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This study begins to explore the efficacy scores of teachers who are employed in a school that is both failing with regards to state achievement tests as well as one that has been negatively impacted by school choice. The study uses the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale to survey 196 teachers in a large rural school. Analytic tools such as an Independent Sample $t$-Test as well as a One Way ANOVA were used. The results show that Elementary teachers have a higher efficacy score in Engagement than either Middle or High School teachers. Female educators scored higher in Efficacy of Engagement than Males. Educators with 25 or more years of experience scored higher regarding Efficacy of Management than educators with less than ten years. Educators holding a Masters Plus scored higher with regards to both Efficacy of Engagement and Management than did those teaches who held a Baccalaureate. With regards to overall Global efficacy scores Caucasians scored higher than non-Caucasians; Elementary educators scored higher than both Middle and High school educators; and females scored higher than males.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

This dissertation is a report of an exploratory study that examined individual teacher’s personal sense of efficacy. Specifically the study explored the sense of efficacy held by teachers who were employed by a school district that was considered to be “failing” and that was in part negatively influenced by school choice.

The goals of this chapter are to: (a) provide a background of efficacy, (b) operationalize and define efficacy, (c) provide a political landscape impacting schools today including an emphasis on school choice, (d) describe the importance of efficacy on student achievement, (e) provide the significance of this study, (f) provide an overview of the methodology used, and (g) present the statement of the problem.

Background of Efficacy

In 2008, then fifth-grader Dalton Sherman, prowled a stage in front of 20,000 Dallas ISD school teachers delivering an inspirational speech.

Do you believe in yourself? Do you believe what you’re doing is not just shaping my generation but that of my children and my children’s children? There’s probably easier ways to make a living but I want to tell you on behalf of all the students in Dallas we need you. We need you now more than ever. Believe in yourself! (Bergmandi, 2008)

The importance of such an idea, teachers believing in themselves, is something that has been researched and debated since 1976.
A study completed by Rand in 1976 opened up discussion regarding an out-of-the-ordinary finding. In an attempt to understand successful reading programs and interventions in low performing schools located in southern California, the researchers added two more items to a questionnaire already in use (Armor et al., 1976). The result of these two items has sparked interest and debate for decades since. In short, the Rand researchers explored the belief that individual teachers held towards their own personal skills and their ability to impact student achievement positively.

Shortly thereafter researchers began to equate this attribute to Albert Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy. Bandura defined self-efficacy as “beliefs in one’s capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments” (Bandura, 1997, p. 3). Throughout the self-efficacy studies, Bandura insisted, “the issues addressed in this line of inquiry are concerned with how people judge their capabilities and how, through their self-percepts of efficacy, they affect their motivation and behavior” (1982, p. 122).

Although a fresh concept in 1976, the idea was not new. In 1954, Julian Rotter developed the concept Locus of Control, which refers to the extent to which individuals believe that they can control events that affect them (Rotter, 1966). Further he developed internal versus external control. Individuals with an internal locus of control believe that their own actions determine any type of reward they may attain, as opposed to those who have an external locus of control, in which individuals believe that personal behavior does not matter that much and rewards are outside of their control (Rotter, 1966).
Using Rotter as a theoretical framework, the Rand researchers first conceived their findings as Teacher Efficacy. Rand defined this new concept as, “the extent to which teachers believed that they could control the reinforcement of their actions, that is, whether control of reinforcement lay within themselves or in the environment” (as cited in Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, & Hoy, 1998, p. 202).

As mentioned earlier, Bandura built a second strand of conceptual work based on the Rand study. Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy resulted from his study of the psychological phenomenon known as Outcome Expectancy. From his research he was able to build a questionnaire to test the efficacy levels of teachers. The data from this questionnaire and further research has led to two common definitions of Teacher Efficacy. Teacher Efficacy has been defined by Berman as “the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to affect student performance” (as cited in Tchannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 2). It has also been defined as “teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated” (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, p. 4).

**Operationalize Efficacy**

For the purposes of this study I have chosen to use Guskey and Passaro’s definition of Teacher Efficacy. This definition places responsibility of student performance or learning on the shoulders of the teacher and also it furthers the discussion with the specific inclusion of the “difficult or unmotivated.” I believe that this inclusion is imperative to understanding student performance and teacher efficacy in failing schools. A search of the literature (Goldring & Phillips, 2008; Krashinsky, 1986;
Rosenbloom, 2009) shows that students who remain in failing schools as opposed to leaving via school choice tend to be the economically disadvantaged with parents who show little interest or value in school. These students can be difficult or unmotivated. This study deals specifically with schools that are labeled “failing” and that have lost a large number of students due to school choice. Thus Guskey and Passaro’s definition fits more accurately into this study.

**Political Backdrop**

Today’s political environment, driven from the federal law, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), has placed a great deal of emphasis on schools being both successful and accountable. Two effects have resulted from this environment. First, states have created systems by which to “grade” a school. Most states create and distribute school report cards that convey how successful the local school districts are via standardized test scores. In Ohio, the report cards are broken into four criteria: (a) number of state indicators met out of a possible 26; (b) performance index ranging from 0–120; (c) adequate yearly progress (AYP); and (d) value-added measures (Ohio Department of Education, 2010). This is the process by which the state determines a school to be a good or “failing” school. If a school is determined by the state to be “failing,” using these four categories, then NCLB has provided legislation for students and their parents in the form of school choice.

This leads into the second effect on today’s political environment, School Choice. NCLB has provided that all students who are attending “failing” schools will have the
option to attend a different school. To meet this requirement the state has provided opportunities for students to choose which school they would like to attend via programs such as open enrollment, vouchers, and or tax free scholarships. Currently, Ohio has three school choice programs (Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program, Autism Scholarship Program, and the Educational Choice Scholarship Program) serving 18,654 students (Campanella & Ehrenreich, 2010). Comparatively, the nation has seen the percentage of students who take advantage of school choice opportunities rise by 5% in 2010. This 5% increase equates to over 180,000 students taking advantage of 18 separate programs that are offered (Campanella & Ehrenreich, 2010).

**Efficacy and Student Achievement**

When teachers in a failing school see a number of students leave via school choice, does it affect their view of their individual skills to educate the students who have chosen to stay? This is an important point of emphasis for Teacher Efficacy because studies have shown that Teacher Efficacy has a substantial impact on student achievement (Ashton & Webb, 1986). It has also been proven that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between Teacher Efficacy and a teacher’s willingness towards innovation, stress levels, and career longevity (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

**Significance of Study**

This study is significant due to the influence that a teacher has on student achievement. For example, if a teacher of a failing school no longer believes that he or she has the skills to teach the students in their classrooms, then how might that belief
system impact student achievement? Are the students who stay in failing schools put at a disadvantage? Who are the students left at failing schools? What is their race? What is their economic status? Does School Choice create a bias, via Teacher Efficacy, concerning the economically disadvantaged?

**Overview of Methodology**

To determine the level of teacher efficacy, the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), also known as the Teachers Sense of Teacher Efficacy Scale, was used. This scale was chosen for a number of reasons. First, it is the latest and most contemporary form of an efficacy scale in use that has a high degree of validity and reliability. Second, the results of the scale include three factors: Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Strategies, and Efficacy in Classroom Management, all of which are determined to be highly influential on student achievement. Lastly, it has two versions, a long or a short version. This allows for flexibility regarding response rate on surveys.

**Statement of the Problem**

In today’s political environment there are many supporters of school choice. With that support have come many legislative decisions to enact various forms of school choice. Also, the most important resource that is placed in the classroom is the teacher. If the teacher does not believe he or she has the skills or capabilities (low efficacy) to educate the students in the classroom what kind of service are we providing for our students? Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore and describe, using a survey
and statistical analysis, the efficacy levels of teachers who are employed in a “Failing” school that has been negatively influenced, in part, by school choice.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study is to explore and describe, using a survey and statistical analysis, the efficacy levels of teachers who are employed in a “Failing” school that has been negatively influenced, in part, by school choice.

The goal of this chapter is to supply a comprehensive review of the literature. To meet this end, the literature review reflects a multiplicity of items: (a) brief history of school choice, (b) drawbacks and inequalities of school choice, (c) positives of school choice, (d) history of efficacy to present, (e) importance of teacher efficacy, (f) a discussion of district report cards, and (g) the importance of this study.

A Brief History of Litigation and School Choice

School choice as a means of personal, political, or educational goal attainment has been used since 1925 (Minow, 2011). Specifically, school choice history weaves five separate themes in the past 90 years. School choice can be seen in the form of individual religious and contractual liberty, resistance to racial desegregation, and as an instrument to further racial desegregation, to promote educational opportunity, and to advance pluralism and educational reform (Minow, 2011).

Religious/Contractual Liberty

The early part of the 20th century opened a floodgate of immigration to the United States. Nativist ideology promoted the custom of using schools to “Americanize”
these newcomers (Spring, 2001). An example can be found in Oregon. Nativist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and a host of others lobbied for compulsory public education with attendance requirements attached (Minow, 2011). In their mind, public schools would become the instrument in which these immigrants were to be “Americanized.” Americanization to them meant to meet the WASP standard, otherwise known as White Anglo-Saxon Protestant. “Americanization” was meant to protect and continue the WASP culture (Spring, 2001).

Opposition to this school attendance requirement, and others, came to life in a 1925 lawsuit known as Pierce v. the Society of Sisters. Two schools played a role in this lawsuit, the Catholic Society of Sisters of the Holy Name of Jesus and Mary and the Hill Military Academy (Minow, 2011). These schools opposed the law on grounds that parental rights to choose an education for their children was violated with the compulsive public education law (The Oyez Project at IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law, 2012).

Helpful to the Society of Sisters was another case, Lochner v. New York. The Lochner case litigated that “government could not regulate private property in a way that destroys people’s ability to earn a living, that is, the state could not put private schools out of business” (Minow, 2011, p. 819). Interesting enough, the Society of Sisters lost its appeal regarding the private property issue but, as an aside, the court respected parental choice and cited Pierce v. Society of Sisters as a key precedent for religious freedom and parental choice (Minow, 2011). In short, the decision created a long-term constitutional shield for parental choice of parochial and other private school options (Minow, 2011).
Like most initiatives or decisions this had unintended consequences as well. The results of this case allowed for only public schools to receive tax dollars, leaving private schools to compete for funds via philanthropy or to compete for consumers who had the financial ability to pay for them (Minow, 2011). This theme, only those who have the financial means can attend private schools, is revisited during a later time period of school choice history.

School choice entered the scholarly world in 1955. Milton Friedman wrote the foundational article where he first coined the phrase school choice. The article, The Role of Government in Education, in Economics and the Public Interest, serves as the foundation to many of the school choice programs and advocating agencies today. Friedman later wrote a book, Capitalism and Freedom, where he advocated for school vouchers and put forth the argument that they would promote a free society, produce competition, and improve schools (Minow, 2011).

**Resistance to Racial Segregation**

*Brown v. Board of Education* serves as the legal lens from which to view the second theme of school choice. For most of American history, racism has been deeply entrenched in the south. Most education of the south featured segregation in both the public and private sectors. *Brown* served as the tool to desegregate much of the south and most certainly public schools.

For many Whites in the south this was an objectionable condition. Individuals began to use school choice as a way to “avoid racial desegregation; (and) private
schooling became an avenue for circumventing court-ordered school desegregation” (Minow, 2011, p. 821).

One example of this can be found in Prince Edward County, Virginia. In 1959 the Supervisors of the County Board of Education voted to bring to an end all funding and essentially to close all public schools due to court-ordered racial desegregation. In the wake of this decision, following suit, many private schools opened their doors to only White students. Elected White politicians used state grants, funds, or other county resources to fund these private schools (Morland, 1964). These abuses of school choice lasted for nearly five years, and close to 1,700 Black children were blocked from educational opportunities (Morland, 1964).

