

Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Novice and Career Teachers in Instructional Strategies,
Student Engagement, and Classroom Management.

by

Jeffrey S. Kerns

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College of the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of

Kay A. Keiser, Ed.D., chair

Omaha, Nebraska

April 23, 2015

Supervisory Committee:

Peter J. Smith, Ed.D.

Jeanne L. Surface, Ed.D.

Nealy F. Grandgenett, Ph.D.

Abstract

Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Novice and Career Teachers in Instructional Strategies,
Student Engagement, and Classroom Management

Jeffrey S. Kerns, M.Ed., Ed.D.

University of Nebraska, 2015

Advisor: Dr. Kay A. Keiser

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the body of literature that identifies where in the career cycle that teachers need the most support and they experience the greatest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies.

Teachers' efficacy beliefs were measured using the 12-item short form version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES- Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This instrument is considered valid and reliable while demonstrating the ability to capture teachers' efficacy beliefs in three areas: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The short form of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale is comprised of 12 items, with three 4-item subscales. These subscales measured teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2001). The teacher/participant administered the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) during a regularly scheduled Friday faculty meeting. From a potential of 61 participants, 59 staff members participated in the study (2 staff members were absent).

The implications of this research may be help district and building level leaders who are looking to impact student achievement advocate transformative learning and the

enhancement of self-efficacy levels for all classroom teachers with special consideration of career cycle stages (White, 2008).

Acknowledgements

“To succeed your positive energy, faith, and belief must be greater than all the negativity and doubt.”

–Jon Gordon

First I want to thank God for granting me the opportunity to undertake this academic journey. I am grateful and continually humbled by the blessings you have provided for me. Thank you to my parents Richard and Lorri Kerns, for always being in my corner and always pushing me to explore opportunities that were beyond my perceived limitations. Thank you for your years of hard work and dedication; you are amazing people and parents. I am forever grateful for the opportunities you have presented me; you have always been my heroes. Lisa, I asked for a baby sister many moons ago, I could never have imagined how much you would enhance my life with your presence. Thank you for always supporting and believing in my crazy goals. Your infamous saying, “A lot of people go to school for seven years, but they are called doctors!” continually motivated me to finish this journey!

Rochelle, thank you for always letting me vent my frustrations and for pushing me to keep going, especially when I was less than cheerful. You are an amazing mother, friend, and wife; I am grateful for your companionship. Allie and Claire I missed you every moment that this academic endeavor separated us. Every decision I make as a professional is done through the lens of a loving father. Without my two beautiful daughters, I would have never achieved such a rich depth of love, compassion, and empathy. Every night when I go to bed I pray for your health, happiness, and one more day to be your dad.

Thank you to Dr. Keiser for your straightforwardness, guidance, and honest feedback. I greatly appreciate your words, beliefs, and insights. Dr. Smith, one of the greatest accomplishments in my academic life was completing your statistics classes. Thank you for being patient and always finding a way to help me understand. Dr. Surface, thank you for calling and checking in on me to see how I was doing and for pushing me when I began to stall. Thank you to Dr. Neal F. Grandgenett for taking the time to be on my committee.

Steve Shadle, Alvern “Al” Agrimson, Steve Rector, Dr. Sullivan, John Southworth, Jeff Alfrey, and Jeanine Beaudin, thank you for granting me the opportunity to serve our community as a teacher, coach, and administrator. Dr. Sutfin, Dr. Williams, Dr. Phipps, and Micky Gehringer, thank you for your guidance and thoughtful questions; you have all been essential to my growth and development. A special thanks to Jennifer Gowin-Hussey and Lesa Brand for lending your academic expertise, editing skills, and time, you both were essential to the completion of this study. Thank you to my staff members for participating in my study. Every single day I take a small walk of gratitude in our hallways. On these gratitude walks I frequently reflect on how blessed our students are to have such caring and dedicated teachers guiding their education. I knew when you stole my office chair on my first day and replaced it with a full sized toilet, complete with flowers planted in the bowl, I was right where God intended me to be. Thank you for accepting me into your culture.

To my fellow administrators, I am fortunate and grateful to be surrounded with amazing and talented educators and leaders; thank you for everything you do for our students and our community.

Table of Contents

Abstract	<i>i</i>
Acknowledgements	<i>iii</i>
Table of Contents	<i>v</i>
List of Tables	<i>viii</i>
Chapter 1 Introduction	<i>1</i>
Theoretical Framework	<i>5</i>
Problem Statement	<i>8</i>
Research Questions	<i>9</i>
Definition of Terms	<i>11</i>
Assumptions	<i>13</i>
Limitations & Delimitations	<i>13</i>
Significance of the Study	<i>13</i>
Outline of the Study	<i>14</i>
Chapter 2 Review of Literature	<i>16</i>
History	<i>16</i>
Development of Teacher Efficacy Instruments	<i>18</i>
Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy	<i>20</i>
District and School Administrator Influence	<i>19</i>
Needs and Tendencies of Novice Teachers	<i>22</i>
Needs and Tendencies of Career Teachers	<i>24</i>
Developing Systems of Support	<i>26</i>
Mentoring	<i>26</i>

Induction Programs	28
District Led Induction Programs	29
B.E.S.T.	29
CADRE	29
Millard Public Schools 3 Year Induction Program	30
Millard Public Schools Professional Learning Communities	31
Millard Public Schools Leadership Academy	33
Future Implications	34
Chapter 3 Methodology	35
Design	35
Research Questions	36
Subjects	39
Data	40
Instruments	40
Chapter 4 Results	42
Purpose of Study	42
Research Question #1	42
Research Question #2	44
Research Question #3	44
Research Question #4	44
Research Question #5	48
Research Question #6	48
Chapter 5 Conclusions and Discussions	64

Discussion of Findings 65

Implications 73

Recommendations 79

References 81

Appendix A Permission to Utilize Survey Instrument

Appendix B Survey Instrument

Appendix C IRB – Board Approval

List of Tables

Tables

- Table 1. Research School (TSES) Responses 43
- Table 2. Differences Between Novice Teachers' Overall TSES Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School 45
- Table 3. Differences Between Novice Teachers' Instructional Strategies TSES Self-Efficacy Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School 46
- Table 4. Differences Between Novice Teachers' Student Engagement TSES Self-Efficacy Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School 47
- Table 5. Differences Between Novice Teachers' Classroom Management TSES Self-Efficacy Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School 49
- Table 6. Differences Between Novice Teachers' Scores Compared to a National Comparison Group 50
- Table 7. Differences Between Career Teachers' Scores Compared to a National Comparison Group 51
- Table 8. Research School Novice Teachers' Overall Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Overall Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 53

- Table 9. Research School Career Teachers' Overall Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Overall Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 54
- Table 10. Research School Novice Teachers' Instructional Strategies Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Instructional Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 56
- Table 11. Research School Career Teachers' Instructional Strategies Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Instructional Strategies Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 57
- Table 12. Research School Novice Teachers' Student Engagement Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Engagement Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 59
- Table 13. Research School Career Teachers' Student Engagement Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Student Engagement Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 60
- Table 14. Research School Novice Teachers' Classroom Management Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Classroom Management Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 62
- Table 15. Research School Career Teachers' Classroom Management Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Classroom Management Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) 63

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Teachers are expected to provide students with the necessary tools to navigate a global economy, thrive in collaborative working environments, utilize critical thinking skills, and become contributing members of our civic society (Friedman, 2005). Teachers are also charged with continually elevating performance standards, excelling in classroom management, building positive relationships, differentiating instruction, assessing student readiness for learning, and deciphering student responses to quality curriculum to provide supplemental material and/or recommend appropriate interventions. (Berry, 2006; Fisher & Frey, 2010; Hunter, 1982). The Nebraska Department of Education's (2011) draft of Teacher Standards was designed to encompass a broad range of effective practice that characterizes the state's best teachers. The NDE lists the following as teacher performance indicators: demonstrating a strong command of content and related instructional strategies, utilizing research based instructional approaches, understanding of cultural and societal influences, comprehending how national, state, and local standards impact teaching, and finally fostering the growth of student learning, development, and achievement. Teachers are expected to carry out a plethora of responsibilities all while working under the assumption that a teacher's working environment does not make much difference in the classroom (Gordon & Crabtree, 2006).

Clearly, the expectations and requirements of teachers are becoming increasingly more demanding and convoluted. School leaders must acknowledge the importance of a positive working environment for educators. Hank Levin stated that "If you can't make a

school a great professional place for its staff, it's never going to be a great place for kids." (Brandt, 1992, p. 22). The work environment has in fact been proven to be influential on a teacher's level of engagement, pedagogy, and retention in the profession. The falsehood of the assumption that work environment has no influence, has proven to cost school districts money while simultaneously having negative effects on both teachers and students (Gordon, 2006).

"If America had deliberately set out to create a highly dysfunctional system of teacher support, we could not have done a better job." (Berry, 2006, p. 34). The National Center for Educational Statistics (2006) suggested teachers were abandoning the educational profession because they are underprepared, overwhelmed, under paid, and under-supported. It has also been suggested that educators are leaving due to the high demand and pressure to improve achievement regardless of individual needs of students and schools. Other prevalent reasons teachers have abandoned their educational careers are lack of emotional support, comprehension deficit of procedures and policies, and lack of time to complete job requirements. Lack of support is widely regarded as the prevailing factor teachers leave the profession (Berry; 2006; Brock & Grady, 1997; Huberman, 1988; Johnson & Birkeland, 2003; Kent & Simpson, 2009). How much longer are we willing to hold our students' academic future captive, by not properly equipping, developing, and retaining our teachers, the most valuable resource in the classroom?

Teacher turnover due to attrition or migration always imposes costs in productivity, interviewing, training, and negatively impacts the school's environment and performance (Gordon & Crabtree, 2006; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Kukla-Acevedo,

2009). Teachers generally require an accumulation of 5 years of experience to have significant impact on learning, and with an estimated 500,000 new teachers being added to the teaching profession every year, it is alarming there is a turnover -rate of 30-50% within the first five years (Curran & Goldrick, 2002; Rivkin, Hanusheck, & Kain, 2005). It is important to note teacher attrition is not limited to the first years of service; there is significant evidence proving the risk of attrition persists after the induction phase is complete (Eros, 2011). The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (2003) reported that 47% of beginning teachers left the profession within five years, 14% in the first year, and 33% left within three years, simultaneously having negative effects on teachers, students, and school systems. Quality teacher shortage and attrition of new and experienced teachers is one of the most challenging issues facing school administration (Houchins, Shippen, & Cattret, 2004).

The most significant factor to student achievement is the classroom teacher. A quality teacher can impact a student's achievement by a full level in one year (Hanusheck, 1992). Teacher effectiveness increases substantially after the initial years in the classroom. If the attrition rate continues at the current rate, school districts and their students will not reap the benefits from the district's initial investment in their teachers. Well-qualified teachers have the largest impact on student learning and they tend to score higher on admission exams. Unfortunately well-qualified teachers are also more likely to leave the profession (Hughes, 2012). Teacher efficacy and collective teacher efficacy has shown to be positively associated with performance levels in mathematic and reading achievement. These findings are consistent with Bandura's ideology that a school's level of achievement can be positively attributed to the efficacy of its teachers. In schools

where efficacy levels are high, teachers were found to act purposefully to enhance student learning while closely monitoring student progress and striving to meet the needs of all learners. (Goodard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000).

The expense of teacher quality is difficult to quantify in numerical terms, but large concentrations of underequipped teachers will create a strain on financial and human resources. The state of California has reported that 20% of schools have 20% of their staff teaching without the required credentials. The lack of experience and training takes an emotional toll on the experienced staff members due to the deficit in pedagogy; professional development resources must be allocated toward enhancing the skills of the inexperienced and under-skilled staff members (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Shields et al., 2001). The Texas Center for Educational Research estimates that an annual turnover rate of 15% costs the state of Texas \$329 million a year. Early attrition can burden school districts in the United States at approximately \$2.6 billion (Fulton, Yoon, & Lee, 2005). The Alliance for Excellent Education (2005) reported that replacing public school teachers who have left teaching costs \$2.2 billion dollars a year, and that number would increase to \$4.9 billion dollars a year if teachers who transferred schools were added into the equation.

