

7-1-2019

Reliability Analysis of Complementary Assessment Tools for Measuring Teacher Candidate Dispositions

Winifred C. Nweke

Clayton State University, winifrednweke@clayton.edu

Tasha P. Perkins

Shorter University, tperkins@shorter.edu

Comfort Y. Afolabi

University System of Georgia, Comfort.afolabi@usg.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gerjournal>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nweke, Winifred C.; Perkins, Tasha P.; and Afolabi, Comfort Y. (2019) "Reliability Analysis of Complementary Assessment Tools for Measuring Teacher Candidate Dispositions," *Georgia Educational Researcher*. Vol. 16: Iss. 2, Article 2.

DOI: 10.20429/ger.2019.160202

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gerjournal/vol16/iss2/2>

This quantitative research is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Georgia Southern Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Georgia Educational Researcher by an authorized administrator of Georgia Southern Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Reliability Analysis of Complementary Assessment Tools for Measuring Teacher Candidate Dispositions

Abstract

Assessing the dispositions of teacher candidates remains a challenge for many Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs). This article details the process and results of establishing the reliability of two complementary instruments, the *Candidate Beliefs Self-Assessment Survey* (SAS) and the *Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric* (CDPA). The instruments are linked through the same dispositional themes that undergird the indicators in the CDPA and belief statements in the SAS. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were determined using Cronbach's alpha for SAS (0.81) and the CDPA (0.96). In addition, inter-rater reliability coefficient of 0.80 was determined for CDPA using Intraclass correlation (ICC) method based on one-way random model and absolute agreement. It is argued that using these instruments in tandem, SAS at program entry and CDPA as well as SAS at program exit, offers a viable solution to assessing and monitoring candidates' development and acquisition of dispositions needed for effective performance in the teaching profession.

Keywords

Disposition; Preservice teacher education; Performance assessment; Self-assessment; Inter-rater reliability; Intraclass Correlation Coefficient; Assessment instrument.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

Measuring teacher candidate dispositions is a complex venture, and teacher educators have tackled the challenge with a range of assessment instruments and approaches. Most researchers report measures of dispositions observed in candidate behavior and/or interactions in classes or during field experiences with students, colleagues and/or parents. Some assessment tools include checklists, scenarios and/or portfolios, rating scales, rubrics and self-reflections (Conderman & Walker, 2015; Notar, Riley, Taylor, Thornburg & Cargill, 2009; Rike & Sharp, 2008). Others involve candidates in reflective activities and assignments (Stooksberry, Schussler, & Bercaw, 2009; Villegas, 2007). A few authors administer separate candidate self-assessments (Schulte, Edward, & Edick, 2008; Thompson, 2009). Dispositions constitute a fundamental aspect of the national standards for teachers created by the Interstate New Teachers Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), and are arguably the undergirding anchor of a teacher's daily decisions and performance. Thus, teacher preparation programs must address and work to ensure candidates graduate with the dispositions needed for the classroom.

In this study, we present the process and results of conducting the reliability analyses of a pair of newly developed, related instruments: The *Candidate Beliefs Self-Assessment Survey* (SAS) and the *Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric* (CDPA). The SAS assesses the teacher candidates' beliefs and attitudes, while the CDPA assesses teacher candidates' dispositions. Both instruments are based on the same themes, whose identification and validation are described elsewhere (Afolabi, Nweke, & Perkins, 2018). The SAS sensitizes candidates to the beliefs and attitudes that undergird their dispositions and familiarizes them with the dispositions included in the CDPA on which they are rated by Educator Preparation Program (EPP) supervisors and P-12 cooperating teachers. Using both instruments, the SAS provides a dispositional audit or awakening at entry and sets the stage for the development of corresponding expected dispositions assessed with the performance assessment (CDPA) at program exit. The SAS could also be administered at program exit to triangulate the results from the CDPA. Specifically, three data points become available when university supervisors and cooperating teachers administer the CDPA while teacher candidates conduct self-evaluation with the SAS.

Literature Review

The term dispositions gained popularity within teacher education preparation during the 1990s (Helm, 2006; Villegas, 2007) and has elicited considerable debate since (Borko, Liston, & Whitcomb, 2007). The former

accrediting body, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2008), defined professional dispositions as the “professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities” (pp. 89-90). Villegas (2007) proposed “that dispositions are tendencies for individuals to act in a particular manner under particular circumstances, based on their beliefs” (p. 373). Considering several definitions, Schussler (2006) deduced that “dispositions exist on the inside but are manifested on the outside through a teacher’s knowledge and behaviors” (p. 259). One commonality among these disposition definitions is the expression of dispositions in behaviors and actions. Similarly, referencing values, beliefs, and actions, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) (2011) provided clusters of “critical dispositions” for each of the ten Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium’s (InTASC) standards. Thus, it is important to underscore the role of beliefs in teachers’ dispositions and the complicated tie between dispositions and behaviors. Consequently, dispositions are defined in this project as “the habits of professional action and moral commitments that underlie an educator’s performances,” borrowing from the InTASC (CCSSO, 2011, p. 6) and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) definitions (2016, p. 180).

However, defining “dispositions” has a history of being a “murky” affair (Schussler, 2006). Schussler argues that dispositions should be from both conceptual and practical vantage points, giving common language for understanding dispositions. She explains that dispositions serve as a “filter” influencing how teachers think and act (p. 259). Yet, a teacher candidate’s dispositions are dynamic, evolving with time, experience, and setting (Curran & Murray, 2008; Frederiksen, Cooner, & Stevenson, 2012; McKnight, 2004). Not only do authors disagree on the definitions of indicators of dispositions (Johnston, America, Henriott, & Shapiro, 2011), they also disagree on which dispositions should be valued in educator preparation (Alawiye & Williams, 2010; McKnight, 2004).

In addition, assessing dispositions is a difficult endeavor (Borko, Liston, & Whitcomb, 2007) for various reasons. First, philosophically, whether or not dispositions can or should be assessed is contested (McKnight, 2004; Thompson, 2009). Secondly, some authors argue that assessing and teaching certain dispositions can be interpreted as enculturation, potentially supporting political and/or ideological biases (Borko et al., 2007; Schussler, 2006). Thus, determining the dispositions to be emphasized in a teacher education program is a serious matter.

Measuring dispositions presents further challenges. Not all dispositions are observed, demonstrated, and/or required during the administration of an assessment (Rike & Sharp, 2008; Wayda & Lund, 2005). Furthermore, reliability among raters can vary depending on the scorer's interpretation of an indicator or application of the rubric criteria based on context (Johnston et al., 2011; Wayda & Lund, 2005). It can also be difficult to assess a teacher candidate's dispositions early in a program due to lack of knowledge of and limited shared experiences with the candidate. Yet, despite these difficulties, evidence suggests that dispositions can be taught and assessed in teacher preparation programs (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Curran & Murray, 2008; Hochstetler, 2014; Villegas, 2007).

