

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 212

SP 040 087

AUTHOR Milson, Andrew J.
TITLE Teacher Efficacy and Character Education.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Private Colleges; Religious Education; *Self Efficacy; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Character Development; Character Education

ABSTRACT

This study applies the teacher efficacy construct to the domain of character development in order to describe the efficacy beliefs of practicing elementary level teachers regarding character education. The Character Development Efficacy Belief Instrument, developed and validated by the researchers, was distributed to a sample of 767 elementary teachers in a large midwestern suburban school district. The results suggest that elementary teachers feel efficacious regarding most aspects of character education and that teachers who earned their undergraduate degrees from private, religiously affiliated universities have a greater sense of efficacy for character development. These findings suggest that programs in private, religiously affiliated universities might serve as a model for preparing teachers for character education. The survey instrument is attached. (Contains 34 references.) (Author/SM)

Teacher Efficacy and Character Education

Andrew J. Milson
Assistant Professor

Department of Teacher Education
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Effective Fall 2001
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Baylor University
Waco, Texas 76798

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
April 2001 - Seattle, Washington

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

A. J. Milson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP040087



Abstract

This study applies the teacher efficacy construct to the domain of character development in order to describe the efficacy beliefs of practicing elementary level teachers regarding character education. The Character Development Efficacy Belief Instrument (CDEBI), developed and validated by the researchers, was distributed to a sample of 767 elementary teachers in a large Midwestern suburban school district. The results suggest that elementary teachers feel efficacious regarding most aspects of character education and that teachers who earned their undergraduate degrees from private, religiously affiliated universities have a greater sense of efficacy for character development. These findings seem to contradict the notion that teachers are uncomfortable or uncertain about their abilities to be character educators and suggest that programs in private, religiously affiliated universities might serve as a model for preparing teachers for character education.

Teacher Efficacy and Character Education

Among the many educational reform initiatives of the past decade has been the resurgence of character education. The notion of developing the character of children through schooling is not new. Diverse philosophers from Plato and Aristotle to Kant and Dewey have reflected on the crucial role of character education in society (Heslep, 1995). Throughout United States history, the concept of character education has been considered a vital purpose of schools (McClellan, 1992). During the 1960s and 1970s, however, the more didactic forms of character education common through the early twentieth century gave way to the values clarification approach (e.g., Rath et al., 1966). During the 1980s and early 1990s, several educators, who viewed the values clarification approach as morally relativistic and ultimately detrimental to the goal of character development, began advocating a return to character education (Ryan, 1986; Lickona, 1991; Bennett, 1991; Wynne, 1991). Character education proponents argued that the traits of good character should be taught explicitly rather than relying on clarification exercises or, worse, the “hidden curriculum.” Ryan (1986) explained, “Exhortation should be used sparingly, and it should never stray far from explanation. Nonetheless, there are times when teachers must appeal to the best instincts of the young and urge them to move in a particular direction” (p. 232). Bennett (1991) echoed this sentiment, “If we want our children to possess the traits of character we most admire, we need to teach them what those traits are” (p.133).

Character education may be defined as the process of developing in students an understanding of, a commitment to, and a tendency to behave in accordance with core ethical values. During the 1990s, those advocating character education asserted that

teachers and schools had shirked their responsibility for character development in recent decades and that the lack of attention to character in schools had fostered a moral decline in youth as evidenced by increasing violence, drug abuse, pregnancy, and similar irresponsible and disrespectful behavior. The proposals for a return to more direct approaches to character education typically place enormous responsibility on teachers. Teachers are called upon to serve as positive role models, to seize opportunities to reflect on moral issues within the context of the curriculum, to create a moral classroom climate and to provide students with opportunities outside of the classroom to practice good character through service programs, clubs, and peer tutoring (DeRoche & Williams, 1998; Lickona, 1991; Ryan & Bohlin, 1999; Wiley, 1998; Wynne, 1997). This call for character education has received support from the federal government (National Character Counts Week, 1994), many state governments (Greenawalt, 1996; Nielsen, 1998), and several professional education organizations, such as the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), the National School Boards Association (NSBA), the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), and the National Education Association (NEA) (Haynes, et al, 1997; Vessels, 1998).

