacher is trained to do and what he or she will be expected to do in a particular school district (Wrobel, 1993).

According to Nelson (2001) and Wrobel (1993), job related stress contributes to teacher attrition among teachers of students with EBD. However, teachers who go through extended teacher education programs have been found to enter and remain in teaching at higher rates than teachers prepared in short-term programs (Darling-Hammond, 2000a). Well prepared teachers are less likely to leave the profession than poorly prepared teachers (McLeskey et al., 2004). Extensive training programs equip teachers with the knowledge and skills that promote effective teaching which in turn promotes their resilience.

There appears to be an increase in the number of teachers of students with EBD who have no specialized preparation to work with the students. For example, in the 2001-2002 school year, over 800,000 students with disabilities receiving special education services were served by teachers who were not fully certified (Sindelar et al., 2005). These teacher shortages negatively impact the provision of quality education and related services to the nation's students with disabilities in public schools (Boe et al., 2008; Brown & Wynn, 2009; OSEP, 2004 as cited by Cook & Boe, 2007; Katsiyannis et al., 2003; Miller et al., 1999). Reducing teacher attrition by eliminating factors that contribute to the high attrition rate of special education teachers (e.g., excessive workload, lack of or inadequate administrative support) may aid in alleviating teacher shortage (McLeskey et al., 2004). Unfortunately, only about one third of teacher attrition in special education is attributed to seeking better jobs outside of education due to poor working conditions; therefore, work place improvements will most likely have a small impact on teachers who leave the profession for personal reasons which account for two-thirds of the reasons teachers leave special education (Boe et al., 2008). Efforts at improving the retention of HQTs such as reorganizing special education service delivery, streamlining special education referrals, and increasing inclusion (Katsiyannis et al., 2003) are other approaches that might curb teacher

shortage resulting from increasing demand created by the enlarging special education student population (Boe, 2006).

Shortages in some states and districts are self-made. For example, Darling-Hammond (2000a) found some districts have in place bureaucratic hiring procedures that prevent efficient and timely hiring (e.g., the 62-step hiring process in Fairfax County, Virginia). Similarly, enforcing requirements for HQTs (e.g., in Massachusetts certified teachers from other states cannot enter the local teaching force until they have passed Massachusetts' own test, which is not offered during summer) now and again discourages qualified candidates who are unwilling to wait resulting in hiring of less-qualified candidates.

#### *Theory to Practice: Teacher Self-Efficacy*

In 1957, teachers who were considered HQT identified classroom techniques for relieving tensions as the most important competency for teachers of students with EBD (Mackie et al., 1957). In 1971, teachers of students with EBD cited providing students with experiences that can help them be successful, as the most important competency (Bullock & Whelan, 1971). According to Fink and Janssen (1993), direct service providers considered structured classroom environments, levels system, identifying the nature and source of behavior problems, identifying the needed social skills, and being able to teach as being the most important competencies for teachers of students with EBD. Preliminary findings of Project Destiny, a three year research and training project on competencies for middle school teachers of students with EBD, indicated that teachers considered themselves most competent in managing the learning environment. However, teachers were little to moderately competent in mean ratings of proficiency in the five

domains: managing the learning environment, communication and collaboration, characteristics of learners, and managing individual students with EBD (Cheney & Barringer, 1995).

Sutherland, Denny, and Gunter (2005) found that teachers of students with EBD were more at ease collaborating with other teachers to provide academic instruction and less confident in providing academic instruction to their students on their own. In a study aimed at examining the theoretical knowledge and classroom practices of early career teachers of students with EBD, Anderson and Hendrickson (2007) found significant disparity between the teachers' theoretical knowledge and overall teaching performance. However, they found significant positive correlation between teachers' knowledge and teachers' use of individualized support strategies. The teachers in the Anderson and Hendrickson (2007) study rated use of tokens, effectively managing transitions, adjusting the physical environment, and individualizing antecedents and consequences as lowest in importance. In addition, no significant correlation was found between teachers of students with EBD's ratings of the importance of competencies and their use of those competencies in the classroom. Results of a study investigating beginning teacher quality revealed that beginning teachers who go through rigorous pre-service and in-service preparation exhibit higher levels of teaching skills (Sindelar et al., 2005). Teacher preparation programs can support the teacher in accruing competence in developing individualized instruction techniques, creative problem-solving as well as other requisite skills. Classroom and behavior management skills are valuable skills for a teacher of students with EBD to possess, because of the complex nature of their students and because conflicts and problems are part of any changing workplace (Wrobel, 1993).

Teachers of students with EBD in the SPeNSE surveys rated themselves as being skillful in use of best practices in behavior management strategies, but rated themselves as less skillful in

preparing students for and interpreting results of standardized testing than their other counterparts in special education (Henderson et al., 2005). In a study investigating teachers' preparedness to teach, over 200 teachers of students with EBD rated the quality of their pre-service programs positively but felt their teacher training program did not prepare them for real classroom experiences (Billingsley et al., 2006).

Beginning special education teachers tend to struggle with pedagogical practices in reading, however, they have relatively strong classroom management practices. Studies of beginning teachers suggest that they might not possess engaged knowledge during the early stages in their career (Brownell et al., 2009). Research into the extent to which research and best practices are implemented in the classrooms observed or interned in by pre-service teachers is lacking (Zionts et al., 2006).

### Summary

Teachers are the single most influential school-based variable in the academic achievement of students. A teacher's competence can influence the academic and social outcomes of a student with EBD. Ultimately, a well prepared teacher who applies evidence-based strategies to plan the educational programming of students is more likely to achieve success than an inadequately prepared teacher. The need for specific skills and knowledge for teachers of students with and without disabilities is undisputed. However, the literature highlights teachers' lack of proficiency in essential skills and knowledge and the divergent views about teacher quality and how it should be measured. Fast track alternative certification routes to get teachers quickly into the classroom have a negative effect on students, especially those with disabilities. The federal mandates calling for HQTs and accountability for all students can be met



by extensive teacher preparation and ongoing professional development. Students with EBD have both academic and behavioral needs that must to be addressed for the students to be successful. Therefore, teachers who serve this population need preparation in programming, behavior management, as well as remedial strategies. Current reform efforts in the education of children with disabilities signify a need for ongoing research on the importance of these competencies for teachers of students with disabilities and their successful implementation in the classroom.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology used in the investigation. It includes a description of the participants, research design, instrumentation, and procedures for data collection and analysis.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was (a) to identify competencies perceived as important by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on preparing teachers to serve students with EBD and (b) to examine ratings of educators' perceived proficiency on each of the competencies. A third purpose was to compare ratings of importance on competencies rated in the 1957 (Mackie, Kvaraceus, & Williams) study, 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the current study.

#### Research Questions

The following research questions were used to guide this study:

Research Question 1: What competencies do educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD perceive as important for success in teaching students with EBD?

Research Question 2: In what category (ies) of knowledge and skills do educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD feel most proficient?

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between educators' ratings of importance and their ratings of proficiency in the competencies?

Research Question 4: In what ways do educators ratings of importance of competencies in the current study differ based on their education, the geographic location where they work, and years of experience?

Research Question 5: What are the differences among the ratings of importance of the competencies or categories of competencies by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study, the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the current study?

Research Question 6: Utilizing data from the 1957 study, 1971 study, and the current study, what are the similarities and differences among the ratings of proficiency of competencies or categories of competencies by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD?

### Research Design

This is a non-experimental correlational study designed to investigate educators of students with EBD ratings of selected competencies and perceptions of their proficiency in those competencies. The current study utilized 88 competencies that were developed for the Mackie et al. (1957) study and used in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study. A comparison of the ratings on importance and proficiency from the 1957, 1971, and the current study was carried out.

### Instrument

Participants completed a web-based survey (Appendix A) containing three sections: (a) demographic information including level and type of educator preparation received as well as number of years teaching students with EBD, (b) competency and proficiency rating scale, and (c) ratings of experiences in the preparation of educators of students with EBD.

The competency rating scale was comprised of 88 competencies derived from the Mackie et al. (1957) study and used in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study. Participants ranked the competencies on their perceived importance using a four-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not important*; 2 = *less important*; 3 = *important*; 4 = *very important*). Participants also rated their perceived proficiency on each competency using a scale of 1 – 3 (1 = *not prepared*; 2 = *fair*; 3 = *good*).

## Participants

The target population for this study was educators of students with EBD who completed a university-based teacher preparation program with a focus on serving students with EBD. The study sample consisted of educators who are members of the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD), a division of the CEC. After permission to proceed with the study was granted by the University of North Texas Institutional Review Board (IRB), an email requesting access to the CCBD directory was sent to the CCBD. Contact information for the participants was furnished by the CCBD. The obtained email list was entered into a computer database and randomly assigned a four digit number. Participants for this study were selected by choosing the even numbers from the email list of members of the CCBD. Participants varied in age, gender, and experience. Only participants who had completed a university-based program for educators of students with EBD were selected for participation in this study. Participants were current K -12 teachers or had previous teaching experience but were currently in different educational roles.

## Data Collection

An electronic mail message inviting recipients to participate in the survey was sent to the selected participants. The invitation described the purpose of the study and contained a hyperlink to the survey. Participants accessed the survey instrument (Appendix A) via any computer with an Internet connection after entering the access code provided in the email invitation. No names or personally identifiable information was used in the study. The survey instrument was composed of three sections: (a) demographic information, (b) competency rating scale, and (c) teacher preparation experiences. The competency rating scale utilized the initial competencies

developed and used in the Mackie et al. (1957) and the Bullock and Whelan (1971) studies. The competency rating scale was used to obtain information on participants' perceived importance of 88 competencies as well as their perceived proficiency for each competency. In the Mackie et al. (1957) study, the 75 participants were from 15 states and had specialized training in EBD. In the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study, forty-seven teachers of students with EBD from a mid-western state participated. In the present study participants included 75 educators who self-reported having completed a university-based program for teachers of students with EBD.

### Data Analysis

The mean ratings of importance were computed by multiplying the number of competencies ranked *very important* by 4, those ranked *important* by 3, those ranked *less important* by 2, and those ranked *not important* by 1. The results for each ranking were then added together and divided by the number of checks for each competency. The mean ratings on proficiency of each competency were computed by multiplying ratings of *good* by 3, ratings of *fair* by 2, and ratings of *not prepared* by 1. The results were then added together and divided by the number of checks for each competency. The standard deviation for each distribution (ratings of importance and ratings of proficiency) was computed. The mean scores were then compared using standard scores ( $z$ ) (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003).

The 88 competencies were grouped into nine categories that correspond to CEC's initial and advanced professional content standards and knowledge skill sets for teachers of individuals with exceptional needs with EBD (CEC, 2009). The CEC content standards were selected because the CEC standards for beginning special educators are the standards most widely adopted by state education agencies. In addition, the CEC standards for beginning special

educators are the standards adopted by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), one of three nationally accrediting agencies recognized by the U.S. Department of Education (U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Content analysis was used to analyze each competency to identify core themes that reflect CEC content standards. Patton (2002) defines content analysis as “any qualitative data reduction and sense-making effort that takes a volume of qualitative material and attempts to identify core consistencies and meanings” (p. 453). Themes from each CEC content standard (CEC, 2009) were used as thematic codes. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003) point out that “employing a coding system that has been used in previous research saves the time required to develop your own system. Also, the use of standard coding categories permits comparison with other studies that have used the same system” (p. 279). A chart for the CEC content standards with the identified thematic codes underlined was created using Microsoft®<sup>1</sup> Word software. The 88 Mackie et al. (1957) study competencies were examined and the identified thematic codes applied to each competency. The competencies with the thematic codes applied were entered into the chart. Refer to Appendix B full description of the 88 competencies grouped into 9 standards and thematic codes applied to each competency. The competencies were classified into 9 categories that correspond to CEC standard domain areas of foundations; development and characteristics of learners; individual learning differences; instructional strategies; learning environments and social interactions; instructional planning; assessment; professional and ethical practice; and collaboration. A factorial ANOVA was computed to determine the relationship between educators’ level of education, years of experience, and geographic work location and ratings of importance and proficiency of each competency. The CEC thematic codes (CEC, 2009) were used to group the 88 competencies into

---

<sup>1</sup> Microsoft Corporation, <http://www.microsoft.com>

9 standards. The nine standards were the dependent variables in the analyses of data (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Data Analysis Categories and Thematic Codes*

Standard	Thematic codes
Foundations of special education	Principles and theories; laws and policies; historical and human issues
Development and characteristics of learners	Similarities and differences in human development; exceptional conditions, abilities and behaviors
Individual learning differences	Effects of an exceptional condition on individual's learning; primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds
Instructional strategies	Instructional strategies; individualized instruction; positive learning results; general and special curricula; learning environments; critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills; self awareness, self-management, self-control, and self-esteem; development, maintenance and generalization of knowledge
Learning environments	Learning environments; emotional well-being, positive social interactions; active engagement; diversity; independence; general education; integrate individuals with exceptional learning needs; direct motivational and instructional interventions
Instructional planning	Individualized instructional plans; goals and objectives; explicit modeling
Educational Assessment	Multiple types of assessment information; legal and ethical principles of measurement and assessment; measurement theory and practices; formal and informal assessments; appropriate technologies
Professional and ethical practice	Multiple roles and complex situations; professional and ethical considerations; professional activities; lifelong learners; evidence-based test practices; limits of practice
Collaboration Among Stakeholders	Collaborate with families, other educators, related service personnel from community agencies.

*Note.* From *What Every Special Educator Must Know: Ethics, Standards, and Guidelines* (6<sup>th</sup> ed. p. 24-25), by Council for Exceptional Children, 2009, Arlington, VA: Author. Copyright 2009 by the Council for Exceptional Children. Reprinted with permission.

To assess the relationship between the ratings of importance and ratings of proficiency within the present study, the Spearman rho ( $\rho$ ) correlation coefficient (Hinkle et al., 2003) was used. Statistical analysis of variance (ANOVA; Hinkle et al.) was used to determine the relationship among the rankings of importance and rankings of proficiency in the present study. To compare mean ratings of importance and proficiency among the three studies a Cohen's *d* was computed.



## CHAPTER 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the analysis of data obtained, procedures employed, and the results of the study. The purpose of this study was to identify competencies perceived as important by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on preparing teachers to serve students with Emotional/ Behavioral Disorders (EBD). The study examined the educators' ratings of their proficiency on each competency. A comparison of ratings of importance and proficiency on competencies was carried out among three groups of teachers: (a) participants in this study, (b) participants in the 1957 (Mackie, Kvaraceus, & Williams) study, and (c) participants in the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study.

