Professional Development for Character Education

An Evaluation of Teachers' Sense of Efficacy for Character Education

ALICE T. LEDFORD
Fort Bend Independent School District

Abstract

Today's teachers and administrators must educate students for character. But, teachers are inconsistently prepared for this challenge. This descriptive study examined teachers' sense of efficacy for character education among pre-K–12 teachers based on their type of character education training. The Character Education Efficacy Belief Instrument (CEEBI) was used to collect data at a southwestern school district of more than 61,000 students and more than 3,500 teachers. By employing analyses of variance (ANOVAs), this study examined the relationship between the teachers' Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) scores and the following teacher characteristics: type of institution from which teacher certification was received, school setting, type of character education training received, and years of teaching experience. The results of this study offer opportunities to understand how to prepare teachers to become character educators. The implications of this study on character education, professional development, pre-service training, and future research are explored.

Introduction

School districts are often in the position of providing teachers with skills necessary to be able to implement character education opportunities for students. Districts accomplish this task by providing professional development opportunities

for teachers. Teachers require this training in order to renew teacher certification and to provide them with the necessary tools to implement character education initiatives in the classroom.

In order to address the professional development needs of teachers, it is important to understand the concept of professional development. The concept of professional development has a number of definitions; however, most definitions involve the idea that professional development is a continuous process. In addition, Guskey (2002) argues, "high-quality professional development is a central component in nearly every modern proposal for improving education" (p. 57).

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) provides a comprehensive definition of professional development, which lists all of the activities that are included under the term professional development. One component of this definition is under section A (iii). Professional development includes activities that "give teachers, principals, and administrators the knowledge and skills to provide students with the opportunity to meet challenging state academic content standards and student academic achievement standards" (NCLB, 2001). As professional development in the area of character education is essential to the success of character education programs, the findings of this study guide the process for training teachers as character educators.

Method

This descriptive study was conducted through the use of survey research. It investigated the characteristics of teachers and the relationship between those characteristics and participants' Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) beliefs as measured by Milson and Mehlig's (2002) Character Education Belief Instrument (CEEBI).

The setting for this study was a district in southwestern United States, which is accredited by the Southern Association of College and Schools. The district had an enrollment of more than 61,500 students from diverse backgrounds, representing countries from around the world. These students and their families speak as many as 82 different languages and dialects. At the time of the study, there were 9 high schools, 3 specialized schools, 11 middle schools, and 36 elementary schools in the district with additional schools planned to accommodate the rapid growth in the area. Each school consists of qualified, certified teachers, administration, and staff.

The survey research involved all 3,585 elementary, middle, and high school teachers in this district in which women comprise 79.3% of the teachers. Men comprise 20.7% of the teachers. The ethnic breakdown of teachers was as follows: 21.6% African American, 7.2% Hispanic, 68.2% White, 2.9% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 0.2% Native Americans of the district's teacher population. On average, these teachers have 10.9 years of experience. The majority of teachers or 75.5% hold a bachelor's degree, 22.1% hold a master's degree, 0.6% hold a doctorate, while 1.7% hold no degree.

All of the full-time teachers in the district were offered the opportunity to participate in this study by either completing the survey during a faculty meeting or receiving a survey in their campus mailbox. A total of 2,539 teachers or 70.8% of teachers completed the survey. The demographics of participants in this study were similar to the district's overall demographic make-up as 80.1% of participants were female and 18.2% were male. A small percentage, 1.7%, did not indicate their gender. The ethnicities of the teachers in sample were also similar to the demographics of the population. The participants appear to be representative of the district's overall teacher population by ethnicity and gender.

Instrumentation

The survey used in this study was The Character Education Efficacy Belief Instrument (CEEBI), which was developed by Milson and Mehlig (2001). This instrument contains 24 statements to which the subjects responded on a 5-point, forced-choice Likert scale. According to Milson (2002), "the items were based on the two dimensions of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) teacher efficacy scale (TES): Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE).

Procedures for Data Collection

Counselors distributed and collected surveys during faculty meetings. Some campuses were unable to comply with the request to distribute and collect surveys at a faculty meeting. All campuses with the exception of one participated in this study. Upon completion of the surveys at each campus, the presenters were instructed to return completed and extra surveys to the researcher in the return envelope that was provided. Although the instructions clearly indicated that the survey was two-sided, some participants completed only one side. Surveys that were not completed on both sides were eliminated from the study ($N = 59$).

