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Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research project was to identify minimum competencies needed for elementary and secondary teachers in the fields of ESL and bilingual education.

Procedures

Two procedural phases were applied in this study. The first phase was the construction of a survey questionnaire which was validated through the Delphi technique. The final questionnaire, which consisted of 56 competency statements, was mailed to a random sample of ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington. The responses of 141 subjects indicated whether the components of the instrument were highly, considerably, moderately, or slightly important.
A two-way analysis of variance was applied for analyses of data and hypotheses testing. Factor analysis was utilized to ascertain the groupings of competencies for purposes of curriculum development.

Findings

The analysis of variance indicated that, except for 20 competencies, no differences existed between the component scores of ESL and bilingual teachers. Differences due to geographic locations were noted for eight elements.

A fifteen-factor solution generated 50 competencies with factor loadings of + .42 or higher.

Conclusions

As a result of findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Twenty-nine competencies attained mean values above 3.000 and were considered as required components; 25 competencies reached mean scores between 2.000 and 2.999 were recommended elements; and two competencies with mean scores below 2.000 were found to be recommended elements for bilingual curriculum, but optional inclusions for ESL curriculum.

2. Nine of the fifteen factors consisted of meaningful competencies according to the rating values assigned by 141 subjects to 56 competency statements.
3. Thirty-six competencies were retained according to teachers' viewpoints; 48 competencies were retained due to geographic areas; only one interaction effect existed.

**Recommendations**

Based upon the findings and conclusions the following recommendations were presented:

1. Two questionnaires that typify ESL and bilingual teachers separately should be developed and should contain more detailed competency statements peculiar to each group.

2. The 29 highly recommended (required) competencies may be used by the Oregon and Washington Departments of Education to establish statewide standardization of minimum competency requirements.

3. ESL and bilingual teachers should reach an agreement on competencies that may lead to their endorsement of a common set of requirements.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The teaching of English as a second language (ESL) with its widespread movement has arrived at a significant stage in its historical development. The expanded increase in the number of non-native English speakers entering America has given rise to an intensified need for ESL and bilingual education and recognition of qualified teachers in these fields. According to Waggoner's research, "only three ESL teachers out of ten had taken even one course in teaching ESL" (Waggoner, 1978, p. 247).

The need for competencies for teachers in the fields of ESL and bilingual education has been recognized by a growing number of states, as a result of educators' increasing awareness of the special needs of limited/non-English students.

In the four years since 1976 the number of states and territories with bilingual certification or endorsement increased from 4 to 13 and those with both from 3 to 7 (Harvey, 1980, p. 11).

The effectiveness of ESL and bilingual teachers should be measured in terms of the ultimate product sought -- a well prepared bilingual/ESL student, who can compete with native speakers in a
college or university situation and who is able to adapt himself or
herself to American society and to new American friends.

ESL and bilingual teachers have difficult duties. The goals of
achievement that they plan for their students are higher than those
of their fellow educators in the modern foreign languages, because
their students must learn certain cultural patterns, as well as
language.

For those whom he teaches, a working command
of English is an educational essential, but
this command must be acquired through methods
which differ from those customarily employed
by the teacher of English to native speakers
of the language (Blatchford, 1979, p. 145).

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose of this study was to identify those compe-
tencies required by elementary/secondary teachers in the fields of
ESL and bilingual education. The focus was to gauge the adequacy
of the preparation of competent teachers. Its approach was that
of generating a bank of items which could be used throughout Oregon
and Washington in developing and improving teacher workshops and
both graduate and undergraduate courses taken by elementary/secondary
ESL and bilingual teachers.

Rationale for the Study

Competency can be described as the acquisition of knowledge,
the application of it, and the development of the needed behaviors
and skills. Houston and Howsam (1972) indicate that teacher compe-
tency involves five factors -- cognitive, performance, consequence,
affective, and exploratory. Barr and his co-workers (1961) categorized the same elements of teacher competency.

There is a relationship between teacher-based competency and teacher preparation. Teacher competency requires appropriate courses and teacher workshops to prepare competent practitioners in the field. According to Blatchford, "teachers of English as a second language should have the same general academic preparation as teachers of other subjects at comparable levels" (Blatchford, 1979, p. 146). He also indicates that their unique responsibilities must not be overlooked. Although bilingual and ESL teachers share a common general background with other teachers, one which helps them to become well educated practitioners, a unique training program should be designed to prepare ESL and bilingual teachers for their specific tasks. The teachers in the fields of ESL and bilingual education should acquaint themselves with some important linguistic and cultural differences which ESL and bilingual students bring with them into the classroom.

Native speakers studying English, French, Mathematics or Biology, etc., are taught by teachers with special training and a license in that specific area. Non-native speakers of English should be instructed under similar quality control conditions. (Appelson, 1980, p. 4).

Institutes of higher education regard the attaining of certification as the acquisition of basic competencies. Regarding that competency—the acquisition and application of knowledge and development of the needed repertoire of critical behaviors and skills, the question remains: Can teachers of other subjects instruct ESL/bilingual students who have language and cultural gaps, or should
only prepared and qualified professionals who meet the minimal competencies in the fields of ESL and bilingual education instruct non-native English speakers? This study formulated implications for developing teacher education curricula content and teaching strategies for the preparation of ESL and bilingual teachers.

Need for the Study

The increased need for English education of non-native speakers of English has resulted in the expectation of minimum competencies in the fields of ESL and bilingual education which would provide primary qualifications for practitioners and would insure quality of instruction.

The federal law also urges that non-native speakers should benefit from the English/bilingual instruction by prepared ESL/bilingual teachers.

The Federal government and the courts have specified English language instruction must be provided to non-native speakers. It follows that this instruction be given by teachers prepared and certified in TESOL (Appelson, 1980, p. 4).

Despite the existence of this law, no official statement of competency requirements of ESL and bilingual teachers yet exists in Oregon, and no ESL-based competency has yet been formulated for the State of Washington (Blatchford, 1979). Therefore, further research is needed to provide information for preparation of the most competent and most informed teachers in ESL and bilingual teaching.
**Assumptions**

Restriction of the population to the elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers practicing in Oregon and Washington necessarily narrows the extent to which the findings can be generalized. It cannot be assumed that elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington are representative of all elementary/secondary teachers in these fields in the United States. For example, bilingual programs in Oregon are not as extensive as those in California.

**Definition of Terms**

For clarity in the meaning of some terms that were used in this study, the following definitions are given. Other terms or phrases are assumed to be self-explanatory.

*Bilingual Education (BE)*: Instruction given through two languages, one of which is English.

*Bilingual Teacher*: One who demonstrates proficiency in English skills as well as a foreign language, and has the experience and knowledge to teach non-English speaking students.

*Competency*: The specific knowledge and ability needed to perform a particular duty or occupation.

*Curriculum*: Those experiences and educational activities used by the school to achieve its goals of education.

*Curriculum Development*: The process of planning, organizing, and implementing curriculum improvement and change.
English as a Second Language (ESL): Instruction given to teach English language skills to non-native English speakers.

ESL Teacher: One who demonstrates proficiency in English language skills and has the background and knowledge to teach English to non-native speakers of English.

Factor Analysis: A statistical method which consists of: 1) a large number of tests (competencies) which measure some aspects of the general trait (ESL/bilingual education) and will represent a bank of elements that might enter into the trait; 2) evaluating inter-correlations among these tests (competencies) to find those which tend to measure the same element or factor; 3) deducting what this trait measures in common and giving it a name (Gunderson, 1971, p. 4).

Foreign Student: A non-English speaker who is from a country other than America.

Non-Native English Speaker/Student: One whose native language is other than English.

Proficiency: The level or degree of expertise required in the performance of a given professional task.

R-mode: A factor analytic method which examines the relationship of every competency with every other competency and provides for a clustering of common competencies. The technique orders competencies according to people (Gunderson, 1971).

TESOL: Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The main intention of this study was to identify minimum competencies needed for ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington. The review of literature, therefore, was organized to: 1) indicate competency needs for teachers in the fields of ESL and bilingual education and 2) present the guidelines for preparing ESL and bilingual teachers.

Competency Need

Here and there calls for help arise from classroom teachers who have no training or background in ESL/bilingual education and yet have to handle ESL/bilingual students in their classroom. "Help! Pedro can't speak English!" (Keyes, 1967, p. 78). If often happens that a principal may introduce a new student by simply saying, Pedro Garcia, and the teacher smiling, may say:

'Hi, Pedro, welcome to our class. It's nice to have you with us.' No response. The brown eyes search your face apprehensively. He doesn't speak any English! (Keyes, 1967, p. 78)

With regard to the problems that non-English speakers and classroom teachers have, these questions come to mind: How can teachers succeed who are untrained in ESL/bilingual education but suddenly find themselves asked to teach English to children with limited or
no language proficiency? Can they efficiently help their students get by in school and meet the graduation competency required by the state? Do the teachers not need much more than the mere abilities to speak English themselves and to conduct classes? The competency that they must teach, after all, is not only reading, speaking, and writing but, according to Walker:

> assimilating the subtleties of the language to the extent that the linguistic meaning of its mores, both social and cultural, become part of the total life of the student (Walker, 1978, p. 20).

Not until high standards are assured for teachers in the fields of ESL and bilingual education will the best teaching be accomplished in the classroom.

For those who wish to teach ESL, or to practice bilingual education, competency generally means preparation. Houston and Howsam identified preparation in all professions as: the acquisition of knowledge and the ability to apply that knowledge and the development of the needed repertoire of critical behaviors and skills. As the necessary knowledge, behaviors, and skills are identified and assessed they become competency objectives (Houston and Howsam, 1972).

Despite the widespread establishment of teaching ESL and bilingual education, neither teacher certification nor even acknowledged competency criteria exist in Oregon for teachers in these two fields -- although a certificate in bilingual education is available in the State of Washington (Blatchford, 1979). The great increase in the population of non-native English speakers in those states in the
1970's has led to an ever-growing demand for trained and qualified teachers in the field, and, according to Blatchford, "of the fifty states, nine have a certificate or endorsement in English as a Second Language, and seventeen in bilingual education" (Blatchford, 1979, p. 158).

Since 1976 the number of states with bilingual certification or endorsement has increased from four to seventeen, and those with ESL from four to nine.

In Oregon non-native speakers of English constitute "7% of the state's entire population (only 2% below the national average), but there is still no certification for either bilingual or ESL teachers" (Harvey, 1979, p. 11).

In spite of the significantly increased number of non-native speakers, there is a limited number of qualified ESL teachers with the experience, education, and skills needed to teach students of limited or no English proficiency. The enrollment of non-native English students is expected to grow rapidly, especially "with economic expansion of the petro-countries and our newly cordial relations with China" (Moussouris and Mackey, 1979, p. 13).

The teachers' language skills survey (TLSS) that was conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1978 gives the preliminary findings on the numbers of non-native English speakers and ESL teachers in public schools. The findings are as follows:

An estimated 28 million persons (one in eight) in the United States have non-English language backgrounds; 10.6 million of these have Spanish backgrounds.
An estimated 2.4 million persons in the United States do not speak English at all.

An estimated 102,000 teachers were involved in teaching English as a Second Language in public schools in 1976-77; only three out of ten had taken even one course in teaching ESL" (Waggoner, 1978, p. 247).

According to the Report on the Teachers of Language Skills Survey presented at the TESOL conference in Boston in 1979, a large number of teachers reported teaching English as a Second Language at the elementary and secondary levels in 1976-77, but only one in twenty indicated that they had training in ESL (Waggoner, 1979).