Teacher efficacy is comprised of the ability to generate an educational environment in the classroom that is conducive to learning (Bandura, 1977). Hoy (2000) defined teacher self-efficacy as at teacher's confidence in the ability to promote students' learning. Teacher efficacy is the teacher's belief in his or her effectiveness to organize and execute courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Bandura (1997)

concluded that a teacher's sense of self-efficacy heavily influences essential educational outcomes for both students and teachers. Furthermore a teacher's belief in personal efficacy to stimulate and advocate learning impacts the learning environment and the academic performance of their students (Bandura 1993). Efficacy also represents the personal satisfaction obtained by teaching, student achievement and growth, and that the effort given is worthwhile (Klassen, Tze, Betts, & Gordon, 2011; Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989). It is important to note that a teacher's lack of belief in their pedagogy is a strong concern in modern education as the importance of interpersonal beliefs influence personal conceptions of teaching (Ng, Nicholas, and Alan, 2010). Regardless of how researchers have defined teacher self-efficacy, the ideology that a teacher's belief in her ability to positively impact student learning and behavior remained consistent (Putman, 2012). To recruit, retain, support, and develop the very best teachers, administrators must demonstrate a working knowledge of teacher self-efficacy and teacher career cycles as outlined below.

Theoretical Framework

Utilizing the theoretical framework of career cycles allows researchers and practitioners to capitalize on conceptualizations of a teacher's career cycle and adult growth and development. Whereas generational and age related frameworks are linear by nature, career cycles do not progress in continuous fashion, instead career cycles progress via dynamic development with influences from both personal and environmental stimuli. The organizational climate of a school heavily influences an educator's progression or regression through various stages of the career cycle (Lynn, 2002). Utilization of career cycle frameworks needs to be taken into account by school administrators when

developing school policies, teacher evaluation, and professional development (Eros, 2011). “As teachers progress throughout their careers, they can engage in transformational processes including critical reflection on practice, redefinition of assumptions and beliefs, and enhanced self-worth. Or they can disengage from the work environment as a source of stimulation for new learning and begin the gradual decline into professional withdrawal.” Steffy also stated “That one essential role for educational administrators should be to promote transformative learning among all staff, especially classroom teachers.” (as cited in Ron White, 2008, p. 1). Educational leaders should design support systems and development opportunities with strong consideration of factors and tendencies attributed to the various stages of the career cycle.

Huberman postulated that there are five stages that define a teacher’s career: Launching the Career, Stabilizing, Various Stage Three Configurations, Professional Plateau, and Preparing for Retirement (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992). Launching the Career typically consists of the first years spent teaching. This stage is characterized as a conglomerate of emotions and stages, as novice teachers are defining themselves as professionals, transitioning from the role of student to lead educator. Conditions that tend to influence perception either positively or negatively are relationships with students, management of behaviors, curriculum mastery, and alignment of beliefs with fellow staff members (Leithwood, 1990).

Educators then transition into the Stabilizing phase, characterized by a move to a non-appraisal contract and an enhanced personal commitment to the profession (Leithwood, 1990). Teachers in this stage begin to demonstrate a more sovereign approach with their pedagogy and display a less intrusive response to administrative

presence. Typically during this stage various instructional strategies are utilized to meet the individual needs of students. Teachers in this phase have established relationships with their peers and many will participate in change processes (Leithwood, 1990.).

Stage three succeeds the stabilization stage and can be portrayed in several configurations. Teachers in stage three tend to fall within the 30-40 year age range, with an abundance of intellectual and physical energy. One subset of teachers in this stage actively pursues professional growth beyond the walls of their classroom. They are actively engaged in the profession and immerse themselves in developing and refining their pedagogy. A second subset of teachers channels their ambition to obtaining administrative positions or vital district, state, and national ventures. A third category of teachers seek to reduce their level of professional responsibilities often pursuing alternative career paths. Teachers in this category typically have experienced poor student performances and difficult classrooms (Leithwood, 1990.)

Stage four, Reaching a Professional Plateau, typically impacts the 40-55 year age group. For some, this can be a time period of affliction, where career and personal decisions and self worth are thoroughly scrutinized (Leithwood, 1990). This stage usually takes one of two paths; one group stops seeking promotion and embraces a deep satisfaction within the classroom. These teachers then become the gatekeepers of tradition for their school. The other path tends to become contemptuous and astringent with no further interest or pursuit of professional development.

Actions in stage five, Preparing for Retirement are largely determined by choices made in stage four. One group can be observed as highly engaged striving to contribute in their area(s) of strength. They surround themselves with like-minded peers and

demonstrate a balance of well-being both at work and their personal lives. A second group demonstrates “defensive focusing” (Huberman, 1988), very similar to the first group yet lacking the positivity in regard to change with pupils and peers. Huberman labels the third group as “disenchanted”. This group has embraced a cynical ideology toward change and change agents. This grouping of staff can be particularly frustrating for staff members in stage one (Leithwood, 1990.).

Problem Statement

Research on teacher self-efficacy and its impact on the classroom environment for both teachers and students originated in the 1970’s with the publication of the RAND studies. Elevated levels of teacher self-efficacy have been linked to higher levels of instructional behavior, student achievement, effort, perseverance, and retention (Bandura, 1997; Putman, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). A teacher’s level of self-efficacy is also a key contributor to overall job satisfaction and associated with higher levels of job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001). Cockburn and Haydn (2004) note that a teacher’s sense of job satisfaction is multifaceted and comprised of student interactions, supportive peer interactions, administrative support, and a positive school climate. Previous studies have looked at self-efficacy’s impact on job performance, student achievement, and retention rates. Fewer researchers have explored how stages in the career cycle (including novice and career teachers) impact self-efficacy in order to design better methods of administrative support and professional development.

Research Questions

Research question #1. Do novice and career teachers in the research school have positive perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management on the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question #2. Are overall self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school on the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question #3. Are instructional strategies self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question #4. Are student engagement self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question #5. Are classroom management self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question #6. Is there a significant difference between the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores and the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores?

- a) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' overall scores in the National

Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

- b) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- c) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- d) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- e) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- f) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy

Scale (TSES) and career teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

- g) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- h) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Definition of Terms

Attrition. Attrition is the process of a teacher leaving their current position.

Burnout. Burnout is a syndrome of reactions to chronic stressors that include physical and emotional exhaustion, depersonalization of the people which whom one is working, and feelings of futility concerning a personal accomplishments (Bandura, 1993).

Career Teacher. A career teacher in this project is defined as a teacher who has completed four or more years of experience in teaching.

Classroom Management. Classroom management is defined by all of the things a teacher does to organize students, space, time, and materials so learning can take place.

This management includes fostering student involvement and cooperation in all classroom activities and establishing a productive working environment (Wong, 2014).

Induction Program. Induction programs are an enculturation process intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance, specifically to beginning teachers, for first years of service offering ethical, professional, and personal assistance. (Huling-Austin, 1990).

Instructional Strategies. Instructional strategies are techniques teachers utilize to actively engage students in the learning process.

Job Satisfaction. Job satisfaction is the perceptions of fulfillment derived from day-to-day work activities, and is associated with higher levels of job performance (Judge, et al., 2001).

Novice Teacher. A novice teacher in this project is defined as a teacher who has completed three or fewer years experience teaching in this district and is non-tenured.

Professional Development. Professional development is a collaborative learning process that nourishes the growth of individuals, teams, and the school through a daily job-embedded, learner-centered, focused approach (NSDC, 2001).

Self-Efficacy. Self-efficacy is the belief(s) in one's abilities to organize and execute the courses of actions required to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997).

Social Cognitive Theory. Social cognitive theory posits that individuals or groups use regulatory mechanisms to engage cognitive, motivational, affective, and selective processes that translate competence (Bandura, 1997).

Student Engagement. A psychological process; in particular the attention, interest, investment, and the effort that students expend in the work of learning (Marks, 2000).

Assumptions

This study has several strong features. The participants' scores will be self-reported and it is assumed they will provide honest responses. A certified administrator is currently evaluating participants in the research school, in adherence to district policy and state guidelines. Participants also participate in district and building staff development, PLC's, and student support meetings. The research school participants are a reflection of a typical middle school located in a suburban neighborhood in the Midwest (6-8).

Limitations and Delimitations

The results of this study are limited as participation is voluntary and may not be a representation of the overall building population. Answers given by the participants are self-reported therefore presenting the potential for social desirability bias. This study is limited in that it examined teacher self-efficacy at one point in time and is not a longitudinal study. It must also be acknowledged that there are inherent differences among the participants. All participants are certified teachers, however no data was collected regarding participation in a teacher induction, mentor support systems, or diversity in prior career experience. This study was delimited to one middle school building, from one district, in a Mid-western suburban school district.

Significance of the Study

A student's academic success directly hinges upon the quality of their teachers. Effective teachers produce better achievement regardless of curriculum resources or

pedagogical approach (Allington, 2002). Our students' academic futures are held hostage when quality teachers leave the classroom. Both career and novice teachers leave the profession due to the deficit of proper support and development opportunities.

If school districts and administrators are committed to improving student achievement, a systematic approach addressing attrition, motivation, and development must be developed based upon understandings of career cycle development, and its' interaction and development of professional expertise (Justice, Greiner, & Anderson, 2003, Leithwood 1990). The results of this study will provide an opportunity for building and district administrators to evaluate organizational environments of schools and school systems that impact policy, school improvement plans, teacher motivation, teacher development, and support for the teacher over the course of a career.

Outline of the Study

As teacher quality, retention, and development continues to be a focal point for educational organizations nationwide, a focus on teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management could prove to be instrumental in keeping talented teachers in the classroom. Chapter One presents an overview of study by providing a description of the background, theoretical framework, problem statement, research questions, vocabulary of the study, assumptions, limitations, delineations, and the significance of the study. Chapter Two establishes the theoretical framework of the study through a review of related literature. Chapter Three presented a description of research design employed to conduct this study, and provides methodology and manner of which the data was analyzed. Chapter Four displays the study results and a detailed analysis of the data. Chapter Five provides a discussion of findings, and

conclusions related to the research questions and related literature. The final chapter addresses implications of the findings for practice and research.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

History

The construct of teacher efficacy has been declared as a decisive factor in teacher development (prospective and practicing) due to its' likelihood of improving teaching practices and positively impacting student learning (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Teacher self-efficacy construct offers a unique insight to an educator's behavior that impact instructional strategies, effort, and perseverance (Putman, 2012).

Researches' from the Rand Corp. gave life to the conceptual notion of teacher self-efficacy when they introduced two questions to an existing teacher questionnaire. These questions were introduced with the intent of defining variables that potentially diagnose differences in effectiveness between educators and the instructional methods they utilized (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). Basing their ideology on the research of Rotter, teachers were asked to commit their level of agreement with the two statements.

- 1) When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.
- 2) If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students (Armour et al. 1976).

Question one was intended to assess an educator's outcome expectations typically referred to teaching efficacy (TE). Item number two's intent was to define personal teaching efficacy (PE). The Rand studies as summarized by Tschannen-Moran and Johnson (2011) "Teacher self-efficacy was positively related to variations in reading achievement among minority students. Students taught by teachers who believed they

could significantly influence student's motivation and learning tended to have a higher reading achievement" (20). A secondary study conducted by Rand researchers found not only did the teacher self-efficacy have a positive effect on student achievement, it also indicated a higher level of project completion, lower teacher turnover and the continuation of successful strategies after federally funded programs had ended (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Albert Bandura continued to fuel interest from educational researchers with his theorization framework on self-efficacy. Bandura (1993) defined self-efficacy as "Beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. People make casual contributions to their own functioning through mechanisms of personal agency. Among the mechanisms of agency, none is more central or pervasive than people's beliefs about their capabilities to exercise control over their own level of functioning, and over events that affect their lives" (118). According to Bandura (1993) "The stronger the perceived self-efficacy, the higher the goal challenges people set for themselves and the firmer their commitment" (118).