As a reaction to these and similar events, southern authorities enacted the “freedom of choice” plans (Minow, 2011). These were developed for the purpose to again desegregate schools as Brown mandated. The intent was for all parents and students to have the ability to choose the best educational option for them without race being a factor. However, when given the choice, Black families chose Black schools and White families chose White schools which did not help the effort to end racial segregation as put forth by Brown (Minow, 2011). This theme, segregation occurring because of choice, is revisited during a later time period of school choice history.

**Racial Desegregation**

The third theme of school choice centers on magnet schools and school vouchers which were implemented in the 1970s and 1980s. The purpose of these school reform policies was to redesign education through options and to heal the failing inner city
public schools (Minow, 2011). Specifically Congress has defined magnet schools as, “a public elementary school, public secondary school, public elementary education center, or public secondary education center that offers a special curriculum capable of attracting substantial numbers of students of different racial backgrounds” (20 U.S.C. § 7231a, 2006).

The original purpose of magnet schools was to work the opposite of the contemporary schooling model of the time. Whereas local and state government would force students to attend a specific school to promote racial desegregation, magnet schools were intended to be so unique and original, while supplying engaging curriculum, that they would attract students of differing backgrounds and in the process create a racially diverse learning community (Chen, 2007). This assumption, that racial diversity will occur in this academic environment, ultimately proved to create the opposite result. Quite often magnet schools would produce diverse populations within the magnet schools but would further reduce diversity in nonmagnet schools as an unintended consequence (Minow, 2011).

This phenomenon, coupled with painful losses in the courtroom, proved to be a powerful setback for magnet schools and school choice. Two major setbacks for magnet schools presented themselves in the mid 1990s. In one decision the court ruled that attempting to draw students from outside of the school to balance racial diversity fell outside of the mandate of schools. The other case involved a high school student, Sarah Wessman, who sued a magnet school for not accepting her due to slots having to be reserved for minority races (Minow, 2011). These two cases highlight the difficult road
that school choice has faced in the process of attempting to balance racial diversity in schools.

The 1990’s provided further examples that school choice, albeit an unintended consequence, created more segregation. This time the segregation was not only race but also demographics. The late 1990s and early millennium was ushered in on the tail of the “dot.com” boom. The Internet had become the new mode of communication and information was at the end of a finger. This time period became known as the “Information Age” and information became a valuable commodity (Castells, 1999). This time period also spoke of a Digital Divide but there was also another lesser known but just as troubling divide, the Information Divide.

Those who had access to information had power and those who did not have access lacked power (Castells, 1999). Unfortunately a lack of access to information regarding school choice left those students who were demographically challenged without power and without hope of a better education through school choice. Researchers have noted that although data is limited there is enough to suggest that school choice (specifically charter schools) were less racially and socioeconomically diverse than the previously segregated public schools (Wells, Holme, Lopez, & Cooper, 2000). A lack of information and resources “prevented a level playing field for school choice programs” (Minow, 2011, p. 828) and essentially for its students as well.

**Educational Opportunity**

The fourth theme of school choice paired seemingly unlikely partners in pursuit of equal educational opportunity and the acquisition of public funds to support religious or
private schools. Conservatives, drawn by the allure of school choice and competition, teamed with both the advocates for public funding of religious schools and the people who sympathized with the hurdles minority and demographically-challenged individuals faced regarding equal opportunity education (Minow, 2011).

The core argument that could benefit all three parties was the belief that the court-ordered treatment of government aid to religious schools was both unfair and unpredictable. For example, through much of the 1970s and 1980s, the court used the Establishment Clause to justify decisions against the funneling of public funds to private schools. The court found practices such as reimbursing private schools for purchasing non-secular books or allowing for tax credits or deductions for private school tuition to be unconstitutional (Minow, 2011). However, in direct contrast to these decisions, the court allowed for public employees and public funds to be dispersed to private schools if those schools offered standardized tests and speech, hearing, and psychological services to its students (Mueller v. Allen, 1983). In 1997 the Supreme Court sided with advocates of school choice and overturned the previous decision allowing for public funds and personnel to be dispersed to private schools as long as the services were equivalent to those offered in public schools as well (Minow, 2011).

This work laid the foundation for the court’s remarkable turn in the Zelman v. Simmons-Harris case (2002). This court case, spotlighting a disparity of educational opportunity in Cleveland, Ohio, approved a voucher plan. This plan allowed vouchers (public funds) to be used by students from low-income families to attend private or religious schools. Interestingly, the court allowed this because the family, not school
personnel, chose the educational institution. Furthermore, the family had a pool of schools to choose from, including public and alternative (Zelman vs. Simmons-Harris, 2002). In contrast to earlier themes of school choice, minorities took advantage of school choice to pursue personal and political progress.

**Pluralism and School Reform**

The last theme of school choice is pluralism and further school reform. Emerging from the previous theme of school choice, pluralism expands school choice in multiple forms of education reform, such as charter schools, technical schools, “small learning communities,” specialized high schools, and transfer schools. (Minow, 2011). The object of the reform is to improve education by attracting students and parents with the allure of greater autonomy, as well as to provide varied and vibrant learning experiences for students (Minow, 2011). However, the allure of choice, if the goal is truly to be equality, demands knowledge and access to information. Sadly, for many students and parents this is not the case.

As mentioned in an earlier theme the goal of school choice was to create greater equality for schools as Brown mandated, yet, school choice has had the opposite effect. In fact, in many cases school choice fostered segregation. For example, Minow found that “Hispanic parents disproportionately select thematic charter schools” (2011, p. 836) for their children. Minneapolis, home of the first charter school, experienced a mass exodus of minority students to charter schools, leaving the public schools at a disproportionately high level of White enrollment (Minow, 2011).
Drawbacks and Inequalities of School Choice

Parental Decision Making

For all of its fanfare and political muscle through the years, school choice has its drawbacks, some of which have been mentioned briefly to this point. First, how to make the decision whether to send children to a private school and the process parents use to determine what school is best for their child is unclear. For many parents the number of schools from which to choose is large. In addition, the amount of data and information to be used for the decision is great and quite often cumbersome and overwhelming.

Bell (2009) suggested that when making this decision, bounded rationality is a relevant framework in which to work. Research has found that “human beings cannot take account of all possibilities when they choose. They use heuristics and shortcuts” when making these decisions (Bell, 2009, p. 192). Further, data suggest that parents do not necessarily make the correct or best decisions all of the time. Parents take the role of a “cognitive miser” and use “experience to construct an expectation of how good a solution we might reasonably achieve and halting the search as soon as a solution is reached that meets the expectations” (Simon, 1990, p. 9).

Bounded rationality involves creating and narrowing the pool of choices to a smaller set called the choice set (Bell, 2009). Parents use a number of variables to create the choice set which could include geography, prestige, cost, and so forth. An underlying variable that is critical to a successful school choice decision is to have a set of schools
varying in quality. Recent studies point to the conclusion that most parents do not have a set of schools in mind that vary in quality (Goldring & Phillips, 2008; Krashinsky, 1986; Minow, 2011).

Parents with a low socioeconomic status end up either choosing or are subjugated (lack of transportation, costs are too high, etc.) to schools that are failing, nonselective, and free while parents with a middle class socioeconomic status choose schools that are non-failing and selective. Parents with higher educational attainment are more likely to place an emphasis on education and as a result will spend more time acquiring the proper information to make a decision. Also, these parents find themselves in a position to access more resources when making this decision (Goldring & Phillips, 2008). Lastly, as Krashinsky (1986) claimed, “Many parents choose private schools specifically because their selectivity ensures that educationally disadvantaged students will not impair the education of others in the school” (p. 143).

Research also suggests an additional constraint to parental decision-making, which is the inequality of resources used by parents to make the decisions (Bell, 2009). If school choice is to solve the inequality issue that education faces then it is imperative that all parents have access to the same information to make quality decisions for their children.

**Segregation and Stratification**

School choice as a means of improving schools through competition and integrating schools across race and socioeconomic levels has also been questioned. Research findings suggest that schools of choice can have the opposite effect of what
Brown mandated, leaving some schools just as segregated, if not more, than the traditional public schools (Mickelson, Bottia, & Southworth, 2008). For example, evidence implies that private school enrollment can be part of the cause to furthering racial segregation (Saporito, 2009). Holme and Richards (2009) found that White parents tended to transfer their children from racially diverse districts to districts that were predominately White.

This problem tends to be true in the publicly funded school choice programs such as charter schools. Charter schools in Michigan (Public Schools Academies or PSAs) have shown to create less diversity and more segregation. For example, charter schools located in racially segregated areas remained segregated. Also, charter schools in racially diverse school districts were less diverse and more segregated than the traditional public school (Ni, 2007).

Mickelson et al. (2008) established four reasons that school choice programs segregate schools by race, SES, and ability: (a) many of these programs are designed for a specific population of student such as special needs; (b) these programs allow schools to formally and informally select their students allowing for individual and group partiality; (c) quite often there are few interdistrict choice programs; therefore they fail to emulate the diversity of the community; and (d) parents demonstrate a preference for specific schools based on a biased set of criteria.

Those Left Behind

There are not enough seats in schools of choice to accommodate every child. Thus, some children are not accepted into their first, second, or sometimes third choice
(Rosenbloom, 2009). This is not to say that these children are not intelligent or do not have the academic abilities to pass in their current school. Rather, it shows that the competition can be so great that any student who is less than gifted might not be accepted. For example, Rosenbloom uncovered a district where 20,000 students applied for the “best” school options in New York and only 3,000 were accepted (2009).

Most students who apply for a specialized school and who are not accepted feel “stuck” in their current school (Rosenbloom, 2009). These traditional schools gain the stigma of being the weak schools who house mainly the poor, defiant, and academically challenged (Rosenbloom, 2009). This can play an integral role in low self esteem and lead to negative feelings regarding education in general (Heath, 2009).

**Teachers’ Views of School Choice**

The literature surrounding the views of teachers regarding school choice is limited. To date, two studies using 1995 data from a teacher survey in Arizona show that experienced teachers who label themselves as Democrats and who have never worked in a competitive school oppose public school choice (Hess, Maranto, & Milliman, 2000). Also, Democrats, union members, and those teachers who describe their school’s culture as “negative” oppose private forms of school choice (Hess, Maranto, & Milliman, 2000).

The same researchers later scrutinized the 1995 data to a greater extent. In this study they found that White, experienced, unionized, Democratic teachers who worked in a “positive” school culture opposed all forms of school choice, both private and public (Frederick, Maranto, Ferraiolo, & Milliman, 2004). These studies are important, due to
the strong influence teachers have on school improvement initiatives. Accounting for this phenomenon certainly needs further research.

Lastly, research has demonstrated that efficacy, in teacher terms, is contextual (Raudenbush, Rowan, & Cheong, 1992), meaning that the context of the political, environmental, and classroom atmosphere impacts teacher efficacy. The study did not reveal all the variables that impact teacher efficacy, especially school choice. However, the study does suggest that teachers tend to feel more efficacious when teaching high track students (Raudenbush et al., 1992).

**Cream Skimming**

A good deal of literature exists regarding the topic of coproducers in education. Education, the school house, is one of the few organizations or institutions whose product primarily relies on the sweat equity of others. Coproduction refers to the actuality that some civic services must rely on inputs from the user (Ostrom & Ostrom, 1978). The result of a student’s educational career or standardized test (output) is not solely attributable to the school and the services provided therewithin but also includes strong influences from the individual student and his or her family (input).

