DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 099 SP 040 445

AUTHOR Shechtman, Zipora; Levy, Merav; Egozi, Sarit; Leichtentritt, Judy

TITLE The Life Skills Training Program (LST): Outcomes and Processes in Teacher Training.

SPONS AGENCY Israel Ministry of Education, Jerusalem.
PUB DATE 2001-08-00
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association (109th, San Francisco, CA, August 24-28, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; Group Instruction; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Self Efficacy; Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Conditions; Well Being
IDENTIFIERS *Israel

ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the impact of length of training in the Life Skills Training (LST) program on teachers' perception of the work climate and sense of self-efficacy, identifying process components affecting those outcomes. The LST program is a psychoeducational model of group intervention designed to improve the well-being of children and adults, including teachers. Based on the rationale that group training affects relationships between participating teachers, it was hypothesized that such training would lead to improved perceptions of the work environment. Also, specific training in life skills was expected to enhance teachers' self-efficacy. A representative sample of 342 Israeli elementary teachers from schools that operated LST programs completed feedback questionnaires measuring work climate, self-efficacy, and various teacher training issues. Participants were divided into three groups: teachers who did not receive training, teachers in their first year of training, and teachers in their second year of training. Results indicated that teachers with about 2 years of training had significantly higher scores on measures of self-efficacy and work environment. Only a few of the process variables, such as administrative support, use of books, and contribution to teaching, related to outcomes. (Contains 29 references.) (SM)

The Life Skills Training Program (LST):

Outcomes and Processes in Teacher Training

Zipora Shechtman, Ph.D

Merav Levy and Sarit Egozi

Judy Leichtentritt

The University of Haifa

Faculty of Education

Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Zipora Shechtman

Faculty of Education

The University of Haifa

Haifa, Israel

Fax: 011-972-4-8343547

e-mail: ziporas@construct.haifa.ac.il

This study was supported by a grant from the Israeli Ministry of Education: The Counseling & Psychological Services

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the outcomes and process of teacher training in the LST program in Israel. As this program is administered to students by teachers, teacher training is key to the program's success. Based on the rationale that group training affects relationships between teachers participating together in the group, it was hypothesized that such training would lead to improved perceptions of the work environment. Moreover, specific training in life skills was expected to enhance teachers' self-efficacy. A representive sample of teachers from schools that operate the LST program (n = 342) participated in the study. 214 of them practiced the program and responded to the feedback questionnaire. They were divided into three groups: teachers who did not receive training, those in their first year of training and those in their second year. Results indicated that teachers with about two years of training had significantly higher scores on both measures. Only a few of the process variables, such as administrative support, use of books and contribution to teaching, were found to be related to outcomes. The discussion highlights implications based on teachers' feedback on the training process.

The Life Skills Training Program (LST):

Outcomes and Processes in Teacher Training

The purpose of this study was twofold: (a) to evaluate the outcomes of teacher training in the Life Skill Training (LST) program; and (b) to identify the process components that affect these outcomes. Outcomes of any intervention are important, as they demonstrate its accountability. However, it is even more important to study the process itself, as this leads to suggestions for improved practice (Lusky & Hayes, 2001). As teachers are the key to success of such school programs, the process of their training warrants study as much as outcomes.

The LST program is a psychoeducational model of group intervention, broadly used in schools worldwide (Elias et al., 1997; Gazda et al., 2001; WHO, 1996), including Israel (Shadmi, 1997). The goal of the LST program is to improve the well-being of children and adults, including teachers, helping them to live more satisfactory and fulfilling lives (Elias et al., 1997; Gazda, 1989). Life skills are defined as all the skills and knowledge a person can have, apart from academic skills, that are necessary for effective living (Gazda et al., 2001). Four central areas of necessary competencies have been identified: identity development/purpose in life; problem solving/decision making; interpersonal relationships; and physical health maintenance (Darden, Gazda, & Ginter, 1996; Elias et al., 1997; Gazda et al., 2001). The program in question is geared to the development of these very skills.