Data from this study were analyzed using Predictive Analytics Software (PASW) statistical software and Microsoft <sup>®</sup> Excel software. These analyses included descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and analyses of variance.

#### Demographic Data

A total of 91 respondents attempted the survey, however, 16 surveys were not included in the data analysis due to large amounts of incomplete data. A few of the 75 surveys included in the data analysis had some missing data; however, the items skipped were not consistent across all respondents. Data from respondents who completed at least 90% of the survey are included in the analysis. Missing data is a problem experienced in most data collection projects because respondents may skip items that are difficult to answer, that request personal information, or may skip items because they do not apply to them (Knoke, Bohrnstedt, & Mee, 2002). The sample size is reflective of the current certification status of most teachers in the area of EBD. A

---

<sup>2</sup> Microsoft Corporation, <http://www.microsoft.com>

significant number of beginning teachers of students with EBD are either not fully certified, have emergency certification, or are certified in other fields (Billingsley, Fall, & Williams, 2006; Henderson, Klein, Gonzalez, & Bradley 2005). The total sample  $N = 75$  was composed of 23.1% male educators and 60.4% female educators; 16.5% of the respondents did not indicate their gender. Although the largest number of educators in this sample was female, Billingsley et al. (2006) found the proportion of male teachers is higher in the category of EBD when compared with other special education categories.

The survey questionnaire requested participants to provide other demographic information including current position, highest level of education attained, years of experience, and geographic work location. These demographic factors provide valuable data because groups of participants often differ significantly on important issues (Alreck & Settle, 2004). Furthermore, background information such as age, professional preparation, and school situation may facilitate more accurate interpretation of opinions expressed by respondents (Mackie et al., 1957). Several educator positions were specified in the questionnaire in addition to an option for other. The primary options listed in the survey were (a) teacher-counselor serving as a consultant to teachers of children and youth with EBD, (b) classroom teacher in a special day school serving children with EBD, (c) self-contained classroom teacher in a public school, (d) classroom teacher in a residential school serving children with EBD, and (e) other. All respondents indicated that they had completed a university-based teacher preparation program focused on preparing educators to serve students with EBD. Teachers of students with EBD serve students in a variety of settings (e.g., regular elementary or secondary school, special education schools or programs, vocational or technical schools, alternative schools)-- a

significant variation compared to other special education teachers (Henderson et al., 2005). Table 2 shows the categorization of respondents according to type of position held.

Table 2

*Current Role of Educator*

Current Position	<i>n</i>	%
Consultant Teacher/Counselor	8	10.7
Classroom Teacher in special school for children with EBD	6	8.0
Self-Contained Special Education Classroom Teacher	21	28.0
Classroom Teacher in Residential School	2	2.6
Other	38	50.7
Total	75	100.0

There was great variation in the current roles of participants in the study. Respondents' specifications of *other* included administrator for EBD programs, coordinator for EBD classrooms, doctoral student, district behavior interventionist, professor, director of special education, instructional specialist, classroom management consultant, transition specialist, and school psychologist.

Special educators obtain their initial certification through bachelor's degree programs, master's degree programs, alternative certification programs, continuing professional development programs, or 5<sup>th</sup> year programs. According to the 2002 Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education (SPeNSE), teachers of students with EBD obtain certification through alternative routes at a higher percentage than other special education personnel. Table 3 shows the preparation levels of participants in the current study.

Table 3

*Participants by Highest Level of Education Attained*

Level of Education	n	%
Doctoral	18	24.0
Masters	43	57.3
Undergraduate	12	16.0
Missing data	2	2.7
Total	75	100.0

Majority (57%) of the participants in this study had a master’s level degree. This is line with findings by Billingsley et al. (2006) that a significant number of special education teachers enter the profession through master’s degree programs, with teachers of students with EBD having the highest percentage (43%) when compared to other special educators (39%). Younger beginning special educators are more likely to leave teaching due to certification issues, and paperwork, while their older colleagues cite overall manageability of the job, entry level salary, and relevant induction programs as factors influencing their intent to stay according to the SPeNSE (2002) study. Table 4 shows the participants by years of experience. Most (42.6 %) of the participants in this study indicated having experience of over 10 years. Respondents with 2 to 5 years experience were the second largest group (25.3%). Participants were asked to indicate their geographic work location. Results presented in Table 5 show that half (50 %) of the participants in the current study indicated working in suburban areas. Respondents working in rural and urban locations were about the same 20% and 24%, respectively. Four participants did not indicate their geographic work location. These results reflect the general distribution of teachers nationally.

Table 4

*Years of Experience Reported by Participants in Current Study*

Years of experience	n	%
One or less	8	10.7
Two to five	19	25.3
Six to ten	14	18.7
Over ten	32	42.6
Missing data	2	2.7
Total	75	100.0

Table 5

*Geographic Work Location of Participants in Current Study*

Geographic Work Location	n	%
Rural	15	20.0
Suburban	38	50.7
Urban	18	24.0
Missing	4	5.3
Total	75	100.0

According to data reported by the U.S. Department of Education (2007), distribution of teachers by geographic work location showed suburban locations having the highest number of teachers (34.5 %), followed by inner city (28.2%), rural (22.8 %) and smaller towns (14.1 %).

According to the U.S. Department of Education (2007) definition:

A principal city is a city that contains the primary population and economic center of a metropolitan statistical area, (...) defined as one or more contiguous counties that have a "core" area with a large population nucleus and adjacent communities that are highly integrated economically or socially with the core. Core areas with populations of 50,000 or more are designated as urbanized areas; those with populations between 25,000 and 50,000 are designated as urban clusters. Rural areas are designated as those areas that do not lie inside an urbanized area or urban cluster. ("Status of Education in Rural America, The New Classification System")

Demographic data are presented for informational purposes and with the likelihood that they may help in the interpretation of data obtained to answer the research questions.

In the paragraphs that follow, I report a summary of the results of the analysis of data obtained from the six research questions.

### Analysis of the Data, by Research Question

Research Question 1: What competencies do educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD perceive as most important for success in teaching students with EBD?

Respondents were asked to rate each of the competencies on *importance*. Respondents selected whether the item was *very important*, *important*, *less important*, or *not important*. The mean importance of each competency was computed by multiplying the number of checks in the *very important* column by 4, those in the *important* column by 3, those in the *less important* by 2, and those in the *not important* column by 1. The sum total was then divided by the number of checks for that competency to obtain a mean rating. A rank order of the 88 competencies was determined based on the mean ratings of importance. Successive whole numbers were applied to each mean for ranks although a small number of competencies received identical mean ratings.

Table 6 shows the ranking and mean ratings of *importance* of the top 10 competencies derived from the combined ratings of importance on all 88 competencies by respondents in the current study. Refer to Appendix C for a complete listing of the rank order of *importance* of all 88 competencies derived from the mean ratings of *importance* by respondents on all 88 competencies for the current study, the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study, and the Mackie et al (1957) study. The competencies are ranked side by side to facilitate comparisons of each competency among the three studies.

Table 6

*Ranking and Mean Ratings of Importance of Top Ten Competencies in the Current Study*

Competency	Rank	Mean
The ability to tolerate antisocial behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.	1	3.85
Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children.	2	3.82
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful.	3	3.82
Knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health.	4	3.80
The ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of students with EBD to the general public, regular school personnel, and non-professional school staff.	5	3.77
Knowledge of causes of such behavior as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting.	6	3.77
The ability to develop a student-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum, based on individual interests, abilities, and needs.	7	3.76
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.	8	3.70
The ability to foster the social responsibility of students with EBD by promoting wholesome social participation and relations.	9	3.67
Knowledge or understanding of differences between normal and atypical behavior at various age levels.	10	3.67

The top ten competencies rated as most important for teachers of students with EBD by the respondents were the ability to tolerate antisocial behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority; knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children; knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful; knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health; the ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of students with EBD to the general

public, regular school personnel, and non-professional school staff; knowledge or understanding of the effects of socio-economic status and home community conditions on the students with EBD's attitudes and behavior; knowledge or understanding of basic human physical and psychological needs; knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development; the ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of, students with EBD to the general public, general school personnel, and non-professional school staff; and the ability to develop and use cumulative educational records on individual students.

About 40% of the top ten rated competencies are in the Learning Environments and Social Interactions standard which suggests that educators of students with EBD consider the learning environment and social interactions as significant factors in the educational planning of students with EBD.

Rank order numbers and the range of mean ratings of all the competencies within each category of *importance* are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

*Distribution of Mean Ratings of Importance and the Number of Competencies in Each Category*

Category	Mean	Range of Mean Ratings	Number of Items
Very Important	3.50 $\leq$	3.50-3.85	25
Important	2.50-3.49	2.64-3.48	61
Less Important	1.50-2.49	2.10-2.29	2
Not Important	$\leq$ 1.49		

Information contained in Table 7 shows that participants in this study considered 97% of the competencies *important* or *very important* for teachers of students with EBD. As explained



earlier, the mean rating of importance was computed by multiplying the number of selections in the *very important* column by four, those in the *important* column by three, those in the *less important* by two and those in the *not important* column by one. The results were summed and divided by the number of respondents who answered each question. Therefore, the highest possible mean for ratings of *importance* on any competency would be 4.0; the highest obtained mean rating of importance was 3.85. This indicates that a significant number of educators rated 25 competencies as *very important*. None of the competencies received a mean rating of 1.49 or less. This suggests that although some educators rated some of the items *not important*, a significant number rated the same competency as *very important* or *important*, therefore, the low rating from those educators did not lower the overall mean rating of the competency.

Participants in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study rated 20 competencies as *very important* with means ranging from 3.50 to 3.86 while participants in the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study rated 12 competencies as *very important* with means ranging from 3.53 to 3.91. The means for competencies rated *very important* in the current study range from 3.50 to 3.85. Participants in the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study rated 57 competencies as *important* with means ranging from 2.51 to 3.49 while participants in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study rated 66 competencies as *important* with means ranging from 2.54 to 3.48). Means for the 61 competencies rated *important* in the current study range from 2.64 to 3.48. None of the competencies was rated below 1.49 by educators in all three studies. The lowest mean rating obtained in the current study was 2.10, whereas, the mean rating in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study was 1.82, and 1.90 in the Mackie et al. (1957) study. Participants in the current study and the Mackie et al. (1957) study tended to find the items more important than participants in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study.

Research Question 2: In what category (ies) of knowledge and skills do educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD feel most proficient?

Table 8 shows the ranking and mean ratings of proficiency of the top ten competencies derived from the combined ratings of proficiency on all 88 competencies by respondents in the current study.

Table 8

*Ranking and Mean Ratings of Proficiency of Top Ten Competencies*

Competency	Rank	Mean
The ability to differentiate between EBD and intellectual disabilities.	1	2.85
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes.	2	2.85
Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children.	3	2.84
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful.	4	2.80
The ability to tolerate anti-social behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.	5	2.80
Knowledge or understanding of the effects of socio-economic status and home community conditions on the attitudes and behavior of students with EBD.	6	2.77
Knowledge or understanding of basic human physical and psychological needs.	7	2.76
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.	8	2.75
The ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of, students with EBD to the general public, general school personnel, and non-professional school staff.	9	2.74
The ability to develop and use cumulative educational records on individual students with EBD.	10	2.72

Participants were asked to indicate their proficiency on each of the competencies by selecting *good*, *fair*, or *not prepared*. The mean proficiency was computed by multiplying the

number of checks in the *good* column by three, those in the *fair* column by two, and those in the *not prepared* column by one. The sum total was then divided by the number of checks for that competency. A rank order of the 88 competencies was determined based on the mean ratings of proficiency for all the competencies. Successive whole numbers were applied to each mean for ranks although a small number of competencies received identical mean ratings.

The ability to differentiate between EBD and intellectual disabilities, the ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes, and knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children had the highest mean rating on proficiency ( $M = 2.85$ ). These three competencies that received an overall rating of 2.85 on proficiency, were rated *good* by over 90% of the respondents. Refer to Appendix D for a complete list of the rankings of the 88 competencies derived from the combined ratings of proficiency by the respondents in the current study, the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study.

The range of mean ratings of proficiency of all the competencies within each category of proficiency is contained in Table 9. Results indicate that participants in the current study considered themselves proficient in 74 competencies. The means for competencies rated *good* ranged from 2.02 to 2.85. Participants in the Mackie et al. (1957) study considered themselves *proficient* in 39 competencies with means ranging from 3.37 to 3.70 while participants in the Bullock & Whelan (1971) study considered themselves *proficient* in 20 competencies with means ranging from 3.18 to 3.62. Participants in the 1971 study considered themselves *fair* in 65 competencies with means ranging from 1.94 to 3.15 and *not prepared* in 3 competencies.

Table 9

*Distribution of Mean Ratings of Proficiency and the Number of Competencies in Each Category*

Category	Mean	Range of Mean Ratings	Number of Items
Good	2.00≤	2.02-2.85	74
Fair	1.00-1.99	1.33-1.98	14
Not Prepared	≤.99	None	0

While participants in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study considered themselves *fair* in 48 competencies with means ranging from 2.21 to 3.35 and *not prepared* in 1 competency.

Participants in the current study considered themselves *fair* in 14 competencies and did not indicate *not prepared* for any competency. Participants in the current study regarded themselves as being more proficient in the competencies than participants in the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study and the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study. The high rating of proficiency in the competencies by participants in all three studies may be the result of self-reporting bias (Alreck & Settle, 2004) attributable to difficulties understanding the survey questions or respondents not being entirely forthcoming in their self-reported proficiency. The results should therefore be interpreted cautiously.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between educators' ratings of importance and their ratings of proficiency on the competencies?

Table 10 shows the results of the correlation analysis for ten items ranked *very important*. The Pearson  $r$  (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003) was computed to determine the relationship between respondents' ratings of importance of each competency and their ratings of proficiency on the same competency. For each competency, a Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was computed between the mean rating of importance and the mean rating of

proficiency. There were positive correlations between the two variables for forty-five items. Forty-three items showed results that were not statistically significantly different between ratings of importance and ratings of proficiency. This indicates that the respondents' ratings of importance did not influence their ratings on proficiency for the items with no statistically significant correlations. The items with positive correlations suggest that respondents tended to rate themselves most proficient in the competencies which they rated most important, and tended to rate themselves less proficient in the competencies they rated low on importance. Refer to Appendix E for a summary of the correlation coefficients for the analysis of the 88 competencies.