Operational Definitions of Variables

The primary variables in this study are personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching (GTE) for teaching character education. In addition, the teacher characteristics analyzed were: type of institution from which certificate was earned (public college/university; private, non-religiously affiliated college/university; private religiously affiliated college/university; alternative certification, not through college/university); school setting (elementary, middle, high school); type of character education training received (undergraduate coursework that addressed character education, graduate coursework that addressed character education, attended a character education session at a conference, attended a staff development workshop on character education, other, no training); and years of teaching experience.

Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE). Personal teaching efficacy (PTE) is the belief a teacher holds about his or her own teaching effectiveness (Bandura, 1986).

General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). General teaching efficacy is a teacher's perception that instruction/teaching can produce learning. The teacher's belief is about the general nature of teaching as an effective means of producing learning regardless of outside circumstances (Bandura, 1986).

Type of institution from which certificate was earned. Participants chose to respond as having attended: public college/university; private, non-religiously affiliated college/university; private religiously affiliated college/university; or alternative certification, not through college/university.

Assigned school setting. Assigned school setting was the teachers' teaching assignment: elementary (pre-K through Grade 5), middle school (Grades 6 through 8), or high school (Grades 9 through 12).

Type of character education training received. Teachers chose from the following: undergraduate coursework that addressed character education, graduate coursework that addressed character education, attended a character education session at a conference, attended a staff development workshop on character education, other, or no training.

Number of years of teaching experience. Participants may choose from the following list of choices: This is my first year teaching, 1–3 years, 4–6 years, 7–10 years, 10–15 years, 15–20 years, 20–25 years, 25–30 years, or more than 30 years.

In addition to the aforementioned teacher characteristics that were examined, descriptive data were also presented for other teacher characteristics such as gender, grade level, special education versus regular education teachers, and subject area taught.

Research Question

Is there a difference in teachers' sense of personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and teachers' sense of general teaching efficacy (GTE) for teaching character education among certified teachers based on type of training in character education?

Procedures for Data Analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data collected in this survey research effort (see Appendix A). Descriptive statistics were used to analyze each of the demographic responses.

Upon completion of data collection, groups were established by teacher characteristic. The type of institution from which teachers received their undergraduate training was in four groups: public college/university; private, non-religiously affiliated college/university; private religiously affiliated college/university; alternative certification, not through college/university. Responses to the question of assigned school setting resulted in three groups (elementary school, middle school,

and high school). The question of type of character education training received first resulted in two groups: those who responded as having received character education training and those who received no character education training. Participants who responded as having received character education training then responded as to whether that training was: undergraduate coursework that addressed character education, graduate coursework that addressed character education, attended a character education session at a conference, attended a staff development workshop on character education, or other training. Participants were allowed to choose all that applied to them. For each response, there were two groups: those who had the type of training indicated and those who did not. For each of these pairs, *t*-tests were conducted to determine statistical significance. In addition, ANOVAs were conducted for PTE and GTE for the following five groups:

1. no training;
2. university-based coursework (undergraduate and graduate);
3. non-university based training (conference session, staff development workshop);
4. some combination of university-based and non-university based work; and
5. all four types of work.

Number of years of teaching experience responses resulted in nine groups as there were nine options from which participants may choose (this is my first year teaching, 1–3 years, 4–6 years, 7–10 years, 11–15 years, 16–20 years, 21–25 years, 25–30 years, more than 30 years). As there were more than two groups, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted for PTE items and then for GTE items for years of teaching experience.

In addition to the 24 survey questions, participants were asked to provide additional information that gives the researcher more understanding of their individual characteristics: gender; type of institution from which certificate was earned (public college/university; private, non-religiously affiliated college/university; private religiously affiliated college/university; alternative certification, not through college/university); school setting (elementary, middle or high); and total years of teaching experience.

Results

Participants were asked to report about their participation in character education training. The first part of the item asked for a response of "yes" or "no" to the question: "Have you received any coursework or staff development in character education?" A *t*-test was conducted in order to analyze the responses to this dichotomous item which revealed $t = 7.50$, $df = 2490$, $d = 0.32$. Participants who had participated in character education training ($N = 1696$, $M = 47.30$, $SD = 5.57$) compared to those who had not participated in character education

training (N = 796, M = 45.49, SD = 5.73) yielded statistical significance, $p < .001$. However, practical significance was $d = 0.32$.