Many schools of choice are privy to this knowledge and consider the input of the equation heavily when selecting potential students. Many schools have created screening devices to separate those students with strong positive inputs from those with weak or negative inputs. To accomplish this end schools have created a multitude of devices to screen out potentially weak students, for example: family interviews, school fees, student conduct reports, high standards of discipline, entrance exams, and minimum grades, as
well as school location (Parry, 1996). During an interview when asked to explain the reasons for such outstanding success of her school, a principal answered, “Selecting students from good homes was the single most influential factor” (Parry, 1996, p. 826).

Cream skimming leads to segregation and further stratification. As Figlio’s research asserted, “The (Our) data appear to confirm that cream skimming occurs: private school students are disproportionately high income, high socio economic status, and high ability, as well as disproportionately white” (Figlio & Stone, 2001, p. 23).

**Strengths of School Choice**

**Performance**

A study in Milwaukee during the 2008 school year reported graduation rates for five years. The years covered during the study were from the 2002–2003 school year through the 2006–2007 school years. The study compared two distinctly different school systems, the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) and the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS). The study upheld the results found in earlier and similar studies, that MPCP students are more likely to graduate than their counterparts who attend MPS. MPS had about 18% fewer students graduate than MPCP. The real economic numbers look like 3,352 fewer students graduating over a five year period which equates to an economic loss, for both the local and state economy, of $21.2 million of personal income and close to $3.6 million in extra tax revenue (Warren, 2010).

The Milwaukee study showed that MPCP not only had better graduation rates than MPS but its students also performed better on standardized tests. Specifically, MPCP students scored higher on mathematics tests as well as showing statistically
significant higher reading scores. Other randomized tests were completed as well that had similar results. For example, the School Choice Demonstration Project realized that gains in test scores were attributable to the MPCP in both seventh and eighth grade math classes (Warren, 2010).

The Charlotte Children’s Scholarship Fund study proved that students who received the said scholarship improved on standardized math scores by between 5.9 and 6.2 national percentile ranking points. Similarly, the standardized reading test scores improved between 5.4 and 7.7 national percentile ranking points (Greene, 2000).

Racial Integration

Critics of school choice state that it will allow for racial segregation. Numerous studies show just the opposite. For example, in Cleveland, Ohio, 19% of students who received vouchers attended schools that fell within 10 percentile points of the racial makeup of the metropolitan area as compared to 5% of students that are represented by public schools. Forster found that private schools participating in Cleveland’s voucher program are 18 points less segregated than the public schools. Other studies have found similar findings for Milwaukee and Washington DC (The Foundation for Educational Choice, n.d.-a).

Cream Skimming

Does school choice lead to Cream Skimming? The evidence from some studies suggests that it does not (The Foundation for Educational Choice, n.d.-b). A study conducted using three separate cities and a representative sample of the eligible
population found that there were no differences between the demographics and educational indicators (test scores) when comparing schools of choice with the public school system. This data and others like it confirm that private schools of choice serve the disadvantaged just as well as public schools (The Foundation for Educational Choice, n.d.-b).

**Tax Savings**

Two new works that illuminated the benefits of school choice were offered in 2007. Dr. Susan Aud found that, contrary to popular opinion, school choice does not cost the taxpayers extra monies nor does it waste taxpayers’ dollars. Aud found that “school choice programs have led to substantial savings for public schools” (as cited in Lips, 2007, p. 1). This new report was founded on evidence gathered from 11 school voucher programs. Specifically, Aud determined that the voucher program had saved state and local taxpayers $444 million between the years of 1990 to 2006 (Lips, 2007).

According to the report schools of choice (i.e., voucher, scholarship, etc.) educate children at a reduced financial rate compared to public schools. The savings the state makes from schools of choice is then passed on to public schools to spend on their students on top of what they originally were granted (Lips, 2007). For example, evidence from Florida’s voucher program reveals that schools of choice spend $3,950 per student compared to the $7,000 per student spent in public schools (Vanderharr, n.d.). To add to the credibility of findings, researchers also found that there was no difference in student achievement between the two types of schools. In the end, according to these studies, it is possible that school choice actually increases per-student spending in public schools.
without adding additional costs to the taxpayer, while continuing the same quality of education.

**History of Efficacy to Present**

**In The Beginning**

**Rand.** Using Rotter’s work as a theoretical base, Rand researchers created a survey to measure student learning as well as teacher characteristics (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). It is unknown as to whether it was sheer luck, a hunch, or a whim, but the results were staggering. Two items on this survey led to great discussion and resulted in what is known today as teacher efficacy. Teacher efficacy has been given multiple definitions but this study uses Guskey and Passaro’s definition that states (1994, p. 4), “teachers’ belief or conviction that they can influence how well students learn, even those who may be difficult or unmotivated.”

The Rand researchers relied on Rotter’s locus of control research in which teacher beliefs would fall into one of two categories: external or internal (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Teachers who exhibited external control believed that much of student achievement lay outside the control of the teacher and a large extent is based in the student’s environment. On the opposite side of the coin are the teachers who exhibited internal control. These teachers expressed confidence in their abilities to teach and motivate the students that they had in their class. They believed that the bulk of student achievement happened in the classroom and was a direct result of their teaching style (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).
The results from this research sparked discussion and debate. The results were powerful and had great potential to impact student achievement. However, much debate centered on the reliability and validity of a two item Likert scale. If this concept had such great potential then the tool to measure it should be as accurate as possible. With that thought in mind many researchers set out to explore this construct and create a longer, more reliable and valid instrument (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

**Guskey.** One of the first to create a measurement system after Rand was Thomas Guskey. Guskey created a 30-item scale called the Responsibility for Student Achievement scale (RSA). The scale offered participants the opportunity to distribute 100 points between two alternatives. The first alternative stated that the teacher and the classroom environment caused the event and the second stated that the event was caused by variables outside of the teacher’s control. Later, this scale would be modified to distribute 10 points as opposed to 100 (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Guskey found that the results to this survey were consistent with Attribution Theory, as there were four types of causes for either the success or failure of the teacher: (a) specific teaching ability, (b) the effort put into teaching, (c) the task difficulty, and (d) luck (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The result of Guskey’s research showed that teachers assumed more responsibility for positive results as opposed to negative results. Put another way, they were more confident in their ability to control a positive outcome than to prevent a negative one. Also, Guskey (1987) found that a greater efficacy was correlated with a high level of confidence in one’s teaching abilities.
**Rose and Medway.** During this same time Rose and Medway created a slightly shorter version than Guskey. They created a 28-question survey called Teacher Locus of Control (TLC). This measure was unique, as it had two competing explanations for the success or failure of students. The teacher had to affix the responsibility of the situation to one of the two competing explanations. Again, as in other tools, the results of student achievement fell either on the responsibility of the teacher or on factors outside the control of the educator (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Like Guskey’s survey, researchers have found weak correlations between this measure and the two Rand items. However, Rose and Medway did find that the TLC survey was a greater predictor of teacher behavior than Rotter’s measure. This is probably due to the fact that the TLC was written in a more specific context (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001), lending itself to a more specific and stronger prediction of teacher behavior.

**Webb.** With the goal of improving the reliability of teacher efficacy measures, Webb sought to improve the scale in areas of perceived weakness. In order to do this’ Webb created a measure with a “forced choice format with items matched for social desirability” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 787). The goal of this was to reduce the social desirability bias found in Rand and other like measures. This measure was used by Webb in his original work but cannot be found in any other works by other researchers and has gone by the wayside (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).
Second Conceptual Strand of Efficacy

Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory

As has been mentioned thus far, the first conceptual strand of efficacy was founded in Rotter’s research. However, throughout the years, another conceptual strand has been formed which is based on Albert Bandura’s work regarding Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura produced the construct of self-efficacy and published his first work regarding it in 1977 with, “Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). According to Bandura (1997, p. 3), self-efficacy can be defined as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments.” In short, self-efficacy is the belief one holds regarding their ability or level of competence in specific situations.

Also, Social Cognitive Theory possesses another expectation known as Outcome Expectancy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Here, an individual estimates the likelihood of accomplishing a given task at a specific level of competence. During his research Bandura found that although Outcome Expectancy can provide motivation or demotivation for a specific behavior, it had little power in predicting efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Ashton Vignettes

Ashton, Buhr, and Crocker (1984) developed an efficacy measure using specific context-oriented vignettes that represent situations an educator may or may not encounter on any given day. The researchers examined two separate forms of measurement. In the
first the participants were asked to make judgments regarding their effectiveness in handling the situation described in the vignette using a scale ranging from “extremely ineffective” to “extremely effective” (Ashton et al., 1984).

The second form challenged educators to compare themselves to other educators, using a scale ranging from “much less effective than most teachers” to “much more effective than most teachers.” Utilizing statistical analysis, Ashton and her colleagues found that the norm referenced-measurement was significantly correlated to the Rand items and the self-referenced measurement was not correlated (Ashton et al., 1984). The norm-referenced measurement had a strong positive relationship with the original Rand items and the self-referenced measurement did not.

**Gibson and Dembo**

Gibson and Dembo developed the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) in the early 1980s. The measure proved to be a hybrid that incorporated conceptual strands from both Rotter and Bandura. Gibson and Dembo created a 30-item measure resulting in a two-scale factor analysis called Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). The researchers believed that the two factors mirror Bandura’s social cognitive theory. They believed that PTE reflected self-efficacy, and GTE reflected Outcome Expectancy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

For the next 20-plus years this measure was used widely. However, during this time, inconsistencies with the tool were discovered. For example, one set of researchers used this measure and found that one GTE item loaded onto a PTE factor and still another item did not load strongly enough to either factor (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy,
2001). Still another study found that a factor analysis of all 30 items indicated that several items loaded onto both factors, encouraging other researchers to use a shortened version of the measure that selected items known to load to one factor or the other (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

**Bandura**

During all of this measurement development regarding teacher efficacy, Bandura quietly built a measure grounded in social cognitive theory. Bandura took note that a teacher’s sense of efficacy is not simply uniform across tasks and subject matter. It is more complicated than that, and he believed it needed more clarity. Thus, he developed a 30-item measure with seven subscales: (a) efficacy to influence decision making, (b) efficacy to influence school resources, (c) instructional efficacy, (d) disciplinary efficacy, (e) efficacy to enlist parental involvement, (f) efficacy to enlist community involvement, and (g) efficacy to create a positive school climate (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

The concept behind the creation of this tool was to build a comprehensive working knowledge of efficacy regarding the complexities that make up teaching. The tool was designed to be wide in scope and general in context. Unfortunately, validity and reliability data has not been released, leaving researchers to wonder about the accuracy of the tool (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

**Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES)**

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) have spent a considerable number of years studying the complex construct of teacher efficacy. The purpose of the research was to
isolate and improve flaws in previous scales. The researchers understood the importance of efficacy and how it relates to teaching, learning, and student achievement. In that vein, the need to create a measure that had a greater level of reliability and validity was of upmost importance.

The result of the research team’s hard work is a five-point 24-item Likert scale. The tool is a direct result of intertwining both Bandura’s and Rotter’s conceptual strands. The results of the measure load into three factors: Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Instructional Practices, and Efficacy in Classroom Management (OSTES Scale). To date, this is the most widely used and accepted efficacy measure found in the literature.

**Importance of Teacher Efficacy**

Years of research have shown that feelings of efficacy have a powerful effect on student achievement, teacher motivation, and organizational culture. Individual teacher efficacy beliefs are made apparent in a teacher’s classroom behavior. For example, efficacy can influence the amount of work a teacher may invest into his or her teaching practice. Efficacy can also influence the effort and time a teacher puts forth regarding planning and organization of the school year (Allinder, 1994) as well as showing greater devotion and commitment to the profession (Coladarci, 1992). Lastly, teachers who possess a greater level of efficacy show a stronger sense of enthusiasm for teaching (Allinder, 1994).