Bandura (1997) associated the evolution of self-efficacy to four components: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion, and physiological factors. Mastery experiences can be defined as the opportunity for individuals to demonstrate skills and behaviors (Putman, 2012). Efficacy beliefs are formulated upon the prosperity or shortcomings of the experience. Vicarious experiences allow the individual to observe others to formulate information. Vicarious experiences were thought by Bandura (1993) to have an essential influence upon the formulation and solidification of efficacious beliefs for teachers. Social persuasion refers to the direct and indirect assessment

provided to the individual relative to the specific action. The validity of the individual providing feedback is deemed to be the essential factor in overall impact for social persuasion. Psychological factors are physical and mental sensations from cerebral stimulation. For example giving a speech in front of a group can cause one to fidget, sweat, and have an increased pulse rate (Redman, 2010). Generally this phase is not as influential as the other three, however the greater command the teacher has over these, then responses will increase the level of self-efficacy.

Development of Teacher Efficacy Instruments

To further teacher self-efficacy research, Gibson and Dembo (1984) created a 53 item Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES). The TES was the first to empirically create a data collection instrument measuring teacher self-efficacy. The authors then eliminated items that did not contribute to the reliability and reduced the TES to a 16-item instrument that consisted of two factors. (Denzine, Cooney, & McKenzie, 2005; Cheung, 2008; Henson, Kogan, & Vacha-Hasse, 2001; Rich, Lev, Fischer, 1996). Factor one was intended to assess an educators' outcome expectations, typically regarded as teaching efficacy (TE). In contrast, the second factor was designed to reflect personal teaching efficacy (PE) (Denzine, Cooney, & McKenzie 2005). Teacher efficacy (TE) is a general feeling that a school system is conducive to improving student achievement despite negative external factors. Personal teaching efficacy (PE) refers to the teacher's belief in their ability to impact the education of their students (Rich, Lev, & Fischer 1996).

Driven to resolve reemerging unresolved issues from previous research on teacher efficacy, Tschannen-Moran, and Hoy formulated a new teacher efficacy data collection instrument. Unlike Rand and Gibson and Dembo, efficacy measurement instruments that

focused on student adversities and invalidating environments, the OSTES/TSES includes factors that encompass an expansive perspective on teacher's daily undertaking.

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) along with team comprised of researchers, professors, doctoral candidates, graduate students, and teachers ventured out to create a new instrument to more accurately measure teacher self efficacy. With consideration to a Likert scale format utilized by Gibson and Dembo, they conceded to an aggrandized scale with targeted focus on teacher capabilities. Each individual on the team created a list of 8-10 questions not depicted on Bandura's instrument. This collaboration process resulted in over 100 items. These items were then congregated by groups, reexamined and revised to encapsulate essential aspects of teaching, thus resulting in a 52-item instrument.

Upon the completion of three separate studies, the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale formerly known as the Ohio State teacher efficacy scale (OSTES) was abbreviated to a 24 item (TSES) long form and a 12 item (TSES) short form. The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) short form is comprised of 12 items, with three 4-item subscales. These subscales measured a teacher's self-efficacy beliefs for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2011). In a third study Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy 2001) found that either the TSES 24 or 12 items instrument to be reasonably valid and reliable. "With either the 24 or 12 items, it is of reasonable length and should prove to be a useful tool for researchers interested in exploring the construct of teacher efficacy (2001 p. 801)." The creators of the TSES stated that studying teacher self-efficacy to be worthwhile practice, as it has proved to be associated with numerous educational outcomes. They list potential impact on educational outcomes such as an educator's grit, fervor, commitment, instructional

practices, student achievement, and student motivation (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Impact of Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teachers with higher self-efficacy are more likely to utilize small group instruction and less likely to be critical of students for incorrect responses. Teachers with elevated levels of instructional efficacy devote more instructional time to academic rigor, provide more instructional devotion to the struggling learner, and provide a higher frequency of praise for the attainment of goals, and are better able to maintain engagement levels (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Educators with higher efficacy tended to have set more demanding goals personally and for their students, take ownership of student performance, and persevere when facing challenging events (Ross, 1995). Educators who tended to score higher on efficacy measures were affiliated with stronger behavior management techniques and held positive expectations for student behavior. A teacher's sense of self-efficacy has continually demonstrated a relationship with student achievement (Emmer and Hickman, 1991).

Teachers who demonstrate an elevated sense of self-efficacy are better equipped to capitalize on their goals; thus, they expend no energy on the perpetual battle of self-doubt (Bandura, 1993). Bandura (1993) noted that a teacher's self-belief in their ability, strongly influences their motivation to continually encourage students and create an educational environment conducive to the student's academic achievement. Bandura (1993) warned that a lowered sense of collective efficacy could be infectious, leading to the formation of self-fulfilling prophecy of defeat and demoralization. Gibson and Dembo (1984) agreed, finding that teachers demonstrating low efficacy in instructional

strategies were prone to criticizing struggling students and frequently spend less time pursuing alternative methods of lesson delivery. Without the self-assurance in their abilities, teachers may not be successful or more inclined to implement lesser quality instructional strategies. Therefore ultimately lower teacher self-efficacy leads to lower student self-efficacy (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2007). Bandura (1993) noted that teachers who did not anticipate success with certain students were likely to put less effort in planning, and instructional practice. These teachers were also more likely to stop pursuing opportunities to help students when things become difficult for the learner (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Teachers are especially susceptible to lower efficacy following the stabilization stage. Teachers with lower self-efficacy beliefs are prone to reducing professional commitments and often seek alternative career options.

Districts and schools can influence staff attrition, efficacy, and ultimately student performance by striving to improve certain working conditions to make a more desirable working environment and positively impact school performance (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006; Smith and Ingersoll, 2004). “Given the importance of teachers’ sense of efficacy for instructional effectiveness and student achievement, it is important that members of the educational community understand possible factors that might enhance or hinder these beliefs.” (Looney, 2003 p. 2). District officials that are cognizant of the cost of attrition and the potential impact of higher teacher efficacy will comprehend the cost of strategic investments in programs such as mentoring, induction, support, and challenging opportunities for career teachers will essentially pay for themselves (Darling-Hammond, 2003). “A supportive, nurturing environment can assist a teacher in the pursuit of a positive career progression. Alternatively, an environmental atmosphere that

includes negative pressures and conflicts can have an adverse effect on a teacher's career (Lynn, 2002, p 179.).”

District and School Administrator Influence

Teachers desire employment in schools where they have increased autonomy, clear expectations, and the support of the principal. These factors strongly impact the decision to stay in teaching or to seek alternative careers (Darling-Hammond, 2003, Hughes, 2012). Administrators and districts committed to hiring and retaining quality teachers create a magnetic effect. Teachers will seek out school districts that have proven to be supportive and appreciative. Thus, the teachers themselves become a magnet attracting fellow educators who seek positive working environments. “Great school leaders create nurturing school environments in which accomplished teaching can flourish and grow” (Darling-Hammond, 2003 p. 13).

Teachers who acknowledge having a supportive environment from the principal prove to have a significant reduction of job dissatisfaction and stress. Studying employees' level of engagement, heart rate, stress levels, and various emotions throughout the day, found that participants who were thriving in Career Well-being anticipated the workday in a positive manner while feeling a sense of deep purpose in life. In engaged subjects studied not only were they three times as likely to report an overall excellent quality of life, they were more likely to have a leader or manager who makes them enthusiastic about the future (Rath & Harter, 2010). Effective and well-qualified teachers are a valuable human resource for schools and they need to be treasured and supported. Teachers are also less likely to relinquish their position in a school when they feel the administrator supports them, suggesting the need to help

principals understand their impact on staff moral and guiding them to promote a positive working environment that empowers teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Hughes, 2012; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

Principals must facilitate crucial connections between novice and career teachers that will assure positive and supportive interactions, or risk exposure and influence of less than positive role models (Roberson & Roberson, 2009). Career cycles also need to be taken into account by school administrators when developing school policies, evaluation, and professional development (Eros, 2011). As educators progress throughout their careers, they have an opportunity to indulge in transformational processes including critical reflection on practice, redefinition of emotional competency, and enhanced self-value. Teachers who are not committed run the risk of disengaging from the work environment, and begin the gradual decline into professional withdrawal to the detriment of the students and staff. “There is an obvious link between the challenges facing a teacher in the first three stages of his or her career cycle and the expertise to be acquired in the first four stages of development of professional expertise. Principals have the opportunity to prevent painful beginnings by providing assistance in the development of classroom management skills, provision of a supportive mentor, and avoidance of heavy-handed supervision practices (Leithwood, 1990, p. 81).” Leithwood (1990) also notes that failure to provide opportunities for development classroom expertise may lead to professional dissatisfaction especially during the third phase of the teaching career cycle. In the latter stages of the career stagnation may be attributed to the lack of exposure to multiple classrooms and lack of collaboration with peers. Typically engaged teachers in the latter phases are willing to take on and accept more responsibility and seek avenues

for schools to benefit from their accumulated experience. To truly impact student achievement educational administrators must advocate transformative learning and the enhancement of self-efficacy levels for all classroom teachers with special consideration of career cycle stages (White, 2008).

Needs and Tendencies of Novice Teachers

Novice teachers are often categorized as being evaluated on an appraisal phase and not having tenure. This phase is characterized as a conglomerate of emotions and phases, as novice teachers are defining themselves as professionals and transitioning from the role of student to lead educator. They strive for acceptance by their peers, students, and administrators. They are focused on acquiring and improving their educational techniques. They are receptive, open, and welcoming of new ideas. They exhibit partially developed classroom management abilities, with limited skill in varying teaching models. (Leithwood, 1990; Lynn, 2002). Novice teachers reported six factors they valued most as: being assigned a mentor, special informational sessions prior to school starting, being provided handbooks and guides, special development opportunities during the school year, informal meetings with other new teachers for peer support, being provided co-planning time, and having the opportunity to observe peers. After administering the Support for New Teachers Survey they found a noticeable discrepancy between supports given and those they valued. Of the four types of support provided most often, only two were in the top half of what novice teachers valued. Thus, reinforcing the need for administrators to understand the importance of career cycles when developing school policies and staff development opportunities (Andrews, Gilbert, & Martin, 2007).

Needs and Tendencies of Career Teachers

Career teachers are often superficially categorized by non-appraisal contracts and tenure. They are however perhaps more complex than their novice peers, passing through a series of non-linear stages of career progression. Definitions and characteristics of career teachers vary by framework, however they report common tendencies, such as an increase in self-competency, elevated instructional practices, enhanced commitment to the profession, and the need for individualized professional development. Career teachers tend to evolve in various stages of the career cycle in classroom management, instructional practices, confidence, self-efficacy, and an elevated understanding of organizational environments. Career teachers have often developed a deeper understanding of how individual students learn, evolving from a self-focus to student-focused pedagogy (Fessler and Christensen, 1992; Leithwood, 1990; Lynn, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 2007).

Engaged teachers (beginning in the stabilizing/stage three stage of the career cycle through preparing for retirement phase) embrace a deep satisfaction within the classroom. They begin to expand upon various teaching models to capture and engage the interest of their students. Career teachers in this phase have established relationships with their peers and many will participate in change processes. At this stage, engaged career teachers are equipped with a greater skill set, and they are able to exhibit both formal and informal leadership. They offer the opportunity to assist administrators in their peers' professional development, thus increasing the instructional capacity of their school (Fessler & Christensen, 1992; Leithwood, 1990; Kirkwood, 2007).

Career teachers are also at-risk to becoming disengaged and disenchanting. They, too, consider and leave the profession much like their novice counterparts. Career educators who become disengaged typically after the stabilization phase, are often frustrated with factors perceived to make teaching difficult and no longer personally rewarding. Factors impacting engagement range from demands of high stake testing, mundane bureaucratic requirements, limited resources, and salary deficits (Lynn, 2002).