A *t*-test comparing GTE between participants who had participated in character education training (N = 1696, M = 42.60, SD = 4.77) and those who had not participated in character education training (N = 796, M = 41.50, SD = 4.83) revealed $t = 5.34$, $df = 2490$, $p < .001$ for PTE. However, the effect size was not practically significant, $d = 0.23$.

For participants who indicated that they had training in character education, there were further options from which to choose indicating the exact type of training received: participation in undergraduate coursework in character education, graduate coursework that addressed character education, attended a character education session at a conference, attended a staff development workshop on character education, or other training. A *t*-test for unpaired samples was conducted that yielded statistical significance for PTE between participants who indicated that they had undergraduate coursework in character education (N = 410, M = 48.76, SD = 5.40) versus those who had no undergraduate coursework in character education (N = 2129, M = 46.31, SD = 5.66) revealed $t = 8.08$, $df = 2537$ and $p < .001$ for undergraduate coursework in character education. The effect size was $d = 0.43$. Thus, participation in undergraduate coursework in character education has both statistical and practical significance for PTE.

A *t*-test for unpaired samples was conducted that yielded statistical significance for GTE between participants who indicated that they had undergraduate coursework in character education (N = 410, M = 43.38, SD = 4.74) versus those who had no undergraduate coursework in character education (N = 2129, M = 42.62, SD = 4.81) revealed $t = 5.25$, $df = 2537$ and $p < .001$ for undergraduate coursework in character education. However, in this case the effect size resulted in $d = 0.28$, which indicated very little practical significance.

The results obtained from analysis of PTE by participation in graduate coursework in character education (N = 248, M = 48.09, SD = 5.85) as compared to no graduate coursework in character education (N = 2291, M = 46.56, SD = 5.65) yielded $t = 4.05$, $df = 2537$, and a statistically significant difference of $p < .001$. However, the effect size of $d = 0.26$ indicates that there was very little practical significant difference on this item for PTE. These results seem to indicate that whether or not the participant received graduate coursework in character education, there was little impact on personal teaching efficacy.

The results obtained from analysis of GTE by participation in graduate coursework in character education (N = 248, M = 43.02, SD = 5.15) as compared to no graduate coursework in character education (N = 2291, M = 42.16, SD = 4.78) using a *t*-test for unpaired samples yielded $t = 2.68$, $df = 2537$ and a statistically significant difference of $p < .008$. However, the effect size of $d = 0.17$ indicated that there was very little practical significant difference on this item for GTE. These results seem to indicate that whether or not the participant received graduate coursework in character education, there was little impact on GTE.

Participants who indicated that they had received training in character education were offered the opportunity to further indicate whether or not they had participated in a character education session at a conference, resulting in two choices: yes or no. A *t*-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in PTE between participants who had participated in a character education session at a conference ($N = 515$, $M = 48.8$, $SD = 5.82$) and those who had not participate in a character education session at a conference ($N = 2024$, $M = 46.36$, $SD = 5.60$). The results obtained from analysis using a *t*-test of personal teaching efficacy by participation in a session in character education at a conference revealed $t = 6.17$, $df = 2537$ and statistical significance of $p < .001$, but little practical significance, $d = 0.30$.

A *t*-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in GTE between participants who had participated in a character education session at a conference ($N = 515$, $M = 42.93$, $SD = 5.02$) and those who had not participate in a character education session at a conference ($N = 2024$, $M = 42.06$, $SD = 4.76$). The results obtained from analysis using a *t*-test of personal teaching efficacy by participation in a session in character education at a conference revealed $t = 3.63$, $df = 2537$ and statistical significance of $p < .001$, but little practical significance, $d = 0.17$.

A *t*-test for unpaired samples was conducted for PTE of participants who had participated in a staff development workshop for character education ($N = 1240$, $M = 47.29$, $SD = 5.66$) or had not participated in a staff development workshop in character education ($N = 1299$, $M = 46.15$, $SD = 5.66$). The results of the *t*-test for personal teaching efficacy by participation in staff development workshop in character education resulted $t = 5.10$, $p < .001$, practical significance of $d = 0.20$.

Similarly, a *t*-test for unpaired samples was conducted for GTE of participants who had participated in a staff development workshop for character education ($N = 1240$, $M = 42.67$, $SD = 4.79$) or had not participated in a staff development workshop in character education ($N = 1299$, $M = 41.83$, $SD = 4.82$). The results of the *t*-test for personal teaching efficacy by participation in staff development workshop in character education resulted $t = 4.44$, $p < .001$, and practical significance of $d = 0.18$.