Currently, several approaches exist for assessing dispositions of teachers and/or teacher candidates. Some authors advocate for self-assessment. For example, to assess candidates' dispositions toward diversity, the *Multicultural Dispositions Index* utilizes 22 self-report statements within the following four categories: cross-cultural competence, multicultural worldview, knowledge of personal and professional self, and professional skills and commitment (Thompson, 2009). Similarly, Schulte, Edwards and Edick (2008) recommend implementing the *Diversity Dispositions Index* as a self-assessment for measuring graduate students' dispositions in teacher preparation programs.

Another common approach is to identify and use dispositional indicators to assess candidates from the perspective of a faculty member, cooperating teacher, and/or university supervisor. Rike and Sharp (2008) developed the *Early Childhood Education Behaviors and Dispositions Checklist* with which faculty rate candidates from 0 - 2 in three courses on four distinct areas: class behaviors, practicum behaviors, communication skills, and general dispositions. Wayda and Lund (2005) created a dispositions rubric derived from Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) faculty expertise to correspond with characteristics for teacher employability. Ten indicators are assessed on the rubric, addressing how well the candidates value the following five categories: learning and knowledge; diversity; collaboration; professionalism; and personal integrity. To ensure that candidates understand program expectations, the rubric, along with a corresponding self-analysis, are provided to candidates in a course early in the preparation program. The rubric is used both formatively and summatively prior to student teaching.

Stooksberry et al. (2009) engaged students in reflective journaling to address the intellectual, cultural, and moral disposition domains (referred to as the *ICM heuristic*). The authors contend this heuristic approach allows for individualized mentoring of students on dispositional areas identified from journal entries as needing further development, and that the approach can also be utilized throughout the education program. Wasicsko, Wirtz, and Resor (2009) developed

the *Perceptual Disposition Model*, adapted from four perceptions identified to distinguish effective from ineffective teachers, to be used as a component of admission requirements to the EPP. The four areas (perceptions of self, others, purpose, and people-orientedness) were assessed on a 7-point Likert scale with descriptions for only the extreme ends of the scale.

None of the available assessment tools comprehensively addresses EPP-desired dispositions along with dispositions for employability (Arial & Miller, 2016; Wayda and Lund, 2005), technology-use-related dispositions (Jung & Rhodes, 2008), and candidates' prior beliefs (Villegas, 2007). Additionally, as Villegas (2007) argued, and in line with CAEP assessment expectations of EPPs, there is a pressing "need to give more focused attention to issues of validity and reliability in the assessment of teacher candidates' dispositions" (p. 378). Thus, we seek to conduct a reliability analysis on a pair of assessment tools with established content validity (Afolabi et al., 2018) for assessing teacher candidates' dispositions—the *Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric* (CDPA) to be used by EPPs to assess teacher candidates' dispositions, and the *Candidate Beliefs Self-Assessment Survey* (SAS) built on the beliefs undergirding the indicators included in the rubric, to elicit candidate beliefs. The two complementary assessment tools are designed to be used in tandem by the teacher candidate, university supervisor, and cooperating teacher to triangulate data on a teacher candidate's dispositions for teaching.

This article describes the development and the process of determining the reliability of both instruments. Thus, this study covers the (a) creation of the CDPA and SAS and (b) the determination of the internal consistency reliability of both instruments as well as the inter-rater reliability of the CDPA.

Research Questions

The following research questions are addressed in this article.

1. Is the *Candidate Beliefs Self-Assessment Survey* (SAS) a reliable instrument for eliciting candidate's beliefs and attitudes?
2. Is the *Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric* (CDPA) reliable for assessing candidates' dispositions by proxy of their performance during student teaching?

Methods

Developing a Rubric and Self-Assessment Survey from the Twenty-four Themes.

To represent both K-12 and higher education values and preferences regarding dispositions, the authors drew upon prior work identifying esteemed dispositions among the entities (Afolabi et al., 2018; Arial & Miller, 2016). To begin, the researchers selected the 24 disposition themes with an acceptable Content Validity Ratio (CVR) as rated by both K-12 and higher education representatives (Afolabi et al., 2018). Twenty of the 24 themes (83.3%) align to InTASC standards (see Appendix A for alignment), reflecting dispositions evident within the CCSSO national InTASC standards (Afolabi et al., 2018). These validated indicators emanating from the themes were selected as the rubric indicators for the CDPA (see Appendix A for rubric indicators). Next, the researchers worked collaboratively to develop corresponding belief statements underlying each dispositional performance indicator. For example, for the indicator stating, “Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate relationships with students,” the following corresponding underlying belief statement was developed: “Candidate believes in interacting with all students in a positive, professional and fair manner at all times” (Appendix A). For each of the belief statements, one or more self-assessment statements were derived, such as “I believe it is essential always to interact with students in a positive and professional way.” Table 1 below shows an example of the progression from an indicator to the belief statement to its corresponding SAS item.

Table 1.

Example of CDPA Indicator, Underlying Belief, and Self-Assessment Statement

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
2. Interaction with Students - Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate relationships with students. [InTASC 9o]	Interaction with students - Candidate believes in interacting with all students in a positive, professional and fair manner at all times.	2. I believe it is essential always to interact with students in a positive and professional way.

Thus, these two assessment tools were developed to be used in tandem for a more robust evaluation of teacher candidates' dispositions by drawing upon the belief statements for the SAS and from the indicators for the CDPA, respectively. Appendix A shows the complete alignment of the belief statements with the CDPA rubric indicators and corresponding SAS items.

The CDPA comprises 24 indicators on a 4-point developmentally sequenced scale. The four developmentally sequenced performance levels are: (1) Unacceptable, (2) Needs Development, (3) Proficient, and (4) Exemplary, with Level 3 serving as an indication of "classroom ready" proficiency. Due to the consequential and summative uses of the CPDA, four levels were selected to prevent raters or assessors from over relying on a neutral rating, which might happen with an odd-numbered level scale.

The researchers collaborated to identify sample behaviors and attitudes which could be observed at each level of the rubric for each indicator, drawing upon professional knowledge, personal experience, and state and national teaching standards. Since dispositions are difficult to observe directly, the performance indicator descriptions were designed to reflect potential behaviors that might be observed at a given performance level for a particular indicator, but the descriptions were not intended to be exhaustive. Additionally, as rubrics allow for complexity within the performance level progressions, the descriptions for performance progressions for each indicator often address multiple facets of one concept. Instructions for using the rubric indicate that the instrument is not an observation instrument and that ratings should include review of artifacts and conversations with the candidate. The feedback provided within the rubric may be utilized by EPPs as desired. One such use can include using the rubric feedback to inform a professional development plan prior to graduation.