It has been suggested that insufficient or inappropriate professional development may be a principle factor for experienced teachers leaving the educational field (Eros, 2011). Few would argue the need and importance of professional development to continue throughout an entire career. However career stage teachers are often overlooked in regard to professional development that historically has been geared toward the retention and development of novice teachers (Kirkpatrick, 2007). Career teachers are more likely to respond to staff development opportunities that affirm their expertise and visceral judgment. Career teachers' professional development should consist of challenging experimental activities, reflective and collaborative opportunities, and exposure to current theoretical ideology (Rodriguez & McKay, 2010; Wallace, 1991).

Developing Systems of Support and Development

Mentoring

A mentor is characterized as a person possessing knowledge that mentees are expected to obtain. Traditionally in education, mentoring has been a novice teacher paired up with one or more veteran teachers to help teachers understand content, provide emotional support, cognitive coaching, discipline, planning, curriculum pacing, willingness to help students, and time management strategies (Bauder, 2005; Koballa &

Bradbury, 2009; NRRC et al., 2004; Roberson & Roberson, 2009; Wang & Odell, 2002). It is crucial to understand the problematic issues encountered by novice teachers to help design an appropriate mentoring experience and/or induction program. Not obtaining this valuable insight is an opportunity missed in improving the well-being for students and teachers alike. Novice teachers have reported that they most valued the opportunity to observe other teachers, co-planning time with staff members, being assigned a mentor, special orientation sessions, and being provided with non-evaluative feedback from observations as the most valued forms of support. (Andrews, et al., 2007; Koballa & Bradbury, 2009; Perry & Hays 2011). Principals should also consider selecting mentors outside of the novice teacher's content area as well, due to the multifaceted aspects of teaching as other content areas could possibly contribute valuable pedagogy and resources that are not necessarily specific to the subject's specific curriculum area (Koballa & Bradbury, 2009).

Novice teachers who were assigned a caring mentor demonstrated a 95% retention rate as compared to a 72% retention rate for those not assigned a mentor (Gold, 1999). School districts in New York, Cincinnati, Columbus, and Toledo have reduced attrition rate by providing novice teachers with a strong induction and mentoring program. Attrition rates in these districts have been reduced by as much as 25%. The induction and mentoring programs are designed to have lasting impact on teacher disposition, self-efficacy, and instructional strategies. Retention is also significantly higher when support works are varied. (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003).

When designing a mentoring program it is imperative to include specific guidelines and selection process, mentor training, a specific course of activities, and time set aside for mentoring activities during the school day. A mentoring and induction program can only be impactful if it is well designed and supported (Bauder, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2003). School administrators must be cognizant of the fact that mentoring novice teachers can be complicated and potentially onerous for career teachers if they do not receive proper support. The act of mentoring should be a learning opportunity for both the career and novice teacher and an opportunity for professional replenishment for career teachers. (Hanson & Moir, 2008; Wang & Odell, 2002).

Induction Program

Mentoring is an important aspect of induction programs; it, however, should not be considered an induction program as a stand-alone. An induction program should be a comprehensive, intelligible, continued opportunities for professional development (Wong, 2004). A solid teacher induction program has the ability to positively impact the retention rate of novice teachers and increase quality of the instruction provided to students. (Huling-Austin, 1990; Lawson, 1992). Teachers who receive support from teaching and administration at the building level during the induction program are more likely to be retained the following year. Induction programs should provide participants with learning opportunities that best emulate authentic classroom experiences. Novice teachers want an induction program that will pair them with career educators that will participate in their growth and development by being available for feedback, advice, and modeling of successful instructional strategies (Johnson & Kardos 2002; Perry & Hays, 2011). The benefit of an impactful induction program is not lost on veteran teachers.

Veteran teachers often report the need for new professional challenges and increased opportunity to collaborate with colleagues (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

District Led Induction Programs

B.E.S.T. (Building Excellent Start to Teaching) program utilized by the Omaha Public Schools, is a collaborative endeavor utilizing the building administrator, mentor teacher, Assistant Superintendents, Office of Staff Development, Human Resources, Curriculum and Learning, Student and Community Services and the local teachers' union to improve academic achievement and decrease attrition rates (Perry & Hays, 2011). The B.E.S.T. program is geared toward novice educators entering the profession and lateral entry of career teachers new to the district. The induction team works to provide learning opportunities in the areas of professional environment, classroom management, and curriculum. The B.E.S.T. program offered a four to five day initial induction process, ongoing study groups, networking opportunities, and an administrative supported mentoring aspect. Mentors are referred to as curriculum consultants and not assigned a classroom. The mentoring aspect provided participants the opportunity to guide intervention, data analysis, and ongoing professional development. The results of this study listed significant differences between ending third year participants when compared with participants ending their first year, in the ability to use assessment results to improve instruction and the ability to understand local, state, and federal policies.

CADRE McGlamery and Edick (2004) studied retention rates of participants in the Career Advancement and Development for Recruits and Experienced teachers (CADRE). The CADRE induction program began in 1994 as a partnership between the University of Nebraska at Omaha, College of Education and area school districts. The

CADRE program provided novice teachers an opportunity to earn an advanced degree (15 months) and career teachers an opportunity for professional certificate renewal. CADRE participants receive full tuition and a stipend for their internship of teaching. CADRE participants are also provided access to staff development opportunities, and mentoring support from a career teacher and a CADRE associate. CADRE associates allocated one-fourth of their time to mentoring CADRE participants and supporting the University endeavors. The remaining portion of time is allocated at the school districts discretion. “The overriding goal of the project is to develop quality educators, through collaborative effort of growth and renewal” (McGlamery & Eddick, 2004 p. 43). CADRE participants reported they were awarded immediate support and feedback opportunities to enhance skills they had not envisioned prior to participating in the program. Principals supervising CADRE participants noted the impact on the entire building because of the content learned and connections made by CADRE participants (Perry & Hays, 2011).

A retention survey was sent to 155 former CADRE teachers with 117 responses received (75%). The results showed that 89% were still teaching, 62% were in the same district they completed their CADRE experience, only 11% of CADRE students were no longer in the classroom.

Millard Public Schools 3 year Induction Program: The Millard Public Schools (2010) provides a New Staff Induction Program. The MPS Induction program is a collaborative effort between Human Resources and the Office of Staff Development to not only recruit, but also retain the highest quality of staff. There are three phases in the program dispersed over a time period of three years.

Year one of the MPS induction program consists of Mentoring Relationships. New teachers in Millard (novice or career) hired after 2002 will be paired with a trained career teacher in their building. The minimum qualifications to become a mentor are a bachelor's degree or higher, valid state teaching certificate, and three consecutive and successful years of teaching in the district. Mentors must also have effective interpersonal and time management skills and have a demonstrated mastery of the Millard Instructional Model. This mentor/mentee relationship is intended to familiarize the mentee with district and building/district culture, teaching competencies, and nomenclature. The mentor supports a new staff member throughout the school year without formal evaluation. Teachers participating will have the opportunity to attend beginning educator workshops and receive guidance and support with curriculum development and delivery.

Year two of the MPS induction program primarily focuses on Peer Coaching. The Millard Instructional Model includes a focus on peer collaboration, observation, self-assessment, and reflection. The participating staff members with less than two years of experience will be paired with a trained career teacher. They will attend four one-hour skill sessions, Coaching Team conversations, and multiple classroom observations during the school year. Participating staff members with more than two years of classroom experience may option for an independent team study. Both participating parties are compensated via a stipend for the completion of year two requirements.

The third year of the MPS induction program consists of three guided professional growth sessions. The first session is focused around professional awareness. Participants will focus on Millard's strategic plan, current legislation, and moving away from appraisal phase into the continuous growth phase. Session two will focus on overall

wellness. Topics will range from physical, emotional, financial, and professional wellness. Session three is an opportunity to speak with the district's veteran staff to help participants develop long-range goals. Participating staff members will be compensated via a stipend for the completion of the year three experiences.

Millard Public Schools Professional Learning Communities

Large reductions in teacher turnover could be attributed to common planning time with subject like peers and the utilization of collaborative networking systems (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). Teachers need to interact in a larger social context within the school organization (Bandura 1997, Looney, 2003). It is important to nurture and celebrate the work of each individual staff member and to support the collective engagement in activities such as vision development, problem identification, learning, and problem solving (Hord, 1997).

The Millard Public Schools (2014) implemented Professional Learning Communities with the intent to transfer the focus from teaching to student learning. "Millard PLC teams are groups of (1) results/data-oriented MPS professionals with (2) shared mission, vision, values, and goals (3) meeting regularly in collaborative teams focused on learning, to (4) inquire into (best practice and current reality), which are (5) actions oriented and (6) committed to continuous improvement" (Millard Public Schools Staff Development, p. 6). Successful PLC's in MPS are asked to address four critical questions: What will students know and be able to do, how will students learn it, how do we know students learned it, and what happens if students do not learn or already know it? PLC's are asked to review curriculum and course outcomes and select a focus as a group. PLC's are also charged to engage in regular collaborative discussions on student

performance data, and to identify and implement instructional strategies based on the analysis of student data.

Millard Public Schools Leadership Academy

Leithwood (1990) postulated that teachers in stage three could be portrayed in several configurations. Teachers in stage three tend to fall within the 30-40 year age range, with an abundance of intellectual and physical energy. One category of teachers actively pursues professional growth beyond the walls of their classroom. They are actively engaged in the profession and immerse themselves in developing and refining their pedagogy. A second category of teachers channels their ambition to obtaining administrative positions or vital district, state, and national ventures.

Millard Public Schools offers an opportunity for career teachers to apply for acceptance in MPS' Leadership Academy. The MPS Leadership Academy is designed to develop the leadership capacity of career teachers within the district. Participants are leaders who aspire to be building administrators, educational facilitators, and for teachers who wish to remain in the classroom. Millard Public Schools defines leadership as the "Art and science of inspiring others toward a common mission and shared vision through collaborative relationships characterized by integrity, humility, resiliency, and commitment to empowering others to reach their highest potential" (MPS Leadership Academy, 2014, p. 1). Upon acceptance into the program applicants utilize the MPS Leadership Framework to develop specific skill-sets intended to improve staff performance and increase student achievement, reflect on personal strengths, leadership styles, and engage in practicum and shadowing experiences within the district. Along with seven scheduled Academy meetings, participants are required to participate in two

4-hour shadowing experiences. Participants are to select two different district leaders and observe them participating or facilitating meetings. They are also asked to arrange a meeting where they have the opportunity to observe a building level meeting or a school improvement meeting. Finally participants are to work with their building administrator to design and complete a leadership experience such as: facilitation of a faculty meeting; coordinate a special project; or filling in for an assistant principal who is out of the building.

Future Implications

Importance must be given to the nurturing and celebration of the work for each individual staff person and for supporting the collective engagement of staff in such activities as shared vision development, problem identification, learning, and problem resolution. It would be a mistake to focus on teachers solely as individuals with a one size fits all approach (Hord, 1997). To recruit, retain, support, and develop the very best teachers, it is critical that administrators have a working knowledge of teacher self-efficacy and teacher career cycles when developing support systems. Effective staff development and support programs are integral to the development of both novice and career teachers. Key elements need to be identified in order to accelerate effectiveness in classroom development and implementation of support systems with career cycle needs and tendencies need to be kept in mind.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the body of literature that identifies where in the career cycle that teachers need the most support and they experience the greatest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies. Huberman postulated that there are five stages that define a teacher's career: Launching the Career, Stabilizing, Various Stage Three Configurations, Professional Plateau, and Preparing for Retirement (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992). Utilizing this theoretical framework of career cycles allows researchers and practitioners to capitalize on conceptualizations of a teacher's career cycle and adult growth and development. Whereas generational and age related frameworks are linear by nature, career cycles do not progress in continuous fashion. Instead, career cycles progress via dynamic progression with influences from both personal and environmental stimuli. Both career and novice teachers leave the profession due to the deficit of proper support and development opportunities. If school districts and administrators are committed to improving student achievement, a systematic approach addressing attrition, motivation, and development must be created based on understandings of the career cycle development, and its' interaction and development of professional expertise (Justice, Greiner, & Anderson, 2003, Leithwood 1990).