The theoretical orientations of the program are both developmental and cognitive. From a developmental perspective, accomplishment of developmental tasks depends on

mastery of life skills – i.e., coping behaviors appropriate to stage and task. A lack of competencies or skills results in dysfunctional behavior. To prevent present and future problem behavior, it is recommended to train children in the basic skills necessary for effective living (Gazda et al., 2001). From a cognitive-behavioral perspective, life skills are learned and can be relearned through training in the areas of deficit. School provides a natural arena for such training (Darden et al., 1996).

Training in life skills is best accomplished in a group, through sharing, modeling, clarifying processes, feedback giving and receiving, and support, and, as in all groups, good practice requires leader training. The skills and personal qualities of the group leader (i.e., the teacher) are of paramount importance to the success of the experience. The array of roles the group leader assumes includes teacher, model, evaluator, motivator and protector. Therefore, teachers who are responsible for carrying out the LST program must be competent to fulfill these roles across skill areas (Gazda et al., 2001).

In Israel, in an effort to include as many students as possible in the LST program, it is supposed to be led by teachers who receive training from trained school counselors. This mode of dissemination by teachers is accepted and has proven to be efficient (WHO, 1996). The teachers in a given school receive training, together with their colleagues, based on a psychoeducational group model, similar to the model they will subsequently use with their students. In the course of the training, they acquire knowledge about the major life skills necessary for school-age children, become acquainted with the written material (books specially prepared for the LST program) and sample the exercises offered on an experiential level.

While this sometimes sounds like a simple task, it may require a change in teachers' attitudes and values beyond mastering the specific program or skills involved. Such change is not easy (Pajares, 1996) and requires sensitive interventions, taking into account teachers' needs and expectations (Fejgin, Ephraty, & Ben-Sira, 1995). Often it requires a dynamic intervention that allows teachers to grow in self-awareness and empathy, as demonstrated by Shechtman (Shechtman, 1994; Shechtman & Or, 1996). Beyond personal growth, teacher training for the LST program also entails group development over time. As with any group, such training needs to go through several developmental stages. First, a climate of trust must be established, including norms of sharing and support. The group then usually goes through a storming phase in which boundaries are set. Only then is the group ready to enter the working stage, in which personal growth can take place, due to cathartic experiences and interpersonal learning in a cohesive group (Corey, 2000; MacKenzie, 1990; Yalom, 1995). The kind of personal and group development needed to prepare good leaders of the LST tends to be time-consuming, suggesting that length of training is an important factor. Indeed, an earlier study suggests that at least two years of training is needed before teachers can master the program (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987).

One of the main characteristics of such training is that it is given to a group of teachers on the same faculty. Due to the therapeutic factors that characterize the group process (e.g., group cohesion, catharsis, interpersonal learning), it is expected that teachers will listen to each other, share personal and professional concerns, openly discuss troubling school issues, and agree more about school rules and regulations. It was therefore expected that teachers will benefit from the dynamics developed in such groups,

particularly in terms of how they perceive their school. In other words, group LST training is expected to improve the perceived work environment, defined as the general psychological mood of the school (Anderson, 1982), reflecting relationships among all people in the organization (Raviv & Reisel, 1990; Schmuck & Schmuck, 1992). The climate of the work environment has been related to teacher satisfaction and teacher burnout, and is reflected in teacher behavior in class (Lumsden, 1998; National Center for Education Statistics, 1997; Verdugo et al., 1997). Taking into account the three central dimensions of the workplace environment identified by Moos (1986) – Relationship, Personal Growth and School Maintenance – it was expected that teacher participation in group training within their faculty would develop closer peer relationships, an increased sense of involvement with school and enhanced feelings of support by the school administration. Furthermore, the open and accepting climate in the group was expected to encourage teachers to fulfill their professional goals with a lessened sense of pressure. Finally, as a result of group discussions about school issues, teachers were expected to be clearer about their school goals and rules.

In addition, the training in a variety of personal and interpersonal skills was expected to help teachers grow in self-efficacy. In the classroom context, self-efficacy can be defined as the level of trust the teacher has that he or she can influence students' functioning and achievements (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Teachers high in self-efficacy have been found to be more motivated to help students who demonstrate learning or behavior difficulties, more optimistic, and more democratic and humanistic in managing their classrooms. In contrast, teachers low in self-efficacy tend to easily give up on students with problems, and their classroom management style

is characterized as angry, authoritarian and punitive (Kipnis, in Bandura, 1997; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Woolfolk, Rosoff, & Hoy, 1990). Administrative support, peer cooperation and recognition, and training have also been found to influence teacher self-efficacy (Elias et al., 1997).