The SAS, on the other hand, whose items each needed to address a single idea or thought, could not be restricted to 24 items. Thus, the SAS comprises 33 5-point Likert scale survey items whose levels range from Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree to Strongly Agree with matching point-values of 1 through 5, respectively (see Appendix A for the SAS statements). A 5-point scale was chosen for the self-assessment to allow candidates the opportunity to express views that were undecided, since the SAS is suggested to be administered at program entry. Five items in the SAS (6, 9, 16, 18, and 28) were negatively keyed to avoid social desirability bias (Fisher, 1993; Grimm, 2010).

The SAS elicits candidates' beliefs underlying the same indicators that formed the basis of the CDPA. One purpose of the SAS is to sensitize candidates about possible beliefs and biases which underlie their dispositions and behavior in

the classroom. Thus, this instrument was designed to be administered at the entry point into a teacher preparation program, not necessarily for selection into the program, but to provide baseline data for planning a candidate's development and growth through the program in accordance with the candidate's self-identified beliefs. Results from the administration of such an instrument would provide information for guiding the candidate as well as introducing him or her to the dispositions he or she would be expected to develop and with which he or she would be evaluated before exiting the program. Therefore, implementing the SAS at program entry and the CDPA during student teaching creates an avenue for disposition monitoring over the course of a candidate's tenure within a program. Additionally, the SAS can be administered at program exit as a supplementary data point to the CDPA results.

Determining the Internal Consistency Reliability of the Instruments.

Reliability is the second most important characteristic of assessment results, second to validity (Miller, Linn & Gronlund, 2013). Reliability addresses how consistent the results obtained from a test are as measured in various ways, leading to different types of reliability.

Each type of reliability is reported as a coefficient that ranges from 0, not reliable, through 1.0, very reliable. How reliable an instrument should be depends on the importance of the decision for which the assessment will be used (Miller, Linn and Gronlund (2013). In general, reliability coefficients 0.80 and higher are considered high and acceptable for most purposes, but the higher the better (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997, Jonsson & Svingby, 2007; Miller, Linn & Gronlund, 2013; Creswell, 2015).

To determine how reliable these duly constructed dispositions instruments are, we pilot-tested the instruments. The purpose of this stage of the study was to determine if the instruments are reliable for EPPs to use with their pre-service teacher candidates. In order to address ethical research considerations, Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was sought and granted prior to the study. All participants included in the study completed an informed consent form. The point person (typically the Assessment Coordinator/Field Experience Coordinator) at each institution provided codes to the participants and researchers in order to match candidates with the correct university supervisor and cooperating teacher to protect the anonymity of the participants.

Participants.

A total of 22 university supervisors and 10 cooperating teachers rated 92 candidates on the CDPA. The 92 candidates were graduating seniors from four

EPPs - two public and two private institutions (one Historically Black College and University (HBCU) and one church-affiliated institution). The teacher candidates completed their clinical experience in various area grade schools in the spring of 2017 and majored in a range of education programs, including elementary, middle level, secondary and music education, and in subjects like Math, English, History, Social Science, and Special Education. Neither CDPA nor SAS collects gender or ethnicity data; however, the point person for each participating institution provided summary-level demographic information regarding the participants. Gender distributions of participants in the pilot study are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.

Participants' Distributed by Gender, Role and Type of Institution

Institution	Candidates		University Supervisors		Cooperating Teachers	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
HBCU	0	3	0	1	0	1
PUB1	3	8	0	5	0	3
PUB2	14	52	3	10	0	0
CHAF	1	11	0	3	2	4
Total	18	74	3	19	2	8

Note. Descriptions of the institutions are abbreviated in the following manner: HBCU – Historically Black College and Universities, PUB – Public, and CHAF – Church-Affiliated.

With regard to race and ethnicity, 70% of the teacher candidates were identified as White, 21% as African American, 3% as Asian, 3% as more than one race or mixed ethnicity, 1% as American Indian/Alaskan Native, 1% as Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 1% as Other. While 60% of the cooperating teachers were identified as White; 40% were African American; 86% of the university supervisors were identified as White and 14% were African American.

Data Collection/Procedures.

First, one coordinator per participating EPP was virtually trained on how to administer the assessments. Second, university supervisors and cooperating

teachers received the same codes as were assigned to the teacher candidates whom they supervised during student teaching for rating the teacher candidates on the *Candidate Disposition Performance Assessment Rubric* (CDPA). Third, participants were allowed a period of 3-4 weeks to complete the self-assessment or the rating of their candidates. The CDPA ratings from university supervisors and cooperating teachers were a summary of an evaluator's observations, review of artifacts such as lesson plans, and discussions with candidates during debriefings; thus, the rating for each candidate was based on an accumulated body of evidence over a specified period of time. Candidates completed the SAS, reflecting on their own beliefs.

Participation was voluntary, and one public EPP opted not to recruit cooperating teachers to participate. The ratings and the self-assessment were completed electronically. Ten candidates were each evaluated by two raters: one university supervisor and one cooperating teacher. Nine were each evaluated by two raters: two university supervisors. The remaining candidates were each evaluated by one university supervisor. The differences in the number of university supervisors per candidate reflect the uniqueness of the programs.

Data Analysis.

Correlation and reliability analyses were performed on the CDPA and SAS data. For the CDPA, the inter-item correlations were calculated using Pearson's correlation method for the 24 rubric indicators. On the other hand, for SAS, 32 of the 33 items were used for analyses. Specifically, one item, Model Professionalism in Attitude, was eliminated from both the correlation and reliability analyses by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (Version 22) because all candidates rated themselves 5, yielding an item variance of zero. Correlation, and by extension reliability, analyses are based on variability of scores.

Five of the 32 SAS items were stated in a negative format, or negatively keyed. For example, item 6 stated, "I do not think it is very important to plan lessons that take into consideration my students' backgrounds." The other four negatively formatted items are items 9, 16, 18 and 28. For purposes of the analyses, the ratings were reverse-scored, i.e. changed to their positive format following the conventional method (Kent State University Libraries, 2017). Specifically, for a Likert scale of 1 to 5, each score is subtracted from 6. Thus, for Item 6, for example, a score of 1, strongly disagreeing with the statement, ends up with a score of 5 (6-1) which means the candidate thinks it is very important to plan lessons that take into consideration students' backgrounds. Similarly, a candidate who strongly agrees with the statement as stated ends up with a score of 1 (6-5).

For reliability analyses, internal consistency reliability coefficients were determined for CDPA and SAS using Cronbach alpha. In addition, an inter-rater reliability coefficient was determined for CDPA using one-way random and absolute agreement model of the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) methodology. The one-way model was chosen because different sets of raters rated different sets of candidates (Nicholas, 1998).