Design

Cross sectional survey design measuring novice and career teacher's perception of self-efficacy on instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management utilizing the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) was utilized. Cross sectional

design was chosen as it has the ability to measure current attitudes or practices, and provide feedback in a short amount of time (Creswell, 2012).

Research Questions and Data Analysis

The following research questions were addressed and answered as part of the study:

Research question #1 Do novice and career teachers in the research school have positive perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management on the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Results for question one displayed as tables indicating means and standard deviation for each item, domain average scores, and average total score.

Research question #2. Are overall self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school on the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question 2 was analyzed using an independent two-tailed *t*-test to determine the significance of the difference in the scores for the research school novice teachers and the research school career teachers. An alpha level of .05 will be used to control for Type I errors.

Research question #3. Are instructional strategies self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question 3 was analyzed using a independent two-tailed *t*-test to determine the significance of the difference in the scores for the research school novice teachers and the

regional sample of novice teachers. An alpha level of .05 will be used to control for Type I errors.

Research Question #4. Are student engagement self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question 4 was analyzed using an independent two-tailed *t*-test to determine the significance of the difference in the scores for the research school career teachers and the regional sample of career teachers. An alpha level of .05 will be used to control for Type I errors.

Research question # 5. Are classroom management self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question 5 was analyzed using an independent two-tailed *t*-test to determine the significance of the difference in the scores for the research school career teachers and the regional sample of career teachers. An alpha level of .05 will be used to control for Type I errors.

Research question #6 Is there a significant difference between the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores and the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores?

- a) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' overall scores in the National

Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

- b) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- c) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- d) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- e) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- f) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy

Scale (TSES) and career teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

- g) Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?
- h) Is there a significant difference between career teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Research question 6 was analyzed using independent two-tailed *t*-tests to determine the significance of the difference in the scores for the research school career teachers and the regional sample of career teachers. An alpha level of .05 will be used to control for Type I errors.

Subjects

A total of 59 teachers (2 staff members were absent) from one middle school participated in this study. The research school is located in a suburban mid-western city. The researcher is an assistant principal in the research school and is the direct supervisor for 25 of the participants. The total number of potential participants ($N = 61$) racial and ethnic origin is 96.6% White, 1.7% African American, and 1.7% Native American.

Potential participants range in age from 23-62. Participants curricular areas of expertise are; English, reading, social studies/history, science, math, foreign languages, money management, career planning, family and consumer sciences, art, industrial technology, music, band, orchestra, choir, speech, and guidance. Participants meet weekly in PLC's with singleton groups (teachers who do not have a peer teaching the same subject in the building) meeting once per hexter. Participants teaching core classes (reading, English, math, social studies/history) meet with an administrator once a week for student support meetings. Participants attend faculty and staff development meetings twice a month.

Data Collection

Permission from research school district personnel was obtained before data was collected and analyzed. Research was conducted in a public school setting during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting and did not disrupt normal educational practices. The researcher provided 61 envelopes that contained two early out coupons per envelope for each participant. (Early out coupons allowed staff members to leave earlier than normal contract hours.) The researcher was not present during the explanation of purpose and collection of data. A teacher/participant in the research school was selected to present the purpose of the study and collect the results of the survey instrument to her peers. All data was collected, analyzed and secured in the researchers office. Data was stored on the districts secure server and backed up on an external hard drive. No individual identifiers were attached to the data.

Instrument

The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) formerly known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale was developed by Megan Tschannen-Moran and Anita Woolfolk

Hoy. Teachers' efficacy beliefs were measured using the 12-item short form version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES- Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This instrument is considered valid and reliable while demonstrating the ability to capture a teachers' efficacy beliefs in three areas: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The short form of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale is comprised of 12 items, with three 4-item subscales. These subscales measured a teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2001). "Positive correlations of the three subscales suggests the 12 item scales shall be considered to measure underlying construct of efficacy and that a total score as well as three subscale scores could be calculated. A principal-axis factor analysis specifying one factor was conducted. All items loaded on this factor ranged from .49-.75 for the short form. The reliability for the 12-item scale was .90, thus the subscale and totals score for the 12-item form can be used to assess efficacy" (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001, p. 801).

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the body of literature that identifies where in the career cycle that teachers need the most support and they experience the greatest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies. Permission from the appropriate school research personnel was obtained before data was collected and analyzed. Teachers' efficacy beliefs were measured using the 12-item short form version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES- Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This instrument is considered valid and reliable while demonstrating the ability to capture teachers' efficacy beliefs in three areas: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The short form of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale is comprised of 12 items, with three 4-item subscales. These subscales measured teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Johnson, 2001).

Research Question #1

Do novice and career teachers in the research school have positive perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management on the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 1, the results for question one will be displayed as tables indicating means and standard deviation for each item, domain average scores, and average total score. As seen in Table 1, scores for all teachers are above 6.5 for all items, which indicates that they agree from "quite a bit" to "a lot". Only two items (items 2 and

Table 1 Research School (TSES) Results

Question	Novice Teachers		Career Teachers		All Teachers	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	6.89	1.05	7.84	1.02	7.69	1.07
2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	6.11	1.69	6.70	1.45	6.61	1.49
3. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	7.11	1.36	7.46	1.01	7.41	1.07
4. How much can you do to help your student value learning?	7.22	1.79	7.24	1.24	7.24	1.32
5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	7.33	1.41	8.00	1.09	7.90	1.16
6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	7.33	1.00	7.92	0.94	7.83	0.97
7. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	7.56	0.88	7.74	1.07	7.71	1.03
8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	7.11	1.27	7.94	1.02	7.81	1.09
9. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	6.67	1.80	7.40	1.29	7.29	1.39
10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	7.78	1.39	8.30	0.71	8.22	0.85
11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	6.11	1.45	6.64	1.44	6.56	1.44
12. How well can you implement alternative teaching strategies in your classroom?	6.78	1.30	7.44	1.23	7.34	1.25

11) had scores below 7.0. When the items are grouped by domains, results are also very high. As seen in Table 2, scores for all teachers were again near 7.0. For the Instructional Strategies domain, 86.4% of the scores were 7.0 or higher. For the Student Engagement domain 52.7% were at least 7.0. And for the Classroom Management domain, 83.0% were 7.0 or higher.

Research Question #2.

Are overall self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different from scores of career teachers in the research school Teachers' Self of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 2, the results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 7.00, SD = 1.11$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.55, SD = 0.70$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 1.98, p = .04, d = 0.61$.

Research Question #3

Are instructional strategies self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Self of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 3, the results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 7.14, SD = 1.39$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.79, SD = 0.76$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 2.03, p < .01, d = 0.30$.

Research Question # 4

Are student engagement self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Self of Efficacy Scale

Table 2

Differences Between Novice Teachers' Overall TSES Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School.

Domain	Novice Teachers		Veteran Teachers		All Teachers	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Instructional Strategies Domain (items 5, 9, 10, 12)	7.14	1.39	7.79	0.76	7.69	0.90
Student Engagement Domain (items 2, 3, 4, 11)	6.64	1.36	7.01	0.92	6.95	0.99
Classroom Management Domain (items 1, 6, 7, 8)	7.22	0.85	7.86	0.78	7.76	0.82
Total Score	7.00	1.11	7.55	0.70	7.47	0.79

Table 3

Differences Between Novice Teachers' Instructional Strategies TSES Self-Efficacy Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School

	Novice Group		Career Group		<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Instructional Strategies	7.14	1.39	7.79	0.76	2.03	<.01	0.30

(TSES)?

Table 4

Differences Between Novice Teachers' Student Engagement TSES Self-Efficacy Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School

	Novice Group		Career Group		<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Student Engagement	6.64	1.36	7.01	0.92	1.03	<.07	0.32

As seen in Table 4, the results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 6.64$, $S.D. = 1.36$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.01$, $S.D. = 0.92$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 1.03$, $p = .07$, $d = 0.32$.

Research Question #5

Are classroom management self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Self of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 5, the results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 7.22$, $SD = 0.85$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.86$, $SD = 0.78$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 2.23$, $p = .91$, $d = 0.78$.

Research Question #6

Is there a significant difference between the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores and the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores?

As seen in Table 6, novice teacher results for question six will be displayed as tables indicating means and standard deviation for each item, domain average scores, and average total score. As seen in Table 7, career teacher results question six will be displayed as tables indicating means and standard deviation for each item, domain average scores, and average total score.

Table 5

Differences Between Novice Teachers' Classroom Management TSES Self-Efficacy Scores Compared to Career Teachers' Scores in the Research School

	Novice Group		Career Group		<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Classroom Management	7.22	0.85	7.86	0.78	2.23	<.91	0.78

Table 6

Differences Between Novice Teachers' Scores Compared to a National Comparison

Group

	Novice Group		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Total	7.00	1.11	6.87		0.35	.74	0.12
Instructional Strategies	7.14	1.39	6.99		0.32	.76	0.11
Student Engagement	6.11	1.45	6.57		0.95	.37	0.32
Classroom Management	7.20	0.85	7.03		0.68	.52	0.22

Table 7

Differences Between Career Teachers' Scores Compared to a National Comparison

Group

	Novice Group		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Total	7.55	0.70	7.29		2.65	.01	0.37
Instructional Strategies	7.79	0.76	7.58		1.90	.06	0.28
Student Engagement	7.00	0.92	6.69		2.46	.02	0.35
Classroom Management	7.86	0.78	7.61		2.27	.03	0.32

Subquestion #6A

Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 8, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher overall scores in the research school ($M = 7.00$, $SD = 1.11$) and novice teacher overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.87$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.35$, $p = .74$, $d = 0.12$.

Subquestion #6B

Is there a significant difference between career teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 9, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a significant difference between career teacher overall scores in the research school ($M = 7.55$, $SD = 0.70$) and career teacher overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.29$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 2.65$, $p = .01$, $d = 0.37$.

Table 8

Research School Novice Teachers' Overall Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Overall Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research School		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Total Score	7.00	1.11	6.87		0.35	.74	0.12

Table 9

Research School Career Teachers' Overall Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Overall Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research School		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Total Score	7.55	.70	7.29		2.65	.01	0.37

Subquestion #6C

Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 10, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher instructional strategies scores in the research school ($M = 7.14$, $SD = 1.39$) and novice teacher instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.99$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.32$, $p = .78$, $d = 0.11$.

Subquestion #6D

Is there a significant difference between career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 11, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between career teacher instructional strategies scores in the research school ($M = 7.79$, $SD = 0.76$) and career teacher instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.58$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 1.90$, $p = .06$, $d = 0.28$.

Table 10

Research School Novice Teachers' Instructional Strategies Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Instructional Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research		National		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	School		Group				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Instructional Strategies	7.14	1.39	6.99		0.32	.78	0.11

Table 11

Research School Career Teachers' Instructional Strategies Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Instructional Strategies Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research		National		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	School		Group				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Instructional Strategies	7.79	.76	7.58		1.90	.06	0.27

Subquestion #6E

Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 12, the results of an independent-measure *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher student engagement scores in the research school ($M = 6.11$, $SD = 1.45$) and novice teacher student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.57$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.95$, $p = .37$, $d = 0.32$.

Subquestion #6F

Is there a significant difference between career teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 13, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a significant difference between career teacher student engagement scores in the research school ($M = 7.00$, $SD = 0.92$) and career teacher student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.69$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 2.46$, $p = .02$, $d = 0.35$.