In view of the proportion of non-native speakers of English entering public schools, there are only two possibilities: either there must be additional specialized training of teachers as facilitators of English acquisition or the needs of students who have to overcome a language barrier will simply be ignored.

There are some problems with the widely-held notion that many non-native English students are receiving services of some kind to help them gain proficiency in English. According to the report on the teachers' language skills survey, "more than half the teachers who reported teaching ESL reported that they spent 10 percent or less of their time in ESL activities" (Waggoner, 1979, p. 2).

There is a need for more experienced teachers who understand children from cultures other than their own. There is also a need for linguistics and testing materials to teach students the standard language, so that they will have access to their new culture. According to the Bilingual Education Act as amended in 1974, students
have the right, at the same time that they are learning English, to enable themselves to complete their coursework and to be taught in their native languages as well. Spolsky believes that the best way to educate bilingual students is to teach them in their native language first. He says, "Not only will this be more efficient and satisfactory, but it will improve his English learning" (Spolsky, 1970, p. 27).

English is the essential component of instruction in both the bilingual and second language approaches. Therefore, it is appropriate to ask who is responsible for instruction in English? A bilingual teacher usually is expected to teach both in English and in the native language of the students, but it is not assured that he or she will use an appropriate approach to the second language. Thus, in most ESL and bilingual programs, instruction is done through team teaching. Harvey (1980) asserts that the team ESL teacher should understand the nature of the language and not downgrade the child's own language and culture. According to Harvey, an ESL teacher should not only have a strong linguistics background, but also should be able to create an environment that encourages communication and related activities for the learning of language.

ESL Guidelines

As Marckwardt (1970) states, the task of ESL teachers is a difficult one. They should be trained and qualified to meet the needs of their limited/non-English speaking students. The following standards are those accepted and approved by the members of National Association
of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) in 1976 (Blatchford, 1979). An ESL teacher, they specify, should:

1. Understand and respect the students and their cultures, to make them feel like involved members of the community.
2. Have proficiency in spoken and written English since he or she functions as a model of correctness in the use of the language.
3. Understand the nature of language and the structure of the English language and the relation of English language systems to the cultures of English speaking peoples.
4. Have had the experience of learning another language and have personal awareness of another culture.
5. Have knowledge of the process of language acquisition.
6. Have an understanding of the principles of language pedagogy and the ability to apply these principles.
7. Have an understanding of the techniques of teaching a second language; and
8. Have an understanding of cultural factors which contribute to the variety of life styles of students of different national origins.

Marckwardt (1970) agrees that an ESL teacher should understand the students' cultures and have experience of learning another language and awareness of another culture. What is meant by culture? According to Keesing (1974), culture can be interpreted as a: a) cognitive system--knowing the why and what about another culture; b) structural system--communicative creations of mind that generate the
cultural elaborations; or as c) symbolic system--sharing the symbols of meaning. For learning a second culture, Kleinjans (1975) suggests a model that includes three categories: 1) cognition; 2) affection; and 3) action. As regards cognition: one will get information about people, places, events; one will analyze parts of the culture such as family and educational systems, religion and language; and one will synthesize the relationship among parts. As concerns affections: one will know and will like aspects of another culture (appreciation); one will change some of his values (reevaluation); one will change some aspects of his life (reorientation); and, finally, will become, in a sense, one with the people of the other culture (identification). As refers to action: one will recognize that certain activity exists (awareness); one will begin to act (attending); and finally, one will interact in social situations.

It is extremely important for ESL and bilingual teachers who deal with students from other cultures to gain information and knowledge about those cultures. Bordie (1970) believes that the reason that English as a Foreign Language teachers are more successful in language teaching than ESL teachers is because they usually live abroad, are aware of cultural differences, and have understandings of their students. By contrast, the ESL teachers function in a similar situation without general awareness of cultural differences. He refers to it as "lack of cultural sensitivity." He concludes that teacher effectiveness might be improved through cultural awareness and believes that EFL/ESL teachers should have experience in learning a foreign language, in order to understand and feel the process of language learning. He states:
While we recognize the validity of the teaching techniques on an intellectual basis, we are unable emotionally to implement all those other factors which make the techniques a success overseas. There is a general lack of cultural sensitivity. Our responses tend to remain conditioned by our original cultural insights which are part of our scholastic and academic background (Bordie, 1970, p. 339).

Pham underlines the awareness of cultural differences for better language teaching and learning system in this way.

A teacher who makes an effort to understand Vietnamese cultural values and concepts and the Vietnamese attitudes toward education which Vietnamese children bring with them will be well-equipped to help them adjust to the sometimes contrasting American value system.

The Vietnamese child and the American teacher will both be the better for this experience (Pham, 1978, p. 4).

ESL teachers not only should be acquainted with the students' life styles, but with a cultural context within which the standard dialect is used. Bosco, in his article points out:

Language has a social, cultural, and historical dimension. If a person is to function effectively in a speech community, he must be acquainted with the life style of the members of the community. Such an orientation includes an understanding of what the speakers consider to be important and what they talk about (Bosco, 1970, p. 75).

For ESL teachers, it is vital to be aware of the cultural differences, because some aspects of one culture may have different meanings in another culture. About the negative evaluation of silence in America, Edmund Glenn states:

If you express an opinion and there is a little silence and then the subject is changed, you know you have said something with which the person you are talking to does not agree. In many other cultures, in contrast, silence is a sign of agreement. When the Russians, French,
Portuguese, Spanish, or Italians express an opinion and you do not reject it explicitly, they assume you have accepted it. Later, when they find you haven't they feel you are hypocritical (Glenn, 1973, p. 278).

According to Applegate (1975), ESL teachers are representatives of both a new language and a new society and should sensitize their students to the social implications of language use.

Knowledge of a second language should include more than just grammatical competence. Communication can only be effective when student is also sensitive to the social and cultural aspects of language use and how these differ between his first and second language (Applegate, 1975, p. 271).

Campa (1951) states that any culture which is the sum of behavior patterns, values, and attitudes is reflected in the language of culture. In teaching language, he emphasizes the cultural content of language, rather than the mechanics of transliteration.

ESL teachers should be able to describe things that the native English speakers have usually not thought to analyze. This means they should possess linguistic background and should be familiar with communication skills, rhetoric, and logic, and should urge their students to "consider who says what to whom, for what purpose and with what effect" (Allen, 1969, p. 254).

Bolinger (1972) in his article points out that a language teacher should know about structure of language and its place in culture, nature of language, grammar, rhetoric, and logic. He underscores the importance of linguistics in ESL and foreign language teaching.

Once we look at various meanings of the term language-teaching, it becomes clear that for each sense of that term there is a different sense in which linguistics can be an influence, whether for good or ill (Bolinger, 1972, p. 107).
Allen believes that ESL students should be taught the literature of America. "Literature enlarges the mind, opens windows on the world, enables people to appreciate what others are up against, in circumstances different from their own" (Allen, 1969, p. 255). Povey argues that teaching literature to ESL students will: a) increase their language skills and extend their linguistic knowledge because subtle vocabulary and complex syntax will be introduced; b) open windows on American culture; c) give the students human insights and awareness; and d) provide opportunities for some gifted students to use their creativity (Povey, 1967).

Allen summarizes the factors that should be taken under the consideration for preparing teachers to teach across dialects as follows:

Thus it seems clear that skills, insights, and information which may help second-dialect teachers have already been developed in such seemingly disparate fields as linguistics, cultural anthropology, communication, rhetoric, literature, and other branches of humanities (Allen, 1969, p. 256).

An ESL teacher should be able to establish the situations and provide a variety of experiences so that meaningful generalizations can be developed. Caroll (1971) recommends managing language learning procedures:

In language teaching, as in other kinds of instruction, probably critical factor in success is in managing the learning procedures of the student in such a way that at any given stage of learning the student is learning just what he needs to learn, being given the appropriate strategy for that learning to take place and being properly reinforced in that learning (p. 113).
The ESL teachers should be able to facilitate language learning for their students. Dubin and Olshtain (1977) believe that the core of effective language learning situation is a decision-making process that requires the ESL teachers to be creative, rather than to follow the content of the text. Anthony (1963) suggests that a good language teacher should use good techniques, methods, and approaches to create effective learning and teaching situations. He views a method as a procedure, an approach as an axiom, and a technique as an implement. According to him, techniques must be compatible with method, as well as with an approach.

Johnson (1972) suggests two methodologies in TESOL; namely, Macro and Micro. According to him, Macro methodology is an overall plan set up by the classroom teacher in a language-learning situation and the roles that the learners play while interacting with each other. Micro methodology is the presentation of new language materials and implications of the new language content. He writes:

Macro methodology has ultimate implications for the classroom teacher. It is the classroom teacher who sets up the overall learning and teaching context. It is the classroom teacher who trains learners to play "roles." It is the classroom teacher who himself assumes roles which will complement the roles that learners desirably play.

Micro methodology, on the other hand, has ultimate implications for the writing of instructional materials. It is the materials writer who designs materials for the presentation of each item of language material in a course of ESL instruction. It is the materials writer who selects, grades and arranges language content, and specifies the ways that language content will be presented to learners, practiced by them and used by them (p. 242).
As Janssens (1977) states, stimulation and presentation of materials affects the assimilation and acquisition of what the students have to learn. He believes in functional language teaching and learning—the language as a means of communication. He suggests different methods of visualization to motivate the students to develop a feel for a language.

A backward glance at the review of literature suggests that an ESL teacher should at least meet the eight guidelines that have been suggested by NASDTEC (Blatchford, 1979) for preparing teachers of English as a Second Language.

**Bilingual Guidelines**

According to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Lau vs. Nichols Supreme Court decisions of January 1974, parents have a legal right to demand a special program to help their limited/ non-English speakers to meet the language learning needs. Oregon state regulations mandate that:

> Districts shall develop and implement a plan for identifying students whose primary language is other than English and shall provide such students with appropriate programs until they are able to use the English language in such manner that allows effective relevant participation in regular classroom instruction and other educational activities. [OAR '581-21-46(8)].

A bilingual program helps to develop the students' cognitive and physical skills. To design a bilingual curriculum one should give serious thought to the qualifications of teachers who will implement the bilingual education curriculum. If there are no
trained teachers to respond to the children from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, instruction "will be dominated by a cultural perspective that is not only inappropriate (for instance) for Mexican-American students, but can be positively damaging to their chances for educational success" (Castillo and Cruz, 1974, pp. 341-342).

The members of NASDTEC (Blatchford, 1979) assert that teachers of bilingual education should have the following qualifications:

1. Possess a standard teacher's certificate in another area than bilingual education.

2. Instruct the bilingual students both in their dominant language and in English with fluency and accuracy, good intonation, and pronunciation.

3. Possess an adequate knowledge of history and culture of the bilingual students and respect the history and culture of the United States.

4. Demonstrate the ability to instruct the bilingual students both in English and in their dominant language in all the basic content areas.

5. Adapt the existing materials to the needs of a bilingual program.

6. Understand the learning styles and language systems of different cultures and apply them in a bilingual setting.

7. Establish a successful relationship with the students, parents, and community members of the target cultural group.
8. Understand dialect differences across cultural and social lines.

9. Demonstrate the ability to use appropriate theory and methodology in teaching bilingual students.

10. Compare and contrast the language of the students with English in terms of sound systems, forms, and structures, and apply it to teaching the bilingual students (Blatchford, 1979, pp. 156-157).