As programs are not always carried out as expected (Lusky & Hayes, 2001), particularly when they are of a large scale (such as LST), it is important to investigate the process of delivery as well as outcomes. Process variables relevant to teacher training in LST program are: the quality of training and supervision, administrative support and mastery of the program.

In light of the above, two hypotheses were suggested. First, length of training will be related to outcomes: the longer the training period, the better the effect on work climate and self-efficacy. Second, process variables will be related to outcomes: the more effective the training process, as reported by teacher feedback, the better the outcomes.

Method

Study Population

The study included 342 teachers from 360 fifth- and sixth-grade classes in 97 schools. The schools were randomly selected from the 600 elementary schools that practice the LST program in Israel; of 100 selected schools, three did not agree to participate, mostly for technical reasons (e.g., the school principal was on leave). These 97 schools represented the whole spectrum of geographical and type of population in the country. School size ranged from 113 to 873 students (mean=428, mode=519); classroom size, from 8 to 39 students (mean=27, mode=29). In regard to SES of the school

population, we relied on an official measure assigned by the Israeli Ministry of Education to all schools. This measure ranges from 50 to 250, where the higher the score, the lower the SES. In the current study population, scores ranged from 104 to 236 (mean=141, mode=138).

In order to measure the relation between length of training and outcomes, the sample of teachers was divided into three groups, based on their answer to a questionnaire item about training (see Instruments): Group 1 = no training; Group 2 = first year of training (about 5-6 sessions); Group 3 = second year of training (about 14-16 sessions).

Training in the LST Program

The LST program is disseminated in Israel by school counselors and/or teachers. According to the original plan, counselors are trained by a group of experts in the program and are expected to provide training to teachers on their faculty in monthly 3-hour meetings. They are also expected to supervise program implementation, when needed. Three books were published, offering written material about the program, including activities suggested for different topics of study and adjusted for specific grade levels. At the training sessions, teachers learn about the different life skills and become acquainted with the written material and various activities offered for classroom operation.

Variables and Measures

Work Climate was measured from an ecological orientation (Anderson, 1982; Moos, 1986) as expressing teacher's perception of their work place. Specifically, it was measured by an abridged version of the Work Environment Scale (Moos, 1986), translated into Hebrew by the first author. The original measure is comprised of three

major dimensions, each of which is further divided into three sub-scales: (1) the Relationships dimension includes Involvement (e.g., "The work is really challenging."), Peer Cohesion (e.g., "People take a personal interest in each other.") and Supervisor Support (e.g., "Supervisors tend to discourage criticism from employees."); (2) the Personal Growth dimension includes Autonomy (e.g., "Few people have any important responsibilities."), Task Orientation (e.g.,"People pay a lot of attention to getting work done.") and Work Pressure (e.g., "There is constant pressure to keep working"); and (3) the School Maintenance dimension includes Clarity of Rules (e.g., "Things are sometimes pretty disorganized."), Control (e.g., "There is strict emphasis on following policies and regulations.") and Innovation (e.g., "Doing things in a different way is valued").

The reported internal consistency ranged from .73 to .86, and test-retest reliability with a one-month interval ranged from .69 to .83. The abridged version used in this study consisted of four questions from each sub-scale, for a total of 36 items. This version was found reliable and valid and correlated highly with the full scale (r = .80) (Moos, 1986). Internal consistency in our sample was .71 for the total scale and ranged from .64 to .76 for the sub-scales. Answers are yes (1) and no (0), and a high score indicates a positive work climate (score range = 0-36).

Self-Efficacy was measured by part of the Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (Woolfolk et al., 1990), translated into Hebrew by the first author. The original scale measures personal teacher efficacy and general teacher efficacy; the one used in this study measures only the former. The scale for personal teacherefficacy is comprised of 10 items, and possible responses range from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree). Sample

items include: "If a student has social difficulties, I know how to help him"; "I know how to deal with an aggressive student".