Table 12

Research School Novice Teachers' Student Engagement Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Engagement Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research School		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Student Engagement	6.11	1.45	6.57		0.95	.37	0.32

Table 13

Research School Career Teachers' Student Engagement Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Student Engagement Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research School		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Student Engagement	7.00	.92	6.69		2.46	.02	0.35

Subquestion #6G

Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 14, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher classroom management scores in the research school ($M = 7.22$, $SD = 0.85$) and novice teacher classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.03$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.68$, $p = .52$, $d = 0.22$.

Subquestion #6H

Is there a significant difference between career teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

As seen in Table 15, the results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a significant difference between career teacher classroom management scores in the research school ($M = 7.86$, $SD = 0.78$) and career teacher classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.61$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 2.27$, $p = .03$, $d = 0.32$.

Table 14

Research School Novice Teachers' Classroom Management Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Novice Teachers' Classroom Management Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research School		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Classroom Management	7.22	.85	7.03		0.68	.52	0.23

Table 15

Research School Career Teachers' Classroom Management Scores Compared to the National Comparative Study Group's Career Teachers' Classroom Management Scores on the Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)

	Research School		National Group		<i>t</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>				
Classroom Management	7.86	.78	7.61		2.27	.03	0.32

Chapter Five

Conclusions and Discussions

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the body of literature that identifies where in the career cycle that teachers need the most support and they experience the greatest levels of self-efficacy in classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies. A teacher/participant in the research school was selected to present the purpose of the study and collect the results of the survey instrument from her peers. The teacher/participant administered the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) during a regularly scheduled Friday faculty meeting. From a potential of 61 participants, 59 staff members participated in the study (2 staff members were absent).

This study utilized the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) formerly known as the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale that was developed by Megan Tschannen-Moran and Anita Woolfolk Hoy. Teachers' efficacy beliefs were measured using the 12-item short form version of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES- Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This instrument is considered valid and reliable while demonstrating the ability to capture a teachers' efficacy beliefs in three areas: student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management, and overall efficacy level (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The short form of the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale is comprised of 12 items, with three 4-item subscales. These subscales measured a teachers self-efficacy beliefs for instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management. "Positive correlations of the three subscales suggests the 12 item scales shall be considered to measure underlying construct of efficacy and that a total score as well as three subscale scores could be calculated. A principal-axis factor

analysis specifying one factor was conducted. All items loaded on this factor ranged from .49-.75 for the short form. The reliability for the 12-item scale was .90, thus the subscale and totals score for the 12-item form can be used to assess efficacy.” (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk, 2001, p. 801).

Discussion of Findings

Research Question #1 Do novice and career teachers in the research school have positive perceptions of self-efficacy in instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management on the Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

Scores for all teachers are above 6.5 for all items, indicating they agree from “quite a bit” to “a lot”. Only two items (items 2 and 11) had scores below 7.0. When items are grouped by overall domains, results are also very high. Question two on the TSES asked: How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school-work? Thus suggesting that future staff development focus on engagement activities for all students. Question eleven on the TSES asked: How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school? Question 11 had the lowest overall scores for both novice and career teachers. Low self-efficacy scores for both novice and career teachers suggests staff members in the research school would benefit from future staff development that promotes strategies that support parents ability to create and develop academic capital fostered in the home.

Research Question #2 Are overall self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different from scores of career teachers in the research school Teachers’ Self of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 7.00$, $S.D. = 1.11$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.55$, $S.D. = 0.70$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 1.98$, $p = .04$, $d = 0.61$. Scores for all teachers were above 7.0. For the Instructional Strategies domain, 86.4% of the scores were 7.0 or higher. For the Student Engagement domain 52.7% were at least 7.0. And for the Classroom Management domain, 83.0% were 7.0 or higher. For novice teachers, two items (items 9 and 12) had average scores below 7.0. The significant differences could be attributed to the research schools' district and building focus of developing and implementing plans to utilize instructional best practices, 3 year mentoring program, building mentor and mentee opportunities, and opportunities for career teachers to participate as instructional coaches, building and district leadership roles, and the districts two year leadership academy.

Career teachers in the research school when compared to novice teachers in the research school reported a significant difference in overall efficacy and instructional strategies. Career and novice teachers had no significant difference in their student engagement and classroom management scores. Career teachers in the research school when compared to a regional sample of career teachers reported a significant difference in overall efficacy, student engagement, and classroom management scores. Novice teachers in the research school did not report a significant difference in overall efficacy or instructional strategies, student engagement, or classroom management.

Research Question #3 Are instructional strategies self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers' Self of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 7.14$, $S.D. = 1.39$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.79$, $S.D. = 0.76$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 2.03$, $p < .01$, $d = 0.30$. Scores in the instructional strategy domain for all teachers is above 7.0 indicating they agree “quite a bit”.

For novice teachers, two items (items 10 and 5) had the highest average scores (7.78 and 7.33), career teachers also scored highest on the same two items (items 5 and 10) with average scores of (8.30 and 8.00). Novice and career teachers scored lowest on the same item (item 9) with average scores of (6.67 and 7.40). Question 5 stated: To what extent can you craft good questions for your students? This could be a result of a two-year focus and numerous staff development opportunities offered at the building and district level that focused on higher level questioning techniques and strategies. Question 10 stated: To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused? The high efficacy scores for question ten could be a product of the human resource office utilizing the Gallup TeacherInsight to identify high aptitude candidates for interview process. The Gallup TeacherInsight questions were researched and designed to identify potentially superior teachers, the research schools pool of applicants provided by the district human resource office contains teachers who score high on TeacherInsight instrument. It should also be noted that a core district belief in the research school is that: We will attract, develop, and retain the highest quality staff dedicated to achieving our mission and objectives.

Research Question # 4 Are student engagement self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers’ Self of

Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 6.64, S.D. = 1.36$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.01, S.D. = 0.92$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 1.03, p = .07, d = 0.32$.

Scores in the student engagement domain for all teachers is above 6.5 indicating they agree between “some degree” to “quite a bit”. For novice teachers, two items (items 4 and 3) had the highest average scores (7.22 and 7.11), career teachers also scored highest on the same two items in reverse order (item 3 and 4) with average scores of (7.46 and 7.24). Novice and career teachers scored lowest on the same (item 11) with average scores of (6.11 and 6.64).

Research Question #5 Are classroom management self-efficacy scores of novice teachers congruent or different to career teachers in the research school Teachers’ Self of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of an independent-measure t-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher scores ($M = 7.22, S.D. = 0.85$) and veteran teacher scores ($M = 7.86, S.D. = 0.78$) on the TSES, $t(57) = 2.23, p = .91, d = 0.78$.

Scores in the classroom management domain for all teachers is above 6.60 indicating they agree from “some degree” to “quite a bit”. For novice teachers, two items (items 7 and 6) had the highest average scores (7.56 and 7.33), career teachers scored highest on items (items 8 and 6) with average scores of (7.94 and 7.92). Novice teachers scored lowest on item (1) with average score of (6.89). Career teachers scored the lowest on item (7) with an average score of (7.74).

Research Question #6 Is there a significant difference between the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores and the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) scores?

Novice teacher results for question six will be displayed as tables indicating means and standard deviation for each item, domain average scores, and average total score. Career teacher results question six will be displayed as tables indicating means and standard deviation for each item, domain average scores, and average total score. Overall scores and domain scores for novice teachers in the research school and the national sample had no significant differences. Overall scores and the domains in student engagement and classroom management for career teachers in the research school and the national sample had significant difference.

Subquestion #6A Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher overall scores in the research school ($M = 7.00$, $S.D. = 1.11$) and novice teacher overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.87$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.35$, $p = .74$, $d = 0.12$.

Subquestion #6B Is there a significant difference between career teachers' overall scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a significant difference between career teacher overall scores in the research school ($M = 7.55$, $S.D. = 0.70$) and career teacher overall scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.29$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 2.65$, $p = .01$, $d = 0.37$. Compared the novice group, career teachers in the research school reported a significant overall higher levels of self-efficacy. It would be reasonable to assume that efficacy levels of the career teachers in the research school were positively impacted by exposure to extensive staff development and career opportunities provided in the building and district.

Subquestion #6C Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher instructional strategies scores in the research school ($M = 7.14$, $S.D. = 1.39$) and novice teacher instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.99$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.32$, $p = .78$, $d = 0.11$.

Subquestion #6D Is there a significant difference between career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a not significant difference between career teacher instructional strategies scores in the research school (M

= 7.79, *S.D.* = 0.76) and career teacher instructional strategies scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.29$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 1.90, p = .06, d = 0.28$.

Subquestion #6E Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of an independent-measure *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher student engagement scores in the research school ($M = 6.11, S.D. = 1.45$) and novice teacher student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.57$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.95, p = .37, d = 0.32$.

Subquestion #6F Is there a significant difference between career teachers' student engagement scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a significant difference between career teacher student engagement scores in the research school ($M = 7.00, S.D. = 0.92$) and career teacher student engagement scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 6.69$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 2.46, p = .02, d = 0.35$. Career teachers having multiple years in the research school were exposed to a building/district focus of Reaching Each Student. The research school intentionally created a culturally responsive and safe environment for all students through homeroom

and classroom activities that focused on students' individual interests and strengths. The research school also carefully studied the results of Gallup Engagement Study that sought out perspectives of all stakeholders (students, parents/guardians, teachers) and incorporated strategies based on these results.

Subquestion #6G Is there a significant difference between novice teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and novice teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was not a significant difference between novice teacher classroom management scores in the research school ($M = 7.22$, $S.D. = 0.85$) and novice teacher classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.03$) on the TSES, $t(8) = 0.68$, $p = .52$, $d = 0.22$.

Subquestion #6H Is there a significant difference between career teachers' classroom management scores in the research school Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) and career teachers' classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES)?

The results of a one-sample *t*-test indicates that there was a significant difference between career teacher classroom management scores in the research school ($M = 7.86$, $S.D. = 0.78$) and career teacher classroom management scores in the National Comparative Study Group's Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale ($M = 7.61$) on the TSES, $t(49) = 2.27$, $p = .03$, $d = 0.32$. As this study shows teacher effectiveness increases substantially after the initial years in the classroom. The research schools high overall

efficacy scores increase the ability to create an educational environment that is conducive to learning (Bandura, 1977).

Implications

A student's academic success directly hinges upon the quality of their teachers. The most significant factor to student achievement is the classroom teacher. A quality teacher can impact a student's achievement by a full level in one year (Hanusheck, (1992). Teacher effectiveness increases substantially after the initial years in the classroom. Effective teachers produce better achievement regardless of curriculum resources or pedagogical approach (Allington, 2002). Our students' academic futures are held hostage when quality teachers leave the classroom. Both career and novice teachers leave the profession due to the deficit of proper support and development opportunities.

If school districts and administrators are committed to improving student achievement, a systematic approach addressing attrition, motivation, and development must be developed based upon understandings of career cycle development, and its' interaction and development of professional expertise (Justice, Greiner, & Anderson, 2003; Leithwood 1990). As teacher quality, retention, and development continues to be a focal point for educational organizations nationwide, a focus on teacher self-efficacy in the areas of instructional strategies, student engagement, and classroom management could prove to be instrumental in keeping talented teachers in the classroom.

Districts and schools can influence staff attrition, efficacy, and ultimately student performance by striving to improve certain working conditions to make a more desirable working environment and positively impact school performance (Guarino, Santibanez, & Daley, 2006; Smith and Ingersoll, 2004). "Given the importance of teachers' sense of

efficacy for instructional effectiveness and student achievement, it is important that members of the educational community understand possible factors that might enhance or hinder these beliefs.” (Looney, 2003, p. 2). District officials that are cognizant of the cost of attrition and the potential impact of higher teacher efficacy will comprehend the cost of strategic investments in programs such as mentoring, induction, support, and challenging opportunities for career teachers will essentially pay for themselves (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

Novice teachers are often categorized as being evaluated on an appraisal phase and not having tenure. This phase is characterized as a conglomerate of emotions and phases, as novice teachers are defining themselves as professionals and transitioning from the role of student to lead educator. They strive for acceptance by their peers, students, and administrators. They are focused on acquiring and improving their educational techniques. They are receptive, open, and welcoming of new ideas. They exhibit partially developed classroom management abilities, with limited skill in varying teaching models. (Leithwood, 1990; Lynn, 2002).