Carlisle-Zepeda and Saldate IV (1977) assert that similar competencies outlined in an unpublished paper by G. M. Blanco [Competencies for University Programs in Bilingual Education (unpublished) Austin: University of Texas, n.d., pp. 4-10] should be required of bilingual teachers. His paper written for the U. S. Office of Education, argues that the bilingual teacher should:

1. Develop strategies which help the children to extend their command of their first and second languages in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

2. Plan and develop teaching units or lessons in the various curriculum areas, using the appropriate terminology in both languages.

3. Develop the ability to incorporate elements of the child's culture into various areas of the curriculum.

4. Use appropriate classroom management techniques.

5. Work effectively with paraprofessionals.

6. Work effectively with community resources.

7. Develop skills in assessing language and basic subject matter, and in utilizing such results for instruction.
8. Identify elements of the home culture to help children develop positive self-concept.

9. Identify elements of the mainstream culture to assist children in dealing with potential areas of conflict.


In a study entitled "Competency Behaviors for Elementary Teachers", Castillo (1975) summarizes competencies required of bilingual bicultural teachers within a framework of language, culture, and cognitive styles. To develop effective learning activities and create meaningful language learning situations, a bilingual teacher should possess competence in both child's native language and in English. McNicholas indicates the following competencies for a bilingual teacher in the area of language.

1. Demonstrates fluency in English and in the child's variety of language.

2. Accepts the child's use of vernacular language.

3. Communicates with the child in the language of his or her choice.

4. Identifies and expands basic concepts in the child's dominant language (McNicholas, 1976, p. 113).

Competency in both the child's native language and in English is necessary for bilingual teachers because, according to the members of the U. S. Commission of Civil Rights.
Bilingual bicultural education is a comprehensive educational approach which involves more than just imparting English skills. Children are taught all cognitive areas, first in their native language. Instruction through English in cognitive areas begins when the child can function in that language and experiences no academic handicap due to insufficient knowledge of the language (U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1975, p. 29).

McNicholas (1976) believes that the development of a child's fluency and literacy in two languages is encouraged through effective language instruction. To devise learning activities and create an effective learning-teaching environment, a bilingual teacher should understand and be sensitive to his or her students' cultures. In evaluating culture, McNicholas writes that an effective bilingual teacher must:

1. Provide activities for role playing family members and family situations.
2. Explore the different roles of people in the community.
3. Arrange for field trips unique to the child's cultural experiences.
4. Utilize people from the community as speakers to acquaint the children with their role.

Language and culture reflect an important role in the child's cognitive development. McNicholas states:

Language and culture of children are seen to play a significant role in the way children communicate and relate to others and in their methods of perceiving, thinking and problem-solving (McNicholas, 1976, p. 114).

In terms of competencies under the area of cognitive styles, McNicholas indicates that an effective bilingual teacher:
1. Possesses a working knowledge of the child's preferred learning style.

2. Provides for the arrangement of the learning environment to facilitate the appropriate adult-child contact in order to promote learning in the field-sensitive and/or field-independent modes.

3. Adapts curriculum materials in keeping with the child's learning styles.

4. Develops cooperative group activities appropriate to the experiences and background of the child (McNicholas, 1976, p. 114).

Carlisle-Zepeda and Saldate IV (1977) note that the child's cognitive skills development takes place most easily and naturally through use of the language he or she understands best. Other significant factors in developing the child's cognitive skills are the pedagogical approach and instruction. The effective pedagogy and instruction provide opportunities for the students to be exposed to appropriate linguistic models, and to experience with problem-solving situations that facilitates the development and acquisition of the child's cognitive skills.

Simeos (1979) says that a pedagogical approach includes: 1) teacher-student interaction and 2) the process of teaching. He concludes that a pedagogical approach is based on the management of the classroom within which a viable learning environment can be developed. Therefore, a bilingual teacher should be able to:
manage a bilingual classroom in which the following thinking process
takes place: categorization of data by the students, who make
"meaningful generalizations, predictions, and explanations of
unknown situations" (Simoes, 1979, p. 16).

Also concerned with pedagogy, Martha Montero describes a
bilingual curriculum in the following way:

Pedagogically, a bilingual curriculum can be
described as a curriculum (materials, tests,
resources, indexes, etc.) that is part of a
bilingual program where instruction is in two
languages (Montero, 1979, p. 61).

She says that "bilingual curriculum" means teaching different
things through different instructional strategies to different people.
In her writing she suggests that for constructing a unit plan in a
bilingual classroom one should consider the language, cultural, and
social factors that affect the bilingual-bicultural experience. She
emphasizes using pedagogical skills and different teaching strate-
gies. Montero writes:

The unit plan will deal with those pedagogical
skills that are the basis of logic and cohesive
plan of study. Several teacher strategies, as
well as goals, objectives, materials, activities
and evaluation schemes, are suggested (Montero,
1979, p. 62).

Duelfer agrees that effective instructions provide viable
environments for learning. Duelfer posits four instructional compo-
nents: 1) goals and objectives, 2) materials, 3) methods, and 4)
test items. She asserts that there should be a strong relationship
among all the above-mentioned components. She states:

Effective instruction occurs when there is
direct relationship among all instructional
components. Goal, materials, and test items
must be directly related (Duelfer, 1979, p. 28).
Chabot (1979) suggests that the systems-context approach described by Antonio Simoes (1977) is a good method to be implemented in a bilingual setting. He declares:

It provides concrete guidelines for the classroom teacher who wishes to actively participate in the adaptation or development of materials in order to insure a closer correspondence between the system, the content and the teaching strategy (Chabot, 1979, p. 41).

In view of the preceding, it is important that bilingual teachers possess a thorough knowledge of philosophy and theory of education, as a whole, and bilingual education specifically. An effective bilingual teacher should be proficient in listening, speaking, reading, and writing because "learning occurs in either the oral/visual or written context" (Duelfer, 1979, p. 42). And, according to Carlisle-Zepeda and Saldate IV, "Proficiency in the two languages is merely a prerequisite. ... The teacher is not qualified to teach in a bilingual program just because the person can function in the second language" (Carlisle-Zepeda and Saldate IV, 1977, p. 331).

The review of literature in the area of bilingual education reflects agreement that a potential bilingual teacher must be efficient in all the areas suggested by NASDTEC (Blatchford, 1979) and Carlisle-Zepeda and Saldate IV, (1977).

Conclusion

Although there are in the literature some suggestions and guidelines for preparation of qualified ESL and bilingual teachers,
no official statement of competency needs of ESL and bilingual teachers yet exists in Washington and Oregon. Therefore, considering the greatly increased population of non-native English speakers, there is a clear need for more programs to train teachers who have non-native speakers of English in their classes. There is also a need to prepare competent teachers in ESL and bilingual education.

Public education needs to establish competencies for ESL and bilingual teachers so that schools may employ adequately prepared teachers. Not until these needs are met will non-native English students be receiving the education they must have in order to compete successfully with native English speaking students.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was an empirical investigation of ESL and bilingual competencies. The results of this study provided necessary information for the development of curricula to prepare teachers in ESL and bilingual education in Oregon and Washington. Described below is the methodology which was employed to delineate the specific steps taken during the study.

Preparation of Need Statement

The initial step consisted of preparing the need statements which measured teacher competency in ESL and bilingual education.

The first step in development of the need statements was to review the related literature on competency needs of ESL and bilingual teachers. The guidelines suggested by Blatchford (1979) for the certification and preparation of teachers of ESL and bilingual education were modified according to the information acquired from the review of the literature and were utilized in developing the initial questionnaire, which contained 54 items.

The second step was to submit the questionnaire to a jury of experts to evaluate the format, content, and clarify the comprehensiveness of the questionnaire. The following jury members were selected to constitute the Delphi panel members:
1. One ESL director from Portland State University.
2. Two elementary/secondary ESL teachers from Beaverton School District #48.
3. One ESL and bilingual coordinator from Mt. Hood Community College.

Thus, a total of five expert panel members participated in the Delphi technique of the research method. A list of jury experts showing their school districts and institutions is found in Appendix A. The following criteria were chosen in selecting the Delphi panel members:

1. The panel members should have comprehensive understanding and awareness of ESL/bilingual education as it exists now.
2. The panel members should have at least two years of experience in teaching ESL/bilingual education and direct contact with ESL/bilingual students.
3. The panel members should be selected based on the best judgement of the selector.

The panel members were initially contacted by telephone, and, at a later date, the instrument and a letter were forwarded to them. Appendix B contains a letter sent to individuals who constituted the Delphi panel for this investigation.

The initial round of the Delphi technique was constituted of three major areas as follows: knowledge of linguistics, grammar,
TESL/bilingual methods and communication skills; ability in acquisition of the knowledge and experience in ESL/bilingual education and culture. The letter and the questionnaire for the first round are contained in Appendix C.

In Round One of the Delphi technique each jury member was asked to review and evaluate the questionnaire and list any recommendations or suggestions he or she had for revision or add to the need statements at the end of each major area.

After the panel participants evaluated and reacted to the questionnaire, the list of recommendations and additional statements were compiled and reviewed. Several items were revised for clarity and eight items were added to the questionnaire, which contained 54 competencies.

The second round of the Delphi included a list of those statements that did not acquire consensus in Round One plus the new statements generated from the analysis of the first Delphi process. Each jury expert was asked to rate and evaluate the revised and the new need statements. Appendix D contains the questionnaire and the letter administered in Round Two.

Round Three contained the need statements which did not acquire consensus from the second round. Jury members were asked to review the items which did not gain a mean score of 2.25 or better in Round Two, and they were asked to either accept or reject the need statements. All items except two were accepted in the final round. Appendix E contains the letter and the questionnaire administered in Round Three.
The final instrument used in the study contained 56 items and included a scale with a continuum consisting of four internal points ranging from highly important, denoted by rating 4, to slightly important, denoted by rating of 1. The final questionnaire was field tested by sending it to a selected group of ESL/bilingual teachers to identify the competencies that were not clear or were difficult to understand. Internal consistency was computed following the data collection using the Hoyt-Stunkard Analysis of Variance Technique (Hoyt, Stunkard, 1952).

Sample Population

The sample for the study contained randomly selected ESL and bilingual teachers from each of two western states (Oregon and Washington). The sampling matrix of the study consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Types of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>N=60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>N=29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size of N=26 for the smallest cell assured the power level = .80 and an effect size of .40 (Cohen, 1961), when α = .05. The samples were randomly drawn using a table of random numbers for the selections.
Statistical Design and Hypotheses

The Hays (1963) mathematical model for analysis of variance was used to move from deductive theories to inductive generalization. According to him:

Mathematical systems are purely abstract and essentially undefined, deductive structures. When a mathematical system is interpreted in terms of real objects or events, then the system is said to be a mathematical model for those objects or events (p. 8).

The following model is appropriate for the fixed effects two-way analysis of variance arrangement used in the study:

\[ Y_{ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \alpha\beta_{ij} + \epsilon_{ijk} \]

Where,

- \( Y_{ijk} \) is a test score.
- \( \mu \) is the true overall mean.
- \( \alpha_i \) and \( \beta_j \) are differential effects associated with teacher type and state, respectively, and \( \alpha\beta_{ij} \) is the interaction effect between levels of teacher type and state.
- \( \epsilon_{ijk} \) is a random variable, NID (0, \( \sigma^2 \)).

Analysis of variance was utilized to test the following hypotheses for each competency statement in the instrument.

- **H01:** There is no significant difference between the component (competency) scores of ESL and bilingual teachers.
- **H02:** There is no significant difference between the component (competency) scores of the two states.
$H_0_3$: There is no significant interaction between the levels of component (comptency) scores of ESL and bilingual teachers and the two states.