Results

Results of the correlation analyses are presented in Tables 3 and 4 for CDPA and SAS, respectively. The inter-item correlations for CDPA ranged from $r=0.26$ to $r=0.76$ (see Table 3). All items are positively and reasonably correlated to one another and yet independent enough to contribute to a measure of candidates' dispositions. On the other hand, inter-item correlations among the SAS items included negative coefficients and ranged in absolute value from $r=0$ to $r=0.69$ (see Table 4).

Table 3.

Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for the Candidate Disposition Performance Assessment Rubric

Indicators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	
1 - Integrity	1.00																								
2 - Interaction with Students	.49	1.00																							
3 - Attitude & Demeanor	.48	.68	1.00																						
4 - Communication	.44	.50	.57	1.00																					
5 - High Expectations for All Students	.41	.71	.60	.61	1.00																				
6 - Attendance/Punctuality	.36	.46	.45	.56	.46	1.00																			
7 - Dependability & Reliability	.42	.44	.52	.63	.54	.63	1.00																		
8 - Interaction with Adults	.51	.65	.73	.68	.58	.56	.59	1.00																	
9 - Collaboration	.47	.60	.57	.65	.52	.61	.60	.72	1.00																
10 - Organization & Preparedness	.42	.48	.53	.62	.54	.45	.64	.50	.49	1.00															
11 - Teachability and Adaptability	.48	.45	.70	.62	.54	.48	.53	.68	.62	.52	1.00														
12 - Content Knowledge	.38	.52	.45	.53	.51	.34	.34	.52	.48	.46	.51	1.00													
13 - Cultural Sensitivity	.33	.47	.55	.56	.61	.26	.34	.55	.43	.40	.41	.49	1.00												
14 - Assessment	.34	.44	.44	.62	.51	.37	.44	.59	.55	.46	.51	.75	.56	1.00											
15 - Fairness	.43	.65	.59	.62	.63	.42	.46	.63	.54	.46	.46	.53	.59	.63	1.00										
16 - Use of Technology	.43	.47	.41	.47	.42	.55	.41	.51	.57	.34	.46	.56	.39	.56	.41	1.00									
17 - Time Management	.42	.40	.52	.65	.53	.47	.70	.49	.61	.71	.56	.41	.46	.48	.46	.42	1.00								
18 - Self Control	.50	.41	.57	.56	.30	.60	.64	.58	.66	.49	.51	.43	.35	.46	.51	.53	.51	1.00							
19 - Professional Appearance	.52	.51	.58	.65	.50	.47	.55	.55	.55	.53	.48	.44	.41	.47	.55	.46	.56	.64	1.00						
20 - Initiative	.46	.70	.59	.57	.63	.42	.49	.60	.62	.63	.59	.61	.42	.57	.58	.54	.54	.45	.56	1.00					
21 - Professional Judgement	.37	.54	.58	.47	.42	.49	.48	.66	.68	.44	.58	.54	.46	.57	.44	.52	.41	.67	.54	.57	1.00				
22 - Passion for Teaching	.49	.75	.69	.59	.74	.45	.59	.67	.64	.57	.54	.54	.47	.50	.62	.49	.55	.48	.66	.76	.52	1.00			
23 - Commitment to School	.26	.51	.44	.48	.53	.50	.38	.55	.59	.43	.52	.59	.49	.62	.55	.54	.41	.49	.53	.66	.61	.58	1.00		
24 - Problem Solving Ability	.41	.49	.51	.55	.45	.45	.54	.54	.61	.57	.52	.72	.40	.64	.46	.57	.53	.56	.50	.71	.65	.56	.57	1.00	

Table 4.
Inter-Item Correlation Matrix for the Candidate Beliefs Self-Assessment Survey

Belief Statements	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32						
1 - Code of Ethics	1.00																																					
2 - Interaction with Students	-0.02	1.00																																				
3 - Professional Communication	-0.02	0.62	1.00																																			
4 - High Expectations for All Students	-0.03	0.13	0.17	1.00																																		
5 - Plan Lesson w/ Student Bkgrd_Pos	-0.06	0.02	0.05	-0.03	1.00																																	
6 - Teachers Overcome Learning Barriers	0.20	0.06	0.10	0.02	-0.03	1.00																																
7 - Punctuality	0.42	-0.06	0.10	-0.08	-0.02	0.20	1.00																															
8 - Attend School Related Events_Pos	0.31	0.15	0.10	0.43	-0.07	0.26	0.29	1.00																														
9 - Reliable & Dependable	-0.09	0.08	0.25	0.04	-0.05	0.22	0.12	0.12	1.00																													
10 - Professional Treatment	-0.05	0.22	0.46	0.09	0.05	0.12	0.26	0.11	0.45	1.00																												
11 - Teamwork	-0.09	0.10	0.15	0.05	-0.03	0.21	-0.12	0.07	0.56	0.20	1.00																											
12 - Preparedness	-0.04	0.26	0.53	0.13	0.09	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.47	0.38	0.39	1.00																										
13 - Open to Constructive Criticism	0.27	0.10	0.15	0.05	0.12	0.17	0.23	0.23	0.31	0.29	0.34	0.38	1.00																									
14 - Teacher Bias	-0.10	0.10	0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.26	0.13	0.03	0.37	0.25	0.31	0.17	0.41	1.00																								
15 - Critical Thinking_Pos	0.12	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.37	0.16	-0.01	0.14	0.14	0.02	0.14	0.10	0.02	0.06	1.00																							
16 - Value Cultural Differences	-0.07	0.14	0.20	0.10	0.23	0.17	0.23	0.28	0.24	0.51	0.20	0.37	0.35	0.27	0.16	1.00																						
17 - Same Assessment	0.34	0.04	-0.13	-0.10	0.05	0.12	0.13	0.04	0.06	-0.13	-0.10	-0.03	0.17	0.11	0.33	-0.07	1.00																					
18 - Variety of Assessments	-0.05	-0.05	-0.05	0.00	0.11	0.16	-0.01	0.15	0.32	0.02	0.26	0.35	0.34	0.50	-0.04	0.15	0.14	1.00																				
19 - Assessment Use	-0.07	-0.07	-0.07	0.03	0.20	0.32	-0.10	0.17	0.08	0.08	0.26	0.13	0.26	0.26	0.28	0.33	0.09	0.27	1.00																			
20 - Evidence Based Decisions	-0.12	-0.12	-0.05	-0.04	0.30	0.19	-0.05	0.10	0.09	0.06	0.17	0.08	0.15	0.17	0.27	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.51	1.00																		
21 - Social Media	0.24	-0.07	-0.06	0.05	-0.03	0.20	0.42	0.20	0.17	0.26	0.04	0.15	0.20	0.02	-0.03	0.25	-0.01	0.16	0.15	0.03	1.00																	
22 - Technology	-0.08	-0.08	-0.07	0.09	0.07	0.06	-0.03	0.29	0.10	-0.08	0.19	0.06	0.14	0.09	0.20	0.04	0.06	0.15	0.28	0.27	0.23	1.00																
23 - Ethical Professional Use of Technology	-0.04	0.26	-0.04	0.03	-0.01	0.10	0.18	0.13	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.28	0.07	0.05	-0.05	0.12	0.01	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.33	0.15	1.00															
24 - Meeting Deadlines	-0.10	0.06	0.20	-0.04	-0.02	0.18	0.36	0.15	0.44	0.45	0.43	0.38	0.32	0.37	0.08	0.36	-0.16	0.16	0.01	0.14	0.25	0.03	0.10	1.00														
25 - Calm in Stressful Situation	-0.17	0.05	0.05	-0.10	-0.06	0.25	0.22	0.14	0.23	0.05	0.10	0.22	0.12	0.23	-0.18	0.23	-0.13	0.22	0.09	-0.01	0.16	0.05	0.28	0.31	1.00													
26 - Value Self Control	-0.10	0.25	0.24	0.03	0.19	0.35	0.27	0.23	0.36	0.44	0.28	0.45	0.35	0.41	0.19	0.44	0.01	0.39	0.26	0.27	0.21	0.20	0.24	0.52	0.31	1.00												
27 - Professional Dressing_Pos	0.40	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.36	0.18	0.26	0.35	0.12	0.16	0.01	0.13	0.19	0.09	0.42	0.35	0.32	0.25	0.32	0.23	0.35	0.11	0.04	0.09	0.02	0.24	1.00											
28 - Initiative	-0.08	0.29	0.16	0.00	0.06	0.33	0.15	0.30	0.52	0.41	0.43	0.40	0.43	0.37	-0.01	0.52	-0.02	0.36	0.07	0.02	0.11	-0.03	0.18	0.46	0.37	0.50	0.17	1.00										
29 - Professional Judgement	-0.06	0.16	0.22	0.05	0.20	0.27	0.27	0.23	0.53	0.45	0.33	0.55	0.48	0.29	0.04	0.46	0.03	0.30	0.06	0.20	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.49	0.32	0.51	0.06	0.67	1.00									
30 - Passionate	-0.06	0.42	0.25	0.07	0.13	0.33	0.09	0.29	0.37	0.38	0.23	0.33	0.14	0.23	0.03	0.23	0.07	0.23	0.03	0.23	0.06	0.05	0.18	0.36	0.22	0.52	0.06	0.59	0.69	1.00								
31 - Commitment	-0.07	-0.07	-0.06	-0.03	0.28	0.36	0.05	0.15	0.34	0.31	0.46	0.39	0.37	0.26	0.17	0.43	-0.02	0.38	0.48	0.41	0.27	0.06	0.14	0.39	0.14	0.55	0.28	0.40	0.48	0.45	1.00							
32 - Teacher Role	-0.07	0.06	0.10	0.02	-0.04	0.40	0.08	0.17	0.27	0.12	0.21	0.26	0.12	0.10	-0.04	0.17	-0.10	0.16	0.08	0.17	0.04	0.10	0.10	0.34	0.14	0.25	0.01	0.37	0.43	0.38	0.30	1.00						