As the current study indicated, novice teachers sometimes have unique perspectives. Novice teachers reported six factors they valued most as: being assigned a mentor, special informational sessions prior to school starting, being provided handbooks and guides, special development opportunities during the school year, informal meetings with other new teachers for peer support, being provided co-planning time, and having the opportunity to observe peers. After administering the Support for New Teachers Survey they found a noticeable discrepancy between supports given and those they valued. Of the four types of support provided most often, only two were in the top half of

what novice teachers valued. Thus, reinforcing the need for administrators to understand the importance of career cycles when developing school policies and staff development opportunities (Andrews, Gilbert, & Martin, 2007).

Career teachers are often superficially categorized by non-appraisal contracts and tenure. They are however perhaps more complex than their novice peers, passing through a series of non-linear stages of career progression. Definitions and characteristics of career teachers vary by framework, however they report common tendencies, such as an increase in self-competency, elevated instructional practices, enhanced commitment to the profession, and the need for individualized professional development. Career teachers tend to evolve in various stages of the career cycle in classroom management, instructional practices, confidence, self-efficacy, and an elevated understanding of organizational environments. Career teachers have often developed a deeper understanding of how individual students learn, evolving from a self-focus to student-focused pedagogy (Fessler & Christensen, 1992; Leithwood, 1990; Lynn, 2002; Kirkwood, 2007).

Engaged career teachers (beginning in the stabilizing/stage three stage of the career cycle through preparing for retirement phase) embrace a deep satisfaction within the classroom. They begin to expand upon various teaching models to capture and engage the interest of their students. Career teachers in this phase have established relationships with their peers and many will participate in change processes. At this stage, engaged career teachers are equipped with a greater skill set, and they are able to exhibit both formal and informal leadership. They offer the opportunity to assist administrators in

their peers' professional development, thus increasing the instructional capacity of their school (Fessler & Christensen, 1992; Leithwood, 1990; Kirkwood, 2007).

Career teachers are also at-risk to becoming disengaged and disenchanting. They, too, consider and leave the profession much like their novice counterparts. Career teachers, who become disengaged typically after the stabilization phase, are often frustrated with factors perceived to make teaching difficult and no longer personally rewarding. Factors impacting engagement range from demands of high stake testing, mundane bureaucratic requirements, limited resources, and salary deficits (Lynn, 2002).

It has been suggested that insufficient or inappropriate professional development may be a principle factor for experienced teachers leaving the educational field (Eros, 2011).

Few would argue the need and importance of professional development to continue throughout an entire career. However career stage teachers are often overlooked in regard to professional development that historically has been geared toward the retention and development of novice teachers (Kirpatrick, 2007). Career teachers are more likely to respond to staff development opportunities that affirm their expertise and visceral judgment. Career teachers' professional development should consist of challenging experimental activities, reflective and collaborative opportunities, and exposure to current theoretical ideology (Rodriguez & McKay, 2010; Wallace, 1991).

Principals must facilitate crucial connections between novice and career teachers that will assure positive and supportive interactions, or risk exposure and influence of less than positive role models (Roberson & Roberson, 2009). Career cycles also need to be taken into account by school administrators when developing school policies, evaluation,

and professional development (Eros, 2011). As educators progress throughout their careers, they have an opportunity to indulge in transformational processes including critical reflection on practice, redefinition of emotional competency, and enhanced self-value. Teachers who are not committed run the risk of disengaging from the work environment, and begin the gradual decline into professional withdrawal to the detriment of the students and staff. “There is an obvious link between the challenges facing a teacher in the first three stages of his or her career cycle and the expertise to be acquired in the first four stages of development of professional expertise. Principals have the opportunity to prevent painful beginnings by providing assistance in the development of classroom management skills, provision of a supportive mentor, and avoidance of heavy-handed supervision practices” (Leithwood, 1990, p. 81). Leithwood also notes that failure to provide opportunities for development classroom expertise may lead to professional dissatisfaction especially during the third phase of the teaching career cycle. In the latter stages of the career stagnation may be attributed to the lack of exposure to multiple classrooms and lack of collaboration with peers. Typically engaged teachers in the latter phases are willing to take on and accept more responsibility and seek avenues for schools to benefit from their accumulated experience. To truly impact student achievement educational administrators must advocate transformative learning and the enhancement of self-efficacy levels for all classroom teachers with special consideration of career cycle stages (White, 2008).

Teachers desire employment in schools where they have increased autonomy, clear expectations, and the support of the principal. These factors strongly impact the decision to stay in teaching or to seek alternative careers (Darling-Hammond, 2003;

Hughes, 2012). “A supportive, nurturing environment can assist a teacher in the pursuit of a positive career progression. Alternatively, an environmental atmosphere that includes negative pressures and conflicts can have an adverse effect on a teacher’s career” (Lynn, 2002, p 179.). Administrators and districts committed to hiring and retaining quality teachers create a magnetic effect. Teachers will seek out school districts that have proven to be supportive and appreciative. Thus, the teachers themselves become a magnet attracting fellow educators who seek positive working environments. “Great school leaders create nurturing school environments in which accomplished teaching can flourish and grow” (Darling-Hammond, 2003 p. 13).

Teachers who acknowledge having a supportive environment from the principal prove to have a significant reduction of job dissatisfaction and stress. Studying employees’ level of engagement, heart rate, stress levels, and various emotions throughout the day, found that participants who were thriving in Career Well-being anticipated the workday in a positive manner while feeling a sense of deep purpose in life. In engaged subjects studied not only were they three times as likely to report an overall excellent quality of life, they were more likely to have a leader or manager who makes them enthusiastic about the future (Rath & Harter, 2010). Effective and well-qualified teachers are a valuable human resource for schools and they need to be treasured and supported. Teachers are also less likely to relinquish their position in a school when they feel the administrator supports them, suggesting the need to help principals understand their impact on staff moral and guiding them to promote a positive working environment that empowers teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2003; Hughes, 2012; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004).

Recommendations

Importance must be given to the nurturing and celebration of the work for each individual staff person and for supporting the collective engagement of staff in such activities as shared vision development, problem identification, learning, and problem resolution. It would be a mistake to focus on teachers solely as individuals with a one size fits all approach (Hord, 1997). To recruit, retain, support, and develop the very best teachers, it is critical that administrators have a working knowledge of teacher self-efficacy and teacher career cycles when developing support systems. Effective staff development and support programs are integral to the development of both novice and career teachers. Key elements need to be identified in order to accelerate effectiveness in classroom development and implementation of support systems with career cycle needs and tendencies need to be kept in mind. Based on the results of this study, a more in-depth qualitative study to help further identify where participants identify with Huberman's stages of career cycle, would provide a more holistic perspective of needs of professional educators. Career teachers in the research school when compared to novice teachers in the research school reported a significant difference in overall efficacy and instructional strategies. Career and novice teachers had no significant difference in their student engagement and classroom management scores. Career teachers in the research school when compared to a regional sample of career teachers reported a significant difference in overall efficacy, student engagement, and classroom management scores. Novice teachers in the research school did not report a significant difference in overall efficacy or instructional strategies, student engagement, or classroom management.

The significant differences in this study could be attributed to the research schools' district and building focus of developing and implementing plans to utilize instructional best practices, 3 year mentoring program, building mentor and mentee opportunities, strong PLC, and opportunities for career teachers to participate as instructional coaches, building and district leadership roles, and the districts two year leadership academy.

References

- Alliance For Excellent Education. (2005). Teacher attrition: A costly loss to the nation and to the states. Retrieved June 16, 2014. <http://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/teacher-attrition-a-costly-loss-to-the-nation-and-to-the-states/s>.
- Allinder, R.M. (1994). The relationship between efficacy and the instructional practices of special education teachers and consultants. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 17, 86-95.
- Allington, R. L. (2002). The Six T's of Effective Elementary Literacy Instruction. Retrieved on September 14, 2014 from <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/six-ts-effective-elementary-literacy-instruction?ID=413>
- Andrews, S.P., Gilbert, L.S., & Martin, E.P. (2007). The first years of teaching: Disparities in perceptions of support. *Action in Teacher Education*, 28(4), 4-13
- Armor, D., Conroy-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1976). Analysis of the school preferred reading programs in selected Los Angeles minority schools, Report No. R-2007-LAUSD. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 130 243).
- Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement*. New York: Longman.

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychology Review*, 84(2), 479-507.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning, *Educational Psychologist*, 28;2, 117-148
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
- Bauder, N. (2005). *Sharing Our Skills*. Delta Kappa Gamma. Bull 71 no4 wn 0519603595005
- Berry, B. (2006). Why We Do Not Support New Teachers. *Democracy & Education* 16(3), 33-38.
- Brandt, R. (1992). On Building Learning Communities: A Conversation with Hank Levin. *Educational Leadership*, 50(1), 19,23. Retrieved August 24, 2014 from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept92/vol50/num01/On-Building-Learning-Communities@-A-Conversation-with-Hank-Levin.aspx>
- Brock, B.L., & Grady, M.L. (1997). *From First Year to First Rate: Principals Guiding Beginning Teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Cheung, H. Y., (2008) Teacher Efficacy: A comparison study of Hong Kong and Shanghai primary in-service teachers. *The Australian Educational Researcher* 35(1) 103-123.

- Cockburn, A. D., & Haydn, T. (2004). *Recruiting and Retaining Teachers: Understanding Why Teachers Teach*. London, England: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Creswel, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Merrill.
- Curran, B., & Goldrick, L. (2002). *Mentoring and Supporting New Teachers*. Washington, DC
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping Good Teachers: Why It Matters, What Leaders Can Do. *Educational Leadership* 60 (no8), 6-13.
- Denzine, G.M., Cooney, J.B., & McKenize, R. (2005). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Teacher Efficacy Scale for prospective teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75 (4), 689-708. Doi:10.1348/000709905x37253
- Emmer, E. & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 51, 755-765.
- Eros, J. (2011). The Career cycle and the Second Stage of Teaching: Implications for Policy and Professional Development. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 112(2), 65-70. Doi:10.1080/10632913.2011.546683
- Flessler, R., & Christensen, J. (1992). *The teacher career cycle: Understanding and guiding the professional development of teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2010). *Enhancing RTI: How to Ensure Success with Effective Classroom Instruction and Intervention*. Alexandria: ASCD.

- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (1992). *Teacher development and educational change*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Fulton, K., Yoon, I., & Lee, C. (2005, August). *Induction into learning communities*. Retrieved June 16, 2014, from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED494581.pdf>
- Gibson, S. & Dembo, M.H. (1984). Teachers Efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 569-582.
- Gold, Y. (1999). Beginning Teacher Support. *Handbook of Research in Teacher Education* (2nd ed pp 458-594). New York: Macmillan
- Goodard, R., Hoy, W., & Hoy, A. (2000). Collective Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning, Measure, and Impact on Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (Summer 2000), pp. 479-507.
- Gordon, G., & Crabtree, S. (2006). *Building engaged schools: Getting the most out of America's classrooms*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Guarino, C., Santibanez, L., & Daley, G. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(2), 173-208.
- Hanson, S., & Moir, E. (February 01, 2008). Beyond Mentoring: Influencing the Professional Practice and careers of Experience Teachers. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89, 6, 453-458.