Reported internal consistency was .81. Validity was measured by comparing the scores with two other scales, showing moderate correlation coefficients (r = .36 and .42). Internal consistency in the present sample was .76.

Process Variables were measured by a Teacher Feedback Questionnaire developed specifically for this study (Shechtman, 2001). First, a group of experts in the LST program suggested items related to successful implementation and training; a total of 46 items were gathered. Next, factor analysis collapsed these items into 14 components. The seven components relevant to teacher training (16 items) were used in the current study.

These included: (1) Counselor Participation, one item ("Does the counselor help you run the program?"); (2) Frequency of Training four items (e.g., "Have you received training in the LST program?"); (3) Use of Books, two items (e.g., "Are you acquainted with the LST written material?"); (4) Contribution to Teaching four items (e.g., "To what extent does the program help you deal with difficult students?"); (5) Contribution to Personal Life, one item ("To what extent do you use the life skills learned in your personal life?"); (6) Administrative Support, two items (e.g., "To what extent does the administration support the program?"); and (7) Quality of Training, two items (e.g., "To what extent did the training help you run the program?").

Possible responses to the item for Counselor Participation were Yes/No, scored 1 and 2, respectively. For Frequency of Training, the score was calculated based on three answers, each of a different range scale: 0 to 5, 1 or 2, 1 to 3. The possible score ranged, therefore, from .65 to 3.33. For Use of Books, the score was calculated based on two

item: 1 or 2, and 1 to 4. Therefore, the possible range was 1 to 3. For the last four components, possible responses fell along a four-point scale, from 1 (very little) to 4 (very much). Mean scores were calculated for each component; the higher the mean, the more that component was perceived to exist.

The Study Process

This study is part of a larger national survey on LST outcomes in Israeli schools. Data for the whole study was gathered from the 97 schools by five graduate students over a period of three months. Teachers filled out the above three questionnaires while their students were busy filling out their own questionnaires.

Outcomes were measured in a Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM) with two levels: school level (including SES and school size) and class level (including size of class). The connection between process and outcomes was measured by Pearson correlation test and by HLM.

Results

Preliminary Results

A preliminary analysis measured the inter-correlation between the sub-scales of the Work Environment Scale, as well as their correlation with self-efficacy. Results indicated low to moderate correlation coefficients among most dimensions of the scale (Table 1). Work pressure was mainly negatively correlated with the other variables, and many of the correlations for administrative control were insignificant. All correlation coefficients are congruent with the literature (Moos, 1986) and justify treatment of each subscale as a unique dimension. Self-efficacy was significantly and positively correlated with only two

work climate dimensions: supervisor support and clarity of rules, and negatively correlated with work pressure.

Insert Table 1 about Here

Outcomes: Work Environment and Self-Efficacy

Scores by teacher group, for all the work climate dimensions and for self-efficacy, are presented in Table 2. Teachers who received about two years of training had higher scores than the other two groups (no training and first year of training) on all subscales except autonomy and work pressure. In the latter case, they had the lowest score; i.e., teachers with the most training felt the least work pressure. It is interesting to note that on several variables, such as self-efficacy, scores tend to decrease in Group 2 (first year of training) before they increase in Group 3 (second year).

Insert Table 2 about Here

The HLM first compared each of the first two groups (1=no training; 2=first year) to Group 3 (second year of training); differences are presented by the t ratio (Table 3). Next, the comparison between Groups 1 and 2 was measured in a contrasting procedure; differences are presented in terms of χ^2. Results indicated the superiority of Group 3 over Group 1 or 2 or both, on most sub-scales. Only one difference was found between Group 1 and Group 2, in regard to clarity. Thus, the progress in work climate and self-efficacy is not linear, but the superior outcomes of the group that received the longest period of training is obvious.

Insert Table 3 about Here

Process Variables

Means for the seven process components, as derived from the Teacher's Feedback Questionnaire, are presented in Table 4. It appears that school counselors often help teachers deliver the program to the students, training is relatively rare and teachers often do not use the LST books. Despite the lack of training, teachers feel pretty goodabout the program and believe that it contributes to their professional and personal lives. Their evaluation of the training quality is quite high; finally, they feel supported by the administration in using the program.