Efficacy beliefs influence a teacher’s determination when things do not go as planned as well as his or her resilience when a setback(s) may occur. Higher levels of
Efficacy beliefs enable educators to work with students who are struggling on a more consistent basis. Teachers with higher levels of efficacy also tend to be less critical of individuals when errors occur (Ashton & Webb, 1986). These teachers are more prone to attempt new teaching styles or methodologies in the classroom (Guskey, 1988). 

There is also ample evidence proving a relationship between teacher efficacy and student achievement. For example, students who had teachers with a greater sense of general teaching efficacy outperformed their peers in math on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Further, research shows that a teacher’s sense of efficacy was related to a student’s individual sense of efficacy for learning (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988). A research study conducted in Ontario, Canada, using the Ontario Assessment Instrument Pool found that teachers with a higher level of efficacy produced considerably superior levels of student achievement (Ross, 1992).

District Report Card

Currently the state of Ohio has a comprehensive report card for individual school districts. The report card is what the state of Ohio uses to inform citizens as well as the school district regarding each school’s performance. The report card is what indicates whether a school is failing or not.

The report card distributes information relative to four categories: (a) number of indicators met, (b) performance index, (c) change in PI (Performance Index) score, and (d) AYP (Average Yearly Progress) status. A school district can be given one of five scores in the above-mentioned categories. Those scores are: (a) excellent, (b) effective, (c) continuous improvement, (d) academic watch, and (e) academic emergency.
It is important to note that with the past 2011 gubernatorial election a change of leadership occurred. The new governor has created a new system with which to grade schools. The new system will go into effect starting with the 2013–2014 school year.

The indicators are made up of 26 achievement indicators derived from the Ohio Graduation Test (OGT), coupled with two other indicators, graduation and attendance rates. The performance index (PI) is a scale rating schools between one and 120. Change in PI score is only considered when the school was in academic watch or emergency the year before. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is a number that measures how much growth the student population has shown via standardized tests.

This study defines a failing school as one which is in academic watch or academic emergency. To reach the level of academic emergency, a school will have met only nine or fewer of the 26 indicators. The school must have a performance index score of 69.9 or below. If the school was in academic watch or academic emergency the year before, the school must then meet the predetermined change in PI score. Lastly, a school must not have met AYP.

**Importance of Study**

A number of studies completed in the past 50 years focus on either teacher efficacy or school choice. Several argue the importance of efficacy on the student, the school, as well as the teacher individually and the collective staff. A number of studies prove the statistically positive impact that efficacy has on student achievement.

Although dozens of studies have addressed teacher efficacy and school choice no study has explored the impact school choice may have on teachers. Yet, it is important to
know the collective impact that school choice may have on schools, specifically the students and teachers.

For example, school X has lost a large population of students to school choice. The majority of students choosing schools of choice are White middle class students whose parents attended college. The students who choose (willingly or unwillingly) to stay are the students whose parents either do not regard school as important, believe the public option is satisfactory, or simply do not communicate that belief system to their child. The students left behind are often the minority students who come with a low socioeconomic status. How does this environment impact a teacher’s belief that he or she has the ability to teach these students? Does this type of environment impact teacher efficacy? If so, how does that impact affect student achievement? The goal of this study is to explore the relationship, if any, which school choice and teacher efficacy have.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe, using a survey and statistical analysis, the efficacy levels of teachers who are employed in a “Failing” school that has been negatively influenced, in part, by school choice. To reach this end, the research design used a single case study quantitative methodology.

The goal of this chapter is to: (a) define the research design, (b) describe the target population and the selection of participants, (c) examine the instrumentation and measures used in this study, (d) describe the procedures to gain both participants and data, and (e) provide a description of the data analysis process.

Research Design

Kohn (1997), in Methods in Case Study Analysis, suggested three purposes for using a case study approach. Two of the three are germane to this study. First, case studies are used in exploratory studies that cover new issues that currently have a lack of research and theory. This study is exploratory in nature, and Chapter II has identified a need for such research.

Second, case studies can be used to describe the effects of an event that may affect a number of people or different parties (Kohn, 1997). This study is descriptive, in that it describes the effects school choice may have on efficacy. Kohn also suggested that it is not “unusual for researchers to combine case studies with quantitative analysis that
use larger data sets” (Kohn, 1997, p. 1). This study contains a quantitative element via the survey while maintaining a case study approach.

Kohn (1997) stated that in case studies with little theory, the researcher must develop a logic model that will define how he or she expects an intervention to impact the study. He also cited three components of a logic model of which one is “what changes are expected” (p. 2). In this study I did not develop a logic model for two reasons. First, there is a great deal of literature on teacher efficacy. Thus, I have a good theoretical framework with teacher efficacy. However, as noted earlier, there is no research linking teacher efficacy to school choice. Second, a true exploratory study does not attempt to predict or determine the end result. Exploratory studies are done when little information is known on a specific issue or problem. The goal is to shed light on the hole in the literature, collect data, and advance the research.

**Target Population and Selection of Participants**

To complete this study an urban school district in the Ohio was chosen because it has recently seen a large number of students exit the district due, in part, to school choice. This school’s state department of education has categorized schools by typology to reflect the success of individual schools and school districts. According to the state department of education this school district exists in an urban area with a low median income including a high poverty rate. As of this writing, 102 school districts fit the same typology in the state.

This school district has been chosen because it fits the criteria needed as illustrated above. Also, it has been selected due to the convenience of the geographical
location and its proximity to the researcher. It is fair to say that, to a degree, the chosen school district has been selected via convenience sampling. A survey was sent to every teacher in the school district.

Due to the convenience sample method as well as the quantitative case study design the study faces generalizability issues. In an effort to minimize this issue I hoped for a high rate of return in order to get as accurate a description as possible. Although a common and reliable way to strengthen a study is to increase the participant size of the sample, currently 277 full time teachers work in the selected school district. Of the teaching staff, 99.3% possess a Bachelor’s degree and 46.7% have attained a Master’s degree (Ohio Department of Education, 2011).

According to the school’s 2010–2011 report card, the students and staff have met 5 of 26 state standards, achieved a score of 82.6 on the performance index, did not meet adequate yearly progress (AYP), and fell “below” regarding value-added. Value added measures the students’ growth during the past year. A score, “below”, means that the school district failed to achieve a year growth for its students. Also, the school met the criteria for attendance by achieving 94.5% which exceeds the state requires by 1.5%. Lastly, the graduation rate was 83%, which is below the state requirement for graduation of 90% (Ohio Department of Education, 2011).

These scores resulted in the district earning a designation ranking of Continuous Improvement (Ohio Department of Education, 2011). Generally districts will be given the designation of School Improvement if they fail to meet AYP two years in a row. Once given this designation, the district must meet AYP two consecutive years in a row.
If a school district that receives federal funds is in School Improvement, then it may have to offer public school choice or other supplemental education services (Ohio Department of Education, 2011).

In the past decade, or last 10 calendar school years, this school has earned the designation of Academic Emergency two times, Academic Watch six times, and Continuous Improvement two times. Not once during the past decade has this school met AYP (Ohio Department of Education, 2011).

For the 2010–2011 year this school district had a total of 3,498 full time enrolled (FTE) students in the district. Of those 3,704 students, 1,653 (44.6%) were considered to be of minority status. In this district, 817 (22%) students were considered to be students with disabilities; and 2,940 students (84.1%) were considered by the district and state to be economically disadvantaged.

In 2012, the district lost 1,537.28 FTEs to school choice. Specifically the loss of students was: 206.78 FTEs to open enrollment, 987.27 FTEs to community schools, 388.17 FTEs to Ed Choice scholarships, and 38.56 FTEs to Other Adjustments. In monetary terms this loss of students equates to $9,337,557.40 total dollars of state aid.

In fact, this continues a troubled past. The state’s SF-3 (School Foundation form) form, a report generated from the state showing revenue based on student enrollment, for 2008 showed a student loss that equated to $7,753,565.80. In 2009 the district lost 1,463.23 FTEs, which equates to $9,041,493.42. The year 2010 showed similar results with 1,555.03 FTEs, resulting in a financial loss of $9,378,325.14. Lastly, fiscal year
(FY) 2011 presented even larger losses: 1,684.45 FTEs have left the district, equaling a net loss of $10,491,594.13.

A look at the school district’s student demographics over the past 10 years sheds light on what demographics has remained part of the school population. For example, the 2002–2003 school year the school district was composed of 5,737 students. Of those students, 34.6% were African American, 3.8% were Multi-Racial, 0.6% were Hispanic, and 60.7% were White, and 64.1% were economically disadvantaged (Ohio Department of Education, 2003). Compare that to the 2010–2011 school year. That year saw a total population of 3,498 students composed of 31.3% African Americans, 11.2% Multi-Racial, 1.4% Hispanic, and 55.5% White, and 84.1% were Economically Disadvantaged (Ohio Department of Education, 2010). In summation, White students decreased by 8.6%, African Americans decreased by 3.3%, Multi-Racial students increased by 10.6%, Hispanic students increased by .8% and the economic disadvantaged increased by 20%.

Appendix B is a chart showing the same data from the year 2001–2011. The 2001 data do not show the percentage of students that were economically disadvantaged. The state did not report the data that year. However, the following year that information was collected and reported. The data show a disturbing trend. The school year 2002-2003 showed a total enrollment of 5,735 students compared to 2011’s total enrollment of 3,498. In that time frame the changes in percentage of economically disadvantaged students rose from 64.1% to 84.1%.

The data suggest that as enrollment decreased, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students increased. This data lends credence to the original purpose of this
research regarding teacher’s personal sense of efficacy and the student population left behind. If the economically challenged have become the majority (and they have) then how does that impact an individual teacher’s sense of efficacy?

**Context of School District**

It is important to note that in the past 6 years there has been a good deal of tension within the school district aimed at its leadership. In 2007 the district hired a new superintendent. Three years later, amid a number of legal allegations, community meetings, and high profile news coverage, the superintendent resigned. Even the resignation brought significant news coverage. This time period became a low point for many teachers as morale was low (Personal Communication, school employee, January 2012).

The year 2010 marked a new era in leadership when the board hired a new superintendent. This superintendent has managed to strengthen morale of the school district and to improve communication throughout the district. In addition, the superintendent has managed to create some exciting innovative initiatives. It is important to note this change in leadership and the context of the school district and its possible impact on teacher efficacy scores.

**Instrumentations/Measurements**

As mentioned earlier, there has been a great deal of debate regarding teacher efficacy over the past three decades. During this time, researchers have attempted to create better measures. The reason for this ongoing review is that the concept has faced
serious academic scrutiny regarding the multiple psychometric attempts to measure the construct. Through the years it has faced two types of issues: what does it mean and what does it measure?

First, the “what does it mean” issue springs from its theoretical birth. Teacher efficacy as it has been historically defined includes both Bandura’s and Rotter’s theories. This has created what some call an identity crisis (Henson, 2001). Second, the concept suffers from measurement issues. Specifically, “the construct validity of scores from the primary instruments purporting to measure teacher efficacy has been severely questioned” (Henson, 2001, p. 5). In short, does it measure what it is intended to measure?