Table 10

*Correlation Coefficients for Items Rated "Very Important"*

	Competency rank	r	p
1	The ability to tolerate antisocial behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.	.082	.532
2	Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children.	.075	.566
3	Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful.	.163	.210
4	Knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health.	.151	.259
5	The ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of students with EBD to the general public, regular school personnel, and non-professional school staff.	.141	.277
6	Knowledge of causes of such behavior as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting.	.239	.063
7	The ability to develop a student-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum, based on individual interests, abilities, and needs.	.238	.650
8	Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.	.259*	.042
9	The ability to foster the social responsibility of students with EBD by promoting wholesome social participation and relations.	.342**	.008
10	Knowledge or understanding of differences between normal and atypical behavior at various age levels.	.017	.897

Note. \*  $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\* $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Research Question 4: In what ways do educators ratings of importance of competencies in the current study differ based on their education, the geographic location where they work, and years of experience?

To examine differences in ratings of importance of competencies by years of experience, education and participant’s geographic work location, a factorial ANOVA was computed. The competencies were grouped for analysis according to nine initial and advanced professional content standards and knowledge and skill sets for teachers of individuals with exceptional needs with EBD (CEC, 2009) (i.e., Foundations; Development and characteristics of learners; Individual learning differences; Instructional strategies; Learning environments and Social interactions; Instructional planning; Educational assessment of students; Professional and ethical practice; and Collaboration among stakeholders. Results of the analyses are presented in Tables 11-19.

Table 11

*ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Foundational Knowledge of Special Education and Educators’ Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$
Education	.613	2	.307	1.141	.331	.037
Experience	1.841	3	.614	2.285	.096	.110
Location	1.206	2	.603	2.245	.121	.072
Education * Experience	.837	4	.209	.779	.546	.050
Education* Location	.543	3	.181	1.495	.225	.033
Experience * Location	1.606	4	.401	.134	.875	.100
Education * Experience * Location	.072	2	.036	.134	.875	.004
Error	9.400	35	.269			
Total	16.671	57				

Note. \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level.

A factorial ANOVA was conducted to analyze the effects of level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on educators' ratings of importance of the competencies in the Foundations of Special Education standard. Table 11 presents results of this analysis. There were no statistically significant effects reported for competencies related to the Foundational Knowledge of Special Education standard. These results suggest that there were no significant main effects of participants' level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on their ratings of importance of competencies in this standard.

A factorial analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the effect of level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on educators' ratings of importance of the competencies in the Development and Characteristics of Learners standard. Refer to Table 12 for the results. The ANOVA results presented in Table 12 for competencies related to the Development and Characteristics of Learners standard and geographic location were statistically significant,  $F(2, 57) = 3.728, p < .05$ .

Table 12

*ANOVA Summary for Competencies Addressing Development and Characteristics of Learners and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$
Education	.055	2	.027	.356	.703	.011
Experience	.426	3	.142	1.846	.156	.067
Location	.573	2	.287	3.728	.034	.090
Education * Experience	1.258	4	.314	4.089	.008	.197
Education* Location	.304	3	.101	1.319	.283	.048
Experience * Location	.481	4	.120	1.563	.205	.075
Education * Experience * Location	.023	1	.023	.300	.587	.004
Error	2.769	36	.077			
Total	6.388	57				

Note. \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level

The observed effect was moderate ( $\eta^2 = .090$ ), indicating that location accounted for about 9% of the variance in rating of importance for the competencies related to the Development and Characteristics of Learners standard. Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) post hoc tests revealed that the mean for educators from rural areas was statistically significantly lower than the means of educators from suburban and urban areas. The means of the suburban and urban groups did not differ significantly ( $p = .157$ ). Taken together, these results suggest that participants' geographic work location, specifically suburban and urban locations, had an effect on educators' rating of importance of competencies in the Development and Characteristics of Learners standard. The interaction between education and years of experience was significant,  $F(4, 57) = 4.089, p < .05$ . The observed effect was moderate ( $\eta^2 = .197$ ), indicating that education and experience accounted for 19.7% of the variance in ratings of importance of competencies in the Development and Characteristics of Learners standard.

Table 13 shows ANOVA results for the effect of educators' level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on their ratings of importance of the competencies in the Individual Learning Differences standard. The effects of the independent variables on ratings of importance of competencies in the standard, Individual Learning Differences indicated that there were no statistically significant differences. This suggests that educators' level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience had no statistically significant effect on their ratings of importance of competencies in the Individual Learning Differences standard. The Levene Statistic ( $F = 1.520, p = .133$ ) was not statistically significant, indicating that variances of the group means were not equal meeting the homogeneity of variance assumption.



Table 13

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Individual Learning Differences and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$
Education	.496	2	.248	1.155	.327	.038
Experience	1.136	3	.379	1.763	.173	.088
Location	.383	2	.192	.892	.419	.030
Education * Experience	1.145	4	.286	1.332	.278	.089
Education* Location	1.297	3	.432	2.013	.131	.100
Experience * Location	1.385	4	.346	1.611	.194	.107
Education * Experience * Location	.189	2	.095	.441	.647	.0146
Error	7.305	34	.215			
Total	12.919	56				

*Note.* \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level.

A factorial ANOVA was conducted to analyze the effect of level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on educators' ratings of importance of the competencies related to the Instructional Strategies standard. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 14. The ANOVA results for competencies in the Instructional Strategies standard indicate that respondents' education level and location have a statistically significant,  $F(3, 52) = 3.234$ ,  $p = .036$  interaction effect on their ratings of importance. The observed effect was moderate ( $\eta^2 = .238$ ), indicating that both education and location accounted for about 24% of the variance in ratings of importance. The interaction between education and experience was moderately significant effect ( $F = 4, 52$ )  $p = .056$ .

Table 14

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Instructional Strategies and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$
Education	.789	2	.395	1.859	.173	.107
Experience	.945	3	.315	1.485	.238	.126
Location	.564	2	.282	1.329	.279	.079
Education * Experience	2.195	4	.549	2.586	.056	.250
Education* Location	2.059	3	.686	3.234	.036	.238
Experience * Location	1.547	4	.387	1.822	.150	.190
Education * Experience * Location	.341	1	.341	1.605	.215	.049
Error	6.579	31	.212			
Total	12.291	52				

*Note.* \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level.

Tukey's HSD post hoc tests revealed that means for educators at the doctoral level in urban areas were moderately higher than masters' or post-doctoral level in suburban or rural areas. These results may be interpreted to mean that educators with doctoral level education in urban areas were more likely to rate the competencies in the Instructional Strategies standard higher than educators with a master's level or post- doctoral level education in suburban or rural areas.

A factorial ANOVA was computed to analyze the effect of educators' level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on the educators' ratings of importance of the competencies related to the Learning Environments and Social Interactions standard. Results are presented in Table 15. The ANOVA results for the competencies were statistically significant for years of experience ( $p = .010$ ), geographic work location ( $p = .009$ ) and the interaction between education and geographic work location ( $p = .010$ ). The observed effects were moderate for years of experience ( $\eta^2 = .273$ ), geographic work location ( $\eta^2 = .237$ ), and for the interaction

between experience and location ( $\eta^2 = .217$ ). However, there was a significant interaction effect between experience and education ( $\eta^2 = .310$ ), indicating the interaction between experience and education accounted for about 31% of the variance in the ratings of importance.

Table 15

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Learning Environments and Social Interactions and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p	$\eta^2$
Education	.239	2	.119	2.068	.142	.106
Experience	.758	3	.253	4.375	.010	.273
Location	.627	2	.313	5.427	.009	.237
Education * Experience	.910	4	.228	3.939	.010	.310
Education* Location	.162	3	.054	.934	.435	.074
Experience * Location	.562	4	.140	2.431	.066	.217
Education * Experience * Location	.340	2	.170	2.431	.066	.144
Error	2.021	35	.058	2.940		
Total	6.108	57				

Note. \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level.

Tukey's HSD post hoc tests revealed that the observed mean for educators with more than 10 years was statistically significant at the .05 level ( $p = .007$ ). However, observed means for the other groups of educators with less than ten years experience were marginally significant  $p = .075$  and  $p = .092$  for educators with one year and six to ten years experience respectively.

A factorial ANOVA was conducted for competencies related to the Instructional Planning standard. Results are presented in Table 16. Results comparing the effect of educators' level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on educators' ratings of importance of competencies, displayed in Table 16, were statistically significant for years of experience,  $F(3, 58) = 3.467$ ,  $p = .026$ . Years of experience accounted for about 22.4% of the

variance in ratings of importance of competencies related to instructional planning. Results of the interaction between years of experience and location were significant  $F(4, 58) = 3.317, p = .02$ . The observed effect was moderate  $\eta^2 = .269$ , indicating that the interaction between experience and location accounted for 26.9% of the variance in ratings of importance.

Table 16

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Instructional Planning and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	<i>p</i>	$\eta^2$
Education	.551	2	.275	2.708	.080	.131
Experience	1.057	3	.352	3.467	.026	.224
Location	.314	2	.157	1.546	.227	.079
Education * Experience	.186	4	.046	.457	.766	.048
Education* Location	.604	3	.201	1.980	.134	.142
Experience * Location	1.349	4	.337	3.317	.021	.269
Education * Experience * Location	.208	2	.104	1.025	.369	.054
Error	3.660	36	.102			
Total	7.313	58				

*Note.* \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level.

However, the interaction effect between education and experience was not significant. These results suggest that the educators' years of experience and their geographic work location had a significant effect on their ratings of importance of competencies in the Instructional Planning standard.

A factorial ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of educators' level of education, geographic work location, and years of experience on educators' ratings of importance of the competencies in the Educational Assessment of Students standard. Table 17

shows the ANOVA results calculated for the effects of the independent variables on respondents' ratings of importance of competencies related to this standard.

Table 17

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Educational Assessment of Students and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	<i>p</i>	$\eta^2$
Education	.467	2	.234	1.371	.268	.079
Experience	2.313	3	.771	4.524	.009	.298
Location	.665	2	.332	1.950	.159	.109
Education * Experience	1.807	4	.452	2.650	.051	.249
Education* Location	1.544	3	.515	3.019	.044	.221
Experience * Location	.782	3	.261	1.529	.226	.125
Education * Experience * Location	.629	2	.315	1.846	.174	.103
Error	5.455	32	.170			
Total	12.530	53				

*Note.* \* = Interaction.  $p < .05$  level.

There was a statistically significant effect of educators' years of experience on the ratings of importance of competencies in the Assessment standard,  $F(3, 32) = 4.524, p = .009$ . The observed effect  $\eta^2 = .298$  was moderate, indicating that years of experience accounted for 29.8 % of the variance on ratings of importance. There were also significant interaction effects between respondents' level of education and years of experience  $F(4, 32) = 2.650, p = .051$ , and level of education and geographic work location,  $F(3, 32) = 3.019, p = .044$ . Tukey's post hoc tests revealed that the mean for respondents with more than ten years experience was statistically significantly higher ( $p = .002$ ) than respondents with two to five years of experience ( $p = .246$ ).

A factorial ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of participants' level of education, their geographic work location, and years of experience on their ratings of importance

of the competencies related to the Professional and Ethical Practice standard. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 18.

Table 18

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Professional and Ethical Practice and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	<i>p</i>	$\eta^2$
Education	2.298	2	1.149	5.237	.010	.221
Experience	1.143	3	.381	1.737	.176	.123
Location	1.734	2	.867	3.953	.028	.176
Education * Experience	1.729	4	.432	1.971	.119	.176
Education* Location	2.499	3	.833	3.797	.018	.235
Experience * Location	2.269	4	.567	2.586	.053	.218
Education * Experience * Location	1.241	2	.621	2.829	.072	.133
Error	8.117	37	.219			
Total	19.548	59				

*Note.* \* = Interaction. *p* < .05 level.

The ANOVA results were statistically significant  $F(2, 37) = 5.237, p = .010$  for respondents' educational level, and geographic work location  $F(2, 37) = 3.953, p = .028$ . There was significant interaction between the respondents' level of education and location  $F(3, 37) = 3.797, p = .018$  and the respondents' experience and location  $F(4, 37) = 2.586, p = .053$ .

The observed effects were moderate for education  $\eta^2 = .221$ , and the interaction between education and location  $\eta^2 = .235$ , indicating that education accounted for 22.1% of the variance in ratings of importance and the interaction effect between education and location accounted for 23.5% of the variance in ratings of importance.

A factorial ANOVA was conducted to analyze the effect of participants' level of education, their geographic work location, and years of experience on their ratings of importance

of the competencies related to the Collaboration Among Stakeholders standard. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 19.

Table 19

*Summary ANOVA for Competencies Addressing Collaboration among Stakeholders and Educators' Level of Education, Years of Experience and Geographic Work Location*

Source	SS	df	MS	F	<i>p</i>	$\eta^2$
Education	.893	2	.446	1.756	.188	.094
Experience	1.433	3	.478	1.880	.152	.142
Location	.997	2	.498	1.961	.156	.103
Education * Experience	2.122	4	.530	2.087	.104	.197
Education* Location	1.118	3	.373	1.466	.241	.115
Experience * Location	1.675	4	.419	1.647	.185	.162
Education * Experience * Location	.556	2	.278	1.093	.347	.060
Error	8.642	34	.254			
Total	15.263	56				

*Note.* \* = Interaction. *p* < .05 level.

The ANOVA results for competencies related to the Collaboration Among Stakeholders standard show that there were no statistically significant main effects for level of education  $F(3, 34) = 1.756, p > .05$ , years of experience  $F(4, 32) = 2.650, p > .05$ , or location  $F(2, 34) = 1.961, p > .05$  on educators' ratings of importance of competencies in this standard.

Research Question 5: What are the differences among the ratings of importance of the competencies or categories of competencies by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study, the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the current study?

Participants in the present study rated the ability to tolerate antisocial behavior that is directed toward authority *very important* with a mean rating of 3.85. Educators in the 1971 study rated knowledge of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful

*very important* with a mean rating of 3.53. In 1957, educators who participated in the study on qualification and preparation of teachers of exceptional children rated knowledge of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good health as *very important* with a mean rating of 3.86. The three competencies correspond to competencies in the Learning Environments/Social Interactions standard (CEC, 2009). The rating of competencies in the same standard high across the three groups of participants indicates that educators of students with EBD understand the significant influence of the learning environment and social interactions on a student's academic and behavioral outcomes. Refer to Appendix B for a comparison of the ranking of all the competencies derived from the mean rating of importance of each competency by participants in the three studies.

Educators in the Mackie et al. (1957) study and in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study considered an educator's knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good health, and knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful as *very important*. However, while educators in the Mackie et al. (1957) study considered knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful and the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development *very important*, educators in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study considered the ability to tolerate antisocial behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority and knowledge or understanding of basic human physical and psychological needs *very important*.

Educators in both the 1957 and 1971 studies seemed to signal the importance of understanding children with EBD by rating the competencies on the ability to differentiate



between EBD and intellectual disabilities and knowledge or understanding of the education and psychology types of exceptional children as very important.