Reliability analysis on CDPA data yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.96 (0.96 on standardized items). Table 5 shows summary statistics on each indicator, specifically, the minimum rating, maximum rating, average rating and standard deviation. Given that the candidates had just completed their student teaching, it is surprising that the minimum rating was as low as 2 (Developing) or 1 (Not Acceptable) for as many as 18 themes. One of the cooperating teachers noted in the feedback comment that he/she rated his/her candidate low on communication with parents and community because he/she shielded student teachers from contact with parents. He/she further noted that he/she did not think candidates were qualified or licensed to participate in sharing personal student/parents' information despite the fact that the candidates had been issued Pre-Service certificates, the first level of a four-tier certification system in the state. This comment indicates an interesting finding as using the rubric caused the cooperating teacher to reflect on his/her practice, especially in terms of the level of exposure he/she gave to teacher candidates with regard to communicating with students' families.

Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics on Candidates Dispositions Performance Assessment

Themes	Number of Ratings	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Integrity	102	3	4	3.70	0.46
Interaction with Students	102	3	4	3.59	0.49
Attitude & Demeanor	102	1	4	3.50	0.56
Communication	102	2	4	3.34	0.57
High Expectation	102	2	4	3.47	0.56
Attendance & Punctuality	102	1	4	3.48	0.66
Dependability & Reliability	102	2	4	3.49	0.58

Interaction with Adults	102	2	4	3.5	0.52
Collaboration with Colleagues	102	3	4	3.55	0.50
Organization and Preparedness	102	2	4	3.40	0.58
Teachability and Adaptability	102	2	4	3.44	0.52
Content Knowledge	102	2	4	3.28	0.50
Cultural Sensitivity	102	3	4	3.54	0.50
Ethical Use of Assessment	102	2	4	3.29	0.52
Fairness	102	2	4	3.47	0.58
Use of Technology	102	2	4	3.43	0.52
Time Management	102	2	4	3.21	0.63
Self-Control	102	2	4	3.50	0.54
Professional Appearance	102	3	4	3.52	0.50
Initiative	102	2	4	3.43	0.57
Professional Judgment	102	2	4	3.45	0.52
Passion	102	2	4	3.53	0.54
Commitment to the School	102	3	4	3.52	0.50
Problem Solver	102	2	4	3.36	0.54

Average Rating Score	102	2.58	4	3.46	0.40
----------------------	-----	------	---	------	------

The reliability analysis for the SAS yielded Cronbach's alpha reliability of 0.81 (0.88 on standardized items). Table 6 shows the summary statistics of the items.

Table 6.

<i>Descriptive Statistics for the Teacher Candidate Self-Assessment Survey</i>					
Themes	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Code of Ethics	92	4	5	4.97	0.18
Positive Student Interaction	92	4	5	4.98	0.15
Model Professionalism in Attitude & Demeanor	92	5	5	5.00	0.00
Communication is Professional	92	3	5	4.96	0.25
High Expectation	92	1	5	4.90	0.47
<i>Cognizant of Students' Background_Pos</i>	92	1	5	4.60	1.05
Overcome Barriers in Student Background	92	2	5	4.70	0.57
Punctuality to Work/School-Related Events	92	4	5	4.89	0.31
<i>Attendance at School-Related Events_Pos</i>	92	1	5	3.92	1.01