Given the important role of teachers in character development, as well as the recent mandates for character education in schools, the need to consider effective means for preparing teachers for their roles as character educators has recently received attention (Berkowitz, 1998; Jones, Ryan, & Bohlin, 1998; Williams & Schaps, 1999). Recent research indicates that teacher educators support preparing teachers for character

education (Jones, Ryan & Bohlin, 1998; Milson, 2000), yet there is little consensus about the curriculum and methods that should be employed to accomplish this task. Jones, Ryan, and Bohlin (1998) noted a dichotomy between the expectations placed on teachers to serve as character educators and the training they receive for this role. In a nationwide survey they found that "Despite widespread support for character education, . . . [it] is not currently a high priority in the curriculum of teacher education" (Jones, Ryan & Bohlin, 1998, p. 17). The exceptions to this statement were those institutions that reported to have character goals as a part of their institutional mission. Such institutions, which tended to be those with religious affiliations, reported specific program features that emphasized character, including admission policies, honor codes, rituals/ceremonies, community service projects, and student governance programs. Much of literature concerning teacher preparation for character education, however, suggests that teacher education programs are not currently preparing teachers for this task (CAEC/CEP, 1999; Williams & Schaps, 1999).

As Lickona (1993) noted, "Character education is far more complex than teaching math or reading; it requires personal growth as well as skills development. Yet teachers typically receive almost no pre-service or in-service training in the moral aspects of their craft. Many teachers do not feel comfortable or competent in the values domain" (p. 11). The teacher education and character education literature appear to lack recommendations for building a sense of efficacy for character development among teachers during either their pre-service coursework or their in-service staff development experiences. Such recommendations would appear vital to teacher educators concerned with improving teacher training for character education. Pre-service teachers are unlikely to develop a

sense of efficacy regarding character development unless teacher education instruction addresses the components of character education that tend to undermine efficacy. Teacher educators seeking to develop such curricula will need to understand how practicing teachers perceive their efficacy for character development.

There is a substantial base of research regarding teacher efficacy, yet there do not appear to be any studies of the relationship between this construct and character development (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Developing character in youth is a complex process that is unlikely to yield immediate or measurable results. The nature of character education requires that teachers be persistent and motivated for the task. Teacher persistence and motivation have been linked to the construct of teacher efficacy in that teachers with high levels of efficacy tend to exert more effort in a teaching situation and tend to persist when faced with obstacles (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Gibson and Dembo (1984) identified two components of teacher efficacy: Personal Teacher Efficacy (PTE) and General Teacher Efficacy (GTE). Personal teaching efficacy is based on Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy and refers to a teacher's belief about his or her abilities and competence as a teacher. General teaching efficacy, based on Bandura's (1977) concept of outcome expectancy, reflects "the degree to which the environment can be controlled, that is, the extent to which students can be taught given such factors as family background, IQ, and school conditions" (Gibson & Dembo, 1984, p. 570). Thus, a teacher's efficacy beliefs are a combination of perceptions of personal influence and perceptions of the influence of factors external to the classroom. Both of these dimensions of efficacy are relevant to understanding a teacher's approach to character development. A teacher who is motivated and persistent regarding character

education is likely to believe in his or her own ability to build the character of students, as well as the ability of teachers in general to overcome destructive influences outside of the classroom.

The two-factor construct of teacher efficacy has been the subject of recent research (Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Deemer & Minke, 1999). Guskey and Passaro (1994) investigated the effect of the internal versus external orientation of items on the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) developed by Gibson and Dembo (1984) and modified by Woolfolk and Hoy (1990). They conclude that, “Contrary to these earlier studies, we could find no evidence to indicate the distinction between these two dimensions relates to personal efficacy versus teaching efficacy. Instead, our results indicate the difference to be an internal versus external distinction... The teachers we surveyed ... did not distinguish between their personal ability to affect students and the potential of teachers in general” (Guskey & Passaro, 1994, pp. 636-637). Deemer and Minke (1999), however, argued that the Guskey and Passaro (1994) study neglected to examine how the positive and negative orientation of the items might bias the factor structure of the TES. They found that, “By revising the items on the original TES to reflect both positive and negative orientations across internal and external influences on teaching, we suggest that teacher efficacy, as measured by the TES, is actually unidimensional. That is, in the absence of wording confounds, those items appear to tap primarily an internal dimension similar to the personal teaching efficacy factor” (Deemer and Minke, 1999, p. 8).