To determine the difference in standardized mean ratings of importance among the three cohorts, the Cohen’s  $d$  effect size (Hinkle et al., 2003) was calculated for (a) the standardized mean ratings of importance in the present study, (b) the standardized mean ratings of importance for the 1971 study, and (c) for the present study and the standardized mean ratings of importance for the 1957 study. Refer to Table 20 for the results.

Table 20

*Difference between the Mean Ratings of Importance of Competencies Among The Three Studies*

Study	N Competencies	M	SD	$df$	$d$
Current study	88	3.25	.70	86	
1971	88	2.89	.48	86	.60
1957	88	3.21	.84	86	.05

The effect size  $d = .60$  between the sample means for the current study and the 1971 study indicate a medium sized effect between the two groups. However, a small effect size  $d = .05$  was found between the current study and the 1957 study. Results show that there was a significant difference between the standardized means of the 1971 study and the current study. Participants in the original study and present study tended to find the items more important than participants in the 1971 study.

Research Question 6: Utilizing data from the 1957, 1971, and current study, what are the similarities and differences among the ratings of proficiency of competencies or categories of competencies by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus on EBD?

The difference in standardized mean ratings of proficiency in competencies among the

three cohorts was computed using the Cohen’s  $d$  effect size (Hinkle et al., 2003). The effect size was calculated for (a) the standardized mean ratings of proficiency in the present study, (b) the standardized mean ratings of proficiency for the 1971 study, and for (c) the standardized mean ratings of proficiency in the present study and the standardized mean ratings of proficiency for the 1957 study.

The results depicted in Table 21 show a small effect size  $d = -.01$  between the current study and the 1957 study and a medium effect size  $d = -.68$  between the current study and the 1971 study on standardized mean ratings of proficiency in competencies. It can be inferred from these results that participants in the 1971 study tended to rate themselves more proficient in the competencies than participants in the current study or the 1957 study.

Table 21

*Standardized Mean Ratings of Proficiency in Competencies among the Three Studies*

Study	N	M	SD	<i>df</i>	<i>d</i>
Current study	88	2.36	.65	86	
1971	88	2.75	.49	86	-0.68
1957	88	2.37	.71	86	-0.01

Educators in the Mackie et al. (1957) study rated the 88 competencies on importance and their own proficiency. The sample selected for the study included educators from urban and rural centers, public and private schools, residential and day schools, and home and hospital programs who were described as superior by each state’s director or supervisor of special education programs. The competencies in which the educators considered themselves most proficient were also among the list of competencies the educators rated *very important*. Educators in the (1957) study rated their proficiency as *good* on (a) the ability to differentiate between EBD and intellectual disabilities, (b) knowledge or understanding of the basic human physical and

psychological needs, (c) the ability to make interpretations from case records and histories, (d) the ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes, and (e) knowledge and understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.

Educators in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study used the same 88 competencies as the Mackie et al. (1957) study. Educators rated their proficiency as *good* on (a) the ability to tolerate antisocial behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority, (b) knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful, (c) knowledge or understanding of basic human physical and psychological needs, (d) knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health, and (e) knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development. See Appendix C for a comparison of the overall rankings of the competencies derived from ratings of proficiency on all competencies among the three studies.

### Professional Preparation Experiences

In part C of the survey, participants in the current study were asked to rate the value of particular professional preparation experiences. Educators' in the Mackie et al. (1957) study were asked to report on various professional preparation experiences including the amount of student teaching experience with students with EBD, planned observation of professional conferences and rehabilitation centers for children with EBD, and experience in diagnosing, developing reports and counseling that they felt teachers of students with EBD needed.

Participants rated the items as *very important*, *important*, *less important*, or *not important*. Table 22 presents descriptive statistics of the data obtained for professional preparation experiences.

The mean rating of the importance of each item was computed by multiplying the number of competencies rated *very important* by four, those rated *important* by three, those rated *less important* by two, and those rated *not important* by one. The results for each rating were then added together and divided by the number of checks for each item. The mean rating for each item was used to rank the professional preparation experiences. Refer to Appendix F for the specific professional preparation experiences rated and ranked in order of importance.

Student-teaching at the secondary level received the highest mean rating among educators in the current study. Other items that received ratings of *very important* were in the area of supervised student-teaching and field experiences related to students with EBD. About 50% of the respondents considered supervised student-teaching of general education students *important*, while about 7% considered visits to the homes of students with EBD *not important*. Respondents were also asked to indicate the amount of student teaching or internship with students of EBD that they thought teachers of students with EBD should have. About 80% of the respondents indicated that they considered at least one or two years of on-the job classroom teaching practice *ideal* or *desirable*. Approximately 95% of the respondents indicated that student-teaching of students with EBD was *ideal*, while about 5% found no student-teaching of students with EBD *desirable*. About 60% of educators in the Mackie et al. (1957) study indicated having had no student teaching experience with students with EBD. However, 52 % of the educators in the Mackie et al. (1957) study reported internship experience with students with EBD as part of their specialized professional preparation. Educators in the Mackie et al. (1957) study considered supervised student teaching of students at the elementary level *most important*.

Table 22

*Evaluation of Professional Preparation Experiences by Participants in the Current Study*

Preparation Experience	Number of Responses					Total	%
	VI	IMP	L. IMP	NI	MISS		
Secondary student-teaching	18	30	9	3	15	75	100
Elementary student-teaching	34	20	6	0	15	75	100
Observation without active participation	35	23	2	0	15	75	100
Observation of conferences for teachers	38	21	1	0	15	75	100
Observation of multi-professional case conferences	25	23	10	2	15	75	100
Supervised student-teaching in special day schools.	15	23	18	4	15	75	100
Field trips throughout the community	26	26	7	1	15	75	100
Student teaching in general education	33	19	7	1	15	75	100
Observation of police, parole, and judicial services	16	26	16	2	15	75	100
Student-teaching in residential schools.	15	27	14	4	15	75	100
Visits to the homes.	12	22	22	3	16	74	100
Clinical experience in diagnosing.	21	26	11	2	15	75	100

*Note.* VI = very important; IMP = important; L. IMP = less important; NI = not important; MISS = missing cases.

To determine differences in ratings of importance of professional preparation experiences and education and experience, a Pearson's product moment correlation was used. Correlation analysis for education and teacher preparation experiences was not significant. However, correlation analysis for years of experience and teacher preparation experiences was significant at the .05 level,  $r = .259$ ,  $p = .046$  for planned observation of police, parole, and judicial services concerned with students with EBD. Years of experience accounted for about 7% of the variance

in ratings of importance of observing aspects of the judicial system that concern students with EBD.

### Summary

In this chapter the findings and results of the analyses of data obtained from the 6 research questions were presented. The purpose of this study was (a) to identify competencies perceived as important by educators who graduated from university-based teacher preparation programs with a focus preparing teachers to serve students with EBD and (b) to examine ratings of educators' perceived proficiency on each of the competencies. A third purpose was to compare ratings of importance on competencies rated in the 1957 (Mackie et al.) study, 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) study, and the current study. Analyses of the data reveal that the purpose of the study was accomplished. The competencies that participants perceived as being very important for educators of students with EBD were identified. Participants in the current rated themselves as proficient in about 84% of the competencies, while participants in the Bullock and Whelan (1971) study considered themselves proficient in about 22% of the competencies, and participants in the Mackie et al. (1957) study considered themselves proficient in about 44% of the competencies.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study on the qualification and preparation of teachers of exceptional children in 1957 initiated formal investigations into competencies for educators of children with disabilities. Findings from this study led to the identification of competencies for teachers of students with visual impairments, hearing impairments, speech impairments, orthopedic impairments, children with emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD), and gifted children (Mackie, Kvaraceus, & Williams, 1957). In 1981, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) developed and issued a revision of professional standards along with a professional code of ethics. The CEC standards were influenced by previous research (e.g., Bullock & Whelan, 1971; Mackie et al., 1957). The CEC standards are routinely re-examined and revisions incorporated based on new knowledge and developments in the field. These standards outline knowledge and skills that educators need to demonstrate in order to serve children with disabilities effectively (CEC, 2004). The current study examined the perceptions of the importance of and the proficiency in 88 competencies for educators of students with EBD as rated by educators who completed a university-based program focused on serving students with EBD.

#### Summary

The first research question focused on competencies that educators perceived as important for teachers of students with EBD. Findings revealed that, overall, educators rated competencies pertaining to the development and characteristics of learners, learning environments, students' social interactions, and instructional planning as very important. The educators signaled the importance of thorough knowledge and understanding of EBD as by the

highly rating competencies related to knowledge and understanding of EBD. For example the competency, “knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children,” received a mean rating of 3.82 out of a total score of 4.0 and was ranked second out of 88. Another competency related to knowledge or understanding of EBD, “knowledge of causes of such behavior as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting” received a mean rating of 3.67 out of 4.0 and was ranked tenth out of 88.

The educators in the study regarded the learning environment as an important factor in the education of students with EBD. This was evidenced by the educators rating “knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which pupils can be successful” as twelfth overall; and rating “knowledge and understanding of techniques adaptable to classrooms situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health” as eleventh out of 88. The teachers also regarded a teacher’s ability to counsel students with EBD about their vocational problems and life goals as very important by rating it ninth, overall.

With the increasing focus on promoting student achievement, it is no surprise that educators in the current study perceived the academic achievement of students with EBD as very important. The educators ranked “the ability to develop a pupil-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum based on individual interests, abilities and needs” as sixteenth, overall, with a mean rating of 3.63. The respondents also placed emphasis on appropriate educational programming for students with EBD. They rated “the ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of pupils to the general public, regular school personnel, and non-school professional staff” as seventh with a mean rating of 3.76 and “an understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development” as thirteenth with a mean rating of 3.66.



Respondents in the current study, as well as in the 1971 (Bullock & Whelan) and the 1957 (Mackie et al.) studies did not consider the competency, “knowledge or understanding of the cultural patterns of other societies- findings of Mead, Malinowski, and Benedict” or the competency, “the ability to administer group intelligence tests and projective tests such as Rorschach, Szondi, and Thematic Apperception tests,” as *important* competencies for educators of students with EBD. Both items received the lowest ratings of all the competencies in all three studies.

Responses to the second research question on educators’ proficiency in the competencies revealed that educators in the current study considered themselves very proficient at differentiating between EBD and intellectual disabilities. They also rated themselves very proficient at creating learning environments that foster positive social interactions, emotional well-being and active engagement. Further, educators in this study indicated that they were proficient in instructional planning. Individualized instruction is a core principle of special education (CEC, 2004); therefore, special education teachers should be able to develop individualized instructional plans. This is in contrast to teachers in the 1957 study whose greatest strengths were understanding children with EBD, counseling these children, and working collaboratively with other professional personnel. Changes in legislation and regulations governing the educational programming of students with disabilities could be a factor in the difference in competencies considered important for educators of students with EBD among the three groups of participants.

Research Question 3 examined the relationship between teachers’ ratings of importance and their ratings of proficiency in the competencies. The items were correlated and results were significant for 45 items. Forty-three items showed results that were not statistically significantly

different between ratings of importance and ratings of proficiency. For the most part, ratings of very important were associated with ratings of *good* on competencies. There was a moderate tendency for teachers to rate highly the competencies in which they felt proficient.

Results of the analysis between educators' ratings of importance of competencies and years of experience, level of education, and geographic work location indicated that respondents with a doctoral level education tended to rate competencies in the Instructional strategies standard higher than respondents with a master level education and an undergraduate level education. Educators' years of experience, level of education, or geographic work location did not have a statistically significant effect on respondent's ratings of importance of competencies related to the Foundational Knowledge of Special Education standard and the Learning Differences standard. However, respondents' years of experience had a significant effect on their ratings of importance of competencies in the Learning Environments/Social Interactions standard, Instructional planning, and Assessment standards. Respondents with more than six years experience tended to rate the competencies in these standards higher than other respondents. A possible explanation for the higher ratings could be that respondents with more experience have had to develop individualized instructional plans and assessments for students and are, therefore, more aware of the importance of these competencies.

Educators in the 1971 and 1957 studies rated five of the same competencies as *very important* and rated themselves as *good* in proficiency on ten of the same competencies. In addition, teachers in both studies tended to rate themselves as *good* at most of the competencies they rated as *very important*. Overall, educators in the current study felt more proficient in competencies associated with identifying the characteristics of learners, developing learning

environments, and social interactions than in standards dealing with instruction or instructional planning.

### Implications

Zionts et al. (2006, p. 7) posit that “an effective method by which to elicit practitioner input into the design and implementation of professional standards has been elusive, making researchers skeptical of the willingness of teachers to participate in the process”. In this study, educators demonstrated a willingness to participate. The review of literature and data analysis confirm that experienced educators of students with EBD have important information to convey about competencies that are important for working with children with EBD. Continued research to determine the most important competencies for educators of students with EBD is needed. The findings from this study add to the body of knowledge regarding the issue of professional standards for teachers of students with EBD. The CEC continues to lead the field in developing standards that guide beginning special education teacher preparation across the nation. The field of EBD needs to continue to develop a common framework to identify and increase the adoption of competencies that all potential beginning teachers of students with EBD should have in their teacher preparation programs. Future research may consider refining the 88 competencies to reflect current terminology and further align the competencies to CEC standards. The 1957 competencies contain knowledge that is still valuable in today’s classrooms. Studying generational differences between educators may bring to light gaps that can be bridged to ensure effective and productive delivery of services for students with EBD.

Given the ongoing effort to include students with disabilities in general education classrooms, teacher educators may need to consider placing more emphasis on courses that

provide general education teachers with knowledge of how best to educate children with various types of exceptionalities. Finally, preparation programs for teachers of students with EBD should consider placing renewed emphasis on curriculum and remedial instruction as most children with EBD are functioning below grade level.

### Recommendations

Although educators in the current study indicated proficiency in several competencies, there were low mean ratings of proficiency in others. Educator preparation programs and school districts need to become more closely allied in order to meet the professional development needs of educators in these competencies.

Direct observation of practicing teachers is essential for assessing teacher quality (Brownell et al., 2009). Therefore, future research should consider incorporating direct observation of instruction in the validation of competencies. Broader and more systematic studies are needed to better determine the competencies that have the most potential for achieving the best outcomes for students with EBD.

APPENDIX A  
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE  
EVALUATION OF COMPETENCIES FOR TEACHERS OF STUDENTS WITH EBD

This instrument is designed to determine how important it is for you in your present position as a teacher of students with EBD to have the following competencies and how you rate your proficiency at each of the competencies.