Insert Table 4 about Here

The Connection Between Process and Outcomes

The relations between process and outcomes were measured in two ways: Pearson correlation analysis and HLM. If we look at the frequency of significant correlations (Table 5), several process variables appear to be related to outcomes, in the following order: First is teachers' sense of contribution of the training to their professional lives and their evaluation of the quality of training: both were correlated with six of the other nine variables (including self-efficacy). Next is the use of books and administrative support, both correlated with five of the variables. Frequency of training correlated with three variables; counselor participation, with two variables; and contribution to personal life, with one variable. Interestingly, this last process variable was related to self-efficacy only. Overall, self-efficacy was correlated with only two process variables, contributing to teachers' professional and personal lives. The work climate dimensions most

frequently related to process variables were peer cohesion, clarity of rules and involvement.

Insert Table 5 about Here

The HLM (Table 6) revealed less process variables related to outcomes. Administrative support was found to be related to both peer cohesion and supervisor support; use of books was related to supervisor support and innovation; contribution to teaching was related to task orientation; and counselor participation was related to clarity of rules. These relations were evident in the correlation analysis as well, but with less frequency.

Insert Table 6 about Here

Discussion

The study examined the impact of the length of training in the LST program on teacher's perception of the work climate and their sense of self-efficacy. Perception of work climate is very much dependent on relationships among people in the school and their experiences with other faculty members. It makes sense to expect improved perceptions following group training in an open and accepting climate, due to the dynamics established in such groups. Such improvement is important considering the impact the work environment has on teacher performance in the classroom (Lumsden, 1998; National Center for Education Statistics, 1997; Verdugo et al., 1997), as well as on their success in implementing the LST program (Elias et al., 1997). Moreover, the

acquisition of life skills through training was expected to increase teachers' sense of self-efficacy, thus further improving their classroom performance (Lumsden, 1998).

Outcomes

Results based on the Work Environment Scale suggest that about two years of training are needed to change teachers' perception of the work climate. Outcomes for the group in its first year of training were not different from the group with no training, except for clarity of rules. However, the group with two years of training was significantly higher than the first or second group, and sometimes higher than both. These results are in congruence with the literature. Hord and colleagues (1987), for example, suggest that teachers need at least two years of training, because at the beginning they treat the program with caution or even suspicion, and only later do they accept the program and actually apply the skills. The lack of gains in the group of teachers in their first year of training may be attributed to the short-term intervention, consisting of about 5-6 monthly meetings. This is certainly not long enough to create change in the group climate. Groups go through stages of development, and at the fifth or sixth session they may still be stuck at the resistance stage or just past it (Corey, 2000; MacKenzie, 1990; Yalom, 1995). Interestingly, work pressure decreased following training for both groups (2 and 3), an important finding for teachers' sense of well-being.

Self-efficacy was improved in the second year of training in an accepting and supportive climate, in congruence with previous results (Coladarci & Breton, 1997). This may be attributed to training in specific life skills, as well as learning through the group process, including modeling, clarifying processes and feedback (Bandura, 1997; Kruger, 1997; Pajares, 1996). This result has important implications, as selfefficacy affects

teacher performance and student gains (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). Moreover, teachers with low self-efficacy have been found to be more authoritarian, angry and punitive (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990; Woolfolk et al., 1990).

In the LST program, teachers need to be able to serve as a model, motivator, facilitator and trainer, all of which are skills that must be acquired and take time to cultivate. Insufficient training may even be harmful, as it can lower the teacher's self-confidence. Indeed, we observed a tendency towards reduced self-efficacy in the first-year group and then an increase in the second-year group.The practical implication of this finding is to allow enough time in planning a training program so that positive gains can be expected and no harm is caused by premature termination.

Process

How does the process inform us about improving practice, a major goal in any intervention evaluation (Lusky & Hayes, 2001)? First, the information gathered from teachers' feedback suggests that counselors are quite active in program implementation. In addition, the frequency of training was very low: One third of the teachers never received training, either because they were new to the school and missed the group training, or because the school did not have a counselor at that time; it is presumed that such teachers learned about the program content independently, from the written material. Another third had received limited training at the time the study was conducted. In other words, only one third of all these teachers received more than one year of training. Thus, although teachers evaluate the program positively, and perceive the school administration as supportive of the program, training is insufficient. This alone may hamper success of the intervention for teachers.