To date the best answer to these issues has been formulated by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001). In an effort to resolve the issues above, these researchers have chosen to weave these theories (Rotter & Bandura) together, creating a new scale named the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale (OSTES). Specifically, they attempt to solve the multiple historical dilemmas pertaining to the measure’s identity crisis by creating a new measure that: (a) accounts for the various sources of efficacy information such as verbal persuasion, vicarious experiences, physiological arousal, and mastery experiences; (b) considers a teacher’s task analysis and teaching competency balance; and (c) recognizes that any teacher efficacy belief should be “referenced to specific tasks” (Henson, 2001, p. 7).

Further, Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) tested the instrument and reported strong scores for both construct validity and reliability data. To reach this end, the
researchers conducted three separate studies utilizing the OSTES. As mentioned earlier, a number of instruments have been used in an effort to quantify teacher efficacy and they have failed in proving to be sound both in validity and reliability. In order to fully explain the rigor implemented to ensure the validity and reliability of the OSTES, a short overview of three separate studies follows.

The first study used an instrument composed of 52 survey items. Not only did participants respond to each item with a 9-point scale but they also were asked to “rate the importance of each item for effective teaching on a 4 point scale” (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001, p. 797). The results of the 52 items were submitted to principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation. Ten factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than one. This produced 31 items with a loading range from .62 to .78. There was also one other item included that produced a factor value of .595. This item was added to the list of 31 because it pertained to what the researchers determined to be an important topic (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Thus, with study one completed, the researchers were left with a 32-item survey to test further for validity and reliability.

Study two started with 32 survey items and involved 217 new inservice and preservice teachers. Again principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotations was used. This time the test resulted in eight factors with an eigenvalue greater than one. However, a scree test suggested that three factors could be extracted from the eight. Utilizing the three factors, the researchers were able to reduce the items from 32 to 18 by removing items that had the lowest loading within the three factors presented via the scree test, items that clearly loaded on more than one of the three factors, and items that
appeared to be redundant (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The three factors that emerged from the varimax rotation were labeled Efficacy for Student Engagement, Efficacy for Instructional Strategies, and Efficacy for Classroom Management (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). In the end the researchers found that these three factors accounted for 51% of the variance in the participants’ responses. Also, reliabilities were computed and resulted in .82 for engagement, .81 for instruction, and .72 for management. Lastly, further examination of study one and study two via another principal-axis factoring of the three factors revealed the potential of loading into one strong factor. This developing factor suggested that the 18 items could also be used to measure three subscales (original three factors) and a total score as well. After another factor analysis it was determined that the 18 items resulted in a total score with a reliability of .95 (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). So, in the end, results of these tests suggest that an individual could complete the OSTES and determine an overall efficacy score as well as three sub scores that load into the three factors described above in both a reliable and consistent way.

Determined to provide the validity of the tool, the researchers examined if a correlation existed between the OSTES and other similar measures. The results showed that the OSTES positively correlated with General Teacher Efficacy (GTE) and Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) of the Gibson and Dembo instrument as well as the original two Rand items (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Still feeling uneasy regarding the Efficacy in Classroom Management low factor load, the researchers chose to add more items to the survey regarding management. Also,
in discussion with teachers and teacher educators, the authors (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) chose to add items regarding instructional strategies. When finished with the new items the measure had grown from 18 items to 36.

The third study to determine the validity and reliability of the measure included 410 participants. Once again principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was used. The results yielded four factors with an eigenvalue greater than one. Next, a scree test was implemented and three factors were extracted once again replicating the results of the previous studies. Efficacy for Instructional Strategies, Efficacy for Classroom Management, and Efficacy for Student Engagement emerged as the factor loads (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

The authors then chose to reduce the size of the scale from 32 items to 24 by choosing the eight items that loaded the highest in each of the three factors. After further analysis it was found that the reliabilities for the three factors were .91 for instruction, .90 for management, and .87 for engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Lastly, to improve the overall usage of the measure, the authors chose to test the four highest loading items in each of the three factors to create a 12-item tool. Here, the reliabilities were high with .86 for instruction, .86 for management, and .81 for engagement. Further strengthening the reliability of the measure, the authors found intercorrelations between the short and long form ranging from .95 to .98 (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Lastly, and once again, the authors examined the construct validity of the measure. To do this they assessed the correlation of both the long and short forms of the OSTES versus the GTE and PTE from the Gibson and Dembo instrument as well as the
original two items of the Rand measure. Both the long and short form proved to be positively correlated (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

All of the research and examination proved to be valuable. At the end of the day the results generated in the three studies suggest that the OSTES, both the short and long form, is a reasonably valid and reliable measure of teacher efficacy.

**Administration and Scoring**

To administer the measure, I used an online survey website called Zoomerang. I recreated the measure exactly as written with demographic questions added. A link to the survey was emailed to every full time educator in the district. Once the educator completed the survey it automatically saved to the website until I downloaded the data.

Once I had the data I scored the results. To score the three subscales of Efficacy in Student Engagement, Efficacy in Classroom Management, and Efficacy in Instructional Practices, I computed the unweighted means of the items that loaded onto each factor. Those three factors consisted of the following survey items (Hoy, 2008):

**Short Form**

Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 2, 4, 7, 11
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 5, 9, 10, 12
Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 1, 3, 6, 8

**Long Form**

Efficacy in Student Engagement: Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, 22
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies: Items 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24
Efficacy in Classroom Management: Items 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21
For this study the OSTES short form was used. With the validity and reliabilities between the short and long form being so close, I believed it was beneficial to use the short form. The study did not lose validity or reliability; however, I decided the short form would appeal to more potential respondents. I believe the short form encouraged completion, as it appeared less time consuming.

**Survey Questions**

1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?

4. How much can you do to help your students value learning?

5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?

8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?

10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?

11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?
12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

**Demographic Questions**

The survey consisted of the 12-item short form of the OSTES. It also included five other demographic questions. This section discusses the rationale of the demographic questions.

First I asked the participants to select an age group. This data allowed me to determine whether a relationship existed between specific age groups and teacher efficacy. For example, teachers who are relatively young may hold different efficacy beliefs than other age groups.

Second, I asked the participants to identify their racial/ethnic background. This allowed me to determine whether a relationship existed between race or ethnicity and efficacy beliefs. For example, do minority teachers possess greater efficacy beliefs towards minority children in a failing school?

Third, I asked participants to identify their gender. This data allowed me to see whether a relationship existed between gender and efficacy beliefs. Also, I can begin to explore if more relationships exist. For example, do women who are older possess greater efficacy beliefs than men who are older?

Next, I asked participants to list their degree attainment. I offered two choices: Baccalaureate or Masters/Masters Plus. Here, I wanted to determine whether a relationship existed between degree attainment and efficacy beliefs. For example, do teachers who have higher levels of degree attainment have differing efficacy beliefs than
those with lesser degrees? Also, as mentioned above, I can begin to explore whether more complex relationships exist.

Next, I ask participants to identify what level in the school system they teach. For example, is Teacher A an Elementary teacher or a Secondary teacher. Is there a relationship that exists between varying school levels? Do teachers from one school level have overall differing efficacy level than another? For example, does the subgroup of Secondary Teachers have a higher or lower efficacy score regarding Classroom Management than that of Middle School Teachers?

Lastly, I ask participants to identify their years of experience in education. Is there a relationship between years of experience and efficacy beliefs? Do educators with less experience lack confidence in their abilities and hence have weaker efficacy beliefs or do more experienced? I wondered if teachers who may have experienced the downward spiral of the school system may have a weaker individual sense of efficacy. To scrutinize further, I can examine the relationship between efficacy and women of color or efficacy and minority men with higher degree attainment.

The added demographic questions were of great value when exploring and extrapolating multiple relationships. It also provided evidence that would warrant another study with a broader scope. It was also important to note that for each demographic question, the participants were given the opportunity to opt out of answering the question. In fact, some respondents chose to opt out on a few of the demographic questions. In Chapter IV, I explain how I handle these respondents in the analysis.
Data Analysis

The data analysis portion of the study consists of two distinct parts. First, as mentioned above, the demographic questions allowed me to explore a number of relationships. They also allowed me to provide a description of specific groups, attitudes, and efficacy beliefs. To explore the correlations that may or may not exist between participant scores and demographics, I used a comparison of means (Independent T-Test and One Way Anova) between two groups to determine if complex interaction between demographic variables affect efficacy scores.

The second portion of the data analysis was an analysis of the respondents’ global efficacy scores. Once the global mean score per subgroup was obtained, I then was able to compare scores of different subgroups.

Summary

This chapter discussed the methodology used in this quantitative case study. The Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale was used to determine if a relationship between a teacher’s efficacy beliefs and schools that are considered failing are also negatively impacted by school choice. Each participant of the study was also asked to answer five demographic questions.

The research design of the study was a quantitative case study. Choosing this design creates a quality study due to the fact that it is truly an exploratory study and the results of the survey help describe the relationship (if any) between teacher efficacy beliefs and school choice.
To complete this study a traditionally large rural school that has seen significant student population decreases due to school choice (among other variables) was targeted as the research site. The OSTEA was recreated via Zoomerang (electronic form) coupled with five demographic questions and sent to every educator in the district.

Data analysis consisted of computing unweighted means for each of the three subscales that loaded into the survey. Also, the demographic questions allowed for the study to provide a description of the respondents. Lastly, I had the opportunity to compare the results of the survey with the description of the respondents.
CHAPTER IV

Data Analysis Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe, using a survey and statistical analysis, the efficacy levels of teachers who are employed in a “Failing” school that has been negatively influenced, in part, by school choice. To explore it I first showed a descriptive analysis of data. To reach this end I described the distribution of male versus female, primary versus secondary, length of teaching career, and degree status. Then I conducted a reliability analysis of the three efficacy measures. Next I analyzed and disaggregated the data scores based upon different attributes of the sample. I compared males versus females and their self-reported effectiveness. To disaggregate the data, I used independent sample t-tests. I then examined the results with respect to primary versus secondary teaching, degree status, and years of experience. To accomplish this I used a One Way Anova analysis.

Description of Respondents

The first step of the analysis requires a description of the respondents. Here I identified a number of groups and the percentage of individuals that made up that group. I described how many males and females participated in the study; how many secondary and primary teachers were in the study; how many female and male teachers were in the secondary as well as the primary school; and how many teachers held a Bachelor, Masters, or a Professional degree. Lastly, I described the respondents in regards to
experience. Categorizing staff members into chunks of experience completes the experience description. For example, one of the choices was 0–5 years of experience. In this example, 10 of the 199 staff members, or 5%, have been teaching between zero and five years.

The number of females that responded far outweighed the number of males. As seen in Table 1, 74% of all respondents were made up of the female gender compared to 20.4% of males. Five percent of the population that responded chose not to denote their gender. There is no appreciable difference between the subgroups’ respondents and the district’s overall total of the subgroup.

Table 1

*Frequency by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>District Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>22.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Originally there were 11 individuals who responded, “I prefer not to indicate my race/ethnicity.” There was a fear that including them in the analysis, due to this and other demographic questions, would make it possible for an individual within the school system to identify the respondent. Not including this group in the analysis does not impact the results in any appreciable way. The overwhelming number of respondents was Caucasian.
The majority of the respondents (41.2%) taught grades one through five. As shown in Table 3, 32.2% of respondents categorized themselves as high school (secondary) teachers. The third largest respondent group (21.1%) was educators employed at the middle school. The smallest group (12.1%) categorized themselves as Pre-Kindergarten through Kindergarten teachers.