Demographic Information

1. Gender                      Male                      Female
  
2. Indicate the type of position which you hold by checking ONE of the following:  
\_\_\_\_ Consultant Teacher- Counselor serving individual children and youth with EBD, making home visits, and serving as consultant to regular classroom teachers  
\_\_\_\_ Classroom teacher in a special day school solely for children with EBD  
\_\_\_\_ Self-contained special education classroom teacher in a regular day school  
\_\_\_\_ Classroom teacher in a residential school serving children with EBD  
\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify): \_\_\_\_\_
  
3. Indicate the approximate number of students on your caseload:  
  
Fewer than 10  
  
10- 15 students  
  
16-20 students  
  
Over 20 students
  
4. Have you completed a university-based teacher preparation program with a focus on serving students with EBD?  
  
Yes              No
  
5. Select the highest level of education attained.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Post doctoral
<input type="checkbox"/>	Doctoral

<input type="checkbox"/>	Masters
<input type="checkbox"/>	Undergraduate

6. Select the grade level(s) of the group of children with EBD that you teach:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

7. How many years of teaching experience with students with EBD do you have?

<input type="checkbox"/>	0-1 year
<input type="checkbox"/>	2-5 years
<input type="checkbox"/>	6-10 years
<input type="checkbox"/>	More than 10 years

8. Select the item which best describes the geographic location in which you work:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Rural
<input type="checkbox"/>	Suburban
<input type="checkbox"/>	Urban

**B. Competency Rating Scale**

Directions: In the left hand column (importance) click the column which BEST indicates how important it is in your present position as a teacher of students with EBD that you have the competency stated. In the right hand column (Rating) click the column which BEST indicates how you rate your proficiency at each of the following items.

<u>Importance</u>		<u>Rating</u>

Very important	Important	Less important	Not important	<u>Item</u>	Good	Fair	Not prepared
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in physical education.</li> <li>2. Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children.</li> <li>3. The ability to make interpretations from medical (including psychiatric) reports.</li> <li>4. The ability to tolerate anti-social behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.</li> <li>5. Knowledge or understanding of the basic human physical and psychological needs.</li> <li>6. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in health education.</li> <li>7. The ability to interpret special educational programs, for and the problems of students with EBD to the general public, regular school personnel, and non-professional school staff.</li> <li>8. Knowledge or understanding of different types of programs (regular class, special class, teacher-counselor, residential school for education of students with EBD and their strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>9. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their</li> </ol>			



				<p>vocational problems and life goals.</p> <p>10. Knowledge of causes of such behavior as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting.</p> <p>11. Knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health.</p> <p>12. Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful.</p> <p>13. Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.</p> <p>14. The ability to differentiate between EBD and intellectual disabilities.</p> <p>15. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes.</p> <p>16. The ability to develop a student-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum, based on individual interests, abilities, and needs.</p> <p>17. The ability to use the interpreted results of projective tests.</p> <p>18. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching throughout both elementary and secondary levels.</p> <p>19. The ability to use anecdotal records.</p> <p>20. Knowledge or understanding of behavior which is</p>			
--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>symptomatic of delinquency.</p> <p>21. The ability to cooperate with vocational rehabilitation agencies in helping students with EBD toward occupational adjustment.</p> <p>22. Knowledge or understanding of sources of procurement and methods of adapting and using educational materials, including audio-visual aids, for increasing teaching efficiency and appeal.</p> <p>23. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students with intellectual disabilities.</p> <p>24. The ability to identify informally special talents and interests.</p> <p>25. The ability to use the interpreted results of individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading ability.</p> <p>26. Knowledge or understanding of the purposes, services, and locations of national organizations concerned with education or general welfare of students with EBD, such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association of School Social Workers.</p> <p>27. Knowledge or understanding of the mores and modes of living of different social and cultural groups in the U.S.</p> <p>28. Knowledge or understanding of the psychoses, such as schizophrenia, paranoia, and manic depressive.</p> <p>29. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>teaching at the secondary level only.</p> <p>30. Knowledge or understanding of the general plan or procedure used in individual counseling, such as psychoanalysis, play therapy, and psychodrama.</p> <p>31. Knowledge or understanding of the cultural patterns of other societies- findings of Mead, Malinowski, and Benedict.</p> <p>32. The ability to accept the role of parent figure.</p> <p>33. Knowledge or understanding of causes of truancy, such as unsuitable curriculum, home, and community factors.</p> <p>34. The ability to administer to students with EBD social maturity scales.</p> <p>35. The ability to administer to students with EBD sociometric tests including sociograms and “guess-who” tests.</p> <p>36. The ability to work with children without disabilities in helping them accept those with disabilities.</p> <p>37. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in dramatic arts.</p> <p>38. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in domestic arts.</p> <p>39. The ability to administer to students with EBD group interest and special aptitude tests.</p> <p>40. The ability to administer to students with EBD individual verbal and performance tests of mental ability, Revised</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Stanford-Binet, Grace Arthur Point Scale.</p> <p>41. The ability to administer to students with EBD group tests of personality and social emotional adjustment.</p> <p>42. The ability to operate amplifiers, record players, film strip projectors, and other visual aids.</p> <p>43. Knowledge or understanding of psychoneurotic behavior disorders, such as neurasthenia, hysteria, anxiety neurosis, and hypochondria.</p> <p>44. The ability to make interpretations from reports of social workers.</p> <p>45. The ability to help parents get factual information from clinics and agencies, so that they can better face the social and emotional problems arising from having a child with EBD in the family.</p> <p>46. The ability to foster the social responsibility of students with EBD by promoting wholesome social participation and relations.</p> <p>47. The ability to avoid identical, stereotyped, demands of students with EBD.</p> <p>48. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their educational problems.</p> <p>49. Knowledge or understanding of differences between normal and atypical behavior at various age levels.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>50. Knowledge or understanding of the effects of socio-economic status and home community conditions on the attitudes and behavior of students with EBD.</p> <p>51. The ability to develop and use cumulative educational records on individual students.</p> <p>52. Knowledge or understanding of adjustment (defense) mechanisms, such as projection, conversion, and displacement.</p> <p>53. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in music.</p> <p>54. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in arts and crafts.</p> <p>55. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in industrial arts.</p> <p>56. The ability to exert external social control when necessary.</p> <p>57. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching at the elementary school level only.</p> <p>58. The ability to teach remedial reading.</p> <p>59. The ability to contribute to community leadership in establishing an educational program for students with EBD.</p> <p>60. The ability to give intensive therapeutic counseling.</p> <p>61. The ability to administer to students with EBD standardized group achievement tests.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>62. The ability to devise informal tests of achievement.</p> <p>63. Knowledge and understanding of research related to causes of “drop-outs” from school.</p> <p>64. Knowledge or understanding of methods and practices of occupational placement and post-school follow-up.</p> <p>65. The ability to administer to students with EBD group intelligence tests.</p> <p>66. The ability to administer to students with EBD projective tests, such as Rorschach, Szondi, and Thematic Apperception Test.</p> <p>67. The ability to develop self-imposed social control within the students.</p> <p>68. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their social problems.</p> <p>69. The ability to make interpretations from case records and histories.</p> <p>70. The ability to establish “limits” of social control (neither over-restrictive nor over-protective).</p> <p>71. The ability to use a broad range of community resources (people, places, things) in teaching students with EBD.</p> <p>72. Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to juvenile delinquency and probation.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>73. Knowledge or understanding of causes, incidence, characteristics, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.</p> <p>74. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in fine arts.</p> <p>75. The ability to administer to students with EBD individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading disability.</p> <p>76. Knowledge or understanding of research related to need frustration and resultant behavior.</p> <p>77. Knowledge and understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the education of these children.</p> <p>78. Knowledge or understanding of sources of, and services offered by, non-school organizations, such as child guidance clinics, courts, churches, recreational clubs, police, and welfare agencies.</p> <p>79. The ability to make interpretations from psychological reports.</p> <p>80. The ability to direct students to healthy leisure-time activities.</p> <p>81. The ability to interpret the symptomatic behavior in terms of physical, psychological, and environmental factors.</p> <p>82. Knowledge or understanding of reference materials and professional literature on the education and care of children</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

				with EBD.			
				83. Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to vocational training programs.			
				84. Knowledge or understanding of research related to why students “like” and “dislike” teachers.			
				85. The ability to establish and maintain good working relationships with other professional staff, such as social workers and psychological personnel.			
				86. Knowledge and understanding of the contribution that can be made to good personality development by an informal classroom atmosphere in which students have their interest reflected through their own handiwork and pets.			
				87. The ability to use the interpretation of tests of mental ability.			
				88. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching the students without disabilities.			

C. Teacher Preparation Experiences

1. Indicate the amount of student-teaching/ internship with students with EBD that you believe should be minimal, desirable, and ideal prerequisites for a teacher of students with EBD.

Student teaching/Internship	Minimal	Desirable	Ideal
-----------------------------	---------	-----------	-------



No student-teaching of students with EBD  At least one semester of half-time student teaching  At least one semester of full-time student teaching  At least one year of on-the job classroom teaching  At least two years of on-the job classroom teaching			
2. Indicate the amount of student teaching/ internship with students with EBD which you have had.			

3. Do you consider the following experiences “very important,” “important,” “less important,” or “not important” in the preparation of teachers of students with EBD? (Check one of the columns).

Very important	Important	Less important	Not important	Item
				1. Supervised student teaching of general education children.  2. Student observation (without active participation) of teaching of students with EBD.  3. Supervised student-teaching of students with EBD- a) at the elementary level. b) at the secondary level c) in special day classes or schools d) in residential schools  4. Planned observation of-

				<p>a) multi-professional case conferences (held by representatives from such fields as social welfare, psychiatry, psychology, and education) to study and make recommendations for students with EBD.</p> <p>b) Conferences for teachers of students with EBD on placement, curriculum development and child study.</p> <p>c) Police, parole, and judicial services concerned with students with EBD.</p> <p>5. Visits to the homes of students with EBD in the company of supervising teachers.</p> <p>6. Clinical experience in diagnosing ability, achievement, interests, and aptitudes of students with EBD.</p> <p>7. Field trips throughout the community to discover and analyze how best to use available resources for students with EBD.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

**Additional Information**

If you have any additional comments regarding your experience and/or knowledge of EBD that you would like to share, please use the text box below.

If you would like to receive the \$10 incentive from Amazon, please enter your email address below. All email addresses will be kept confidential.

Thank you for your time.

Principal Investigator:  
Maureen N. Wanyonyi-Short

Doctoral Faculty Advisor:  
Lyndal M. Bullock

Doctoral Candidate  
University of North Texas  
Denton, TX  
[REDACTED]  
maureen.wanyonyi@unt.edu

Regents Professor  
University of North Texas  
Denton, TX  
940.565.3583  
lyndal.bullock@unt.edu

APPENDIX B

A COMPARISON OF THE MACKIE, KVARACEUS, & WILLIAMS (1957) STUDY  
COMPETENCIES AND CEC CONTENT STANDARDS

Competencies in Current Study Standard 1: Foundations of Special Education	CEC Content Standards Standard 1: Foundations
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Knowledge or understanding of the <u>cultural patterns of other societies</u>- findings of Mead, Malinowski, and Benedict.</li> <li>2. Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing <u>Federal, State, and local laws and regulations</u> pertaining to juvenile delinquency and probation.</li> <li>3. Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing <u>Federal, State, and local laws and regulations</u> pertaining to the education of these children.</li> <li>4. Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing <u>Federal, State, and local laws and regulations</u> pertaining to vocational training programs.</li> <li>5. Knowledge or understanding of <u>reference materials</u> and <u>professional literature</u> on the education and care of children with EBD.</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Common themes are underlined.</i></p>	<p>Special educators understand the field as an evolving and changing discipline based on <u>philosophies, evidence-based principles, and theories, relevant laws and policies, diverse and historical points of view, and human issues</u> that have historically influenced and continue to influence the field of special education and the education and treatment of individuals with exceptional needs in both school and society.</p>
<p>Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of learners</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various <u>types of exceptional children</u>.</li> <li>2. Knowledge or understanding of the basic <u>human physical and psychological needs</u>.</li> <li>3. Knowledge of <u>causes of such behavior</u> as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting.</li> <li>4. The knowledge or understanding of <u>behavior</u> which is symptomatic of delinquency.</li> <li>5. Knowledge or understanding of the <u>psychoses</u>, such as schizophrenia, paranoia, and manic depressive.</li> <li>6. The ability to differentiate between <u>EBD</u> and <u>intellectual disabilities</u>.</li> </ol>	<p>Standard 2: Development and Characteristics of learners</p> <p>Special educators know and demonstrate respect for their students first as unique human beings. Special educators understand the <u>similarities and differences in human development</u> and the <u>characteristics</u> between and among individuals with and without exceptional learning needs. Moreover, special educators understand how <u>exceptional conditions can interact</u> with the domains of human development and they use this knowledge to respond to the varying <u>abilities and behaviors</u> of individuals with exceptional learning needs. Special educators understand how the <u>experiences</u> of individuals with exceptional learning needs can impact families, as well as the individual's ability to</p>

<p>7. Knowledge or understanding of <u>differences</u> between normal and atypical behavior at various age level.</p>	<p>learn, interact socially, and live as fulfilled contributing members of the community.</p>
<p><i>Common themes are underlined.</i></p>	
<p>Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Knowledge or understanding of <u>curriculum</u> and <u>methods</u> of teaching students with intellectual disabilities.</li> <li>2. Knowledge or understanding of <u>causes of truancy</u>, such as <u>unsuitable curriculum</u>, <u>home</u>, and <u>community</u> factors.</li> <li>3. Knowledge or understanding of research related to why pupils “<u>like</u>” and “<u>dislike</u>” <u>teachers</u>.</li> <li>4. Knowledge and understanding of research related to causes of “<u>drop-outs</u>” from school.</li> <li>5. Knowledge or understanding of <u>causes</u>, <u>incidence</u>, <u>characteristics</u>, and <u>treatment</u> of juvenile delinquency.</li> <li>6. Knowledge or understanding of research related to need <i>frustration</i> and resultant behavior.</li> <li>7. Knowledge or understanding of adjustment (defense) mechanisms, such as projection, conversion, and displacement.</li> <li>8. Knowledge or understanding of the purposes, services, and locations of national organizations concerned with education or <u>general welfare</u> of students with EBD, such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association of School Social Workers.</li> <li>9. Knowledge or understanding of the mores and modes of living of different social and <u>cultural groups</u> in the U.S.</li> </ol>	<p>Standard 3: Individual Learning Differences</p> <p>Special educators understand the <u>effects that an exceptional condition can have on an individual’s learning</u> in school and throughout life. Special educators understand that the <u>beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures</u> can affect relationships among and between students, their <u>families</u>, and the <u>school community</u>. Moreover, special educators are active and resourceful in seeking to understand how primary language, culture, and familial backgrounds interact with the individual’s exceptional condition to impact the individual’s academic and social abilities, attitudes, values, interests, and career options. The understanding of these <u>learning differences</u> and their possible interactions provides the foundation upon which special educators individualize instruction to provide meaningful and challenging learning for individuals with exceptional learning needs.</p>
<p><i>Common themes are underlined.</i></p>	
<p>Standard 4: Instructional Strategies</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in <u>physical education</u>.</li> </ol>	<p>Standard 4: Instructional Strategies</p> <p>Special educators possess a repertoire of <u>evidence-based instructional strategies</u> to</p>

2. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in health education.
3. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in music.
4. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in arts and crafts.
5. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in industrial arts.
6. The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in fine arts.
7. The ability to exert external social control when necessary.
8. The ability to develop self-imposed social control within the pupils.
9. The ability to establish “limits” of social control (neither over-restrictive nor over-protective).
10. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students without disabilities.
11. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their educational problems.
12. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students without disabilities.

individualize instruction for individuals with Exceptional learning needs. Special educators select, adapt, and use these instructional strategies to promote positive learning results in general and special curricula and to modify learning environments appropriately for individuals with exceptional learning needs. They enhance the learning of critical thinking, problem-solving, and performance skills of individuals with exceptional learning needs, and increase their self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, and self-esteem. Moreover, special educators emphasize the development, maintenance, and generalization of knowledge and skills across environments, settings, and the life span.