The hypotheses were tested according to the decision table shown below.

### Table I

Analysis of Variance Arrangement
(Fixed Model)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Computed F</th>
<th>Critical F $\alpha=.05$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>$MS_A/MS$ Error</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/1</td>
<td>$MS_B/MS$ Error</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/1</td>
<td>$MS_C/MS$ Error</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the analyses, if a computed F value equaled or exceeded the critical tabular value for F, the null hypothesis was rejected. Computed F values which were smaller than the critical F were retained.

Factor analysis was used to ascertain the groupings of competencies for purposes of planning curricula. Cluster of competencies were identified utilizing the R-mode of the factor analysis tool.
The Data Collection Process

The data for this research project were collected through 141 elementary and secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in the States of Oregon and Washington.

Upon the selection of elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in the two selected western states (Oregon and Washington), a contact was made by mail with the superintendent/assistant superintendent of the sample school districts three weeks prior to the actual survey. All selections were confidential. Described below is the process followed for the data collection:

1. A letter explaining the study along with a self-addressed post card was sent to the superintendents or assistant superintendents of the sample school districts in Oregon and Washington asking for their permission and cooperation in the study. (Appendix F). The response card (Appendix G) asked each superintendent or assistant superintendent to indicate whether or not he or she was willing to cooperate in the study and to identify the ESL/bilingual contact person of the representative school district with whom there could be further communication.

2. A minimum of ten copies of the validated questionnaire (Appendix H), along with a self-addressed return envelope, was sent to the ESL/bilingual contact person in each school district from which permission had been granted.
by the superintendent or assistant superintendent. The cover letter (Appendix I) explained the purpose of the study and asked that a copy of the questionnaire be forwarded to each ESL and bilingual teacher of the districts who participated in the study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The findings were the results of analyses -- two-way analysis of variance, factor analysis, and Hoyt-Stunkard internal consistency analysis of the responses of 141 ESL and bilingual teachers at the elementary/secondary levels in the States of Oregon and Washington. The analyses examined the significance of the collected data for the three hypotheses presented in Chapter III. The findings were divided into six sections: namely, the Reliability of the Instrument, Testing the Hypotheses, Results of Factor Analysis, Differences by Types of Teachers, Differences by Regions, and Differences Due to Interaction Effects.

The Reliability of the Instrument

An estimate of the internal consistency reliability of the scores assigned by subjects to the ESL and bilingual competencies was determined using the method described by Hoyt and Stunkard (1959). This method, using the analysis of variance, provides a straightforward solution to the problem of estimating the reliability coefficient for unrestricted scoring items. For this test, 56 competencies were included in the instrument. Hence, there was one matrix, with 141 subjects, k competencies, and one response per cell. Schematically, the matrices are shown as follows:
### Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y_{11}</td>
<td>Y_{12}</td>
<td>Y_{13}</td>
<td>Y_{1j}</td>
<td>Y_{141}</td>
<td>Y_{1}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_{21}</td>
<td>Y_{22}</td>
<td>Y_{23}</td>
<td>Y_{2j}</td>
<td>Y_{241}</td>
<td>Y_{2}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_{31}</td>
<td>Y_{32}</td>
<td>Y_{33}</td>
<td>Y_{3j}</td>
<td>Y_{341}</td>
<td>Y_{3}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_{i1}</td>
<td>Y_{i2}</td>
<td>Y_{i3}</td>
<td>Y_{ij}</td>
<td>Y_{i41}</td>
<td>Y_{i}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td>\vdots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y_{k1}</td>
<td>Y_{k2}</td>
<td>Y_{k3}</td>
<td>Y_{kj}</td>
<td>Y_{k41}</td>
<td>Y_{k}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total   | Y_{.1} | Y_{.2} | Y_{.3} | Y_{.j} | Y_{.41} | Y_{..} |}

Each $Y_{ij}$ represents the score judgementally assigned by the $j$th subject to the $i$th component. The total sum of square is given by:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{141} (Y_{ij})^2 = \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{141} Y_{ij})^2}{141k}
$$

The sum of squares for subjects was obtained by:

$$
\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{141} (Y_{..j})^2}{k} - \frac{(Y_{..})^2}{141k}
$$

The sum of squares for components was obtained by:

$$
\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (Y_{i..})^2}{141} - \frac{(Y_{..})^2}{141k}
$$
The residual sum of squares was obtained by subtraction.
The estimate of reliability was obtained by:

\[
\text{Mean Square Subjects - Mean Square Residual} \\
\text{Mean Square Subjects}
\]

The computed reliability coefficient for the instrument, shown in Table II, was found to be 0.94. This reliability coefficient indicates that the respondents were consistent throughout the competencies included in the instrument.

Table II

The Reliability Coefficient for the Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.9629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>9.3288 0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>7700</td>
<td>0.5544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7895</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testing the Hypotheses

The 0.05 level of probability was selected as the rejection level for the null hypotheses for each competency. A two-way analysis of variance was utilized to test the hypotheses. It was ascertained that for \(df=1, 100\), the computed \(F\) of 3.91 or greater is significant at the 0.05 level. The hypotheses were tested utilizing
a population of 141 ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington during the 1980-1981 school year. The years of teaching experience ranged from 3.2069 to 4.2367 for ESL teachers and from 3.3269 to 3.3846 for bilingual teachers (Table III, Appendix J).

Factor analysis was used to ascertain the groupings of competencies. The R-mode was utilized to cluster the competencies in this study.

Results of Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was employed to determine the statistical relationships among 56 competencies included in the research. The procedure clustered the competencies, according to generated factor loadings, that had highly correlated variances, resulting in the extracted factors. Each factor consisted of competencies with factor loadings of + .42 or higher. The results of factor analysis are shown in the discussion below.

R-Mode Analysis

The R-mode factor analysis examined the intercorrelated variance of every competency with every other competency. This technique clustered the competencies according to the respondents' ratings on all elements (competencies).

The fifteen-factor solution accounted for 50 competencies with factor loadings of + .42 or higher with no competencies clustering in Factors XI, XIII, XIV, and XV. The one-factor solution extracted eight competencies with factor loadings of + .42 or higher. The
two-factor solution had seven competencies with factor loadings of + .42 or greater. Five competencies were clustered under Factor III with factor loadings of + .45 or higher. The four-factor solution included six competencies with factor loadings of + .45 or greater. A total of four competencies were generated for Factor V with factor loadings of + .46 or higher. The six-factor solution had five competencies with factor loadings of + .47 or higher. The seven-factor solution extracted four competencies with factor loadings of + .43 or greater. Factor VIII had two competencies with factor loadings of + .67 or higher. Factor IX contained two competencies with factor loadings of + .73 or greater. Two competencies were in Factor X with factor loadings of + .59 or higher. The eleven-factor solution generated only one competency with a factor loading of + .74. The twelve-factor solution clustered two competencies with factor loadings of + .43 or higher. Factor XIII contained one competency with a factor loading of + .56. Factor XIV extracted one competency with a factor loading of + .44. The fifteen-factor solution contained one competency with a factor loading of + .62. (See Appendix K)

The cumulative percentage of the common variance accounted for in the analysis increased as additional factor solutions were drawn. The total variance (100 percent) was accounted for as the fifteenth factor was identified. Table IV presents the cumulative percentage of the variance accounted for in the fifteen-factor R-mode solution.
Table IV
Cumulative Percentage of Common Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Solution</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>86.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the R-mode analysis for fifteen-factor solution are presented in Tables V through XIX (Appendix K). Each factor solution was defined to summarize the pattern of competencies with factor loadings of + .42 or higher. Competencies with factor loadings under + .42 were considered as spurious competencies and were listed...
Figure 1. Percentage of common variance for the R-mode analysis.
under factors where their highest loading occurred. The overlapping competency was the result of the loading of a competency on more than one factor. For the study, overlap occurred only one time. The means, standard deviations, factor loadings and rankings of the 56 competencies, based upon data collected from 141 respondents are presented in Tables V through XIX.

Factor I - History and Literature of English and the Learner's Language. Factor I extracted eight competencies (items 5, 17, 27, 30, 34, 35, 37, and 38) with factor loadings of + .43 or higher, and one spurious competency (item 43) with factor loading of + .30. This factor was one of the largest in numbers of items and accounted for 39.8 percent of the common variance. Two of the eight competencies had to do with history of English and the learner's language. Four competencies pertained to literature of English and the learner's language and the reasoning process of the English language. One of the competencies included cultural anthropology. Factor I had low means, low standard deviations and low mean scores (Table V, Appendix K).*

Factor II - Methodology. Factor II clustered seven competencies (items 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, and 31) with factor loadings of + .42 or greater, and one spurious competency (item 19) with factor loading of + .36. Exactly 10.6 percent of the common variance was due to covering theory, methodology, and practice of teaching. Items 19

*Note: For purposes of curriculum development, competencies with mean scores greater than 3.000 should be considered for inclusion into education programs for the preparation of ESL and bilingual teachers. For purposes of this discussion, standard deviations which exceed 1.000 are considered to be large.
and 25 dealt with professional information. Item 21 pertained to the culture of the United States, and item 31 covered audio-visual aids. Factor II was rather homogeneous (most of the competencies being about methodology), and it had high means and low standard deviations. (Table VI, Appendix K)

Factor III - Teaching Skills. Five competencies (items 39, 40, 41, 45 and 46) were clustered under Factor III with loadings of + .45 or higher, and two spurious competencies (items 36 and 47) with factor loadings of + .37 or higher loaded on the same factor. Factor III accounted for 8.3 percent of the common variance. This factor was moderately homogeneous and included content related to teaching skills. Factor III had high means and low standard deviations. (Table VII, Appendix K)

Factor IV - Linguistics and Applied Linguistics. A total of six competencies (items 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11) with factor loadings of + .45 or higher were extracted from Factor IV. The factor accounted for 7.3 percent of the common variance. All the competencies pertained directly to linguistics and were homogeneous. Factor IV had moderately high means with low standard deviations. (Table VIII, Appendix K) There was one overlap, on competency 9, Structure of American English, between Factors IV and VII.