Bandura (1997) asserted that teacher efficacy is specific to the teaching task and subject matter. For example, a teacher may feel very efficacious when teaching grammar, yet feel little efficacy in the character domain. One explanation for the weaknesses of the

TES, as noted by Deemer and Minke (1999), is that it is a global instrument that tends to “decontextualize efficacy judgments and lack close relationships to specific teaching tasks” (p. 9). Given the complexities of the TES scale, many researchers have modified the scale for context-specific purposes such as science teaching (Riggs & Enochs, 1990) and special education (Coladarci & Breton, 1997). Deemer and Minke (1999) noted, “Instruments that separately assess teachers’ perceptions in specific domains of teaching can be expected to tap the variations in efficacy judgments and increase the predictive power of efficacy perceptions” (p. 9). Although there appear to be problems with the use of the two-factor scale for teacher efficacy in the global sense, the context-specific applications appear to reflect efficacy beliefs in the specific domain more accurately. The current study was designed to apply the teacher efficacy construct to the domain of character development, and subsequently to describe the efficacy beliefs of practicing elementary level teachers regarding character education with the goal of contributing to future teacher training in this area.

Method

Participants

The population sample of this study is a large Midwestern suburban school district chosen primarily for its size and population diversity. Demographic reports of 1998 indicate that the district employed 1824 full-time equivalent teachers. Of these 1824 teachers, 88.0 percent were White, 2.9 percent were Black, 8.2 percent were Hispanic, 0.8 percent were Asian, and 0.1 were Native American. Twenty-three percent of the teachers were male, and 77.0 percent were female. The average years of teaching experience in the

district was 15.5 years, and 52.3 percent of the teachers had earned a master's degree or master degree plus hours.

The demographics for the sample were fairly consistent with and representative of district-level information. Respondents reported that they had spent an average of 15.98 years teaching ($s=10.23$), with 62.4 percent (159) holding a post-baccalaureate degree. Of the 254 respondents, 92.1 percent (234) were female and 7.9 percent (20) were male. The discrepancy in gender is likely to be due to the fact that the sample consisted of elementary teachers, whereas the district level numbers include secondary teachers. Eighty-nine percent of the respondents identified themselves as Caucasian (226), 7.5 percent (19) as Hispanic, 1.2 percent (3) as Asian/Pacific Islander, 0.8 percent (2) as African American, and 0.4 percent (1) as "Other" without clarification. Thus, the number of Caucasians and Asian/Pacific Islanders was slightly over-represented while the number of African Americans is under-represented.

Given the possibility that variables such as age, experience, and education might affect a teacher's efficacy beliefs regarding character education, we requested additional demographic information in order to test the significance of these variables in relation to the findings. Respondents were asked to report their ages by one of six categories: under 25 (4 percent), 25-30 (15.5 percent), 31-40 (19.8 percent), 41-50 (29.8 percent), 51-55 (21.8 percent), and over 55 (9.1 percent). We also requested respondents to report the type of institution from which their undergraduate degree was received in one of three categories: "private, religiously affiliated" (21.0 percent), "private, non-religiously affiliated" (7.5 percent), or "public" (71.4 percent). Finally, respondents reported their grade level teaching assignments as 15 (5.5 percent) kindergarten, 31 (11.5 percent) first

grade, 35 (13.0 percent) second grade, 31 (11.5 percent) third grade, 28 (8.7 percent) fourth grade, 34 (12.6 percent) fifth grade, 24 (8.9 percent) sixth grade, 69 (25.5 percent) reported teaching multiple grade levels. The respondents had an average of 9.17 years ($s=8.35$) teaching at their current grade level.

Instrument

The Character Development Efficacy Belief Instrument (CDEBI), developed and validated by the researchers, was designed to measure teachers' sense of efficacy for character education (See Appendix). The CDEBI consists of 24 statements to which the subject responds on a five point Likert scale. These 24 statements were designed to measure two dimensions of teacher efficacy, Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). The twelve PTE items use the first person referent "I" and are designed to investigate teachers' beliefs about their own abilities regarding various components of character education. The twelve GTE items use the third person referent "teachers." These items are designed to investigate teachers' beliefs about the ability of teachers in general to exert influence over external factors such as students' family background and home environment. Cronbach's index of internal consistency was used to test the reliability of each of these scales. The reliability coefficients for PTE ($\alpha = .8286$) and GTE ($\alpha = .6121$) suggest acceptable evidence of the reliability of these scales (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Although, the CDEBI is contextualized and thus may provide a more valid measure of efficacy judgments than the TES (Pajares, 1997; Bandura, 1997; Deemer & Minke, 1999), the somewhat problematic nature of the PTE and GTE dimensions of teacher efficacy must be considered as a potential limiting factor of this study.