*Common themes are underlined.*

Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions

1. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their vocational problems and life goals.
2. Knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health.
3. Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which pupils can be successful
4. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes.
5. The ability to work with children without disabilities in helping them accept those with disabilities.

Standard 5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions

Special educators actively create learning environments for individuals with exceptional learning needs that foster cultural understanding, safety and emotional well-being, positive social interactions, and active engagement of individuals with exceptional learning needs. In addition, special educators foster environments in which diversity is valued and individuals are taught to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world. Special educators shape environments to encourage the independence, self-motivation, self-direction, personal empowerment, and self-advocacy of individuals with exceptional learning needs.

6. The ability to foster the social responsibility of students with EBD by promoting wholesome social participation and relations.
7. The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their social problems.
8. The ability to direct pupils to healthy leisure-time activities.
9. The ability to interpret the symptomatic behavior in terms of physical, psychological, and environmental factors.
10. Knowledge and understanding of the contribution that can be made to good personality development by an informal classroom atmosphere in which pupils have their interest reflected through their own handiwork and pets.

Special educators help their general education colleagues integrate individuals with exceptional learning needs in general education environments and engage them in meaningful learning activities and interactions. Special educators use direct motivational and instructional interventions with individuals with exceptional learning needs to teach them to respond effectively to current expectations. When necessary, special educators can safely intervene with individuals with exceptional learning needs in crisis. Special educators coordinate all these efforts and provide guidance and direction to paraeducators and others, such as classroom volunteers and tutors.

*Common themes are underlined.*

Standard 6: Instructional Planning

1. The ability to interpret special educational programs, for and the problems of students with EBD to the general public, regular school personnel, and non-professional school workers.
2. Knowledge or understanding of different types of programs (regular class, special class, teacher-counselor, residential school for education of students with EBD and their strengths and weaknesses).
3. Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.
4. The ability to develop a pupil-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum, based on individual.
5. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching throughout both elementary and secondary levels.
6. Knowledge or understanding of sources of procurement and methods of adapting and using educational materials, including audio-visual aids, for increasing teaching efficiency and appeal.

Standard 6: Instructional Planning

Individualized decision-making and instruction is at the center of special education practice. Special educators develop long-range individualized instructional plans anchored in both general and special education curricula. In addition, special educators systematically translate these individualized plans into carefully selected shorter-range goals and objectives taking into consideration an individual's abilities and needs, the learning environment, and a myriad of cultural and linguistic factors. Individualized instructional plans emphasize explicit modeling and efficient guided practice to assure acquisition and fluency through maintenance and generalization. Understanding of these factors as well as the implications of an individual's exceptional condition, guides the special educator's selection, adaptation, and creation of materials, and the use of powerful instructional variables. Instructional plans are modified based on ongoing analysis of the individual's learning progress. Moreover, special educators facilitate this instructional planning in a collaborative context including



<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching at the secondary level only.</li> <li>8. Knowledge or understanding of the general plan or procedure used in <u>individual counseling</u>, such as <u>psychoanalysis</u>, <u>play therapy</u>, and <u>psychodrama</u>.</li> <li>9. Knowledge or understanding of <u>curriculum and methods</u> of teaching at the elementary school level only.</li> </ol>	<p>the individuals with exceptionalities, families, professional colleagues, and personnel from other agencies as appropriate. Special educators also develop a variety of individualized transition plans, such as transitions from preschool to elementary school and from secondary settings to a variety of postsecondary work and learning contexts. Special educators are comfortable using appropriate <u>technologies</u> to support instructional planning and individualized instruction.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Common themes are underlined</i></p>
---	--

<p>Standard 7: Student Assessment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The ability to make interpretations from <u>medical (including psychiatric) reports</u>.</li> <li>2. The ability to use the interpreted results of <u>projective tests</u>.</li> <li>3. The ability to use <u>anecdotal records</u>.</li> <li>4. The ability to identify informally special talents and interests.</li> <li>5. The ability to use the interpreted results of individual <u>diagnostic tests</u> of arithmetic and reading ability.</li> <li>6. The ability to administer to students with EBD <u>social maturity scales</u>.</li> <li>7. The ability to administer to students with EBD, <u>sociometric tests including sociograms and “guess-who” tests</u>.</li> <li>8. The ability to administer to students with EBD <u>group interest and special aptitude tests</u>.</li> <li>9. The ability to administer to students with EBD <u>individual verbal and performance tests of mental ability</u>, Revised Stanford-Binet, Grace Arthur Point Scale.</li> <li>10. The ability to administer to students with EBD <u>group tests of personality and social emotional adjustment</u>.</li> <li>11. The ability to make interpretations from <u>reports of social workers</u>.</li> <li>12. The ability to develop and use <u>cumulative educational records</u> on individual pupils.</li> <li>13. The ability to administer to students with</li> </ol>	<p>Standard 7: Assessment</p> <p>Assessment is integral to the decision-making and teaching of special educators and special educators use <u>multiple types of assessment information</u> for a variety of educational decisions. Special educators use the results of assessments to help identify exceptional learning needs and to develop and implement individualized instructional programs, as well as to adjust instruction in response to ongoing learning progress. Special educators understand the legal policies and ethical <u>principles of measurement and assessment related to referral, eligibility, program planning, instruction, and placement</u> for individuals with exceptional learning needs, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Special educators understand measurement theory and practices for addressing issues of validity, reliability, norms, bias, and interpretation of assessment results. In addition, special educators understand the appropriate use and limitations of various types of assessments. Special educators collaborate with families and other colleagues to assure nonbiased, meaningful assessments and decision-making.</p>
---	--

- EBD standardized group achievement tests.
14. The ability to devise informal tests of achievement.
  15. Knowledge or understanding of methods and practices of occupational placement and post-school follow-up.
  16. The ability to administer to students with EBD group intelligence tests.
  17. The ability to administer to students with EBD projective tests, such as Rorschach, Szondi, and Thematic Apperception Test.
  18. The ability to make interpretations from case records and histories.
  19. The ability to administer to students with EBD individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading disability.
  20. The ability to make interpretations from psychological reports.
  21. The ability to use the interpretation of tests of mental ability.

*Common themes are underlined.*

Standard 8: Professional Ethics and Practice

1. The ability to tolerate anti-social behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.
2. The ability to accept the role of parent figure.
3. The ability to avoid identical, stereotyped, demands of students with EBD.
4. The ability to contribute to community leadership in establishing an educational program for students with EBD.

Standard 8: Professional Ethics and Practice

Special educators are guided by the profession's ethical and professional practice standards. Special educators practice in multiple roles and complex situations across wide age and developmental ranges. Their practice requires ongoing attention to legal matters along with serious professional and ethical considerations. Special educators engage in professional activities and participate in learning communities that benefit individuals with exceptional learning needs, their families, colleagues, and their own professional growth. Special educators view themselves as lifelong learners and regularly reflect on and adjust their practice. Special educators are aware of how their own and others' attitudes, behaviors, and ways of communicating can influence their practice. Special educators understand that culture and language can interact with exceptionalities, and are sensitive to the many aspects of diversity of individuals with

exceptional learning needs and their families. Special educators actively plan and engage in activities that foster their professional growth and keep them current with evidence-based best practices. Special educators know their own limits of practice and practice within them.

*Common themes are underlined.*

Standard 9: Collaboration

1. The ability to cooperate with vocational rehabilitation agencies in helping students with EBD toward occupational adjustment.
2. Knowledge or understanding of the purposes, services, and locations of national organizations concerned with education or general welfare of students with EBD, such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association of School Social Workers.
3. The ability to help parents get factual information from clinics and agencies, so that they can better face the social and emotional problems arising from having a child with EBD in the family.
4. Knowledge or understanding of methods and practices of occupational placement and post-school follow-up.
5. The ability to use a broad range of community resources (people, places, things) in teaching students with EBD.
6. Knowledge or understanding of sources of, and services offered by, non-school organizations, such as child guidance clinics, courts, churches, recreational clubs, police, and welfare agencies.
7. The ability to establish and maintain good working relationships with other professional workers, such as social workers and psychological personnel.

Standard 9: Collaboration

Special educators routinely and effectively collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways. This collaboration assures that the needs of individuals with exceptional learning needs are addressed throughout schooling. Moreover, special educators embrace their special role as advocate for individuals with exceptional learning needs. Special educators promote and advocate the learning and well-being of individuals with exceptional learning needs across a wide range of settings and a range of different learning experiences. Special educators are viewed as specialists by a myriad of people who actively seek their collaboration to effectively include and teach individuals with exceptional learning needs. Special educators are a resource to their colleagues in understanding the laws and policies relevant to individuals with exceptional learning needs. Special educators use collaboration to facilitate the successful transitions of individuals with exceptional learning needs across settings and services.

*Common themes are underlined.*

*Note.* From *What Every Special Educator Must Know: Ethics, Standards, and Guidelines* (6<sup>th</sup> ed. p. 26-30), by Council for Exceptional Children, 2009, Arlington, VA: Author. Copyright 2009 by the Council for Exceptional Children. Reprinted with permission.

APPENDIX C

RANKINGS OF COMPETENCIES DERIVED FROM RATINGS OF IMPORTANCE  
AMONG THE THREE STUDIES

Competencies	Rankings in Studies		
	Current study	1971	1957
The ability to tolerate antisocial behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.	1	3	28
Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children.	2	2	26
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful.	3	1	2
Knowledge or understanding of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health.	4	5	1
The ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of students with EBD to the general public, regular school personnel, and non-professional school staff.	5	65	37
Knowledge of causes of such behavior as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting.	6	23	12
The ability to develop a student-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum, based on individual interests, abilities, and needs.	7	18	6
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.	8	6	3
The ability to foster the social responsibility of students with EBD by promoting wholesome social participation and relations.	9	21	8
Knowledge or understanding of differences between normal and atypical behavior at various age levels.	10	13	22
Knowledge or understanding of the effects of socioeconomic status and home community conditions on the attitudes and behavior of students with EBD.	11	32	23
The ability to establish limits of social control (neither	12	7	31

over-restrictive nor over-protective).			
Knowledge or understanding of the basic human physical and psychological needs.	13	4	7
Knowledge and understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and Local laws and regulations pertaining to the education of these children.	14	56	48
Knowledge or understanding of causes of truancy, such as unsuitable curriculum, home, and community factors.	15	45	29
The ability to establish and maintain good working relationships with other professional staff such as social workers and psychological personnel.	16	10	18
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes.	17	27	5
Knowledge or understanding of behavior which is symptomatic of delinquency.	18	30	17
Knowledge or understanding of different types of programs (regular class, special class, teacher-counselor, residential school) for education of students with EBD, and their strengths and weaknesses.	19	38	38
Knowledge and understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching throughout both elementary and secondary levels.	20	34	68
The ability to identify informally special talents and interests.	21	16	24
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their vocational problems and life goals.	22	48	39
The ability to teach remedial reading.	23	64	54
The ability to differentiate between EBD and intellectual disabilities.	24	24	4
The ability to help parents get factual information from clinics and agencies, so that they can better face the	25	66	34

social and emotional problems arising from having a child with EBD in the family.			
The ability to use the interpreted results of individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading ability.	26	19	25
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their social problems.	27	47	10
The ability to use a broad range of community resources (people, places, things) in teaching students with EBD.	28	51	32
Knowledge or understanding of the psychoses, such as schizophrenia, paranoia, and manic depressive.	29	35	78
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their educational problems.	30	16	44
The ability to exert external social control when necessary.	31	78	53
Knowledge and understanding of research related to causes of “drop-outs” from school.	32	64	71
The ability to use anecdotal records.	33	29	46
The ability to develop and use cumulative educational records on individual pupils.	34	27	49
The ability to work with children without disabilities in helping them accept those with disabilities.	35	41	66
The ability to develop self-imposed social control within the pupils.	36	8	9
Knowledge or understanding of sources of procurement and methods of adapting and using educational materials, including audio-visual aids, for increasing teaching efficiency and appeal.	37	14	42
Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to juvenile delinquency and probation.	38	75	45

The ability to interpret the symptomatic behavior in terms of physical, psychological, and environmental factors.	39	36	16
Knowledge or understanding of research related to need frustration and resultant behavior.	40	52	47
The ability to make interpretations from case records and histories.	41	42	11
The ability to avoid identical, stereotyped, demands of students with EBD.	42	12	13
Knowledge or understanding of adjustment (defense) mechanisms, such as projection, rationalization, compensation, introjections, conversion, and displacement.	43	20	35
The ability to direct pupils to healthy leisure-time activities.	44	32	15
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students without disabilities.	45	12	59
Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to vocational training programs.	46	67	65
Knowledge or understanding of sources of, and services offered by, non-school organizations, such as child guidance clinics, courts, churches, recreational clubs, police, and welfare agencies.	47	53	40
Knowledge and understanding of the contribution that can be made to good personality development by an informal classroom atmosphere in which pupils have their interest reflected through their own handiwork and pets.	48	61	19
Knowledge or understanding of causes, incidence, characteristics, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.	49	49	33
The ability to cooperate with vocational rehabilitation agencies in helping students with EBD toward occupational adjustment.	50	58	57