Table 3 lists 199 total teachers who responded to this survey. The total number of individuals, if added up, equals 212. The reason for the discrepancy is that some staff members checked more than one grade level. I believe these staff members teach “special” classes such as band or physical education, so it is possible that they would teach more than one of the grade levels indicated. Later in the study I add “special” to the analysis to account these individuals.
Table 3

*Frequency by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PreK–K</th>
<th>Grades 1–5</th>
<th>Grades 6–8</th>
<th>Grades 9–12</th>
<th>PreK–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 4, 34.7% of the teachers employed have earned and exceeded a Master’s degree whereas 13.8% of the staff has earned a Master’s degree. The largest group is those educators who have only a Baccalaureate (43.8%). Six and half percent of the respondents have categorized themselves as “Other.”

Comparison with the overall district is similar except for those with a Master’s degree. The individuals surveyed are underrepresented with regards to the total population. This may skew the data analysis with regards to this specific subgroup. If there are any statistical significant differences within the data, it may be difficult to suggest that the survey respondents’ beliefs are generalizable to all of the staff members with a Master’s degree.
Table 4

*Frequency by Degree Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>District Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s plus</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only a few educators, 16.3%, have been employed for less than 10 years. As shown in Table 5, 20.9% of the teaching staff responded that they have been teaching between 11 and 15 years. The percentage of teachers who responded that they have been teaching between 16 and 20 years is 18.9%. Next, 15.8% of all respondents stated they have been teaching for 21 to 25 years. Finally, 28.1% of staff members have taught for more than 25 years.
Table 5

Frequency by Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+ years</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of Instrument

Although the authors of the instrument have taken extensive steps and measures to ensure reliability, it is responsible to measure the reliability of the instrument within the scope of this specific study. To do this I used Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient. I chose Cronbach’s Alpha due to its ability to measure the internal consistency of instruments where respondents of a study answer each question by responding to a rating scale. My analysis revealed results similar to the authors of the tool. Regarding the 12 items of the survey the Cronbach’s Alpha score equaled .885 as compared to the .90 reported by the authors of the tool.

For the reliability of this study, 196 of the 199 respondents’ responses were considered valid. I measured all 12 items found in the short form of the OSTES. The Reliability Coefficient measured .885. Typically a Reliability Coefficient of .8 or higher
is used to determine if a study or scale is considered reliable. The architects of the OSTES in their work provided a Cronbach’s Alpha for the short form at .90 (Hoy, 2008). Thus the internal reliability of the tool as used in this study is large enough for the tool and study to be considered acceptable.

An analysis of the original 12 questions of the OSTES can be found in Appendix D. Here I generated the mean score for each question as well as dispersion analytics such as standard deviation and skew. There does not appear to be a great deal of dispersion in the data set. The lowest standard deviation is .592 and the largest is .859. The variance between questions seems to be low.

The skewness value also shows a low level of skew. A perfect skew score would be zero. Therefore, the skew value should be close to zero. The largest skew value in the original 12 questions is question number six with a value of -.446.

Analysis of Different Sample Attributes

In this section I developed an analysis examining the sample by attributes regarding their efficacy score. To start I provide a table of means for each subscale that was analyzed. After that I provide a deeper analysis of each individual subscale.

First, I examined how the different genders (see Table 6) scored on the three factors that load into the OSTES. In this analysis, females scored higher on all three factors. The largest difference between the genders falls in Efficacy of Student Engagement. On average there is a .4-degree difference in the total score for Efficacy of Student Engagement. Through an Independent-Samples t-test, I found that of the three factors, one, Efficacy of Student Engagement, had a statistically significant difference. In
this case, the female mean score is statistically significant higher than that of men. Therefore, the difference in the scores was not due to sampling error.

Table 6

*Efficacy Score by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.615</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.9175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2575</td>
<td>4.0775</td>
<td>3.6675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>3.2575</td>
<td>4.0775</td>
<td>3.6675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, I examined the difference in efficacy scores in the sample population regarding teaching level (see Table 7). For example, is there any difference between primary and secondary teacher.
### Table 7

*Efficacy Score by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.4775</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.0325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3325</td>
<td>4.1125</td>
<td>3.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.565</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.215</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-Value

|     | 0.00 | 0.362 | 0.065 |

The manner in which individuals responded to the questionnaire required me to add another category. A number of individuals responded to more than one category. For example one respondent chose both K–5 and 6–8. I elected to categorize these individuals as “Special.” These respondents could have multiple certifications or teach special classes such band, music, or the like.

There is no appreciable difference between school levels in two of the three factors. Using a One Way ANOVA, I discovered the largest difference existed in Efficacy of Student Engagement. Here there is a statistically significant difference between the four levels. A Tukey Correction of the difference reveals that Elementary teachers have a statistically significantly larger Efficacy of Engagement score than both the Middle (mean difference of .51967) and High Schools (mean difference of .56360).
Next I compared means of efficacy scores in the sample population regarding years of experience.

Table 8

*Efficacy Score by Years of Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>4.1175</td>
<td>3.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.5575</td>
<td>4.2575</td>
<td>4.0175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.2275</td>
<td>4.1625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the data, there are two areas of interest. The first, the smaller dispersion of the two, falls under Efficacy of Instructional Strategies. Staff members with 0 to 10 years of experience had an average efficacy score of 4.0. In contrast, teachers with 16 to 20 years of experience had an average efficacy score of 4.26.

The second area of interest is Efficacy of Classroom Management. Teachers with 0 to 10 years of experience had an average efficacy score of 3.77 whereas staff members with 21 to 25 years of experience had a score of 4.1925. The data also shows that teachers with 25 or more years of experience have a statistically significantly higher efficacy score than those with zero to ten years of experience.
Next, I examined the efficacy scores of the sample population with regards to race and ethnicity.

Table 9

*Efficacy Score by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Caucasian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To begin the analysis, it is important to note that the “I prefer not to indicate my racial/ethnic group” respondents totaled 16. I chose not to place this group in either the Caucasian or non-Caucasian groups. It was feared that to include them in one group might influence the *t*-score and thus compromise the integrity of the results.

However, there was also a fear of biasing the results if I chose not to include the group “I prefer not to indicate my racial/ethnic group” at all in the analysis. To ensure that did not happen I ran both an Independent-Samples *t*-test between non-Caucasian and Caucasian as well as a One Way ANOVAs utilizing the aforementioned groups as well as the “I prefer not to indicate my racial/ethnic group.” This was done to determine the impact of the “I prefer not to indicate” group.

The results of the One Way ANOVA determined there was a significant difference between groups. The Tukey Correction indicated that both Caucasian and
non-Caucasian groups were both statistically significantly higher than the “I prefer not to indicate” group. It also showed that the Caucasian group had a statistically significant higher score than the non-Caucasian group.

Next, I chose to not include the “I prefer not to indicate my race/ethnic group” in the data. I ran an Independent Samples $t$-test. The results showed a statistically significant difference in two of three factors. In this analysis the Caucasian group was statistically significantly higher than the non-Caucasian group.

Due to both of these analyses, I chose not to include the “I prefer not to indicate my race/ethnic group” and to reproduce the test results of only the Independent-Samples $t$-test. The results show that Caucasians had a statistically significant higher efficacy score than non-Caucasians with regards to Efficacy of Engagement and Efficacy of Instruction.

The group that provided the most variance in responses is the Degree Status grouping (see Table 10). This analysis showed two of the three factors being statistically significantly different. A One Way ANOVA revealed a statistically significant difference between groups in both the Efficacy of Engagement and Efficacy of Management factors.
Table 10

*Efficacy Score by Degree Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Plus</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.69*</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-Value
0.013 0.197 0.011

With respect to Efficacy of Engagement, the Tukey Correction provided data indicating those teachers who possess a degree status of a Masters Plus have a higher efficacy score than those with a Baccalaureate. In regards to Efficacy in Classroom Management the Tukey Correction revealed that teachers who possess a Masters Plus have a higher efficacy score than those with a Baccalaureate.

In summation, the more education that an individual has the greater efficacy belief he or she has with regards to Efficacy of Engagement and Efficacy of Classroom Management. The data suggests that degree status does not affect Efficacy of Classroom Instruction.
Global Efficacy Scores

Lastly, I examined the global efficacy beliefs of the staff members versus the global scores of each individual subgroup. From a global perspective it appears the staff scored above the median number of three on two of the three factors. Efficacies of Instruction and Management have stronger global scores than Efficacy of Engagement. This analysis exemplifies what the earlier analysis suggests. The earlier analysis showed multiple areas of statistically significant differences between Efficacy of Engagement and the other two factors.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next I used a t-test (see Table 12) to determine if race had an impact on global efficacy scores. The results presented suggest there is a statistically significant difference between Caucasians and non-Caucasians with regards to global scores. Caucasians have a statistically significant higher global efficacy scores than non-Caucasians.
Table 12

*Global Means and Standard Deviations by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/ethnic Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>11.8012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Caucasian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

To determine variance in global scores based on the school level sub group, I used a One Way ANOVA analysis. The data signifies there is a statistically significant difference in efficacy scores. The Tukey correction shows that variable one, the Primary level educators, has a statistically significant higher global efficacy score than both Middle and High School educators.

Table 13

*Global Means and Standard Deviations by Grade Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>12.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Next I used a *t*-test to determine the variance in global efficacy regarding the sub group of gender. The data suggest there is a statistically significant difference between the two. Females have a statistically significant higher global efficacy score than males.
Table 14

*Global Means and Standard Deviations by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15: Please indicate your gender.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.2313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>11.9138*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Next, I compared the subgroup of years of experience using a One Way ANOVA (see Table 15). In this table one represents zero to ten years, two represents 11-15 years, three represents 16-20 years, four represents 21-25 years and five represents 25 years or more. The results of the data do not suggest there is a statistically significant difference in scores or between groups.

Table 15

*Global Means and Standard Deviations by Years Experience*
(I) Question 17: Please indicate how long you have been in education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>11.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, I examine global scores regarding Degree Attainment (Table 16). Those teachers that possess a Masters Plus degree have a significantly higher global efficacy score than those holding either Baccalaureate and Master’s degree.

Table 16

*Global Means and Standard Deviations by Degree Attainment*
Question 1: Please indicate the highest Degree you hold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters +</td>
<td>12.161*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Summary of Analysis

The research analysis showed that overall the school district showed an above the median (score of 3) score on the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale. Digging deeper into the data reveals a number of findings. First, there is a statistically significant difference between elementary teachers and middle/high school teachers regarding Efficacy of Engagement. Elementary teachers show a statistically significant higher Efficacy of Engagement score. Also, women scored statistically significantly higher in regards of Efficacy of Engagement than that of men.

Second, teachers who responded to having 25 or more years of teaching experience have a statistically significantly higher Efficacy of Management score than those teachers who responded with 10 or less years of experience. Degree status also
played a role in efficacy scores. Teachers who had a Masters Plus degree had higher efficacy scores in both Engagement and Management than those teachers with a Baccalaureate. Also, Caucasians scored significantly higher in both Engagement and Instruction.

Third, looking specifically at global efficacy scores, there are significant findings as well. Caucasians had a statistically significant higher global efficacy score than non-Caucasian. Primary educators had a statistically significant higher score than their peers at both the Middle School and High School levels. Females had a statistically significant higher global efficacy score than males. In terms of years of experience there were no data to suggest there were any significant variance between any of the subgroups. These results would suggest that it is possible for Caucasian Female educators at the Primary level to have a higher Global Efficacy score than the other sub groups. Finally, those teachers who hold a Master’s Plus degree have a significantly higher global efficacy score than those who don’t.
CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the research question, discussion of the limitations to the study, contributions of the study, and finally conclusions with recommendations to both the school as well as future research.

Research Question

The purpose of this study was to investigate the efficacy beliefs of teachers who are employed in a “failing” school that has been negatively impacted, in part, by school choice. The global scores regarding the three efficacy factors would show that the staff scored at the median or higher on all three. To this point there is very little literature to compare with the scores obtained in this study.