Factor V - Foreign Language Experience I. Four competencies (items 2, 52, 53, and 55) with factor loadings of + .46 or higher were found in Factor V. This factor accounted for 5.3 percent of the common variance. Two of the competencies (items 2 and 55) related to knowledge and experience of a foreign language, and the
other two (items 52 and 53) pertained to experience in teaching and studying in another culture. Factor V had relatively homogeneous competencies, moderate means and high standard deviations. (Table IX, Appendix K)

Factor VI - Learning/Teaching Theories and Techniques. A total of five competencies (items 28, 29, 32, 33, and 51) with factor loadings of +.47 or higher were clustered in Factor VI. Factor VI accounted for 4.5 percent of the common variance. Competencies included in this factor were rather homogeneous and had high means, small standard deviations, and high mean rankings. (Table X, Appendix K)

Factor VII - Linguistics II. Four competencies (items 9, 12, 13, and 16) with factor loadings of +.43 or higher were generated by Factor VII. Factor VII accounted for 4.1 percent of the common variance. All the competencies included in this factor were concerned with the knowledge of structures, grammar systems, semantics and language variations. All four elements were relatively homogeneous. Two competencies had moderately high means and low standard deviations while the other two elements had high means with rather high standard deviations. (Table XI, Appendix K)

Factor VIII - Cross/Inter-cultural Communication. Factor VIII consisted of two competencies (items 1 and 3) with factor loadings of +.67 or higher. Factor VIII accounted for 3.9 percent of the common variance; the two competencies pertained to cross/inter-cultural communication and social/psychological factors of cross-cultural education. The elements were homogeneous and had high means and small standard deviations. (Table XII, Appendix K)
Factor IX - Socio-Psycho-linguistics. Two competencies (items 14 and 15) with factor loadings of + .73 were generated by Factor IX. This cluster accounted for 3.1 percent of the common variance. Both competencies were related to each other and had moderately high means with low standard deviations. (Table XIII, Appendix K)

Factor X - Professional Interaction. Factor X contained two competencies (items 49 and 56) with loadings of + .59 or higher. Factor X accounted for 2.5 percent of the common variance. The competencies in this factor were rather homogeneous, with high means and small standard deviations. (Table XIV, Appendix K)

Factor XI - Foreign Language Experience II. Only one competency (item 54) with a factor loading of + .74 was generated by Factor XI. Factor XI accounted for 2.5 percent of the common variance. The competency covered the speaking of a non-native language and had a moderately high mean and a large standard deviation. (Table XV, Appendix K)

Factor XII - Cultural Studies. Factor XII contained two competencies (items 6 and 22) with factor loadings of + .43 or higher. Factor XII accounted for 2.3 percent of the common variance and extracted one spurious competency (item 24) with a factor loading of + .40. The content of the cluster related to the nature of English and the learner's language, and cultural studies. The competencies had high means and small standard deviations. (Table XVI, Appendix K)
Factor XIII - Second Language Pedagogy I. One competency was included in Factor XIII; it had a factor loading of + .56. This factor accounted for 2.1 percent of the common variance. The competency was concerned with the application of second language pedagogy, and had a moderately high mean with a small standard deviation. (Table XVII, Appendix K)

Factor XIV - Assessment. Factor XIV contained one competency (item 48) on criterion-referenced tests with a factor loading of + .44. Factor XIV accounted for 1.9 percent of the common variance. The competency had a moderately high mean, with a small standard deviation. (Table XVIII, Appendix K)

Factor XV - Second Language Pedagogy II. Only one competency (item 50), concerned with ESL/bilingual methods at elementary and secondary levels was included in Factor XV. Its factor loading was + .62. Factor XV accounted for 1.9 percent of the common variance. One spurious competency (item 44), with a factor loading of + .28, was generated by Factor XV. The spurious competency pertained to potential language learning difficulties. Factor XV had high means and low standard deviations. (Table XIX, Appendix K)

In summary, 15 factors were extracted from the analysis from which Factors XI, XIII, XIV, and XV contained only one competency which was interpretable. Of the 56 competencies generated from the analysis, 48 had factor loadings higher than + .42, two had factor loadings of + .42, and six had factor loadings of + .41. The highest factor loading of + .86 occurred on item 53 in Factor V.
and the lowest factor loading of + .28 occurred on item 44 (a spurious competency) in Factor XV. Twenty-nine competencies had means greater than 3.00, 25 had means higher than 2.00, and only two had means lower than 2.00. Four competencies had standard deviations of 1.00 or higher, and 52 had standard deviations below 1.00.

Differences by Types of Teachers

Hypothesis #1 was examined to determine if a significant difference existed between the component mean scores of ESL and bilingual teachers. Two-way analysis of variance was used to test the null hypotheses included in the design. Of 56 competencies, the null hypothesis was rejected for 20 statements (items 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 52, 53, 54, and 55). A significantly lower ESL mean score was found to exist for items 30, 34, and 54. In concert, bilingual teachers had significantly lower mean scores for items 53 and 55. (Table XXII, Appendix N)

Differences by Regions

An examination of hypothesis #2 indicated significant differences for eight competencies. The null hypothesis was rejected for competencies 12, 16, 28, 32, 40, 41, 44, and 47. Means for elements 12 and 44 were found to be significantly lower in the State of Oregon than for Washington. Means for the rest were similar. (Table XXIII, Appendix 0)
Differences Due to Interaction Effects

The test of hypothesis #3 revealed a rejection for only one competency; namely, basic concepts and theories in modern linguistic. A disordinal type of interaction effect occurred between levels of types of teachers and locations of the respondents. For this element, bilingual teachers in Washington responded quite differently from those in Oregon. The Washington bilingual teachers' mean responses were 3.34, compared to a mean of 2.62 for Oregon bilingual teachers' responses. This interaction pattern is plotted in Appendix P.

In summary, a two-way analysis of variance was used to test the three null hypotheses for each competency in the instrument. Hypothesis #1 was found to be in the rejection region for 20 competencies; the second null hypothesis was rejected for eight competencies; and null hypothesis #3 was rejected for one competency (item 7). (Table XXIV, Appendix Q)
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This study was based upon an empirical investigation conducted to determine the level of acceptance of 56 statements of competency needed for ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington.

A survey questionnaire was developed which was derived from the review of related literature. A jury of experts was chosen to evaluate the format, content, clarity, and comprehensiveness of the questionnaire. The final questionnaire consisted of 56 competency statements generated through the use of three rounds of the Delphi technique. The computed reliability coefficient was found to be +.94 and assured a high level of consistency for the instrument.

The questionnaire was designed so that ESL and bilingual teachers could respond to the level of acceptance for each competency with regard to their job. Their responses indicated whether the competencies were highly, considerably, moderately or slightly important.

A total of 141 elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers were randomly selected, using a table of random numbers to assure randomness.
Three hypotheses were tested for each competency statement using a two-way analysis of variance. The 95 percent confidence level was selected as the criterion for retaining or rejecting each of the null hypotheses. It was ascertained that if the computed \( F \) value was less than the critical tabular value, the null hypothesis was retained. The hypotheses tested in the study were as follows:

- \( H_{01} \): There is no significant difference between the component (competency) scores of ESL and bilingual teachers.
- \( H_{02} \): There is no significant difference between the component (competency) scores of the two states.
- \( H_{03} \): There is no interaction between the component (competency) scores of ESL and bilingual teachers and the two states.

Factor analysis was utilized to ascertain the groupings of competency statements.

**Summary of Findings**

The two-way analysis of variance revealed that, according to the ratings assigned to 56 competencies by ESL and bilingual teachers, differences existed for 20 competencies on the types of teachers variable. Differences were found between the two states on eight competencies. Except for competency 7, there was no significant interaction between the types of teachers and the two states. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained for 55 competency statements.
The R-mode of factor analysis was utilized to identify the common competencies. A fifteen-factor solution extracted 50 competencies with factor loadings of +.42 or higher. The fifteen-factor solutions were identified as follows:

1. Factor I - History and Literature of English and the Learner's Language.
2. Factor II - Methodology.
3. Factor III - Teaching Skills.
5. Factor V - Foreign Language Experience I.
10. Factor X - Professional Interaction.
12. Factor XII - Foreign Language Experience II.
13. Factor XIII - Second Language Pedagogy I.
14. Factor XIV - Assessment.
15. Factor XV - Second Language Pedagogy II.

For purposes of planning curricula, a mean score of 3.000 or higher was considered as the breaking point for required components; a mean value of 2.000-2.999 was considered as the criterion for recommended competencies; and competencies with mean values below 2.999 were regarded as optional elements. Appendix M contained the 10 highest mean ranked competencies; the 10 lowest mean ranked competency statements are included in Appendix L.
Fifty-six competencies were evaluated at the 0.05 alpha level and at a mean breaking point of 3.000.

According to the results of the findings, 29 competencies (items 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 39, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, and 56) were considered to be highly important and should be regarded as required elements included in teacher training programs for ESL and bilingual teachers. Twenty-five competencies (items 2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 24, 25, 27, 31, 35, 37, 38, 42, 43, 44, 48, 52, 53, 54, and 55) acquired mean scores of 2.000-2.999 and were recommended competencies. Competencies with mean scores below 2.000 (items 30 and 34) were considered as optional inclusions in such programs. (See Appendix R)

Conclusions

From the interpretation of the data and the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The 29 highest competencies with mean scores of 3.000 or higher were considered the most important and should be required for inclusion in teacher training programs for elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers. The 25 top competency statements with mean scores ranging from 2.000-2.999 should be regarded as recommended inclusions in such curricula. The remaining competencies, those with mean values below 2.999, should be viewed as optional inclusions.
2. Competencies which clustered in nine of the fifteen-factor solutions (Factors II, III, IV, VI, VII, VIII, X, XII, and XV) revealed meaningful groups of competencies as rated by 141 sample subjects.

3. ESL and bilingual teachers shared common viewpoints on 36 competency statements. However, ESL teachers' views differed from those of bilingual teachers, with regard to the minimum competencies, on 20 competency statements. Thus, the data showed significant differences for 20 competencies due to teacher types. (See Appendix S, Table XXVIII)

4. ESL and bilingual teachers in two western states (Oregon and Washington) shared common viewpoints on 48 competency statements. The data indicated significant differences for eight competencies due to geographic locations. (See Appendix S, Table XXIX)

5. Differences created by interaction effects of teacher types and geographic areas could be neglected in the standardization of competency needs. Only one of the 56 competency statements revealed a significant difference due to interaction effects. (See Appendix S, Table XXX)

Implications

As a result of information drawn from this study and from the conclusions generated by other researchers and writers, the following implications emerged for the development of teacher training programs for the groups and regions who responded to the questionnaire.
1. Competencies with high factor loadings that clustered under a factor should be viewed as competencies sharing common characteristics and should be considered for curriculum development. However, it should be remembered that high loaded competencies vary in importance, depending upon their mean score values.

2. ESL and bilingual teachers in the States of Oregon and Washington had common viewpoints on the needs of cross/inter-cultural communication and cultural studies. Therefore, competencies clustered under these two factors should be considered as required components when designing or revising future curricula.

3. There were no significant differences between ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington for those competencies which clustered within Factor II, concerning methodology and practice of teaching ESL and bilingual education. Therefore, competencies under this factor should receive special emphasis in the development or revision of future curricula. Three competencies -- 19 (a spurious competency), 25, and 31 -- each having mean scores below 3.000, were recommended but not required components.

4. Competencies clustered within Factor III were homogeneous in regard to the high mean values, but were heterogeneous as to significant differences which were due to types of teachers and geographic locations. Although significant
differences were indicated between two states on two competencies (items 40 and 41) and between two groups (on competency 46), they were found to be highly important, due to the high mean values, and should be included as required elements in planning teacher training programs for ESL and bilingual teachers. Spurious competencies (items 36 and 47) also had high mean scores and were viewed as required inclusions. The differences that existed on these elements should not create problems in the standardization of competency requirements.

5. ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington had clear-cut and similar opinions on their need for linguistics and applied linguistics. A negligible interaction effect was found on one competency and should not create problems in developing future curricula for ESL and bilingual teacher training.

6. The findings revealed that no significant differences existed between types of teachers concerning the competency needs clustered under learning/teaching theories and techniques. Therefore, due to the high mean values, these competencies should be considered as required inclusions in developing or revising future curricula. However, significant differences existed between the two states on two competencies (items 28 and 33) clustered within this factor. The high mean scores revealed the importance of inclusion of the two competencies in curricula.
7. This study suggested that competencies generated by factor X - Professional Interaction, should be classified as required elements in future curricula. No significant differences were indicated and high mean values supported the importance of the competencies.

8. Two competencies (items 9 and 16) derived from Factor VII, pertaining to linguistics, should be regarded as required competencies in future curricula. It should be noted that ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington had different viewpoints in regard to competency 16, but that the mean score was high for this item. Two other competencies (12 and 13) were found as recommended inclusions in the curriculum development.