Procedure

The school district office provided a list of elementary schools in the district that included the number of “certified staff” at each school and the names of the principals. A packet was prepared for each of the 36 schools consisting of a cover letter to the principal, and copies of the survey for each of the “certified staff” members at the school. At the request of the district office, the packets were delivered to the district office, which then distributed them to schools. The cover letter to the principal requested that he or she place a copy of the survey in the mailbox of each teacher in the school. The cover letter to the teachers invited them to participate by completing the survey and returning it to an envelope in the school office. The packets were then returned to the district office for return to the researchers. Of the 36 packets that were prepared, 20 of these were returned. The 20 packets that were returned contained 767 surveys originally, of which 270 were completed and returned.

Ideally, we would have preferred to send the survey directly to a sample of the teachers in the district. The district office, however, preferred the above method of distribution. This procedure limited us in our ability to calculate a precise response rate in that the number of “certified staff” for each school included counselors, administrators, and others who were not members of our target population. Thus, the number of surveys created for each school was actually larger than the number of teachers who received the survey. We also are not able to be certain that all schools distributed the survey to their teachers. Therefore, we have calculated an approximate response rate of 35.20 percent based on the number of surveys distributed to the schools that returned the packets. As with all survey research, a response bias must be considered.

Results

The responses to the CDEBI were analyzed using SPSS 9.0. Frequency distributions were generated for descriptive analysis and composite scores were calculated and used in ANOVA comparisons against key demographic variables. The responses to the CDEBI suggest that elementary teachers exhibit high levels of both Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) regarding character education. The mean composite scores of 48.58 ($s = 5.44$) on the PTE scale and 45.34 ($s = 4.17$) on the GTE scale are considered high given the possible range of scores of 12-60. Additionally, with 5.00 representing the highest possible score on each item, six of the PTE items and five of the GTE items had mean item scores above 4.00 and only Item 13 had a mean item score below 3.00.

The distribution of responses to each PTE item, presented in Table 1, shows a high level of efficacy exhibited by respondents with regard to specific components of character education. The PTE items that garnered the most positive response were Item 3, "I am confident in my ability to be a good role model" and Item 1, "I am usually comfortable discussing issues of right and wrong with my students." Similarly, most (92.8 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the negatively phrased Item 6, "I am usually at a loss as to how to help a student be more responsible." The one PTE item that was problematic for respondents was Item 14, "When I have a student who lies regularly, I can usually convince him to stop lying to me." Many of the respondents (37.9 percent) marked uncertain and a relatively large percentage (23.4 percent) disagreed with this statement.

An examination of the distribution of responses to the GTE items, presented in Table 2, shows a similar pattern of high efficacy. Most of the respondents (90.8 percent)

disagreed or strongly disagreed with the negatively phrased Item 10, “Teachers who spend time encouraging students to be respectful of others will see little change in students’ social interaction.” Similarly, 89.1 percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with Item 4, “Teachers are usually not responsible when a child becomes more courteous.” In contrast to the PTE scale though, more of the GTE items appeared problematic for the respondents. A relatively large percentage of respondents (35.4 percent) marked uncertain for Item 12, “If parents notice that their children are more responsible, it is likely because teachers have fostered this trait at school.” Additionally, nearly one-fourth of the respondents marked uncertain for both Item 16, “If responsibility is not encouraged in a child’s home, teachers will have little success teaching students to be more responsible” (24.0 percent uncertain) and Item 20, “Teaching students what honesty is results in students who are more honest” (23.7 percent uncertain). Furthermore, the only item on either scale of the CDEBI that countered the positive efficacy trend was Item 13, “Some students will not become more respectful even if they have had teachers who promote respect.” Most respondents (70.2 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with this negatively phrased item.