Reliability and Dependability	92	4	5	4.75	0.44
Professional Treatment of School Community	92	4	5	4.91	0.28
Value Team Work	92	4	5	4.78	0.41
Preparedness	92	4	5	4.94	0.25
Open to Constructive Criticism	91	3	5	4.77	0.45
Teacher Bias is Possible	91	1	5	4.50	0.78
<i>Critical Thinking_Pos</i>	92	1	5	4.59	1.03
Value Cultural Differences	91	4	5	4.84	0.37
<i>Administration of Assessments_Pos</i>	91	1	5	3.84	1.33
Variety of Assessments	91	4	5	4.90	0.30
Using Assessment Results to Provide Feedback	90	3	5	4.77	0.52
Evidence-Based Decisions	91	2	5	4.40	0.80
Using Social Media Effectively & Appropriately	90	3	5	4.80	0.50
Using Technology for Student Engagement	91	3	5	4.78	0.47
Professional & Ethical Use of Technology	91	4	5	4.93	0.25
Value Meeting Deadlines	92	3	5	4.67	0.52
Calm in Stressful Situations	92	2	5	4.21	0.78

Value Self-Control	92	4	5	4.75	0.44
<i>Value Professional Dressing_Pos</i>	92	1	5	4.44	0.98
Show Initiative	92	4	5	4.78	0.41
Demonstrate Sound Professional Judgment	91	4	5	4.87	0.34
Passionate about Work	92	4	5	4.88	0.33
Commitment to School's Mission & Vision	90	4	5	4.84	0.36
Teacher's Role as Problem Solver	91	1	5	4.75	0.59

Note. Italicized themes with “Pos” added to the name portray items that were reverse-scored before analyses.

The average score per item ranged from a minimum of 3.86 (out of 5) to a maximum of 4.98, with an overall mean of 4.71. This range of item means shows that, in general, the candidates had positive beliefs. Nevertheless, Table 6 shows some scores of 1 and 2. Five of the 8 items that had a minimum of 1 are items that were originally negatively keyed. The five items also have the highest standard deviation ranging from 0.98 on *Value Professional Dressing* to 1.33 on *Administering Same Assessment*. Thus, it is not clear if some candidates misunderstood the items. Nevertheless, the average scores for these items suggest that very few candidates, if any, misunderstood the items. Open-ended comments were also reviewed.

Several comments were positive and indicated the assessment instruments were well received. For example, one respondent commented on CDPA “I like how the ‘4’ category for several components incorporates the idea that the teacher candidate is a leader among his/her peers.” Some concerns expressed included the difficulty of attaining a level four for indicator #4, Communication, and the complexity of the rubric level progression for indicator #17, Time Management on the CDPA.

Finally, Table 7 shows the result of the inter-rater reliability calculated on CDPA data using intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC). Using the average measure, the inter-rater reliability for CDPA is 0.80, with a 95% interval from 0.67 to 0.90.

Table 7.

Intraclass Correlation Coefficient

	Intraclass Correlation	95% Confidence Interval		F Test with True Value 0			
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Value	df1	df2	Sig
Single Measures	0.05	0.03	0.10	5.07	23	1872	0.00
Average Measures	0.80	0.67	0.90	5.07	23	1872	0.00

One-way random effects model where people effects are random.

Discussion

This study examines two complementary dispositions instruments that can be completed by and on teacher candidates. The instruments are based on dispositional themes validated using Lawshe’s method (1975) with K-12 and Higher Education experts as panelists (Afolabi, et al., 2018). In addition, the assessment tools include dispositions related to technology, an essential aspect of dispositions in today’s technology-laden educational environment (Jung & Rhodes, 2008). Based on the findings within this study, the CDPA and the SAS can be considered reliable instruments with regard to internal consistency and inter-rater reliability for the CDPA. Specifically, data analysis showed Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of 0.96 and 0.81, respectively, for the instruments while the CDPA also shows an inter-rater reliability based on ICC of 0.80.

We advocate the use of the SAS at program entry, not for selection, but to develop a baseline for subsequent monitoring, by faculty throughout the program, of the attitudes and beliefs elicited and the attendant dispositions. This approach would be in line with recommendations to expose teacher candidates to desired

dispositions early in the program (Conderman & Walker, 2015; Cummins & Asempapa, 2013; Villegas, 2007; Wayda & Lund, 2005). We also recommend using the SAS during clinical practice as well. Using a self-assessment instrument like the SAS will provide an avenue for candidates to confront their beliefs and attitudes which undergird the dispositions that are expected of them as teachers.

We also suggest that EPPs introduce the CDPA in methods courses or at the beginning of student teaching by encouraging students to self-evaluate and reflect on the CDPA indicators. EPPs can, thus, strengthen candidates' exposure to the dispositions that employers and state teaching standards espouse. Moreover, candidates would be adequately informed of the expectations set forth in the rubric before it is used as a summative dispositions evaluation during student teaching. Consequently, this research work provides two complementary instruments that if fully utilized can help an EPP explore, develop and assess candidates' dispositions. This pair of valid and reliable instruments can be used to create entry, monitoring, remediation, retention, program completion and exit policies tied to dispositions that are valued by EPPs and P-12 partners. This work provides a manageable avenue for addressing the challenges replete in the literature and discussed previously in this paper for measuring a candidate's dispositions.

Study Limitations

Although a diverse group of participants is represented in the pilot through the inclusion of two public, one private HBCU and one private church-affiliated education preparation program, a limitation of the study remains the selection and composition of the participants. As with many research in education and social sciences, participation is usually voluntary and not based on random selection or assignment. Consequently, the resulting sample is not a probability sample and, thus, results should be applied or interpreted with caution. Users of these instruments should always verify and report their Cronbach alpha, as well as inter-rater, reliability indices.

Conclusion

These assessment tools provide an avenue for explicit feedback to an EPP and its candidates regarding areas of strength and areas that need further development through a detailed and extensive review of the results from the CDPA and candidates' self-assessment of their own beliefs. These instruments, built with indicators previously validated elsewhere (Afolabi et al., 2018), can serve as bookends for the development and assessment of teacher candidates' dispositions within an EPP's teacher preparation program(s), thus, demarcating the impact of dispositional growth and development provided within the education program and

paving the way for future teachers who embody the dispositions expected of them in their waiting classrooms. We offer the CDPA and SAS in response to Villegas' call for the "need to give more focused attention to issues of validity and reliability in the assessment of teacher candidates' dispositions" (2008, p. 378) and in alignment with CAEP's expectations of the validity and reliability of instruments that help verify the quality of teachers that EPPS prepare (CAEP, 2013).