Looking at specifics within this study, however, suggest other findings. To accomplish this I diagnose each of the three efficacy factors. To begin, I start with Efficacy of Engagement. Here the data suggest that portions of the teaching staff struggle with Efficacy of Engagement. Females have a higher efficacy score than men. Elementary teachers have a higher efficacy score than teachers working at the middle and high school grade levels. Teachers with a Masters Plus have a higher efficacy score than teachers with a Baccalaureate. As mentioned before there is not a great deal of literature available regarding this topic.
That being said, studies that do exist have shown results that are both similar and
contradictive to these results. Martin (2006) found that male teachers reported higher
efficacy scores for engagement (utilizing the Martin’s Student Motivation and
Engagement Scale) than female teachers and primary teachers scored higher efficacy
scores regarding engagement than high school and middle school teachers. Another
study concluded what Martin and I each found, that is, primary educators have a higher
score of self-efficacy (utilizing the OSTES) in student engagement. However, this study
further found that primary educators also have a higher sense of self-efficacy regarding
classroom management (Klassen & Chiu, 2010).

Next, I move onto Efficacy of Classroom Management. There was a statistically
significant difference in Efficacy of Classroom Management. The analysis revealed that
teachers with 25 or more years of experience had a higher efficacy score than teachers
with less than 10 years of experience. As a comparison, Klassen and Chiu (2010) found
that females have a lower self-efficacy score in Classroom Management whereas primary
teachers scored higher on Classroom Management.

Next, I analyzed Efficacy of Instruction. Again, the overall global score for
Efficacy of Classroom Instruction was above a median score. Diving further into the
analysis, no data suggest that any of the subgroups statistically significantly differ in
terms of instruction.

Analyzing the global efficacy scores we find that Caucasians have a higher
efficacy score than non-Caucasians, females have a higher efficacy score than males,
primary educators scored higher than both middle and high school educators and, there
was not a significant variance in the global scores regarding the sub group Years’ Experience.

Limitations of the Study

The first, and most pressing, limitation to the study is the nature of its design. Whereas the question that I asked and investigated was rightly suited for an exploratory design, it comes with limitations. An exploratory design is only intended to explore relationships that may or may not exist between two or more variables. The design is not intended to grant an outcome, make predictions, or decisions.

Babbie (1989) made known that exploratory research is used when the topic or issue is new. Babbie also stated that exploratory research is used to create a formal hypothesis. The intent of this study was to explore a potential new issue that currently has no literature as well as to determine a more formal hypothesis or research question for further analysis.

The design of this study included convenience sampling. The individuals of this sample were chosen simply because they were readily available and willing to be involved. Since my sample is made up of volunteers, there is a chance it could be biased because the volunteers may be actively promoting a strong sense of personal confidence regarding teaching.

Due to the reasons mentioned above, an exploratory study is not one that is usually generalizable to the population. The results of this study are context specific and therefore only apply to the specific site in which the study was conducted. The results of
this study are only applicable to the school in which the analysis was conducted and can offer very little in the way of lessons or advice to other schools.

Also, there is no qualitative element to this study. Exploratory studies quite often are founded in qualitative analysis. Qualitative evidence would have added an element of context and could have provided data or questions for further investigation. That being said, I chose specifically to only use quantitative data because there is no literature of this type and quantitative data provided me the opportunity to explore relationships between subgroups of teachers.

I believed that determining if there was a statistically significant difference between subgroups was the first step in studying this issue. The data would provide or pinpoint specific relationships that need to be studied further, potentially through qualitative means.

For example, the data reveal a statistically significant difference between elementary teachers and middle/high school teachers in regards to Efficacy of Engagement. Armed with this knowledge a follow-up study could be conducted specifically designed to determine the reasons for the difference. Qualitative research could provide insight into what elementary teachers do differently or not differently than middle/high school teachers in engaging both students and their families.

Furthermore, I cannot infer anything related to school choice and failing schools. To do so would require a comparison with a similar district that has either not been impacted by school choice or has had a positive impact from school choice. Also, the
district would have to have trend data showing it has performed well academically through the years. As I have stated before, to date, this data does not exist.

The superintendent poses another limitation. His hiring and presence has clearly had a positive impact on the district (Personal Communication, school employee, January 2012). Could he have impacted the current efficacy scores? If so, are these scores a true measure of longevity for each of these subgroups? The population’s downward spiral began under the previous superintendent. It could be that efficacy scores are better in spite of the population trend due to the potential impact of the new superintendent.

**Contributions of Study**

This study is the first of its kind; therefore, it has begun the process of contributing knowledge of a teacher’s personal sense of efficacy who is employed by a school that is considered or has been considered failing and one that is losing students to school choice. The information that was gained in this study may be able to provide guidance for (a) policy makers, (b) school administrators/resident educators, and (c) academic research.

**Policy Makers**

As research continues to tie education to the economy, policy makers will become more and more interested in the interworking of the education system. To be sure, we have been witness to political struggle as well as governmental control of schools. To a certain degree, local control is a thing of the past. For example, the state controls how many days a school is open, the number of hours a student must sit in an academic seat to
graduate, number of math and science credits needed to graduate, bullying and harassment training, parenting education, character education, and body mass index evaluations (Vollmer, 2011). The list goes on and on.

Some policy makers believe that simply controlling schools may not be the best way to improve education. They believe that providing some control and giving choice to the consumer (i.e., parent or student) can improve education. An exhaustible set of literature exists to promote the benefits of schools and the free market (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Hastings & Weinstein, 2008; Hoxby, 2003). Vouchers, Charter Schools, open enrollment, and other types of free market education were created as a form of school choice. Much of the political conversation today revolves around school choice.

All of that being said, I believe it is imperative that policy makers have an understanding of how school choice impacts the efficacy beliefs of individual teachers. As the literature review presented earlier in this study shows, there is an undeniable connection between a teacher’s sense of personal efficacy and student achievement. If policy makers truly want to reform education and if they really believe in high quality educators then some light needs to be shed on any impact that school choice may or may not have on educators and their individual efficacy beliefs, specifically those educators who are employed in a school that is considered to be failing that is also losing students to school choice.

**School Administrators and Resident Educators**

In Chapter II, I made a case regarding the importance of teacher efficacy in education. That being said, a short summation is helpful here. Teacher efficacy impacts
student individuals in the school house in a number of ways. Individual efficacy beliefs influence the time a teacher devotes to planning and organization (Allinder, 1994), commitment to the profession (Coladarci, 1992), and the sense of enthusiasm for the teaching profession (Allinder, 1994). Studies have shown that efficacy will motivate staff members to attempt new teaching styles and methodologies (Guskey, 1988). Further they have been shown to positively impact student achievement (Anderson et al., 1988; Ross, 1992; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998)

With all that in mind I believe it is imperative that school leaders develop a framework to build competent and confident young teachers with OSTES as the foundation. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) worked tediously to develop a reliable and valid tool. After much testing and analysis they developed a survey that loads into three factors: Efficacy of Engagement, Efficacy of Instruction, and Efficacy of Classroom Management.

I believe that these three factors can serve as the foundation of competent educators. More importantly I believe that these three factors can serve as the framework of Resident Educator (first, second, third and fourth year teachers) programs. For students, and in the process teachers, to be successful, the teacher must feel a personal sense of efficacy toward the three factors. Therefore Residential Educator programs should use the three factors when possible.

These three factors work within the framework of Ohio’s current Residential Educator program. Just as important, these three factors also work within the guidelines of a comprehensive induction program. For example, new teacher induction programs
should incorporate career learning and professional development and treat induction as part of a life long professional development program (Wong, 2004). Further, Wong stated, comprehensive induction programs should: (a) last for a period of two to three years, (b) provide study groups for new teachers to network and build support, (c) incorporate administrative support, (d) include a mentorship piece, and (e) provide a structure for modeling effective teaching.

Incorporating the three factors into a residential educator program would take at least three years; it would form as the foundation to life long learning and professional development; it should be supported by the administration; and it would allow opportunity for school leaders to model effective teaching. The new teachers’ induction program should incorporate a mix of individual mentors and large group mentors. To accomplish this I suggest the following concepts:

1. As my research has shown, teachers in their first five years have a low efficacy score. Teachers with 25 or more years have a statistically significant higher efficacy score. Therefore I suggest that the first year induction program should focus on classroom management. Each school should adopt a classroom management plan. This plan should be modeled and mentored for new teachers. The new teachers should have a mentor that has 25 or more years of experience.

2. Second and third year of induction program should be a review and continuation of classroom management. However, the second year should begin to focus more on classroom instruction. Each school should develop
certain teaching strategies that all staff members master. For example, the induction program could incorporate proven classroom instructional strategies such as Marzano’s Essential Nine (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001). Also, teacher leaders could model reading across curriculum strategies, short answer and extended response formats, as well as vocabulary acquisition models, and so forth.

3. The fourth year of induction should be a review and continuation of both classroom management and instruction. This year should also focus on student engagement. Each school should develop strategies to ensure that students have a sense of efficacy themselves, to be sure that students can think both critically and creatively, to discover ways to motivate all students, as well as to connect with families.

   For example, schools could choose to adopt problem-based learning or another inquiry model (Gunter, Estes, & Mintz, 2007). This approach would build in relevance while challenging students to think both creatively and critically. Also, because this approach builds more relevancy, it could help motivate all students to learn (Hattie, 2011).

   Also, as my research has shown, female primary teachers have a statistically significantly higher efficacy score in Classroom Engagement. I suggest that schools look to this population to serve as the mentor for new teachers in the induction program.
4. New teachers should be assigned to individual mentors. These mentors should meet with the new teachers on a consistent basis. Also, all new teachers and mentors should meet together as a large group on a consistent basis.

5. Individual mentors should change with each efficacy factor. For example, the school should supply a mentor for a first year teacher who is both competent and confident with regards to Classroom Management. When the new teacher has completed the first phase of induction and is ready to begin the next phase of induction, the school should provide a mentor who is both competent and confident regarding Classroom Instruction, and so on.

It is important to remember that these are just overarching concepts, meaning that not all schools will use these concepts exactly as outlined above. For example, some schools may think it is a stretch to focus only on Efficacy of Classroom Management the first year. They may feel that new educators should be taught or introduced to classroom instruction techniques as well. In this case schools will use these concepts above but align them in the order and time frame they feel is appropriate.

When administrators and other school leaders view induction programs through the lenses of the OSTES and the accompanying three factors, they then can begin to develop confident young teachers. We know that most new teachers are competent because they have passed the Praxis or other state certified assessment. They know their content areas. What we need is to build confidence in our young teachers. The research
on teacher efficacy makes it clear: confidence is what counts. Do our teachers believe they have the abilities to teach the students that occupy their classroom seats?

Academic Research

The authors of the original survey (OSTES) did not report the efficacy scores in their research. The main concern of the researchers was to create an instrument that was valid and reliable; not necessarily to report the individual efficacy score. With that in mind, this study contributes both global and subgrouping scores within the three factors. Also, this study is the first to contribute such scores to schools that are considered failing and have been negatively impacted by school choice. This study can serve as a baseline data set with which future studies can be compared.

Recommendations

School District

There are a number of suggestions for the school that participated in this study. First, I believe it would be beneficial to have all teachers employed as full-time staff members complete the survey. According to ODE (2011), the school has 277 full time educators and 196 have successfully completed the survey. The other 81 educators could certainly benefit from the survey and the school could benefit from the additional data.