Analysis of Variance

An examination of the differences between groups of respondents based on demographic characteristics revealed few significant results. One-way analyses of variance were conducted for both PTE and GTE for the characteristics of age, highest degree earned, type of undergraduate institution, grade level teaching, and years of teaching experience. The results of these analyses, presented in Tables 3 and 4, reveal no statistically significant differences on either scale for age, highest degree, grade level, or

years of experience. Although no significant result was obtained on the PTE scale for type of undergraduate institution, the ANOVA on the GTE scale produced a statistically significant result. Pairwise comparisons using Tukey's HSD were performed to examine the nature of the differences between respondents who attended different types of undergraduate institutions. The post hoc investigation indicated that those respondents who received their undergraduate degree from a private, religiously affiliated college or university scored significantly higher on the GTE scale ($p = .032$) than those who received an undergraduate degree from public institutions.

Discussion

Implications for Character Education

The character education literature typically identifies teachers as a crucial factor in the development of character in youth. The results of this study suggest that elementary teachers feel confident in their abilities to serve as role models, to discuss issues of right and wrong with their students, and to use strategies that might lead to positive changes in students' character. Elementary teachers also seem to believe they can foster traits such as honesty, responsibility, courtesy, compassion, and respect. In general, these results are positive for those promoting character education. This study does reveal, however, a few sources of uncertainty for teachers, as well as some intriguing group differences.

As mentioned earlier, the only item on the CDEBI that resulted in a relatively low level of efficacy was Item 13, "Some students will not become more respectful even if they have had teachers who promote respect." This item elicited 70.2 percent agree or strongly agree responses. This raises some interesting questions. Do teachers believe that some students are hopeless? Do they simply doubt the ability of teachers to reach all students?

Do they doubt the effectiveness of “promoting respect?” Since this item is on the GTE scale, we might conclude that these teachers doubt the ability of all teachers to effectively promote respect in a way that overcomes the lack of respect evident in some students. However, the scale does not appear to be as relevant when this result is compared with a similar item on the PTE scale. Item 14, “When I have a student who lies regularly, I can usually convince him to stop lying to me,” reflects a challenge with a specific trait that is applied to the teacher personally. The relatively high level of uncertainty (37.9 percent) suggests that the respondents may doubt the ability of themselves and teachers in general to positively change the character of some students. These results suggest that teachers feel confident regarding character development when they are dealing with most students in their classrooms, but that they are less comfortable with their ability to redirect a troubled youth.

This result is perhaps not surprising to those who have spent time in elementary schools. At times it does seem that some students are simply unreachable. The efficacy literature would suggest that since these teachers display a high sense of efficacy for character education, they are likely to be highly motivated for the task, as well as persistent in the face of obstacles. We must question, however, whether the global sense of efficacy that teachers seem to exhibit for character education is evident regardless of the type of students with whom the teacher works. It is possible that teachers feel less efficacious when they are teaching precisely the students who need character guidance the most.

Implications for Teacher Education

This study also explored potential differences among groups of respondents based on demographic categories. The results suggest that teachers who earned their undergraduate degrees from private, religiously affiliated colleges or universities have a greater sense of efficacy for character development than those who attended public or secular private institutions. Jones, Ryan, and Bohlin (1998) found that private, religiously affiliated universities tend to have a greater “mission-level” commitment to character, as well as specific program features intended to promote character. For example, “religious institutions are almost twice as likely as public institutions... to report having a community service program which explicitly incorporates character education themes” (Jones, Ryan, & Bohlin, 1998, p. 21). Additionally, they found, “Deans from religious institutions tended to describe character education as extending from a teacher’s own moral character rather than as a technique to be used or issue to be covered. Overall, the religious programs seemed to convey a more clearly defined philosophical basis for addressing character education than did the secular institutions” (p. 25). They conclude that, “The intention here is not to say that secular institutions should adopt a religious perspective in order to teach character education, but rather that much can be gleaned from the more clearly articulated, mission-level commitment of religious institutions to character education” (p. 24). Further research into the nature and effectiveness of programs that exist in private, religiously affiliated institutions may provide a model for the development of character education teacher training in public institutions. It would be useful to learn which types of program features (e.g., community service, student governance, admissions policies, honor codes, ceremonies, or written missions) tend to lead to higher levels of

efficacy. Furthermore, studies that investigate various teachers' character education practice in relation to their efficacy would be beneficial to provide an understanding of the strength of the efficacy-practice connection.