Knowledge or understanding of reference materials and professional literature on the education and care of students with EBD.	51	27	64
Knowledge or understanding of the mores and modes of living of different social and cultural groups in the U.S.	52	45	79
The ability to make interpretations from psychological reports.	53	43	14
The ability to make interpretations from reports of social workers.	54	39	30
The ability to make interpretations from medical (including psychiatric) reports.	55	37	27
The ability to use the interpreted results of projective tests.	56	51	41
The ability to devise informal tests of achievement.	57	22	76
Knowledge or understanding of the purposes, services, and locations of national organizations concerned with education or general welfare of students with EBD, such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association of School Social Workers.	58	68	77
The ability to accept the role of parent figure.	59	76	63
The ability to contribute to community leadership in establishing an educational program for students with EBD.	60	58	55
Knowledge or understanding of methods and practices of occupational placement and post-school follow-up.	61	78	72
The ability to use the interpretation of tests of mental ability.	62	32	20
Knowledge or understanding of psychoneurotic behavior disorders, such as neurasthenia, hysteria, anxiety neurosis, and hypochondria.	63	46	70
Knowledge or understanding of research related to why	64	54	62

pupils “like” and “dislike” teachers.			
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students with intellectual disabilities.	65	55	43
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching at the secondary level only.	66	78	87
The ability to administer to students with EBD individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading disability.	67	24	61
Knowledge or understanding of the general plan or procedure used in individual counseling, such as psychoanalysis, play therapy, and psychodrama.	68	70	58
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in music.	69	69	50
The ability to administer to students with EBD social maturity scales.	70	84	80
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching at the elementary school level only.	71	64	56
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in domestic arts.	72	72	69
The ability to give intensive therapeutic counseling.	73	82	74
The ability to administer to students with EBD group tests of personality and social emotional adjustment.	74	86	84
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in industrial arts.	75	78	52
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in arts and crafts.	76	61	51
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in health education.	77	60	36
The ability to administer to students with EBD group interest and special aptitude tests.	78	81	82

The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in dramatic arts.	79	80	67
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in physical education.	80	52	21
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in fine arts.	81	74	60
The ability to administer to students with EBD pupils sociometric tests including sociograms and “guess-who” tests.	82	83	81
The ability to operate amplifiers, record players, film strip projectors, and other visual aids.	83	41	73
The ability to administer to students with EBD standardized group achievement tests.	84	73	75
The ability to administer to students with EBD individual verbal and performance tests of mental ability, Revised Stanford-Binet, Grace Arthur Point Scale.	85	71	83
Knowledge or understanding of the cultural patterns of other societies- findings of Mead, Malinowski, and Benedict.	86	87	88
The ability to administer to students with EBD group intelligence tests.	87	85	85
The ability to administer to students with EBD projective tests, such as Rorschach, Szondi, and Thematic Apperception Test.	88	88	86

APPENDIX D  
RANKINGS OF COMPETENCIES DERIVED FROM RATINGS OF PROFICIENCY  
AMONG THE THREE STUDIES

Competencies	Rankings in Studies		
	Current Study	1971	1957
Knowledge or understanding of education and psychology of various types of exceptional children.	1	59	38
The ability to differentiate between EBD and intellectual disabilities.	2	29	1
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of providing experiences in which students can be successful.	3	2	7
The ability to tolerate anti-social behavior particularly when it is directed toward authority.	4	1	16
Knowledge or understanding of the effects of socio-economic status and home community conditions on the attitudes and behavior of students with EBD.	5	26	8
Knowledge or understanding of basic human physical and psychological needs.	6	3	2
Knowledge or understanding of the advantages of flexibility of school programs and schedules to permit individual adjustment and development.	7	5	5
The ability to interpret special educational programs for, and the problems of, students with EBD to the general public, general school personnel, and non-professional school staff.	8	18	40
The ability to develop and use cumulative educational records on individual students with EBD.	9	15	33
Knowledge or understanding of causes of such behavior as temper tantrums, stealing, enuresis, and nail biting.	10	37	21
Knowledge of techniques adaptable to classroom situations for relieving tensions and promoting good mental health.	11	4	11
The ability to establish and maintain good working relationships with other professional staff, such as social workers and psychological personnel.	12	6	6
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their educational problems.	13	13	17

The ability to make interpretations from case records and histories.	14	19	3
Knowledge or understanding of different types of programs (regular class, special class, teacher-counselor, residential school) for education of students with EBD and their strengths and weaknesses.	15	33	53
Knowledge or understanding of causes of truancy, such as unsuitable curriculum, home and community factors.	16	16	10
Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and Local laws and regulations pertaining to education.	17	71	61
Knowledge or understanding of differences between normal and atypical behavior at various age levels.	18	17	19
The ability to use anecdotal records.	19	11	27
The knowledge or understanding of behavior which is symptomatic of delinquency.	20	34	15
The ability to identify informally special talents and interests.	21	35	35
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their personal attitudes.	22	25	4
The ability to work with children without disabilities in helping them accept those with disabilities.	23	22	46
The ability to foster the social responsibility of students with EBD by promoting wholesome social participation and relations.	24	45	9
The ability to develop a pupil-centered rather than a subject-centered curriculum, based on individual interests, abilities, and needs.	25	12	12
Knowledge or understanding of reference materials and professional literature on the education and care of students with EBD.	26	37	59
The ability to establish “limits” of social control (neither	27	8	25

over-restrictive nor over-protective).			
The ability to interpret the symptomatic behavior in terms of physical, psychological, and environmental factors.	28	51	42
Knowledge or understanding of the purposes, services, and locations of national organizations concerned with education or general welfare of students with EBD, such as the Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association of School Social Workers.	29	54	76
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students without disabilities.	30	7	24
The ability to exert external social control when necessary.	31	27	30
Knowledge and understanding of research related to causes of “drop-outs” from school.	32	63	56
The ability to accept the role of parent figure.	33	49	18
The ability to avoid identical, stereotyped, demands of students with EBD.	34	20	22
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching throughout both elementary and secondary levels.	35	38	66
Knowledge or understanding of the psychoses, such as schizophrenia, paranoia, and manic depressive.	36	48	79
The ability to make interpretations from psychological reports.	37	51	37
The ability to make interpretations from medical (including psychiatric) reports.	38	42	55
The ability to use the interpreted results of individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading ability.	39	9	29
Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to juvenile delinquency and probation.	40	82	57
Knowledge and understanding of the contribution that can be made to good personality development by an informal	41	58	44

classroom atmosphere in which pupils have their interest reflected through their own handiwork and pets.			
The ability to make interpretations from reports of social workers.	42	39	20
The ability to devise informal tests of achievement.	43	16	60
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their social problems.	44	37	14
The ability to operate amplifiers, record players, film strip projectors, and other visual aids.	45	29	51
The ability to direct pupils to healthy leisure-time activities.	46	46	32
The ability to use a broad range of community resources (people, places, things) in teaching students with EBD.	47	47	28
The ability to teach remedial reading.	48	28	52
Knowledge or understanding of causes, incidence, characteristics, and treatment of juvenile delinquency.	49	54	36
Knowledge or understanding of sources of procurement and methods of adapting and using educational materials, including audio-visual aids, for increasing teaching efficiency and appeal.	50	31	49
Knowledge or understanding of the mores and modes of living of different social and cultural groups in the U.S.	51	43	67
Knowledge or understanding of research related to why pupils “like” and “dislike” teachers.	52	64	47
The ability to develop self-imposed social control within the pupils.	53	23	23
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching at the elementary school level only.	54	45	26
Knowledge or understanding of adjustment (defense) mechanisms, such as projection, conversion, and displacement.	55	10	43
Knowledge or understanding of research related to need	56	64	50



frustration and resultant behavior.			
The ability to administer to students with EBD individual diagnostic tests of arithmetic and reading disability.	57	29	45
The ability to use the interpretation of tests of mental ability.	58	21	13
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching at the secondary level only.	59	45	73
The ability to counsel students with EBD regarding their vocational problems and life goals.	60	51	41
The ability to help parents get factual information from clinics and agencies, so that they can better face the social and emotional problems arising from having a child with EBD in the family.	61	66	58
The ability to administer to students with EBD standardized group achievement tests.	62	44	31
A knowledge or understanding of sources of, and services offered by, non-school organizations, such as child guidance clinics, courts, churches, recreational clubs, police, and welfare agencies.	63	72	39
Knowledge or understanding of curriculum and methods of teaching students with intellectual disabilities.	64	57	54
The ability to use the interpreted results of projective tests.	65	56	75
The ability to contribute to community leadership in establishing an educational program for students with EBD.	66	75	64
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in physical education.	67	73	63
Knowledge or understanding of provisions for students with EBD under existing Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to vocational training programs.	68	82	82
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in health education.	69	61	34
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in arts and crafts.	70	79	70

The ability to cooperate with vocational rehabilitation agencies in helping students with EBD toward occupational adjustment.	71	63	74
The ability to administer to students with EBD group interest and special aptitude tests.	72	73	62
Knowledge or understanding of psychoneurotic behavior disorders, such as neurasthenia, hysteria, anxiety neurosis, and hypochondria.	73	54	68
The ability to administer to students with EBD social maturity scales.	74	80	77
The ability to administer to students with EBD group tests of personality and social emotional adjustment.	75	76	65
Knowledge or understanding of the general plan or procedure used in individual counseling, such as psychoanalysis, play therapy, and psychodrama.	76	66	72
Knowledge or understanding of methods and practices of occupational placement and post-school follow-up.	77	85	84
The ability to administer to maladjusted pupils sociometric tests including sociograms and “guess-who” tests.	78	74	78
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in music.	79	80	81
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in fine arts.	80	78	69
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in domestic arts.	81	74	86
The ability to administer to students with EBD group intelligence tests.	82	60	48
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in dramatic arts.	83	84	71
The ability to administer to students with EBD individual verbal and performance tests of mental ability, Revised Stanford-Binet, Grace Arthur Point Scale.	84	70	80

A knowledge or understanding of the cultural patterns of other societies- findings of Mead, Malinowski, and Benedict.	85	82	87
The ability to provide experience for students with EBD in industrial arts.	86	87	85
The ability to give intensive therapeutic counseling.	87	86	83
The ability to administer to students with EBD projective tests, such as Rorschach, Szondi, and Thematic Apperception Test.	88	88	88

APPENDIX E  
SUMMARY INTERCORRELATION TABLES

Table E.1

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 1-10 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	1a	2a	3a	4a	5a	6a	7a	8a	9a	10a
1b	.015*									
2b		.566								
3b			.009**							
4b				.532						
5b					.010**					
6b						.002**				
7b							.277			
8b								.268		
9b									.003**	
10b										.063

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.2

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 11-20 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	11a	12a	13a	14a	15a	16a	17a	18a	19a	20a
11b	.259									
12b		.210								
13b			.042*							
14b				.364						
15b					.267					
16b						.065				
17b							.256			
18b								.118		
19b									.241	
20b										.220

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.3

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 21-30 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	21a	22a	23a	24a	25a	26a	27a	28a	29a	30a
21b	.836									
22b		.002**								
23b			.000**							
24b				.011*						
25b					.407					
26b						.432				
27b							.015*			
28b								.177		
29b									.161	
30b										.068

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.4

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 31-40 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	31a	32a	33a	34a	35a	36a	37a	38a	39a	40a
31b	.026*									
32b		.000**								
33b			.020*							
34b				.249						
35b					.238					
36b						.440				
37b							.020*			
38b								.047*		
39b									.008**	
40b										.558

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.



Table E.5

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 41-50 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	41a	42a	43a	44a	45a	46a	47a	48a	49a	50a
41b	.011*									
42b		.006**								
43b			.042*							
44b				.422						
45b					.005**					
46b						.008**				
47b							.000**			
48b								.244		
49b									.897	
50b										.001**

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.6

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 51-60 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	51a	52a	53a	54a	55a	56a	57a	58a	59a	60a
51b	.668									
52b		.002**								
53b			.001**							
54b				.003**						
55b					.183					
56b						.031*				
57b							.000**			
58b								.122		
59b									.012*	
60b										.340

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.7

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 61-70 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	61a	62a	63a	64a	65a	66a	67a	68a	69a	70a
61b	.039*									
62b		.014*								
63b			.418*							
64b				.007**						
65b					.041*					
66b						.146				
67b							.040*			
68b								.516		
69b									.187	
70b										.931

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.8

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 71-80 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	71a	72a	73a	74a	75a	76a	77a	78a	79a	80a
71b	.011*									
72b		.004**								
73b			.001**							
74b				.000**						
75b					.025*					
76b						.065				
77b							.096			
78b								.043*		
79b									.928	
80b										.585

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 10$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

Table E.9

*Summary of Intercorrelations of Competencies 81-88 on Importance and Proficiency*

Variables	81a	82a	83a	84a	85a	86a	87a	88a
81b	.028*							
82b		.002**						
83b			.006**					
84b				.159				
85b					.813			
86b						.095		
87b							.431	
88b								.000**

*Note.* Correlation coefficients for importance of competencies ( $n = 8$ ) are presented above the diagonal, and correlation coefficients for proficiency in competencies ( $n = 8$ ) are presented below the diagonal. a = Importance; b = Proficiency. \* $p < .05$  level, 2-tailed. \*\*  $p < .01$ , 2-tailed.

APPENDIX F  
PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION EXPERIENCES

Rank	Item
1	Supervised student-teaching of students with EBD at the secondary level.
2	Supervised student-teaching of students with EBD at the elementary level.
3	Student observation without active participation of teaching of students with EBD.
4	Planned observation of conferences for teachers of students with EBD on placement, curriculum development and child study.
5	Planned observation of multi-professional case conferences held by representatives from fields such as psychiatry, psychology, and education) to study and make recommendations for students with EBD.
6	Supervised student-teaching of students with EBD in special day classes or schools.
7	Field trips throughout the community to discover and analyze how best to use available resources for students with EBD.
8	Supervised student teaching of general education children.
9	Planned observation of police, parole, and judicial services concerned with students with EBD.
10	Supervised student-teaching of students with EBD in residential schools.
11	Visits to the homes of students with EBD in the company of supervising teachers.
12	Clinical experience in diagnosing ability, achievement, interests and aptitudes of students with EBD.