Second, once the survey is completed, I suggest the school manipulate the data to reflect the sub-groupings incorporated in this study. Once this is complete, the school leaders can determine which, if any, of the three factors they excel or languish in. Also, the sub-groupings would provide the opportunity to identify certain populations within
the district that either excel or languish in any of the three factors. This would provide data for school leaders to find areas of strength as well as improvement.

Third, I suggest the school provide time and resources for professional development in the areas of strengths and weaknesses. For example, the data obtained from this study concluded that females and elementary educators have a higher global efficacy score than middle or high school educators.

These data provide an opportunity for teacher-to-teacher led professional development. Female teachers from the primary building could form an efficacy committee designed to work with other grade levels. These groups can work together to determine what it is that makes female teachers at the primary level more confident than others. The groups can then work on ways to recreate this at the middle and high school levels.

Fourth, I suggest that the school district consider using the OSTES as a foundational piece for their new teacher induction program. School leaders can determine what school wide interventions to implement for each of the three factors. The school should also consider periodically having the entire staff reassess themselves with the OSTES. School leaders will then be able to ascertain what areas of improvement on which they can focus within their professional development time frame.

Future Research

As I have mentioned a number of times to this point, this is the first time a study like this has been done. Studies regarding teacher efficacy or school choice are commonplace. However, a study analyzing the personal efficacy beliefs of educators in a
school that is considered failing and one that has also been negatively impacted by school choice is not so common. That being said, there is much work still to be done regarding this specific topic.

First, future research needs to continue in regards to continuously improving the measurement tool itself. Although the OSTES is a very valid and reliable instrument, it is not perfect and could use improvement. Again, as mentioned in Chapter II, there is an undeniable relationship between individual efficacy beliefs of teachers and student achievement. If efficacy beliefs are such a powerful construct, then the measurement tool bears continuous attention.

Second, research needs to be conducted to find global efficacy scores. As I have said, there is little research with regards to efficacy scores. That being said, what little there is mainly involves researching sub groups and their efficacy scores. More attention needs to be paid to the global efficacy score to create yet another invaluable baseline data set.

Third, the research on efficacy needs to use the OSTES on types of schools for comparison purposes. For example, I suggest analyzing many more urban, rural, wealthy, poor, high minority, low minority, state, and private schools, as well as schools that have been negatively impacted by school choice as well as schools that have been positively impacted by school choice. Researchers need to develop a database for each of these schools so we can begin to make comparisons.

For example, the school in my study is a rural school educating students from a low socioeconomic status with a diverse population that has been negatively impacted by
school choice. It would be beneficial if we could compare efficacy results with similar schools. This would give researchers the ability to analyze school leaders, school cultures, and the like to determine successful characteristics and best practices.

Fourth, data from such investigations will allow researchers the ability to explore relationships between different school types. It would be beneficial to school leaders and policy makers to understand the relationship of school choice in urban schools versus rural schools. In fact, if the proper data are generated, researchers can begin to explore relationships between a number of dichotomies such as low socio-economic status schools versus high socio-economic schools or schools negatively impacted by school choice versus schools positively impacted.

Data in such studies could influence future policy decisions regarding school choice. For example, what if it were to be determined that schools of low socio-economic status that were negatively impacted by school choice had statistically significant lower efficacy scores than schools that were high socio-economic choice experiencing positive impacts from school choice? What lessons could researchers, school leaders, or policy makers extrapolate from that?

Fifth, future research needs to incorporate a qualitative approach. The quantitative approach is useful for determining surface relationships but the qualitative piece will allow researchers to dig deeper. For example, Ashton and Webb (1986) utilizing one of the few qualitative approaches to teacher efficacy found that the following factors account for lower teacher efficacy scores: excessive role demand, low status, inadequate salaries, poor morale, and lack of recognition.
Qualitative analysis allows the ability for the researcher to go beyond the numbers. To simply accept the fact that elementary female teachers have a statistically significantly higher efficacy score than male middle school teachers is not enough. Qualitative research enables the researcher to seek out the why and how to this relationship. It allows the data to offer significant life lessons for teachers in similar situations.

Lastly, regarding the context of the school district and the role of leadership during the time period the school lost students to school choice, I suggest there needs to be research completed into the individual leaders of the school district. With respect to the new superintendent, a qualitative analysis could reveal data and lessons concerning positive school change. If school choice is a trend that we will continue to see and if efficacy scores are proven to be lower in schools negatively impacted by school choice then any lesson in positive school leadership would be invaluable.

**Conclusion**

For a fifth grader, Dalton Sherman, has great insight. As he preaches to the Dallas ISD teaching staff, one point cannot be any clearer, “Believe in yourself” (Bergmandi, 2008). He is so correct, efficacy is a powerful construct. Without it many of our teachers and students could be set up for failure.

Teaching is a difficult profession that comes with many challenges. To make education even more problematic, teachers must deal with added pressures such as school choice, high stakes testing, and district report cards. In an environment like this,
confidence is so important. That being said, is there a relationship between school choice and efficacy? Efficacy and a school that is considered failing?

This study, being the first of its kind, has shown that it is possible for educators employed in a district that has been labeled failing a number of times in its recent history and one that has also been negatively impacted by school choice to have a positive efficacy score. This study has also been able to show that efficacy beliefs will vary between subgroupings within the staff. This study has shown that there are a number of distinctions between the subgroups. Those distinctions matter also. These distinctions can allow opportunity for continued growth and improvement.

As policy makers continue to work for ways to improve both education and the economy, schools will continue to be scrutinized. A potential school improvement plan for policy makers will continue to be school choice. Also, policy makers may continue to evaluate schools based on standardized tests.

As long as this environment continues to exist, then the need for further research like this study needs to take place. Confidence really does count and if state policies do anything to jeopardize that confidence and in the process student achievement then policy makers and school leaders must know.

Our students and staff deserve the very best that we can provide them. If the most important resource that we make available in a classroom is the teacher then it is imperative that we put the best teacher we can in the classroom. A prominent piece to providing the best teacher is making sure the teacher is both competent and confident.
The OSTES can play a significant role in ensuring the confidence of our teachers. The survey can allow school leaders to determine efficacy levels of the entire staff as well as subgroupings. The findings by the original authors with regards to the three factors are important. School leaders can begin to develop resident educator programs aimed at improving the confidence of the teaching staff.

It is imperative that researchers, policy makers, and school leaders fully understand the power of this construct. It is imperative that researchers continue to research this topic further to provide deeper insight. It is imperative that policy makers stay abreast of all potential impacts of school choice and how that may affect student achievement. It is imperative that school leaders embrace the lessons learned to this point regarding teacher efficacy and school choice and then use those lessons to improve student achievement. Our communities, our schools, our teachers, and our students deserve nothing less.
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APPENDIX A

ENROLLMENT HISTORY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001–2002</td>
<td>5,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–2003</td>
<td>5,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–2004</td>
<td>5,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>5,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>5,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>4,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>4,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>3,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>3,498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

ENROLLMENT BY STUDENT RACE
### Enrollment by Student Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
<th>2009-2010 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,093</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>55.50%</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008-2009 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
<th>2007-2008 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>8.90%</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>55.80%</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-2007 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
<th>2005-2006 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,674</td>
<td>34.50%</td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td>57.20%</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004-2005 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
<th>2003-2004 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3,289</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3,368</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002-2003 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
<th>2001-2002 Enrollment</th>
<th>% of Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1,987</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>60.70%</td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>3,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

MEDIAN INCOME
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010–2011</td>
<td>$21,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>$22,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>$22,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>$22,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>$21,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>$21,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>$22,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–2004</td>
<td>$22,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–2003</td>
<td>$22,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–2002</td>
<td>$22,953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5% change in income
APPENDIX D

SURVEY STATISTICS
## Survey Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.757</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.387</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>-0.378</td>
<td>-0.446</td>
<td>-0.284</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SURVEY QUESTIONS
Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Survey Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

Page 1 - Question 1 - Rating Scale - Matrix  [Mandatory]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

Page 1 - Question 2 - Rating Scale - Matrix  [Mandatory]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?

Page 1 - Question 3 - Rating Scale - Matrix  [Mandatory]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?

Page 1 - Question 4 - Rating Scale - Matrix  [Mandatory]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much can you do to help your students value learning?
**Page 1 - Question 5 - Rating Scale - Matrix**

To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 1 - Question 6 - Rating Scale - Matrix**

How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 1 - Question 7 - Rating Scale - Matrix**

How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 1 - Question 8 - Rating Scale - Matrix**

How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Page 1 - Question 9 - Rating Scale - Matrix**

How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some Influence</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?

Not Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?

Not Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?

Not Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

Please indicate your age group.

- under 25
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 56-65
- 65+
- I prefer not to indicate my age group.
Page 1 - Question 14 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your racial/ethnic category.

- Caucasian
- African American
- Hispanic
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Mixed
- I prefer not to indicate my racial/ethnic group.

Page 1 - Question 15 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate your gender.

- Male
- Female
- I prefer not to answer.

Page 1 - Question 16 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)

Please indicate the highest degree you hold.

- Baccalaureate
- Masters
- Specialist
- Doctorate
Please indicate how long you have been in education.

- 0-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-25 years
- More than 25 years
APPENDIX F

LETTER TO TEACHING STAFF
Teacher efficacy in its purest form is simply, “Do I have the abilities/skill set to teach these students?” Of course time and place can have an impact on the students who sit in your classrooms. The current contemporary political landscape facing educators offers a challenge in the form of school choice. School choice can greatly impact the students who are left to sit in your seats. It is possible that it can also in turn impact teacher efficacy.

To this point, there have been a number of studies researching teacher efficacy. There also have been a number of studies researching school choice. However, there is yet to be a study that aims to research the relationship between school choice and teacher efficacy.

Why are you receiving this letter? Mansfield City schools for the past decade have faced serious challenges. The staff has faced ever changing state mandates in the form of standards and standardized tests. The staff has faced serious, almost crippling, economic conditions within the community. Also, the staff has faced education challenges in the shape of a large number of students choosing to leave the school system via school choice. Through it all, the core of the Mansfield City teaching staff has remained largely intact.

It is time for a research study to be completed that investigates the relationship between teacher efficacy and school choice. Due to the reasons listed above I believe that Mansfield City is a perfect place to complete such a study. In the near future you will be receiving an email asking you to fill out a very short survey regarding teacher efficacy.
The survey consists of 12 questions focused on classroom experiences. The survey will also consist of six demographic questions. Please consider taking 5 – 10 minutes to answer the survey questions.

Please understand that it will be impossible for anyone to know your answers to the survey or anyone’s individual identity. The survey will be stored electronically. The data obtained will be kept in a secure location and destroyed after the appropriate length of time. The name and location of the school system used in the study will never be mentioned in the study. Instead the school district will be referred to in a generic form such as a large rural school district in Ohio.

Once again, please consider taking the time to answer the survey questions so we can complete this very important study. Thanks in advance for both your time as well as your commitment to our students.

Yours in Education,

Michael Martin
APPENDIX G

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER
TO: Dr. Ann Shelly  
FROM: Randy Gearhart, Chair  
DATE: December 21, 2011  
SUBJECT: Human Subjects Review Board Approval

The Human Subjects Review Board has approved the research proposal of Michael Martin for the project Teacher Efficacy and School Choice, HSRB Approval Code: 12-11-033. The investigator may proceed with the project.

The primary function of the HSRB is to ensure protection of human research subjects. As a result of this mandate, we ask that you pay close attention to the fundamental ethical principles of autonomy, justice, and beneficence when establishing your research proposal. These ethical principles pertain specifically to the issues of informed consent, fair selection of subjects, and risk/benefit considerations.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Sincerely,

Randy Gearhart  
Phone: 419-207-6198  
Fax: 419-289-5460  
E-mail: rgearhart@ashland.edu