Ryan and Bohlin (1999) stated, "One of the stumbling blocks preventing schools from embracing character education is that few teachers have been prepared for this work. Although there are stirrings within the teacher education community to give character education greater prominence, the great majority of teachers are very unsure of what they can and should do as character educators" (pp. 152-153). The results of this study would seem to contradict the notion that teachers are uncomfortable or uncertain about their abilities to be character educators. The respondents in this study exhibited relatively high levels of efficacy for components of character education. The question of how well prepared these teachers are to engage their students in meaningful character building lessons is one that remains, though. Furthermore, we must ask whether teachers feel greater efficacy for character development when they are teaching students who pose few problems. As Berkowitz (1999) noted, although some teachers have a natural inclination to be character educators, others "find the whole enterprise an unwelcome concept" and "lack the skills, knowledge, and motivation to be character educators" (p. 22). Additional research identifying possible predicting factors that would distinguish those with a "natural inclination" from those who find the "enterprise an unwelcome concept" would be valuable.

This study suggests that most elementary school teachers exhibit high levels of efficacy for character education. Additionally, those teachers who earned their baccalaureate degrees from private, religiously affiliated colleges and universities seem to

be more efficacious regarding character education than those who earned degrees from public and secular institutions. Given these results, more explicit, programmatic and mission-level commitment to character education in teacher education institutions would seem to be a priority for those concerned with fostering character in our youth.

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.
- Bennett, W. J. (1991). Moral literacy and the formation of character. In J. S. Benninga (Ed.), Moral, character, and civic education in the elementary school (pp. 131-138). New York: Teachers College.
- Berkowitz, M. W. (1998). Obstacles to teacher training in character education. Action in Teacher Education, 20, 1-10.
- Berkowitz, M. (1999). Building a good person. In M. M. Williams & E. Schaps (Eds.), Character education: The foundation for teacher education. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership and Association of Teacher Educators.
- Center for the Advancement of Ethics and Character & Character Education Partnership (1999). Teachers as educators of character: Are the nation's schools of education coming up short? Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.
- Coladarci, T. & Breton, W. (1997). Teacher efficacy, supervision, and the special education resource-room teacher. Journal of Educational Research, 90, 230-239.
- Deemer, S. A. & Minke, K. M. (1999). An investigation of the factor structure of the teacher efficacy scale. Journal of Educational Research, 93, 3-10.
- DeRoche, E. F. & Williams, M. M. (1998). Educating hearts and minds: A comprehensive character education framework. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gibson, S. & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, (4), 569-582.

- Glass, G. V. & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). Statistical methods in education and psychology (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Greenawalt, C. E. (1996). Character Education in America. Harrisburg, PA: Commonwealth Foundation for Public Policy Alternatives. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 327)
- Guskey, T. R. & Passaro, P. D. (1994). Teacher efficacy: A study of construct dimensions. American Educational Research Journal, 31, (3), 627-643.
- Haynes, C., Leming, J., Groth, J., Lindquist, T., Lockwood, A., Marshall, P., & Nickell, P. (1997). Fostering civic virtue: Character education in the social studies. Social Education, 61, 225-227.
- Heslep, R. D. (1995). Moral education for Americans. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Jones, E. N., Ryan, K. & Bohlin, K. (1998). Character education and teacher education: How are prospective teachers being prepared to foster good character in students? Action in Teacher Education, 20, 11-28.
- Lickona, T. (1991). Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility. New York: Bantam.
- Lickona, T. (1993). The return of character education. Educational Leadership, 51, 6-11.
- McClellan, B. E., (1992). Schools and the shaping of character: Moral education in America, 1607-present. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies / Social Science Education.
- Milson, A. J. (2000). Social studies teacher educators' perceptions of character education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 28, 144-169.

National Character Counts Week Proclamation of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-301, 108 Stat. 1558-1559 (1994).

Nielsen, L. (1998). New study shows states returning to character education. Character Educator, 6, 9.

Pajares, F. (1997). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66, 543-578.

Raths, L., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. B., (1966). Values and teaching. Columbus: Merrill.

Riggs, I. M. & Enochs, L. G. (1990). Toward the development of an elementary teacher's science teaching efficacy belief instrument. Science Education, 74, 625-638.

Ryan, K. A. (1986). The new moral education. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 228-233.

Ryan, K. & Bohlin, K. E. (1999). Building character in schools: Practical ways to bring moral instruction to life. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68, (2), 202-248.