9. Competencies under Factor IX - Socio/Psycho-linguistics, were recommended components in planning teacher training programs.

10. It was determined that competencies included in Factors V and XI - Foreign Language Experience, should be considered as recommended elements for developing future curricula. Due to the high mean scores obtained for competencies 2 and 54, it was concluded that these two competencies should be required inclusions in bilingual teacher training programs. It was noticed that ESL and bilingual teachers' viewpoints differed in regard to the needs of foreign language experience on all competencies clustered within these two factors.
11. Competencies concerned with second language pedagogy, Factors XIII and XV, are also recommended in the design of future curricula. A difference was detected between ESL and bilingual teachers' views on competency 42. The spurious competency (item 14) was also considered as a recommended element. However, differences were indicated between the teachers' viewpoints in the two states.

12. The competency pertaining to assessment should be considered as element recommended for inclusion in the curricula.

13. Five of the seven competencies extracted from Factor I attained mean values above 2.000 and were considered as recommended components in designing teacher education curricula. The two competencies (items 30 and 34) acquiring mean scores below 2.000 should be considered as optional inclusions in ESL teacher training programs; they were recommended for inclusion in bilingual curricula. The spurious competency (item 43) was found to be required for inclusion in a bilingual curriculum; in the development of an ESL curriculum, was only a recommended element.

Overall, competencies which reached mean values of 3.000 or higher were considered as required elements; those which acquired mean values between 2.000 to 2.999 were recommended for inclusion in curricula; and competencies that received mean scores below
2,000 were classified as optional inclusions in planning teacher training programs for ESL and bilingual teachers in the two states.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of this study the following recommendations were made:

1. The development of two separate questionnaires for ESL and bilingual teachers is needed.
2. Inclusion of more specific and detailed competency statements concerning ESL and bilingual education is desirable.
3. The Oregon and Washington Departments of Education should establish statewide standardization of minimum competency requirements using the Delphi technique for developing geographic competency lists.
4. The Oregon and Washington Departments of Education might do well to consider the 29 highly recommended (required) competencies generated from this study as the basis of statewide standardization of minimum competencies needed for ESL and bilingual teachers.
5. As mentioned earlier, bilingual endorsement exists in Washington. However, bilingual teachers in Oregon and ESL teachers in both states should be encouraged to reach an agreement on competencies that will lead to the establishing of a common set of requirements.
LITERATURE CITED


Blanco, G. M. Competencies for university programs in bilingual education. Unpublished, The University of Texas at Austin, pp. 4-10.


Oregon Department of Education. *Oregon Laws Relating to Bilingual Education*.


APPENDIX A

The Delphi Panel List of the ESL and Bilingual Experts

1. Sue Braithwaith
ESL and Bilingual Teacher
Beaverton Schools
P. O. Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97074
649-0259
Experience in Bilingual Education: five years
Highest Degree: B. A. in Spanish; Bilingual Specialist Credential

2. Doris Marks
ESL Teacher
Beaverton Schools
P. O. Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075
649-0259
Experience in TESOL: six years
Highest Degree: B. A. in French; Working on M.A. in TESOL

3. Dr. N. Greis
Director of ESL
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97307
229-4088
Experience in TESOL: twenty-six years
Highest Degree: Ph.D. in English

4. Tu Meksavanh
ESL and Indochinese Instructor Coordinator
Maywood Annex
10100 N. W. Prescott
Portland, OR 97220
256-5463
Experience in TESOL and Bilingual Education: five years
Highest Degree: 5th year diploma in ESL

5. Joan Riverman
ESL Coordinator
Beaverton Schools
P. O. Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075
649-0259
Experience in TESOL: seven years
Highest Degree: M. A. in TESOL
APPENDIX B

A Sample Letter Sent to the Delphi Panel Members

Shervin Behroozian
710r S. W. 5th Ave.
Portland, OR 97219
January 30, 1981

Dear Fellow Educator:

A research project is currently underway at Oregon State University to determine the minimal competencies needed for elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in two selected western states (Oregon and Washington).

Your analysis, revisions and additions of need statements to be included in the research will contribute greatly to the research information necessary for ESL and bilingual teachers at elementary/secondary level. Your participation in this project is specifically directed to this task: minimal competencies for ESL and bilingual teachers at elementary/secondary level in Oregon and Washington.

There are five major areas to consider as an initial beginning for determining minimal competencies: knowledge of linguistics, grammar, TESL/bilingual materials, TESL/bilingual methods, and communication skills.

The Delphi research method is employed to identify needs and redefine needs. It is anticipated that three rounds will provide the necessary research information; however, a fourth round may be necessary if items cannot be validated.

Olaf Helmer and his colleagues developed the Delphi technique at Rand Corporation in 1950. The basis of the Delphi technique was to obtain opinions without using face-to-face group meetings. The Delphi procedure is as follows:

1) The first questionnaire may call for a list of opinions provided by Delphi members.

2) The initial questionnaire asks that you analyze, reconstruct, evaluate and add to, the need statements. Panel members should Retain, Reject, or Revise each statement. Panel members are encouraged to add need statements.
3) The second questionnaire includes the list generated from the analysis of the first Delphi process. Each panel member is asked to rate and evaluate the revised need statement.

4) The third questionnaire includes the list which panel members have expressed consensus on pertaining to each specific need statements. It provides the final chance for revision.

The Delphi technique has been extremely useful in predicting the future political, economic and social environment, and anticipating the needs of client group; it has also been employed in educational research.

Your interest and professional cooperation in working with this project is greatly appreciated. Enclosed is the first round questionnaire. Please return this questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely,

Shervin Behroozian
APPENDIX C

Delphi Questionnaire

Name ___________________________ Address __________________
Telephone ___________________ __________________

Delphi Questionnaire

Round I

Attached is the Delphi questionnaire for Round One in identifying minimal competencies needed for elementary/secondary ESL and or bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington. I am attempting to measure differences between the component scores of ESL and bilingual teachers, between the component scores of the two states and interaction between the component scores of teacher types and the two states.

The major objective of the Delphi panel is to determine the need statements which are to appear in the final questionnaire. There may be statements that you wish to add, please list these at the end of each major section.

Please return the form as soon as completed.

Directions: Read each statement and place an (X) if you Retain or Reject the statement. If you wish to revise the statement, do so in space provided for under Revise. Please make additions at the end of each major area.

Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

1. Human and intercultural relations
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _______________________

2. a foreign language
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _______________________


Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

3. social/psychology of cross-cultural education
   Retain _______  Reject _______  Revise ____________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

4. language cross culture
   Retain _______  Reject _______  Revise ____________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

5. cultural anthropology
   Retain _______  Reject _______  Revise ____________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

6. comparative cultures
   Retain _______  Reject _______  Revise ____________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

7. general linguistics
   Retain _______  Reject _______  Revise ____________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

8. phonology of American English
   Retain _______  Reject _______  Revise ____________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

9. structure of American English
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ____________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

10. comparative linguistics
    Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ____________________
        __________________________
        __________________________

11. applied linguistics including problems of second language learning
    Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ____________________
        __________________________
        __________________________

12. semantics
    Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ____________________
        __________________________
        __________________________

13. dialectology
    Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ____________________
        __________________________
        __________________________

14. sociolinguistics
    Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ____________________
        __________________________
        __________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

15. psycholinguistics
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

16. grammar systems
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

17. history and development of the English language
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

18. theory and methodology of teaching a bilingual child in content area
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

19. current issues in bilingual education/ESL
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________

20. theory and practice of teaching English as a second language
   Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise __________________________
   __________________________
   __________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

21. the culture and traditions of the United States
   Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________

22. the culture and traditions of the child's native country
   Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________

23. methods and materials in ESL/bilingual education
   Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________

24. phonology, morphology and syntax of the child's language as these elements contrast with English
   Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________

25. cross-cultural communication
   Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________

26. the nature of English and the learner's language
   Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

27. professional information sources such as: journals, research reports, and professional organizations

Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ______________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

Additional Items:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

28. use the ways in which language affects individual perception and thought
Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ______________________

29. use the ways in which language is used to manipulate people
Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ______________________

30. trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language
Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ______________________

31. explain the reasoning process of the English language
Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ______________________

32. adapt verbal and non-verbal skills to classroom audience
Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ______________________

33. respond objectively and subjectively to English literature
Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise ______________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

34. describe the major characteristics of the American literary tradition as well as non-American literary tradition.

Retain ______  Reject ______  Revise ____________________

35. determine reading levels of instructional materials

Retain ______  Reject ______  Revise ____________________

36. diagnose the level of students' reading ability and interest

Retain ______  Reject ______  Revise ____________________

37. communicate basic ideas in a second language

Retain ______  Reject ______  Revise ____________________

38. apply the principles of second language pedagogy in development of effective teaching plans including: history of English/bilingual education, models, introduction materials, etc.

Retain ______  Reject ______  Revise ____________________
Major Areas: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

39. assist students to gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills in both the child's native language and English
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________________

40. compare and contrast the language of the students for purposes of pinpointing the potential language learning difficulties
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________________

41. understand the life styles of different cultures and their effect on learning a second language
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________________

42. understand the learning styles of different cultures and their effect on learning a second language
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________________

43. prepare and assist students to interact effectively in a cross-cultural setting
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise _________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

44. recognize the similarities and differences between American and the other cultures and their effects on creating conflicts and opportunities for children.
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ____________________________

45. apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ____________________________

46. prepare test to evaluate achievement of proposed objectives of instruction
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ____________________________

47. explain the rationale, goals, and procedures of ESL/bilingual education to other personnel of school
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ____________________________

Additional Items:
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to have experience in:

48. using a variety of English as a second language teaching styles and methodologies at elementary and secondary levels
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ________________________

49. using a variety of ESL/bilingual teaching styles and methodologies at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ________________________

50. teaching in another culture
Retain _______ Reject _______ Revise ________________________
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to have experience in:

51. studying in another culture

Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise _________________________

52. speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and of parents (in conferences, etc.)

Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise _________________________

53. hosting persons from other cultures

Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise _________________________

54. teaching a foreign language

Retain _____ Reject _____ Revise _________________________

Additional Items:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

Round Two of Delphi Technique

TO: Delphi Members

FROM: Shervin Behroozian

SUBJECT: Round Two of Delphi Technique for Minimal Competency Project

DATE: March 20, 1981

Thank you for responding to the first Delphi Round for identifying minimal competencies needed for elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington. There were several items which acquired group consensus on the first round; these will be revised slightly and included in the final research process.

The Second Round Delphi includes revised statements, non-consensus statements and new statements submitted by Delphi members. Please read the instructions and return the completed form as soon as possible. Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to phone me at 245-8164.

Round Three will include only those items which did not acquire consensus, and you will be asked to reconsider the statements for final analysis.

Thank you for your quick response and assistance in completing Rounds one and two. Your suggestions have been tremendous.

SB
Encls.
ROUND TWO

Delphi Technique

Minimal Competencies Needed for Elementary/Secondary ESL and Bilingual Teachers in Two Selected Western States
(Oregon and Washington)

Directions: Section I are the statements which need to be re-examined from Round One. Please make your very best professional intuitive judgements on the statements listed in this section.

Section II are new statements presented in Round One from Delphi members. Please give your very best consideration to these items.