The connection found between process and outcomes bears further implications for improvement. Of the process components that were related to outcomes, some are relatively infrequent in the training process; the use of the written material is one such example. Moreover, the frequent correlation of contribution to teaching with outcomes suggests that a balance should be maintained between process intervention and learning. Without abandoning the goal of improving the work climate through dynamic groups based on experiencing, training should also address a need for learning that is practically relevant and that provides tools which can be used immediately in the classroom. While the focus is on achieving change in teachers' attitudes and behavior (Shechtman, 1994; Shechtman & Or, 1996), teachers may exhibit resistance to process intervention if they feel they are wasting time. Thus, an effort must be made to ensure that teachers appreciate the gains to be had from the intervention.

In sum, the program was effective in generating improved perception of the work climate and in increasing self-efficacy, but this improvement required about two years of intervention. Several process variables were identified which may accelerate gains; understanding them may improve the impact of training.

Practical Implications

Several practical implications may be drawn from the information gathered based on teachers' feedback, which may indeed help to improve practice:

- Increase frequency of training. The availability of training was extremely low in this study, yet it was positively correlated with several of the variables studied. To increase gains in work climate, it is recommended to increase training for teachers.

- Increase familiarity with the books. The use of written material in this study was relatively low, yet it was correlated with several outcomes. These books serve as guides to the teachers, and using the written material secures the validity of program implementation. Hence, more efforts should be given to training teachers in use of these materials.
- Ensure administrative support. In this study, administrative support was quite good. It was frequently correlated with work climate variables. It is important to secure administrative support before and throughout the process of program implementation, to ensure its smooth functioning.
- Make the training effective for the teachers' professional lives. Teachers need to feel that they learn and grow professionally. They often expect to learn applicable methods and educational tools, which they can immediately apply in their classrooms. Related to this is making sure that thedelivery of training is effective and appreciated by teachers. Usually, training is provided by the school counselor, who needs to be well informed and trained to be able to deliver the program effectively.

In conclusion, no matter how good a program is,appropriate training of group leaders is crucial. Most of our study population simply did not receive sufficient training in LST. When limited guidance is given, there is even a tendency for results to be less positive than when there is no training at all. As our findings have shown, to secure positive outcomes, it is imperative to invest enough time in training. Appropriate supervision and long-term training are essential if teachers and students are to reap the full benefits of the LST program.

References

Anderson, C. S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 368-420.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman & Company.

Coladarci, T., & Breton, W. A. (1997). Teacher efficacy, supervision, and the special education research-room teachers. The Journal of Educational Research, 90, 230-239.

Corey, G. (2000). Theory and practice of group counseling. Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole.

Darden, A. D., Gazda, G. M., & Ginter, E. J. (1996). Life skills and mental health counseling. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 18, 134-141.

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M., Kessler, R., Schwab-Stone, M. E., & Shriver, T.P. (1997). Promoting social and emotional learning: Guidelines for educators. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fejgin, N., Ephraty, N., & BenSira, D. (1995). Work environment and burnout of physical education teachers. Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 15, 64-78.

Gazda, M. (1989). Group counseling: A developmental approach (4th ed.) Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gazda, G. M., Ginter, E. J., & Horne, A. M. (2001).Group counseling and group psychotherapy. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.

Hord, S. U., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., Hall, G. E. (1987) Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kruger, J. L. (1997). Social support and self-efficacy in problem solving among teacher assistance teams and school staff. Journal of Educational Research, 90, 164-168.

Lumsden, L. (1998). Teacher morale. Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 120, 2-5.

Lusky, M. B., & Hayes, R. L. (2001) Collaborative consultation and program evaluation. Journal of Counseling and Development, 79, 26-38.

MacKenzie, R. K. (1990). Classics in group psychotherapy. Washington, D.C.: American Group Psychotherapy Association.

Moos, R. H. (1986). Work Environment Scale (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). Job satisfaction among America's teacher: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics and teacher compensation. Washington, D.C.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. Review of Educational Research, 66, 543-578.

Raviv, A., & Reisel, E. (1990). Teachers and students: Two different perspectives; Measuring social climate in the classroom. American Educational Research Journal, 27 141-157.