Vessels, G. G. (1998). Character and community development: A school planning and teacher training handbook. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Wiley, L. S. (1998). Comprehensive character-building classroom: A handbook for teachers. DeBary, FL: Longwood Communications.

Williams, M. M. & Schaps, E. (1999). Character education: The foundation for teacher education. Washington, DC: Character Education Partnership.

Woolfolk, A. E. & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 81-91.

Wynne, E. A. (1991). Character and academics in the elementary school. In J. S. Benninga (Ed.), Moral, character, and civic education in the elementary school (pp. 139-155). New York: Teachers College.

Wynne, E. A. (1997). For-character education. In A. Molnar (Ed.), The construction of children's character: Ninety-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part two (pp. 63-76). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Table 1

Distribution of Responses to Personal Teaching Efficacy Items

CDEBI Item	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. I am usually comfortable discussing issues of right and wrong with my students.	73.3	23.5	1.6	0.8	0.8
2. When a student has been exposed to negative influences at home, I do not believe that I can do much to impact that child's character.	1.2	5.6	11.6	46.2	35.5
3. I am confident in my ability to be a good role model.	77.3	21.9	0.8	0.0	0.0
6. I am usually at a loss as to how to help a student be more responsible.	0.4	3.2	3.6	51.4	41.4
7. I know how to use strategies that might lead to positive changes in students' character.	29.6	56.4	10.0	3.2	0.8
8. I am not sure that I can teach my students to be honest.	1.2	9.2	14.0	47.2	28.4
11. I am able to positively influence the character development of a child who has had little direction from parents.	15.2	61.6	17.2	4.8	1.2
14. When I have a student who lies regularly, I can usually convince him to stop lying to	3.6	34.3	37.9	23.4	0.8

me.					
17. I often find it difficult to persuade a student that respect for others is important.	1.2	9.3	7.3	65.7	16.5
19. I will be able to influence the character of students because I am a good role model.	0.0	1.2	8.9	62.9	27.0
21. I often don't know what to do to help students become more compassionate.	0.4	11.7	17.0	58.3	12.6
23. I am continually finding better ways to develop the character of my students.	19.5	58.9	17.5	2.4	1.6

Note. SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Uncertain, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly

Disagree. Values represent percentages of respondents selecting a given response.

Table 2
Distribution of Responses to General Teaching Efficacy Items

CDEBI Item	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Teachers are usually not responsible when a child becomes more courteous.	0.4	2.4	8.1	53.2	35.9
5. When a student shows greater respect for others, it is usually because teachers have shown respect for students.	30.1	50.2	16.1	2.8	0.8
9. When students demonstrate diligence it is often because teachers have encouraged the students to persist with tasks.	18.1	60.2	15.3	5.6	0.8
10. Teachers who spend time encouraging students to be respectful of others will see little change in students' social interaction.	0.8	4.8	3.6	54.0	36.8
12. If parents notice that their children are more responsible, it is likely because teachers have fostered this trait at school.	3.3	53.7	35.4	7.7	0.0
13. Some students will not become more respectful even if they have had teachers who promote respect.	7.3	62.9	12.1	14.1	3.6
15. If students are inconsiderate, it is often because teachers have not sufficiently modeled how to respect others.	12.1	52.4	18.5	14.5	2.4
	3.7	19.9	24.0	47.2	5.3

16. If responsibility is not encouraged in a child's home, teachers will have little success teaching students to be responsible.	14.7	65.7	17.6	2.0	0.0
18. When a student becomes more compassionate, it is usually because teachers have created caring classroom environments.	18.0	52.7	23.7	5.7	0.0
20. Teaching students what honesty is results in students who are more honest.	0.0	3.3	8.5	50.8	37.4
22. Teachers are often at fault when students are dishonest.	23.4	64.9	9.3	2.0	0.4
24. Teachers who encourage responsibility at school can influence students' level of responsibility outside of school.					

Note. SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, U = Uncertain, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly

Disagree. Values represent percentages of respondents selecting a given response.