References

- Afolabi, Afolabi, C., Nweke, W. C., & Perkins, T. (2018). Validating dispositional indicators for evaluating teacher candidates Using Lawshe's method. *GATEways to Teacher Education*, 29(1), 32-43.
- Alawiye, O., & Williams, H. (2010). Disposition profile inventory: An assessment tool for measuring the professional attitudes and behaviors of teacher education candidates. *National Social Science Journal*, 34(2), 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.nssa.us/journals/2010-34-2/2010-34-2-01.htm>
- Anastasi, A. & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Arial, M. & Miller, S. (2016). What schools look for when hiring new teachers: An examination of dispositions statements on hiring reference forms. *GATEways to Teacher Education*, 27(1), 47-52. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/gaate/docs/gateways_fall_2016
- Borko, H., Liston, D., & Whitcomb, J. (2007). Apples and fishes: the debate over dispositions in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58(5), 359-364.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP]. (2013). Retrieved May 9, 2019 from the CAEP website: <http://www.caepnet.org/about/vision-mission-goals>
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation [CAEP]. (2016). *CAEP Accreditation Handbook, Version 3*. Retrieved from the CAEP website: <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-handbook>
- Conderman, G. & Walker, D.A. (2015). Assessing dispositions in teacher preparation programs: Are candidates and faculty seeing the same thing? *The Teacher Educator*, 50(3), 215-231).
- Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO]. (2011). *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue*. Retrieved from the CCSSO website: [http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_A_Resource_for_State_Dialogue_\(April_2011\).html](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_A_Resource_for_State_Dialogue_(April_2011).html)

- Cummins, L. & Asempapa, B. (2013). Fostering teacher candidate dispositions in teacher education programs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(3), 99-119. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1017120.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Curran, E. & Murray, M. (2008). Transformative learning for professional educators: building competencies and changing dispositions. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(3), 103-118. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ854867.pdf>
- Frederiksen, H., Cooner, D. & Stevenson, C. (2012). Assessing teacher dispositions in pre-service teachers. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 9(1), 39-52.
- Fisher, R. J. (1993). Social desirability bias and the validity of indirect questioning. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 20(2), 303-315.
- Helm, C. M. (2006). Teacher dispositions as predictors of good teaching. *The Clearing House*, 79(3):117-118.
- Hochstetler, S. (2014). The critical role of dispositions: What's missing in measurements of English teacher candidate effectiveness. *Clearing House*, 87(1), 9-14.
- Grimm, P. (2010). Social Desirability Bias. *Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing*. doi:10.1002/9781444316568.wiem02057
- Johnston, P., America, G. M., Henriott, D., & Shapiro, M. (2011). Descriptions of dispositions for assessment in pre-service teacher education field experiences. *Education*, 132(2), 391-401.
- Jonsson, A. & Svingby, G. (2007). The use of scoring rubrics: Reliability, validity and educational consequences. *Educational Research Review*, 2, 130-144.
- Jung, E. & Rhodes, D. (2008). Revisiting disposition assessment in teacher education: broadening the focus. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(6), 647-660.

- Kent State University Libraries. (2017). Qualtrics tutorials: Reverse coding. Retrieved June 14, 2017, from <http://libguides.library.kent.edu/qualtrics/howto/coding>
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575.
- McKnight, D. (2004). An inquiry of NCATE's move into virtue ethics by way of dispositions (is this what Aristotle meant?). *Educational Studies*, 35(3), 212-230.
- Miller, M. D., Linn, R. L., & Gronlund, N. E. (2013). *Measurement and assessment in teaching*. (11th Ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE]. (2008). *Professional Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions*. Retrieved from the Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from the NCATE website: <http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/NCATE%20Standards%202008.pdf>
- Nicholas, D. P. (1998). Choosing an intraclass correlation coefficient. *SPSS Keywords*, Number 67. Retrieved from <https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/spss/library/spss-library-choosing-an-intraclass-correlation-coefficient/>
- Notar, C., Riley, G. & Taylor, P. Thornburg, R.A., & Cargill R.L. (2009). Dispositions: Ability and assessment. *International Journal of Education*, 1, 2-14.
- Rike, C. J., & Sharp, L. K. (2008). Assessing pre-service teachers' dispositions: A critical dimension of professional preparation. *Childhood Education*, 84(3), 150-153.
- Schulte, L., Edwards, S., & Edick, N. (2008). The development and validation of the Diversity Dispositions Index. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, 5(3), 11-19. Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Journals/AASA_Journal_of_Scholarship_and_Practice/FALL08FINAL.pdf
- Schussler, D. (2006). Defining dispositions: Wading through murky waters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(4), 251-268.

- Stooksberry, L., Schussler, D., & Bercaw, L. (2009). Conceptualizing dispositions: intellectual, cultural, and moral domains of teaching. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(6), 719-736.
- Thompson, F. (2009). The development and validation of the Multicultural Dispositions Index. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 11(2), 94-100.
- Villegas, A. M. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58, 370-380.
- Wasicsko, M. M., Wirtz, P., & Resor, C. (2009). Using dispositions in the teacher admission process. *SRATE Journal*, 18(2), 19-26. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ948673.pdf>
- Wayda, V. & Lund, J. (2005). Assessing dispositions: An unresolved challenge in teacher education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 76(1), 34-41.

Appendix A

Alignment of Rubric Indicators, Undergirding Belief Statements, and Self-Assessment Statements

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
1. Integrity - Teacher candidate abides by professional codes of ethics for teaching and demonstrates ethical conduct and integrity in his/her actions. Teacher candidate is a person of good reputable character. S/he always maintains confidentiality. [InTASC 9o]	Integrity - Candidate values and believes that the Georgia Code of Ethics should undergird all actions in which the teacher candidate engages.	1. I believe that all educators should abide by the Georgia Code of Ethics at all times.
2. Interaction with Students - Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate relationships with students. [InTASC 9o]	Interaction with students - Candidate believes in interacting with all students in a positive, professional and fair manner at all times.	2. I believe it is essential always to interact with students in a positive and professional way.
3. Attitude & Demeanor - Teacher candidate maintains a positive attitude and demeanor. S/he is flexible, professional, and enthusiastic.	Attitude & Demeanor - Candidate believes in modelling and promoting professional attitudes and behavior.	3. Teachers should model professionalism in their attitudes and demeanor.
4. Communication - Teacher candidate communicates effectively and professionally in all domains (verbal,	Communication - Candidate believes in maintaining professional and effective communication with	4. I believe that all communication between teacher and students, colleagues and parents

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
nonverbal, written, technologically) and with tact. [InTASC 8q]	students, colleagues, and parents, verbally, written, and electronically.	should always be professional and effective.
5. High Expectations for All Students - Teacher candidate is committed to student learning and believes all students can learn. S/he holds high expectations for all students. [InTASC 21]	High Expectations for All Students - Candidate believes that academic ability, cultural experiences, and background are all important influences on students' learning; consequently, candidate believes in utilizing various teaching strategies to help each and every student reach his/her highest potential. Candidate remains aware of students' diverse learning styles and utilizes various teaching methods that benefit every student.	5. I hold high expectations for all students. 6. I do NOT think it is very important to plan lessons that take into consideration my students' backgrounds, interests, and learning styles. 7. I believe teachers can overcome potential learning barriers created by differences in cultural experiences and academic ability.
6. Attendance/Punctuality - Teacher candidate is always present and on time to work/school, meetings, and events.	Attendance/Punctuality - Candidate believes in being present at and punctual to all school-related functions.	8. Being on time to school/work and school related events is a high priority to me. 9. I believe it is NOT very important for a teacher to attend all school related events or functions.