- Hanusheck, E.A. (1992). The Trade-Off Between Child Quantity and Quality. *Journal of Political Economy*. 84-117.
- Houchins, D.E., Shippen, M.E., & Cattret, J. (2004). The Retention and Attrition of Juvenile Justice Teachers. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 27(4), 374-393.
- Hoy, A. W. (2000) Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved June 2014
<file:///Users/jskerns/Downloads/00463528a203766e84000000.pdf>
- Huberman, M. (1988). "Teacher Careers and School Improvement." *Journal of Curricular Studies* 20, 2:119-132. Center for Educational Statistics
- Hughes, G.D. (2012). Teacher Retention: Teacher Characteristics, School Characteristics, Organizational Characteristics, and Teacher Efficacy, *The Journal of Educational Research*, 105:4, 245-255.
- Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher Induction Programs and Internships. *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 535-548). New York: Macmillan
- Hunter, M. C. (1982). *Mastery teaching*. El Segundo, CA: TIP Publications.
- Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2003). The Wrong Solution to the Teacher Shortage. *Educational Leadership* 60 (no8), 30-33.
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617.

- Johnson, S., & Kardos, S. (2002). Keeping New Teachers in Mind. *Educational Leadership* 59 (6): 12-16.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The Job Satisfaction-job performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 376-407.
- Justice, M., Greiner, C., & Anderson, S. (2003). Determining the Influence of Traditional Texas Teachers vs. Teachers in Emergency Teaching Certification Programs. *Education*, 124(2), 376-389.
- Kent, A., & Simpson, J. (2009). Pre-service Teacher Institute: Developing a Model Learning Community for Student Teachers. *College Study Journal* no2 2009 ptB
- Kirkpatrick, C. L. (2007). To Invest, Coast, or Idle: Second –Stage Teachers Enact Their Job Engagement. Paper Presented at the American educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, IL. April 2007 Retrieved September 1, 2014 from http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1240460.files/CLK_area_2007_paper_to_post.pdf
- Klassen, R.M., Tze, V. M. C., Betts, S. M., & Gordon, K. A. (2011). Teacher efficacy Research 1998-2009: Signs of Progress or Unfulfilled Promise? *Educational Psychology Review*, 23 (1), 21-43. Retrieved July 14, 2014 from <Http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-010-9141-8>

- Koballa, T., & Bradbury, L. (2009). Leading To Success: The Educational Digest. 75(no2) 39-42.
- Kukla-Acevedo, S. (2009). The Journal of Educational Research Jul/August Vol. 102, no.6.
- Lawson, H. (1992). Beyond the Conception of Teacher Education. Journal of Teacher Education 43(3), 163-172.
- Leithwood, K. (1990). The Principals Role in Teacher Development. 1990 ASCD yearbook (3-25). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Looney, L. (2003). Understanding Teachers' Efficacy Beliefs: The Role of Professional Community. Dissertation; University of Maryland.
- Lynn, S. (2002). The Winding Path: Understanding the Career Cycle of Teachers. The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 75:4, 179-182.
- Marks, H.M. (2000, April). Student Engagement in Instructional Activity: Patterns in the Elementary, Middle, and High School Years. American Education Research Journal, 37, 1, 153-184. Retrieved October 2014.
<http://www.indiana.edu/~ceep/hssse/Marks.pdf>
- McGlamery, S. & Edick, N. A. (2004). "The Cadre Project: A Retention Study" Teacher Education Faculty Publications. Paper 23.

Millard Public Schools. (2014) Leadership Academy Overview and Expectations.

Retrieved June 2014.

<http://staffdev.mps.schoolfusion.us/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=292361&sessionid=09210b8c4ea96845e648a741423d2edb&sessionid=09210b8c4ea96845e648a741423d2edb>

Millard Public Schools, (2010). New Staff Induction Program: Retrieved June 2014.

<http://mps.hr.schoolfusion.us/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/1024206/File/New%20Staff%20Induction%20Files/Frequently%20Asked%20Questions%202010-11.pdf>

Millard Public Schools, (2014). Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) Building

PLC Parameters: Retrieved June 2014

<http://staffdev.mps.schoolfusion.us/modules/groups/homepagefiles/cms/3091866/File/PLC/MPS%20PLC%20Parameters.pdf?sessionid=09210b8c4ea96845e648a741423d2edb>

Millard Public Schools Staff Development. (2014). Office of Staff Development 2013-2014 Annual Report. Retrieved on September 1, 2014.

<https://docs.google.com/a/mpsomaha.org/file/d/0B8MuWjt0n0o0OEtWkRHam8tdmc/edit>

Millard Public Schools Leadership & Learning. (2014). Leadership Academy.

Retrieved on September 15, 2014.

<http://staffdev.mps.schoolfusion.us/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=292>

361&sessionid=bbf70b4a8f81930408f0ed8c66ac5730&sessionid=bbf70b4a8f81930408f0ed8c66ac5730

National Center for Educational Statistics. (2006). Characteristics of schools, districts, teachers, principals, and school libraries in the United States: 2003-04 Schools and staffing survey. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (2003). No Dream Denied: A Pledge to America's Children. Washington, DC: Retrieved June 2014.
http://nctaf.org/wp-content/uploads/no-dream-denied_summary_report.pdf

National Staff Development Council. (2001). Standards for Staff Development (Rev. ed.) Oxford, OH: Author.

Nebraska Department of Education. (2011). Nebraska Department of Education Teacher Standards. Retried June 2014.
www.education.ne.gov/standardssurvey/Documents/TeacherStandards.pdf

Northeast Regional Resources Center, Learning Innovations at West ED & University of the State of New York, The New York State Education Department. (2004, November). Keeping the Quality of Teachers: The Art of Retaining General and Special Education Teachers. Albany, NY: Retrieved on September 14, 2014.
<http://www.p12.nysed.gov/specialed/publications/persprep/qualityteachers/intro.pdf>

- Newmann, R., Rutter, R., & Smith, M. (1989). Organizational factors that affect schools sense of efficacy, community, and expectations. *Sociology of Education* 62, 221-238.
- Ng, W., Nicholas, H., & Alan W. (2010). School experience influences on pre-service teachers' evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 278-289.
- Perry, B., & Hays, K. (2011). The Effect of a New Teacher Induction Program on New Teacher on New Teachers Reported Teacher Goals for Excellence, Mobility, and Retention Rates. Retrieved on July 8, 2014.
<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ972907.pdf>
- Putman, S. (2012). Investigating Teacher Efficacy: Comparing Pre-service and In-service Teachers with Different Levels of Experience. *Action In Teacher Education*, 34 (1), 26-40.
- Rath, T., & Harter, J. K. (2010). *Wellbeing: The five essential elements*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Redman, B. (2010). *Self-Efficacy Theory: Do I think that I can succeed in my work? Work Attitudes and Motivation*. Pennsylvania State university, PA: World Campus.
- Rich, Y., Lev, S., & Fischer, S., (1996). Extending the concept and assessment of teacher efficacy. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 6, 1015-25.

Rivkin, S., Hanushek, E., & Kain, J.F., *Econometrica*. (March, 2005). Vol. 73. No. 2.

417-459/ Retrieved July 17, 2014. Retrieved July 10, 2014 from

<http://www.econ.ucsb.edu/~jon/Econ230C/HanushekRivkin.pdf>

Roberson, S. & Roberson, R. (2009). The Role and Practice of the Principal in

Developing Novice First Year Teachers. *Clearing House* 82 no3 Ja/F 2009

Rodriguez, A., & McKay, S. (2010). Professional Development for Experienced

Teachers Working with Adult English Language Learners. CAELA Network.

Retrieved September 15, 2014 from

<http://www.cal.org/caelanetwork/resources/experienced.html>

Ross, J.A. (1995). Strategies for enhancing teachers' beliefs in their effectiveness:

Research on a school improvement hypothesis. *Teachers College Record*, 97 (2),

227-251.

Skaalvik, E. M., Skaalvik, S. (2007) Dimensions of teacher Self-Efficacy and Relations

with Strain Factors, Perceived Collective Teacher Efficacy, and teacher burnout.

Journal of Educational Psychology. Volume 99 (3).

Shields, P.M., Humphrey, D.C., Weschsler, M.E. Riel, L.M., Tiffany-Nrales, J.,

Woodworth, K., Young, V.M., & Price, T. (2001). The status of the teaching

profession, 2001. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and

Learning.

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and Mentoring on Beginning Teacher Turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 681-714.

Texas Center for Educational Research. (2000). *The cost of teacher turnover*. Austin, TX: Texas State Board for Teacher Certification

Tschammem-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher Efficacy: Capturing an Elusive Concept *Teaching and Teacher Education* 17, 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Science Direct Teaching and Teacher Education* 23 (2007) 944-956.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W.K. (1988). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, 68 (2), 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Johnson, D. (2011). Exploring literacy teachers' Self-Efficacy Beliefs; Potential Sources at Play. *Teaching and Teacher Education*
Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.12.005

Vacha-Hasse, T., Kogan, L. R., Tani, C. R., & Woodall, R. A. (2001). Reliability generalization: Exploring variation of reliability coefficients of MMPI Clinical Scale Scores. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*. 61, 45-59.

Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

- Wang, J., & Odell, S.J. (2002). Mentored Learning to Teach According To Standard-based reform: A Critical Review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72, 481-546.
- White, R. (2008). Teachers' Professional Life Cycles. *IH Journal*. Retrieved August 1, 2014 from <http://ihjournal.com/teachers-professional-life-cycles/print/>
- Wong, H. (2014). *The Well-Managed Classroom*. Professional Reference for Teachers. Retrieved October 6, 2014.
http://go.hrw.com/resources/go_sc/gen/HSTPR034.PDF
- Wong, H. (2004). Induction Programs that Keep New Teachers Teaching and Learning. *NASSP Bulletin*, 88, 43. Retrieved on September 14th, 2014.
<http://boe.cabe.k12.wv.us/schoolimprovement/documents/InductionProgramsThatKeepTeachersMovingWongInformationforLegislativePacket.pdf>

Appendix A

Permission to Utilize Survey Instrument

"Megan Tschannen-Moran" <mxtsch@wm.edu> 6/7/2013 2:09 PM >>>

Jeffery,

You have my permission to use the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (formerly called the Ohio State Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale) that I developed with Anita Woolfolk Hoy in your research. You can find a copy of the measure and scoring directions on my web site at <http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch> . Please use the following as the proper citation (even though the earlier name was used in that article):

Tschannen-Moran, M & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.

I will also attach directions you can follow to access my password protected web site, where you can find the supporting references for this measure as well as other articles I have written on this and related topics. I would love to receive a brief summary of your results.

All the best,

Megan Tschannen-Moran

The College of William and Mary
School of Education
PO Box 8795
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795
Telephone: 757-221-2187
<http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch>

Appendix B

Survey Instrument

Teacher Beliefs		This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.								
<i>Directions:</i> Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.										
Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your <i>current</i> ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.										
		None at all		Very Little		Some Degree		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1.	How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
2.	How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3.	How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
4.	How much can you do to help your students value learning?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
5.	To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6.	How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
7.	How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
8.	How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
9.	To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
10.	To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
11.	How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
12.	How well can you implement alternative teaching strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

13. How long have you been teaching (at the beginning of this 2014-2015 school year)?

(1) (0-3) years.

(2) (4+) years.

Appendix C

IRB – Board Approval



NEBRASKA'S HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER

Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA)
Institutional Review Board (IRB)

February 24, 2015

Jeffrey Kerns, Ma. Ed. Admin.
Education
UNO - VIA COURIER

IRB # 092-15-EX

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Self-Efficacy Perceptions of Novice and Career Teachers in Instructional Strategies, Student Engagement, and Classroom Management

The Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA) has reviewed your application for *Exempt Educational, Behavioral, and Social Science Research* on the above-titled research project. According to the information provided, this project is exempt under 45 CFR 46.101b, category 2. You are therefore authorized to begin the research.

It is understood this project will be conducted in full accordance with all applicable HRPP Policies. It is also understood that the ORA will be immediately notified of any proposed changes for your research project.

Please be advised that this research has a maximum approval period of 5 years from the original date of approval and release. If this study continues beyond the five year approval period, the project must be resubmitted in order to maintain an active approval status.

Sincerely,

Signed on: 2015-02-24 16:52:00.000

Gail Kotulak, BS, CIP
IRB Administrator III
Office of Regulatory Affairs