Table 3

Analysis of Variance of Personal Efficacy Composite Scores by Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	SS	Df	MS	F	P
Age	132.571	5	26.514	.893	.487
Error	7008.437	236	29.697		
Highest Degree	58.826	2	29.413	.994	.372
Error	7132.534	241	29.596		
Undergraduate Institution	45.211	2	22.605	.789	.465
Error	6851.289	239	28.666		
Grade Level	73.162	4	18.290	.608	.657
Error	7008.271	233	30.078		
Experience	95.557	4	23.889	.802	.525
Error	7089.110	238	29.786		

Table 4

Analysis of Variance of General Teaching Efficacy by Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	SS	Df	MS	F	p
Age	136.330	5	27.260	1.596	.162
Error	3611.440	229	17.081		
Highest Degree	34.135	2	17.068	.980	.377
Error	4076.860	234	17.422		
Undergraduate Institution	115.777	2	57.888	3.473	.033*
Error	3866.819	232	16.667		
Grade Level	92.520	4	23.130	1.318	.264
Error	3966.268	226	17.550		
Experience	26.569	4	6.642	.377	.825
Error	4073.240	231	17.633		

Appendix

Character Development Efficacy Belief Instrument

Character Development Efficacy Belief Instrument (CDEBI)

As you read each of the following statements, please indicate your level of agreement by circling the appropriate letters in the left column.

SA = STRONGLY AGREE
A = AGREE
U = UNCERTAIN
D = DISAGREE
SD = STRONGLY DISAGREE

- | | |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SA A U D SD | 1) I am usually comfortable discussing issues of right and wrong with my students. |
| SA A U D SD | 2) When a student has been exposed to negative influences at home, I do not believe that I can do much to impact that child's character. |
| SA A U D SD | 3) I am confident in my ability to be a good role model. |
| SA A U D SD | 4) Teachers are usually not responsible when a child becomes more courteous. |
| SA A U D SD | 5) When a student shows greater respect for others, it is usually because teachers have effectively modeled that trait. |
| SA A U D SD | 6) I am usually at a loss as to how to help a student be more responsible. |
| SA A U D SD | 7) I know how to use strategies that might lead to positive changes in students' character. |
| SA A U D SD | 8) I am not sure that I can teach my students to be honest. |
| SA A U D SD | 9) When students demonstrate diligence it is often because teachers have encouraged the students to persist with tasks. |
| SA A U D SD | 10) Teachers who spend time encouraging students to be respectful of others will see little change in students' social interaction. |
| SA A U D SD | 11) I am able to positively influence the character development of a child who has had little direction from parents. |

- | | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| SA A U D SD | 12) If parents notice that their children are more responsible, it is likely that teachers have fostered this trait at school. |
| SA A U D SD | 13) Some students will not become more respectful even if they have had teachers who promote respect. |
| SA A U D SD | 14) When I have a student who lies regularly, I can usually convince him to stop lying. |
| SA A U D SD | 15) If students are inconsiderate it is often because teachers have not sufficiently modeled this trait. |
| SA A U D SD | 16) If responsibility is not encouraged in a child's home, teachers will have little success teaching this trait at school. |
| SA A U D SD | 17) I often find it difficult to persuade a student that respect for others is important. |
| SA A U D SD | 18) When a student becomes more compassionate, it is usually because teachers have created caring classroom environments. |
| SA A U D SD | 19) I will be able to influence the character of students because I am a good role model. |
| SA A U D SD | 20) Teaching students what it means to be honest is unlikely to result in students who are more honest. |
| SA A U D SD | 21) I sometimes don't know what to do to help students become more compassionate. |
| SA A U D SD | 22) Teachers cannot be blamed for students who are dishonest. |
| SA A U D SD | 23) I am continually finding better ways to develop the character of my students. |
| SA A U D SD | 24) Teachers who encourage responsibility at school can influence students' level of responsibility outside of school. |

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research effort.



U.S. Department of Education
 Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
 National Library of Education (NLE)
 Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



Reproduction Release
 (Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teacher Efficacy and Character Education	
Author(s): Andrew J. Milson	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Andrew J. Milson, Assistant Professor	
Organization/Address: Department of Teacher Education Northern Illinois University DeKalb, Illinois 60115	Telephone: 815-753-9027	Fax: 815-753-8594
	E-mail Address: amilson@niu.edu	Date: 3/8/2001

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory (Bldg 075)
College Park, Maryland 20742

Telephone: 301-405-7449
Toll Free: 800-464-3742
Fax: 301-405-8134
ericae@ericae.net
<http://ericae.net>

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)