The needs rating scale for your responses is as follows:

4 -- Considered to be highly important
3 -- Considered to be considerably important
2 -- Considered to be moderately important
1 -- Considered to be slightly important

Please place an (X) for your response in the appropriate blank space for each item. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

1. human and intercultural communication
2. a foreign language
3. social/psychological factors of cross-cultural education
4. general characteristics of languages across cultures
5. cultural anthropology
6. comparative cultures
7. basic concepts and theories in modern linguistics
13. language variations
18. theory, methodology and language ability in child's native language
19. current issues and legislation in ESL/bilingual education
21. the culture of the United States
22. the culture and traditions of the countries represented in an ESL/bilingual classroom

24. contrastive analysis of English and the learner's language

26. the nature of English and as much of the learner's language as possible

Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

28. use various learning theories

29. use language effectively with non-native speakers of English at all levels

30. trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language

31. facilitate an understanding of the reasoning process of the English language

33. respond objectively and subjectively to English literature and the literature of the second language

34. facilitate the study of American literature
37. communicate basic and complex ideas in teaching content areas at elementary level

38. apply the principles of second language pedagogy based on the history of English, bilingual education, etc., in the development of effective teaching plans

39. assist students to gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills in both the learner's native language and English

40. compare and contrast the language of the students with English for purposes of pinpointing the potential language learning difficulties

46. use and interpret criterion-referenced tests

47. explain the rationales, goals, and procedures of ESL/bilingual education to other personnel of school

Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to have experience in:

49. using a variety of ESL/bilingual teaching styles and methodologies at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction

50. teaching in another culture
51. studying in another culture

52. speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and of parents (in conferences, etc.)

53. hosting persons from other cultures

54. teaching a foreign language
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

1. theory and practice of teaching reading to children and/or adults learners
   4 3 2 1

2. children's literature in English and in the child's primary language
   4 3 2 1

3. learning theories
   4 3 2 1

4. American and British literature
   4 3 2 1

5. measurement/evaluation of instructional materials
   4 3 2 1

6. use of audio-visual aids
   4 3 2 1

Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to have experience in sharing theory and methodology with other professionals.

4 3 2 1
APPENDIX E

Round Three of Delphi Technique

TO: Delphi Members
FROM: Shervin Behroozian
SUBJECT: Round Three of Delphi Technique for Minimal Competency Project
DATE: April 25, 1981

Thank you for responding to the first and second Delphi Round for identifying minimal competencies needed for elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington.

The Third Round Delphi includes only those items which did not acquire group consensus. Please read the instructions and return the completed form as soon as possible. Enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to phone me at 245-8164.

Thank you for your quick response.

SB
ROUND THREE
Delphi Process

Minimal Comptencies Needed for Elementary/Secondary ESL and Bilingual Teachers in Two Selected Western States (Oregon and Washington)

The following items did not gain consensus for Delphi Panel members in Round Two. Reconsider these items for final analysis.

Directions: You are to either accept or reject the statements; please place an (X) for your response in the appropriate blank.

Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

5. cultural anthropology Accept____ Reject____

18. theory, methodology and language ability in child's native language Accept____ Reject____

4(N) American and British literature Accept____ Reject____

Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

28. use various learning theories Accept____ Reject____

31. facilitate an understanding of the reasoning process of English language Accept____ Reject____

33. respond objectively and subjectively to English literature of the second language Accept____ Reject____

34. facilitate the study of American literature Accept____ Reject____
Major Area: An elementary/secondary ESL and/or bilingual teacher is expected to have experience in:

53. hosting persons from other cultures  Accept___ Reject___

54. teaching a foreign language  Accept___ Reject___
APPENDIX F
A Sample Letter Sent to
Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent

Shervin Behroozian
7568 S. W. Oleson Rd. #B3
Portland, OR 97223
April 15, 1981

Dear Sir:

As part of a doctoral dissertation, I am doing a research study on the minimal competencies needed for elementary/secondary ESL and bilingual teachers in Oregon and Washington.

I hope that my efforts will assist your teachers with their task; that is generating a larger bank of items that can be used throughout the Oregon and Washington states in developing and assessing teacher workshops and/or graduate and undergraduate courses dealing with ESL and bilingual education.

This research project requires at least 50 ESL and 50 bilingual teachers in each state. Twenty-six responses from each group (ESL and bilingual) in each state (Oregon and Washington) will be randomly selected. A Likert-scale questionnaire allows the respondents to react to the instrument in 20 minutes or less.

If you wish to cooperate by allowing me to send a copy of the questionnaire to a selected ESL and bilingual teachers of your school district, I will be most appreciative. The findings of the study will be shared with the cooperating schools.

I have enclosed a self-addressed post card for getting your approval as a sample school district. If approved, I will send a copy of the questionnaire to the ESL and bilingual teachers of your school district in spring.

Thank you for any help that you may render. Hopefully, the results will provide some practical benefits to your own school district as well as to me.

If you have any questions, please feel free to phone me at (503) 245-8164.

Sincerely,

Shervin Behroozian
Shervin Behroozian will appreciate your participation in this study.

Our district wishes to cooperate.  ____ Yes  ____ No

Our contact person in ESL program is:

__________________________________________

Our contact person in bilingual program is:

__________________________________________

Signed
APPENDIX H

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
MINIMAL COMPETENCIES NEEDED FOR ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY
ESL AND BILINGUAL TEACHERS IN OREGON & WASHINGTON

A Research Project
by
Shervin Behrooziann

INSTRUCTION FOR COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE

Following is a list of knowledge, ability and experience items related
to competency needs and requirements for ESL and bilingual teachers at
elementary/secondary level. For each item please circle the answer
which best shows your feeling about the necessity for the knowledge,
ability, and experience required by ESL/bilingual teachers. The
following key ratings should be used:

Highly Important (4)
Considerably Important (3)
Moderately Important (2)
Slightly Important (1)

Please check ( ) the appropriate items

1. Bilingual Teacher   ESL Teacher
2. Oregon             Washington
3. Number of years of teaching
                    ESL/Bilingual Education

LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Considerably Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. cross/inter-cultural communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a foreign language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. social/psychological factors of cross-cultural education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. general characteristics of language across culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. cultural anthropology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Acceptance</td>
<td>Highly Important</td>
<td>Considerably Important</td>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. comparative cultures</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. basic concepts and theories in modern linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. phonology of American English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. structure of American English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. comparative linguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. applied linguistics including problems of second language learning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. semantics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. language variations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. sociolinguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. psycholinguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. grammar systems</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. history and development of English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. theory and methodology of teaching a bilingual child in a content area</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. current issues and legislation in ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. theory and practice of teaching English as a second language/bilingual education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. the culture of the United States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. the culture and traditions of the countries represented in an ESL/bilingual classroom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. methods and materials in ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. the nature of English and as much as of the learner's language as possible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. professional information sources such as: journals, research, reports, and professional organizations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. theory and practice of teaching reading to children and/or adult learners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. children's literature in English and in the child's primary language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE

Highly Important  | Considerably Important  | Moderately Important  | Slightly Important

A. An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate knowledge of:

28. Learning theories......................... 4 3 2 1
29. Measurement/evaluation of instructional materials. 4 3 2 1
30. American/British literature.......................... 4 3 2 1
31. Use of Audio-Visual aids.......................... 4 3 2 1

B. An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

32. Use various learning theories......................... 4 3 2 1
33. Use language effectively with non-native speakers of English at all levels.......................... 4 3 2 1
34. Trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language.................. 4 3 2 1
35. Facilitate an understanding of the reasoning process of the English language.................. 4 3 2 1
36. Adapt verbal and non-verbal skills to classroom audience.......................... 4 3 2 1
37. Respond objectively and subjectively to English literature and the literature of the learner's language.......................... 4 3 2 1
38. Facilitate the study of American literature...... 4 3 2 1
39. Determine reading levels of instructional materials 4 3 2 1
40. Diagnose the level of students' reading ability and interest........................................... 4 3 2 1
41. Communicate basic and complex ideas in teaching content areas at elementary level.......................... 4 3 2 1
42. Apply the principles of second language pedagogy based on the history of English, bilingual education, etc., in the development of effective teaching plans.......................... 4 3 2 1
43. Assist students to gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills in both the learner's language and English.......................... 4 3 2 1
44. Compare and contrast the language of the students with English for purposes of pinpointing the potential language learning difficulties.......................... 4 3 2 1
45. Understand the learning styles of different cultures and their effect on learning a second language... 4 3 2 1
### B. An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to demonstrate ability to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Considerably Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>prepare and assist students to interact effectively in a cross-cultural setting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>use and interpret criterion-referenced tests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>explain the rationales, goals, and procedures of ESL/bilingual education to other personnel of school</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. An elementary/secondary ESL or bilingual teacher is expected to have experience in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Important</th>
<th>Considerably Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>using variety of ESL/bilingual teaching methods and techniques at elementary/secondary level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>using a variety of ESL/bilingual teaching styles and methodologies at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>teaching in another culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>studying in another culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and of parents (in conferences, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>teaching a foreign language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>sharing theory and methodology with other professionals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Additional Statements:
A Sample Letter Sent to ESL and Bilingual Teachers

Shervin Behroozian  
7568 S. W. Oleson Rd. #B3  
Portland, OR 97223  
(503) 245-8164  
May 5, 1981

Dear Sir:

For my doctoral thesis I am doing a study of minimum competency requirements for ESL and bilingual teachers at elementary/secondary level in the States of Oregon and Washington.

The purpose of this study is to identify minimal competencies, sort them out, route them by a large sample of ESL/bilingual teachers, verify the results, and make them available to schools that wish to use them.

Your district superintendent has granted me his permission to do a random sample of your ESL/bilingual teachers. I am aware of the demands of your time and will be very appreciative of your professional assistance.

Enclosed are ten copies of the questionnaire. If possible, please forward a copy of the enclosed questionnaire to each of your ESL and bilingual teachers and ask him or her to take a few minutes to mark and return the questionnaire. I will be most appreciative. A summary of the results will be sent to participating school districts; it should be of use to your teachers as well as to me.

Enclosed is a self-addressed envelope for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaires. If you have any questions, please feel free to phone me at (503) 245-8164.