Schmuck, R. A., & Schmuck, P. A. (1992).Group processes in the classroom. Dubuque, IA: Brown.

Shadmi, H. (1997). Life skills. School Counselor Journal, 7, 6-8 (Hebrew).

Shechtman, Z. (1994). Challenging teacher beliefs about classroom diversity via counseling methods: A descriptive study. Teaching Education, 6, 29-40.

Shechtman, Z. (2001). Teacher Feedback Questionnaire on LST program. Haifa University, Haifa, Israel. (In Hebrew).

Shechtman, Z., & Or, A. (1996). Applying counseling methods to challenge teacher beliefs with regard to classroom diversity and mainstreaming: An empirical study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 12, 137-147.

Verdugo, R. R., Greenberg, N. M., Henderson, R. D., Uribe, O., & Schneider, J. M. (1997). School governance regimes and teachers' job satisfaction: Bureaucracy, legitimacy, and community. Journal of Educational Administration Quarterly, 33, 2866.

WHO. (1996). Life skills education planning for research. Washington, DC: World Health Organization, Division of Mental Health and Prevention of Substance Abuse.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Perspective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 81-98.

Woolfolk, A. E., Rosoff, B. & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about managing students. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6, 137-148.

Yalom, I. D. (1995). The theory and practice of group psychotherapy. New York. Basic Books.

Table 1

Correlation Coefficients Among All Dependent Variables (n = 342)

	Peer Cohesion	Supervisor Support	Autonomy	Task Orientation	Work Pressure	Clarity	Control	Innovation	Self-Efficacy
Involvement	.57***	.36***	.27***	.47***	.03	.30***	.18***	.36***	.06
Peer Cohesion		.45***	.25***	.34***	-.05	.27***	.08	.36***	.07
Supervisor Support			.24***	.29***	-.11*	.34***	.03	.43***	.17**
Autonomy				.24***	.04	.20***	.00	.29***	-.04
Task Orientation					.10*	.28***	.18***	.44***	.09
Work Pressure						-.19***	.11*	.00	-.11*
Clarity							.26**	.24***	.16**
Control								.06	.07
Innovation									.04

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Means and SD for the Work Environment Scale and Teacher Self-Efficacy

		Group 1 No Training (n=65)	Group 2 1st Yr of Training (n=84)	Group 3 2 Yrs of Training (n=65)
Involvement	**M**	1.76	1.76	1.86
	SD	0.25	0.25	0.20
Peer Cohesion	**M**	1.67	1.76	1.78
	SD	0.29	0.27	0.25
Supervisor Support	**M**	1.71	1.67	1.77
	SD	0.25	0.28	0.27
Autonomy	**M**	1.67	1.74	1.71
	SD	0.19	0.23	0.23
Task Orientation	**M**	1.89	1.86	1.92
	SD	0.19	0.21	0.18
Work Pressure	**M**	1.85	1.80	1.73
	SD	0.17	0.24	0.25
Clarity	**M**	1.56	1.67	1.76
	SD	0.29	0.27	0.25
Control	**M**	1.69	1.75	1.80
	SD	0.24	0.22	0.18
Innovation	**M**	1.84	1.80	1.90
	SD	0.23	0.26	0.22
Self-Efficacy	**M**	2.95	2.84	3.03
	SD	0.37	0.35	0.33

Note: Reduced n is due to missing data from teachers who did not practice the program and therefore did not respond on the feedback questionnaire.

Table 3

Results of HLM for Work Climate Dimensions and Self-Efficacy

Group	Coefficient	SE	df	t ratio	χ^2
		Involvement			
Intercept	2.972184	0.670212	85	4.43***	
1 vs. 3	0.445200-	0.331559	203	-1.34	
2 vs. 3	0.859438-	0.295123	203	-2.91**	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 2.37$
		Peer Cohesion			
Intercept	-0.071829	0.491078	85	-0.14	
1 vs. 3	0.610991-	0.235658	205	-2.59**	
2 vs. 3	0.392174-	0.222111	205	-1.76[a]	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 1.13$
		Supervisor Support			
Intercept	1.423815	0.508416	85	2.80**	
1 vs. 3	-0.372980	0.248290	203	-1.50	
2 vs. 3	0.546507-	0.226916	203	2.40-*	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 0.68$
		Task Orientation			
Intercept	1.784313	0.715715	85	2.49*	
1 vs. 3	-0.417893	0.355916	204	1.17-	
2 vs. 3	0.610400-	0.321725	204	1.89-[a]	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 2.81$
		Work Pressure			
Intercept	0.401579	0.512850	85	0.78	
1 vs. 3	0.801782	0.253787	205	3.15**	
2 vs. 3	0.468774	0.223253	205	2.10*	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 1.89$