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
7. Dependability & Reliability-Teacher candidate demonstrates consistency in tasks and responsibilities; s/he is considered to be reliable and dependable by peers, professors, and mentor teachers.	Dependability & Reliability - Candidate believes in demonstrating consistency and dependability in all dealings with peers and the entire school community. Candidate believes s/he can be depended upon by his/her peers, and the school community at large.	10. I let people know they can count on me to be reliable and dependable.
8. Interaction with Adults - Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate and professional relationships with adults (includes parents, colleagues, etc.). [InTASC 10q]	Interaction with Adults - Candidate believes in interacting in a positive and professional manner with colleagues, parents, and the community.	11. I believe colleagues, parents, and other members of the school community should always be treated professionally.
9. Collaboration - Teacher candidate works collaboratively with colleagues and is a valuable member to the team. S/he is cooperative and a team player who is willing to assist and accept responsibilities. [InTASC 10q]	Collaboration - Candidate believes collaboration can benefit self, students, and the school. The candidate believes in working as a team player.	12. I value working in a team.
10. Organization & Preparedness - Teacher candidate organizes classroom to optimize learning and provides academically challenging learning environment.	Organization & Preparedness - Candidate values organization and being well-prepared for teaching. The candidate believes that how well the environment is organized	13. It is very important to me to always be prepared for teaching and/or class.

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
Teacher candidate is well-prepared for teaching. [InTASC 3p]	and how well the candidate is prepared greatly affect student learning.	
11. Teachability and Adaptability - Teacher candidate demonstrates a willingness to learn and/or grow professionally and has a commitment to improving his/her practice. S/he adapts to change and accepts constructive criticism and feedback well. [InTASC 9n; 10t]	Teachability and Adaptability - Teacher candidate believes s/he is capable, but should always remain willing to learn and grow.	14. I am open to receiving constructive criticism.
12. Content Knowledge - Teacher candidate stays current in field and understands potential biases within his/her content areas. Teacher candidate values critical thinking. [InTASC 4: 4o, 4p, 4q]	Content Knowledge - Teacher candidate believes knowledge is robust and often dynamic; that biases can exist in curriculum delivery; and that being a critical thinker and teaching students to think critically is an important aspect of any content area.	15. I believe teachers can bring potential bias to curriculum delivery, and thus it is important for me to be a critical thinker. 16. I think teaching students to be critical thinkers is NOT a high priority.
13. Cultural Sensitivity - Teacher candidate shows respect for and an understanding of a student's or other person's diversity, including respect of differences in race, class, gender, ability,	Cultural Sensitivity - Teacher candidate believes diversity among students is of great value and that all students, regardless of differences, are deserving of dignity and equal access	17. I believe teachers should be sensitive to and value cultural differences among students.

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
culture, religion, and sexuality. [InTASC 2m]	to educational opportunities.	
14. Assessment - Teacher candidate uses assessments ethically, makes appropriate accommodations, and uses a variety of assessments with his/her students. [InTASC 6u]	Assessment - Teacher candidate believes assessment is an essential aspect of instruction that can provide important feedback to students and guardians, believes assessment should be administered ethically and fairly, and believes students with identified needs should be allowed the recommended accommodations.	18. I think assessments should be administered exactly the same way for every student, regardless of differences among students. 19. I think using a variety of assessments when teaching is a good idea. 20. Assessment results can provide useful information for supporting students in future learning.
15. Fairness - Teacher candidate makes fair decisions based on data/evidence; s/he treats students fairly and equitably. [InTASC 6v]	Fairness - Teacher candidate believes that to be fair, decisions should be based on data/evidence; s/he believes all students should be treated fairly and equitably. Teacher candidate believes students should receive fair but equitable educational opportunities.	21. To be fair to all students, I believe decisions about students should be based on evidence or data.
16. Use of Technology - Teacher candidate understands and practices legal and ethical boundaries for technology. S/he uses technology to enhance student learning	Use of Technology - Teacher candidate believes technology is a useful tool for engaging students and facilitating student learning. Thus, s/he believes in keeping abreast	22. I believe any social media account that I have should not contain inappropriate content.

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
and communicates efficiently. Misuse of cell phone and/or social media is not an issue with the candidate. [InTASC 9o]	of new technological development while remaining professional and ethical in their use.	23. I think technology is an excellent way to engage students in learning. 24. I believe as a teacher I should always use technology ethically and professionally.
17. Time management - Teacher candidate plans effectively, manages time well, submits work in a timely manner, and meets deadlines. [InTASC 7p]	Time management - Candidate believes in being proactive and in managing his/her time effectively to ensure that deadlines are met.	25. I have a high value for always meeting deadlines.
18. Self-Control - Teacher candidate displays composure and self-control and demonstrates the capacity to handle stress. [InTASC 9o]	Self-Control - Candidate believes in showing a calm composure in the face of stressful situations.	26. I react calmly in stressful situations. 27. I have a high value for demonstrating self-control.
19. Professional Appearance - Teacher candidate dresses according to school policy and presents him/herself in a professional manner.	Professional Appearance - Candidate believes in modelling appropriate and professional dress code at all times.	28. I do NOT think it is very important to dress professionally as a teacher.
20. Initiative - Teacher candidate displays initiative, creativity, and resourcefulness. Teacher candidate is intrinsically motivated. [InTASC 10r]	Initiative - Candidate believes in being a self-starter and in thinking outside the box to generate creative and resourceful solutions to school related	29. I think it is important to show initiative in getting things done.

Indicators of Dispositions (on CDPA)	Undergirding Belief Statements	Self-Assessment Statements
	issues and takes actions accordingly.	
21. Professional Judgement - Teacher candidate demonstrates professional judgement and makes professional decisions consistently. [InTASC 9o]	Professional Judgement - Candidate believes in consistently making sound and professional decisions.	30. I think teachers should always demonstrate sound professional judgement.
22. Passion for Teaching - Teacher candidate is committed, passionate, and enthusiastic with regard to teaching. [InTASC 10p]	Passion for Teaching - Candidate believes that instruction should be approached with passion and enthusiasm.	31. I believe teachers should be passionate about their work.
23. Commitment to School - Teacher candidate supports the school mission and vision, is loyal to the employer/school, and understands and follows policies, procedures, and rules. [InTASC 10p]	Commitment to School - Candidate believes in the school's mission and vision and the attendant rules and regulations that guide behaviors and actions towards their attainment.	32. It is important to be committed to the mission and vision of any K-12 school where I am placed or work.
24. Problem Solving Ability - Teacher candidate is an active problem solver. [InTASC 10t]	Problem Solving Ability - Candidate believes in being actively involved in finding/providing solutions to problems.	33. I believe a teacher should play an important role in finding solutions to problems faced in the school.