Once again, my thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Shervin Behroozian
APPENDIX J

Table III
Mean of Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teachers</th>
<th>State</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>4.2367</td>
<td>3.3846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3.2069</td>
<td>3.3269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3.3846</td>
<td>3.3269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX K
### TABLE V

**Factor I - History and Literature of English and the Learner's Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cultural anthropology</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>2.4823</td>
<td>.8912</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>History and development of English</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>2.1418</td>
<td>.8911</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Children's literature in English and in the child's primary language</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>2.4326</td>
<td>.9126</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>American/British literature</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>1.8085</td>
<td>.7830</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>1.7589</td>
<td>.9095</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Facilitate an understanding of the reasoning process of the English language</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>2.8014</td>
<td>.8126</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Respond objectively and subjectively to English literature and the literature of the learner's language</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>2.2766</td>
<td>.9495</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Facilitate the study of American literature</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>2.0355</td>
<td>.8653</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Spurious Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Assist students to gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills in both the learner's language and English</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>2.9149</td>
<td>1.0856</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX K

**Table VI**

**Factor II - Methodology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Theory and methodology of teaching a bilingual child in a content area</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>3.2695</td>
<td>.8691</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theory and practice of teaching ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>3.5035</td>
<td>.7033</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The culture of the United States</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>3.1844</td>
<td>.8333</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Methods and materials in ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>3.6454</td>
<td>.5872</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Professional information sources such as: journals, research, reports, and professional organizations</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>2.5461</td>
<td>.8492</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Theory and practice of teaching reading to children and/or adult learners</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>3.2908</td>
<td>.7796</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Use of Audio-Visual aids</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>2.8298</td>
<td>.9177</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spurious Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Current issues and legislations in ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>2.7092</td>
<td>.8987</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX K

**Table VII**

Factor III - Teaching Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Determine reading levels of instructional materials</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>3.198</td>
<td>.7948</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Diagnose the level of students' reading ability and interest</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>3.347</td>
<td>.7745</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Communicate basic and complex ideas in teaching content areas at elementary level</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>3.106</td>
<td>.8594</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Understand the learning styles of different cultures and their effect on learning a second language</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>3.305</td>
<td>.8276</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Prepare and assist students to interact effectively in a cross-cultural setting</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>3.531</td>
<td>.6819</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spurious Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>3.695</td>
<td>.5338</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Adapt verbal and non-verbal skills to classroom audience</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>3.539</td>
<td>.6270</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX K

Table VIII

**Factor IV - Linguistics and Applied Linguistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>General characteristics of language across culture</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>3.1489</td>
<td>.7832</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Basic concepts and theories in modern linguistics</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>2.8369</td>
<td>.9073</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Phonology of American English</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td>3.3121</td>
<td>.8293</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Structure of American English</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>3.4539</td>
<td>.7604</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Comparative linguistics</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>2.6879</td>
<td>.8547</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Applied linguistics including problems of second language learning</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>3.3688</td>
<td>.7503</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table IX

Factor V - Foreign Language Experience I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A foreign language</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>2.8085</td>
<td>1.1014</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Teaching in another culture</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>2.4255</td>
<td>1.0572</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Studying in another culture</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>2.4539</td>
<td>.9962</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Teaching a foreign language</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>2.0213</td>
<td>1.0452</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Title of Competency</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Learning theories</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>3.0709</td>
<td>.8250</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Measurement/evaluation of instructional materials</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>3.0142</td>
<td>.7745</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Use various learning theories</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>3.2837</td>
<td>.7867</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Use language effectively with non-native speakers of English at all levels</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>3.5745</td>
<td>.7195</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Using a variety of ESL/bilingual teaching methods and techniques at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>3.5390</td>
<td>.6155</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XI
Factor VII - Linguistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Structure of American English</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>3.453</td>
<td>.7604</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Semantics</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>.9176</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Language variations</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>.8272</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Grammar systems</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>.8159</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Title of Competency</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cross/inter-cultural communication</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>3.5745</td>
<td>.6004</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Social/psychological factors of cross-cultural education</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>3.4148</td>
<td>.7286</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table XIII**

**Factor IX - Socio/Psycho-Linguistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sociolinguistics</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>2.5461</td>
<td>.8235</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>2.5106</td>
<td>.8670</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XIV

Factor X - Professional Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Explain the rationales, goals, and procedures of ESL/bilingual education to other personnel of school</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>3.3972</td>
<td>.6957</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sharing theory and methodology with other professionals</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>3.0567</td>
<td>.8765</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XV

Factor XI - Foreign Language Experience II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and or parents (in conferences, etc.)</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>2.3121</td>
<td>1.1284</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table XVI**

Factor XII - Cultural Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Comparative cultures</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>3.0567</td>
<td>.8261</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The culture and traditions of the countries represented in an ESL/bilingual classroom</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>3.2482</td>
<td>.7479</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spurious Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The nature of English and as much of the learner's language as possible</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>2.9149</td>
<td>.9963</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XVII
Factor XIII - Second Language Pedagogy I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Apply the principles of second language pedagogy based on the history of English,</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>2.770</td>
<td>.8894</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bilingual education, etc., in the development of effective teaching plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Title of Competency</td>
<td>Factor Loading</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean Ranking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Use and interpret criterion-referenced tests</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>2.8156</td>
<td>.8832</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Table XIX

**Factor XV - Second Language Pedagogy II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Using variety of ESL/bilingual teaching methods and techniques at elementary/secondary level</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>3.5390</td>
<td>.6816</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Compare and contrast the language of the students with English for purposes of pinpointing the potential language learning difficulties:</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>2.7809</td>
<td>.9418</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Spurious Competency_
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Table XX

Ten Lowest Ranked ESL/Bilingual Competencies Based Upon Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.7589</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>American/British literature</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1.8085</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Teaching a foreign language</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.0213</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Facilitate the study of American literature</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.0355</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>History and development of English</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.1418</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Respond objectively and subjectively to English literature and the literature of the learner's language</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.2766</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and of parents (in conferences, etc.)</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>2.3121</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Teaching in another culture</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.4255</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Children's literature in English and in the child's primary language</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.4326</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cultural anthropology</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>2.4823</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE XXI

Ten Highest Ranked ESL/Bilingual Competencies Based Upon Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Title of Competency</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students</td>
<td>Spurious* III</td>
<td>3.6950</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Methods and materials in ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.6454</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cross/inter-cultural communication</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>3.5745</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Use language effectively with non-native speakers of English at all levels</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3.5745</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Adapt verbal and non-verbal skills to classroom audience</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>3.5390</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Using variety of ESL/bilingual teaching methods and techniques at elementary/secondary level</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>3.5390</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Using a variety of ESL/bilingual teaching methods and techniques at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3.5390</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Prepare and assist students to interact effectively in a cross-cultural setting</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>3.5319</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Theory and practice of teaching ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.5035</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Structure of American English</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.4539</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Table XXII

Mean Score of ESL and Bilingual Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ESL</th>
<th>Bilingual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8085</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7191</td>
<td>3.0385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0337</td>
<td>3.4423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0112</td>
<td>2.3654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5506</td>
<td>2.9808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.2921</td>
<td>2.6731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6854</td>
<td>2.0192</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.7079</td>
<td>3.3462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.5281</td>
<td>2.1538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.6966</td>
<td>3.2692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.1236</td>
<td>2.5385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.5843</td>
<td>3.0962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.6854</td>
<td>3.3077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.6292</td>
<td>3.0385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.6742</td>
<td>3.2885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.6742</td>
<td>3.5385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.1910</td>
<td>2.8269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.3034</td>
<td>1.0046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.8764</td>
<td>3.0577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.6629</td>
<td>.8912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XXIII

Mean Score of the Two Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6628</td>
<td>3.1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0233</td>
<td>3.4436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.8005</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.1860</td>
<td>3.4364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0769</td>
<td>3.5385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.9767</td>
<td>3.3091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.5930</td>
<td>3.0727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.6395</td>
<td>3.7818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Disordinal interaction between $T_1$ and $T_2$. 
Table XXIV

Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance on Individual Competency Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Means (Teacher Type)</th>
<th>Computed F</th>
<th>HO Decision</th>
<th>Means (State)</th>
<th>Computed F</th>
<th>HO Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td>OH Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.243</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>16.571</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.773</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>5.752</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.565</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>5.304</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Means (Teacher Type)</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
<td>HO Decision</td>
<td>Means (State)</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
<td>HO Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.019</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.168</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>4.907</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.716</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>8.261</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>15.630</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>18.075</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>5.302</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.544</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>9.979</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>9.192</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Means (Teacher Type)</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
<td>HO Decision</td>
<td>Means (State)</td>
<td>Computed F</td>
<td>HO Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.632</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>9.874</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>8.416</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.614</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.801</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>13.372</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>6.623</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.366</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>31.314</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>Retain</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>knowledge of cross/inter-cultural communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>knowledge of social/psychological factors of cross-cultural education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>knowledge of general characteristics of language across culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>knowledge of comparative cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>knowledge of phonology of American English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>knowledge of structure of American English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>knowledge of applied linguistics including problems of second language learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knowledge of grammar systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>knowledge of theory and methodology of teaching a bilingual child in a content area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>knowledge of theory and practice of teaching English as a second language/bilingual education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>knowledge of the culture of the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>knowledge of the culture and traditions of the countries represented in an ESL/bilingual classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>knowledge of methods and materials in ESL/bilingual education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>knowledge of theory and practice of teaching reading to children and/or adult learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>knowledge of learning theories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XXV - Cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>knowledge of measurement/evaluation of instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ability to use various learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ability to use language effectively with non-native speakers of English at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ability to adapt verbal and non-verbal skills to classroom audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ability to determine reading levels of instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ability to diagnose the level of students' reading ability and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>ability to communicate basic and complex ideas in teaching content areas at elementary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>ability to understand the learning styles of different cultures and their effect on learning a second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>ability to prepare and assist students to interact effectively in a cross-cultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ability to apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>ability to explain the rationales, goals, and procedures of ESL/bilingual education to other personnel of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>experience in using variety of ESL/bilingual teaching methods and techniques at elementary/secondary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>experience in using a variety of ESL/bilingual teaching styles and methodologies at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>experience in sharing theory and methodology with other professionals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XXVI

Recommended Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>knowledge of a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>knowledge of cultural anthropology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knowledge of basic concepts and theories in modern linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>knowledge of comparative linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>knowledge of semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>knowledge of language variations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>knowledge of sociolinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>knowledge of psycholinguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>knowledge of history and development of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>knowledge of current issues and legislation in ESL/bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>knowledge of the nature of English and as much as of the learner's language as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>knowledge of professional information sources such as: journals, research, reports, and professional organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>knowledge of children's literature in English and in the child's primary language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>knowledge of use of Audio-Visual aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ability to facilitate an understanding of the reasoning process of the English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ability to respond objectively and subjectively to English literature and the literature of the learner's language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>ability to facilitate the study of American literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ability to apply the principles of second language pedagogy based on the history of English, bilingual education, etc., in the development of effective teaching plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ability to assist students to gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills in both the learner's language and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ability to compare and contrast the language of the students with English for purposes of pinpointing the potential language learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>ability to use and interpret criterion-referenced tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>experience in teaching in another culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>experience in studying in another culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>experience in speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and of parents (in conferences, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>experience in teaching a foreign language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table XXVII

**Optional Competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>knowledge of American/British literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ability to trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Table XXVIII

Rejected Competencies Due to ESL/Bilingual Teachers' Viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>knowledge of a foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knowledge of basic concepts and theories in modern linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knowledge of grammar systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>knowledge of history and development of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>knowledge of current issues and legislation in ESL/bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>knowledge of children's literature in English and in the child's primary language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>knowledge of American/British literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>ability to use language effectively with non-native speakers of English at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>ability to trace the historical development of the English language and the learner's language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>ability to adapt verbal and non-verbal skills to classroom audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>ability to respond objectively and subjectively to English literature and the literature of the learner's language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ability to apply the principles of second language pedagogy based on the history of English, bilingual education, etc. in the development of effective teaching plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ability to assist students to gain mastery of both receptive (listening and reading) and productive (speaking and writing) skills in both the learner's language and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ability to compare and contrast the language of the students with English for purposes of pinpointing the potential language learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>ability to prepare and assist students to interact effectively in a cross-cultural setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ability to apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>experience in teaching in another culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>experience in studying in another culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>experience in speaking in a non-native language to meet the basic needs of students and of parents (in conferences, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>experience in teaching a foreign language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table XXIX

Rejected Competencies Due to the Two States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>knowledge of Semantics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>knowledge of grammar systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>knowledge of learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>ability to use various learning theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>ability to diagnose the level of students' reading ability and interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>ability to communicate basic and complex ideas in teaching content areas at elementary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>ability to compare and contrast the language of the students with English for purposes of pin-pointing the potential language learning difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>ability to apply teaching strategies appropriate to ESL and bilingual students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX S

### Table XXX

Rejected Competency Due to Interaction Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>knowledge of basic concepts and theories in modern linguistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>