Clarity					
Intercept	1.199247	0.484818	85	2.47*	
1 vs. 3	0.988110-	0.233753	204	4.22-***	
2 vs. 3	0.409200-	0.220443	204	-1.85[a]	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 8.48$**
Control					
Intercept	0.753904	0.479652	85	1.57	
1 vs. 3	-0.541530	0.229509	203	-2.36*	
2 vs. 3	0.204379-	0.221677	203	0.92-	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 2.78$
Innovation					
Intercept	1.259590	0.563373	85	2.23*	
1 vs. 3	0.636602-	0.278090	205	2.28-*	
2 vs. 3	0.637293-	0.257466	205	-2.47*	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 0.00$
Self-Efficacy					
Intercept	3.059550	0.134417	85	22.76***	
1 vs. 3	0.086521-	0.064426	205	1.34-	
2 vs. 3	0.186079-	0.060423	205	3.08-*	
1 vs. 2					$\chi^2(1) = 0.09$

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$; [a] = .08

Table 4

Process Components Based on Teacher Feedback (means and SD)

Components	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Counselor Participation	1.55	.50	1.00	2.00
Frequency of Training	1.18	.65	0.65	3.33
Use of Books	1.85	.66	1.00	3.00
Contribution to Teaching	2.67	.75	1.00	4.00
Contribution to Personal Life	2.82	.90	1.00	4.00
Administrative Support	2.87	.82	1.00	4.00
Quality of Training	2.82	.87	1.00	4.00

Table 5

Correlation Coefficients Between Process Components and Outcomes (n = 141-182)

(only significant results are presented)

	Counselor Particip.	Frequency of Training	Use of Books	Contrib. to Teaching	Admin. Support	Qual. of Training	Contrib. to Personal Life
Involvement		.14*		.21**	.25**	.18*	
Cohesion	.18*		.14*	.18*	.31***	.19*	
Support			.19**	.28***			
Autonomy				.18*			
Task Orient.			.14*	.30***		.21*	
Pressure		-.17*					
Clarity	.24***	.29***	.28***		.30***	.23**	
Control		.21***			.23***	.27**	
Innovation			.19**		.29***	.19*	
Self-Efficacy				.23**			.23**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Table 6

Results of HLM for Dependent Variables (only significant results are presented)

	Coefficient	SE	df	t
Peer Cohesion				
Administrative support	0.761322	0.226325	99	4.18***
Supervisor Support				
Use of books	0.573616	0.275390	97	2.08*
Administrative support	0.866676	0.235159	97	3.69***
Task Orientation				
Contribution to teaching	0.757312	0.401410	98	2.05*
Clarity				
Counselor participation	0.596124	0.265465	99	2.26*
Innovation				
Use of books	0.852001	0.273717	97	3.11**
Self-Efficacy				
Quality of training	0.104647	0.054184	99	1.93*

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

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: The Life Skills Training Program (LST): Outcomes and Proess in Teacher Training	
Author(s): Zipora Shechtman, Merav Levy, Sarit Egozi, & Judy Leichtentritt	
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 each document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified documents, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

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) 1	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) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ☑	Level 2A ☑	Level 2B ☑
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 these documents 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.

Sign here, → please	Signature: Zipora Shechtman	Printed Name/Position/Title: Zipora Shechtman, Ph.D. Uni. professor
	Organization/Address:	Telephone: 04-8249722 FAX: 04-8343547
		E-Mail Address: ziporas@construct.haifa.ac.il Date: Dec. 17. 01

APA '01

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 these documents from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of these documents. (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 Counseling & Student Services
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
201 Ferguson Building
PO Box 26171
Greensboro, NC 27402-6171