## REFERENCES

- Alreck, L. P., & Settle, R. B. (2004). *The survey research handbook* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Alexander, P., & Judy, J. (1988). The interaction of domain-specific and strategic knowledge in academic performance. *Review of Educational Research, 58*, 375 - 404.
- Anderson, L. F., & Hendrickson, J. M. (2007). Early-career EBD teacher knowledge, ratings of competency importance, and observed use of instruction and management competencies. *Education and Treatment of Children, 30*(4), 43-65.
- Billingsley, B. S., Fall, A., & Williams Jr., T. O. (2006). Who is teaching students with emotional and behavioral disorders? A profile and comparison to other special educators. *Behavioral Disorders, 31*(3), 252-264.
- Blanton, L. P., Sindelar, P. T., & Correa, V. I. (2006). Models and measures of beginning teacher quality. *Journal of Special Education, 40*(2), 115-127.
- Berliner, D. C. (2005). The near impossibility of testing for teacher quality. *Journal of Teacher Education, 56*(3), 205-213.
- Boe, E. E. (2006). Long-term trends in the national demand, supply, and shortage of special education teachers. *Journal of Special Education, 40*(3), 138-150.
- Boe, E. E., Shin, S., & Cook, L. H. (2007). Does teacher preparation matter for beginning teachers in either special or general education? *Journal of Special Education, 41*(3), 158-170.
- Boe, E. E., Cook, L. H., & Sunderland, R. J. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. *Exceptional Children, 75*(1), 7-31.
- Brown, K. M., & Wynn, S. R. (2009). Finding, supporting, and keeping: The role of the principal in teacher retention issues. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 8*, 37-63.
- Brownell, M. T., Hirsch, E., & Seo, S. (2004). Meeting the demand for highly qualified special education teachers during severe shortages: What should policymakers consider? *Journal of Special Education, 38*(1), 56-61.
- Brownell, M. T., Ross, D. D., Colon, E. P., & McCallum, C. L. (2005). Critical features of special education teacher preparation: A comparison with general teacher education. *Journal of Special Education, 38*(4), 242-252.
- Brownell, M. T., Sindelar, P. T., Kiely, M. T., & Danielson, L. C. (2010). Special education teacher quality and preparation: Exposing foundations, constructing a new model. *Exceptional Children, 76*(3), 357-383.



- Brownell, M. T., Bishop, A. G., Gersten, R., Klingner, J. K., Penfield, R. D., Dimino, J., Haager, D., Menon, S., & Sindelar, P. T. (2009). The role of domain expertise in beginning special education teacher quality. *Exceptional Children, 75*(4), 391-411.
- Bullock, L. M., Dykes, M. K., & Kelly, T. J. (1974, November). Competency based teacher preparation in behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children, 41*(3), 192-194.
- Bullock, L. M., & Gable, R. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Quality personnel preparation in emotional/behavioral disorders: Current perspectives and future directions*. Denton, TX: Institute for Behavioral and Learning Differences, University of North Texas.
- Bullock, L. M., & Whelan, R. J. (1971, March). Competencies needed by teachers of the emotionally and socially maladjusted: A comparison. *Exceptional Children, 37*(7), 485-489.
- Burke, P. J. (1976). Personnel preparation: Historical perspective. *Exceptional Children, 43*(3), 144-147.
- Carlson, E., Brauen, M., Klein, S., Schroll, K., & Willig, S. (2002). *Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education (SPeNSE)*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Department of Special Education under contract from U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.
- Carlson, E., Lee, H., & Schroll, K. (2004). Identifying attributes of high quality special education teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 27*, 350-359.
- Center, D. B., & Stevenson, C. (2001). The EBD Teacher Stressors questionnaire. *Education and Treatment of Children, 24*(3), 323-335.
- Cheney, D., & Barringer, C. (1995). Teacher competence, student diversity, and staff training for the inclusion of middle school students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 3*(3), 174-183.
- Cook, L. H., & Boe, E. E. (2007). National trends in the sources and supply of teachers in special and general education. *Teacher and Special Education, 30*(4), 217-232.
- Council for Exceptional Children (CEC; 1983). CEC professional standards: Retrospect and prospect. *Exceptional Children, 50*(3), 226-229.
- Council for Exceptional Children (CEC; 2003). *What every special educator must know. Ethics, standards and guidelines for special educators* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.
- Council for Exceptional Children (CEC; 2004). *The Council for Exceptional Children definition of a well-prepared special education teacher*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Council for Exceptional Children (CEC; 2009). *What every special educator must know: Ethics, standards, and guidelines for special educators* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Arlington, VA: Author.

- Cullinan, D. (2004). Classification and definition of emotional and behavioral disorders. In R. B. Rutherford Jr., M. M. Quinn, & S. R. Mathur (Eds.), *Handbook of research in emotional and behavioral disorders* (pp. 32-53). New York: Guilford.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000a). *Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How can we ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000b). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1). ISSN 1068-2341.
- Dorward, B. A. (1963). A comparison of the competencies of regular classroom teachers and teachers of emotionally disturbed children. *Exceptional Children*, 30(2), 67-73.
- Duda, M. A., Dunlap, G., Fox, L., Lentini, R., & Clarke, S. (2004). An experimental evaluation of positive behavior support in a community preschool program. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 24(3), 143-155.
- Eber, L., Sugai, G., Smith, C. R., & Scott, T. M. (2002). Wraparound and positive behavioral interventions and supports in the schools. *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Support*, 10(3), 149-158.
- Fenstermacher, G. D., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determinations of quality in teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 107(1), 186-215.
- Fink, A. H., & Janssen, K. N. (1993). Competencies for teaching students with emotional behavioral disabilities. *Preventing School Failure*, 37(2), 11-16.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). Collecting research data through observation and content analysis. In A. E. Burvikovs (Series Ed.), *Educational Research an introduction* (7<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 253-286). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Retrieved July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/index.html>
- Greenlee, B., & Brown, J. J. (2009). Retaining teachers in challenging schools. *Education*, 130(1), 96-109.
- Henderson, K., Klein, S., Gonzalez, P., & Bradley, R. (2005). Teachers of children with emotional disturbance: A national look at preparation, teaching conditions, and practices. *Behavioral Disorders*, 31(1), 6-17.
- Hinkle, D., E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Holmes, G., & Hooper, N. (2000, October). Core competence and education. *Higher Education*, 40(3), 247-258.

- Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-82, 20 U. S. C. 8001 (1994).
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997, Pub. L. No. 105-17, 111 Stat. 37 (1997).
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-446, 118 Stat. 2647 (2004).
- Joseph, G. E., & Strain, P. S. (2003). Comprehensive evidence-based socio-emotional curricula for young children: An analysis of efficacious adoption potential. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 23*(2), 65-77.
- Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., & Conroy, M. (2003). Availability of special education teachers: Trends and issues. *Remedial and Special Education, 24*(4), 246-253.
- Kendziora, K. T. (2004). Early intervention for emotional and behavioral disorders. In R. B. Rutherford Jr., M. M. Quinn, & S. R. Mathur (Eds.), *Handbook of research in emotional and behavioral disorders* (pp. 327-351). New York: Guilford.
- Kleinhammer-Tramill, J., & Fiore, T. A. (2003). A history of federal support for preparing special educators and related services personnel to serve children and youth with disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 26*(3), 217-229.
- Knoke, D., Bohrnstedt, G. W., & Mee, A. P. (2002). *Statistics for social data analysis* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Lane, K. L., Gresham, F. M., & O'Shaughnessy, T. E. (2002). Serving students with or at-risk for emotional and behavior disorders: Future challenges. *Education and Treatment of Children, 25*(4), 507-521.
- Lane, K. L., Wehby, J., & Barton-Arwood, S. M. (2005). Students with and at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders: Meeting their social and academic needs. *Preventing School Failure, 49*(2), 6-9.
- Lewis, T. J., Hudson, S., Richter, M., & Johnson, N. (2004). Scientifically supported practices in emotional and behavioral disorders: A proposed approach and brief review of current practices. *Behavioral Disorders, 29*(3), 247-259.
- Mackie, R. P., Kvaraceus, W. C., & Williams, H. M. (1957). *Teachers of children who are socially and emotionally maladjusted: A report based on findings from the study "Qualification and preparation of teachers of exceptional children."* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (Bulletin No. 11). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Mackie, R. P., & Williams, H. M. (1959). Teachers of exceptional children. *Review of Educational Research, 29*(5), 395-407.
- McLesky, J., & Ross, D. D. (2004). The politics of teacher education in the new millennium: Implications for special education teacher educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 27*(4), 342-349.

- McLesky, J., Tyler, N. C., & Flippin, S. S. (2004). The supply and demand for teachers: A review of research regarding the chronic shortage of special education teachers. *Journal of Special Education, 38*(1), 5-21.
- Miller, M. D., Brownell, M. T., & Smith, S. W. (1999). Factors that predict teachers staying in, leaving, or transferring from the special education classroom. *Exceptional Children, 65*(2), 201-218.
- Murnane, R. J., & Steele, J. L. (2007). What is the problem? The challenge of providing effective teachers for all children. *The Future of Children, 17*(1), 15-43.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. A report to the nation and to the Secretary of the U.S. department of education*. Retrieved July 29, 2007, from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/title.html>
- Nelson, J. R. (2001). Sources of occupational stress for teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders, 9*(20), 123-131.
- Neiman, S., & Devoe, J. (2009). *Crime, violence, discipline, and safety in U.S. public schools: Findings from the school survey on crime and safety: 2007-08*. (NCES 2009-326). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Niesyn, M. E. (2009). Strategies for success: Evidence-based instructional practices for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Preventing School Failure, 53*(4), 227-233.
- No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2001). *Public Law 107-110, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved July 28, 2009, from the U.S. Department of Education Web site: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Nougaret, A., Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (2005). Does teacher education produce better special education teachers? *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 217-229.
- Oliver, R. M., & Reschly, D. J. (2010). Special education teacher preparation in classroom management: Implications for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 35*(3), 188-199.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative analysis and interpretation. In C. D. Laughton, D. E. Axelsen, & K. Peterson (Eds.), *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., pp. 431-540). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reynolds, M. (1999, September). Standards and professional practice: The TTA and initial teacher training. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(3), 247-260.
- Richardson, B. K., Alexander, A., & Castleberry, T. (2008). Examining teacher turnover in low-performing, multi-cultural schools: Relationships among emotional labor, communication symmetry, and intent to leave. *Communication Research Reports, 25* (1), 10-22.

- Roberson, L., Woosley, M. L., Seabrooks, J., & Williams, G. (2004). An ecobehavioral assessment of teaching behaviors of teacher candidates during their special education internship experiences. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 27*(3), 264-275.
- Rosenberg, M. S., Sindelar, P. T., & Hardman, M. L. (2004). Preparing highly qualified teachers for students with emotional or behavioral disorders: The impact of NCLB and IDEA. *Behavioral Disorders, 29*(3) 266-278.
- Rutherford, R. B., Jr., Quinn, M. M., & Mathur, S. R. (1996). Effective strategies for teaching appropriate behaviors to children with emotional/ behavioral disorders. In L. M. Bullock, & R. A. Gable (Eds.), *Mini-library series on emotional and behavioral disorders*. Arlington, VA: Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.
- Shores, R. E., Cegelka, P. T., & Nelson, C. M. (1973, November). Competency based special education teacher training. *Exceptional Children, 40*(3), 192-197.
- Sindelar, P. T., Bishop, A. G., Brownell, M. T., Rosenberg, M.S., & Connelly, V.J. (2005). Lessons from special education research. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(3), 35-47.
- Smith, D. D. (2006). Introduction to Lienemann & Reid: More than ever before our emphasis is on quality. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 29*(1), 1-2.
- Stempien, L. R., & Loeb, R. C. (2002). Differences in job satisfaction between general and special education teachers: Implications for retention. *Remedial and Special Education, 23*(5), 258-267.
- Study of Personnel Needs in Special Education [SPeNSE] (2002). *Key findings*. Retrieved June 10, 2009, from <http://www.spense.org>
- Sutherland, K. S., Denny, R. K., & Gunter, P. L. (2005). Teachers of students with emotional and behavioral disorders reported professional development needs: Differences between fully licensed and emergency licensed teachers. *Preventing School Failure, 49*(2), 41-46.
- Sutherland, K. S., Lewis-Palmer, T., Stichter, J., & Morgan, P. (2008). Examining the influence of teacher behavior and classroom context on the behavioral and academic outcomes for students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Journal of Special Education, 41*(4), 223-233.
- Swanson, C. B., & Stevenson, D. L. (2002). Standards-based reform in practice: Evidence on state and classroom instruction from the NAEP state assessments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(1), 1-27.
- Thompson, S. J., Lazarus, S. S., Clapper, A. T., & Thurlow, M. L. (2006). Adequate yearly progress of students with disabilities: Competencies for teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 29*(2), 137-147.

- Thompson, S., Lazarus, S., & Thurlow, M., Educational Policy Reform Research Institute [EPRRI], (2003). *Preparing educators to teach students with disabilities in an era of standards-based reform and accountability*. College Park, MD: University of Maryland, College Park Educational Policy Research Reform Institute. Retrieved June 30, 2009, from <http://www.eprii.org>
- U.S. 111<sup>th</sup> Congressional Session (2009). *H.R. 1161 To amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for innovative teacher retention programs*. Retrieved July 19, 2009, from <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h111-1161>
- U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008). *Labor force statistics from the current population survey*. Retrieved July 29, 2007, from <http://www.bls.gov/cps/tables.htm>
- U. S. Department of Education (2004). *Building the legacy: IDEA, 2004*. Retrieved July 29, 2007, from <http://idea.ed.gov/>
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Status of education in rural America*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ruraled/page4.asp>
- U. S. Department of Education (2010). Financial aid for postsecondary students. Accreditation in the United States. Specialized accrediting agencies. Retrieved September 5, 2010 from [http://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation\\_pg7.html#ed](http://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation_pg7.html#ed)
- Wayne, A. J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research*, 73(1), 89-122.
- Wehby, J. H., Lane, K. L., & Falk, K. B. (2003). Academic instruction for students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *The Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 11(4), 194-197.
- Whelan, R. J., & Kauffman, J. M. (1999). Educating students with emotional and behavioral disorders: Historical perspectives and future directions. In L. M. Bullock, & R. A. Gable (Eds.), *Third CCBD Mini-Library series: What works for children and youth with E/BD: Linking yesterday and today with tomorrow*. Reston, VA: council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.
- Wrobel, G. (1993). Preventing school failure for teachers: Training for a lifelong career in EBD. *Preventing School Failure*, 37(2), 16-26.
- Wynn, S. R., Carboni, L. W., & Patall, E. A. (2007). Beginning teachers' perceptions of mentoring, climate, and leadership: Promoting retention through a learning community's perspective. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6, 209-229.
- Zionts, L. T., Shellady, S. M., & Zionts, P. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of professional standards: Their importance and ease of implementation. *Preventing School Failure*, 50(3), 5-12.