Analysis of personal teaching efficacy by whether the participant has participated in other character education training ($N = 145$, $M = 48.11$, $SD = 5.59$) or has not participated in other character education training ($N = 2394$, $M = 46.62$, $SD = 5.68$) using a *t*-test for unpaired samples yielded $t = 3.07$, $df = 2537$, $p = .002$ and $d = 0.26$.

Analysis of general teaching efficacy by whether the participant has participated in other character education training ($N = 145$, $M = 42.62$, $SD = 4.77$) or has not participated in other character education training ($N = 2394$, $M = 42.22$, $SD = 4.82$) using a *t*-test for unpaired samples yielded $t = 0.98$, $df = 2537$, $p = .326$ and $d = 0.26$.

PTE by Character Education Using a One-Way ANOVA

As teacher efficacy for teaching character education was the primary focus of this study, participants' participation in character education was also examined

through a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Similarly to Milson (2003), participants were divided into five groups:

1. no training;
2. university-based coursework (undergraduate and graduate);
3. non-university based training (conference session or staff development workshop);
4. some combination of university-based and non-university based work; and
5. all four types of work.

For the purposes of the analysis, the groups were coded as follows: Group 1: Participants who had no training; Group 2: Participants who had undergraduate coursework only, graduate coursework only, both undergraduate and graduate coursework; Group 3: Conference session training only, staff development workshop only, both conference session and staff development, or other; Group 4: Undergraduate coursework and conference session, undergraduate coursework and staff development, undergraduate coursework, graduate coursework, and conference session, undergraduate coursework, graduate coursework, and staff development, undergraduate coursework, conference session, and staff development, graduate coursework and conference session, graduate coursework and staff development, graduate coursework, conference session, and staff development; and Group 5: Undergraduate coursework, graduate coursework, conference session, staff development. No group was created for participants who indicated that they had received other training, as there were very few teachers who gave this response ($N = 145$).

Results obtained from analysis of personal teaching efficacy by character education training using a one-way analysis of variance ($N = 2539$) revealed statistical significance of $p < .001$. As statistical significance was found, pair-wise comparisons were conducted using Tukey's test for honestly significant difference. The comparison between PTE score of participants with no training in character education and PTE score of participants with university-based training resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance of $d = 0.38$. PTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with non-university-based training (conference session or staff development workshop) resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ but no practical significance, $d = 0.21$. PTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with university (undergraduate and graduate) and non-university-based training resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance of $d = 0.56$.

Similarly, PTE scores of participants with no training in character education compared to those of participants with all four types of training resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance of $d = 0.65$. Neither statistical significance, $p = .119$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.17$, were found between PTE scores of participants with university-based training compared to those with non-university-based training. Similarly, neither statistical

Table 1. Personal Teaching Efficacy by Character Education Training Using a One-Way Analysis of Variance (N = 2539)

Analysis of Variance					
	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Squares*	*F*	*p*
Training	2931.23	4	732.81	23.47	< .001
Error	79126.76	2534	31.23		

Means and Standard Deviations			
Training	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*
No Training	940	45.60	5.69
University-Based Training	237	47.78	5.31
Non-University-Based Training	1063	46.82	5.51
University and Non-University-Based Training	252	48.85	5.75
All Four Types of Training	47	49.43	5.76
Total	2539	46.71	5.69

Pairwise Comparisons			
Comparison	*Difference*	*p*	*d*
No Training < University-Based Training	2.17	< .001	0.38
No Training < Non-University-Based Training	1.22	< .001	0.21
No Training < University and Non-University-Based	3.24	< .001	0.56
No Training < All Four Types of Training	3.72	< .001	0.65
University-Based > Non-University-Based	0.96	.119	0.17
University-Based < University and Non-University-Based	1.07	.214	0.19
University-Based < All Four Types of Training	1.65	.346	0.29
Comparison	*Difference*	*p*	*d*
Non-University-Based < University and Non-University-Based	2.03	< .001	0.35
Non-University-Based < All Four Types of Training	2.61	.015	0.45
University and Non-University-Based < All Four Types	0.58	.966	0.10

significance, $p = .214$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.19$, were found between PTE scores for participants with university-based training compared to participants with university and non-university-based training, $d = 0.19$.

A comparison of PTE scores for participants with university-based training to participants with both university and non-university-based training resulted in

no statistical significance, $p = .214$, and no practical significance, $d = 0.19$. Similarly, neither statistical significance, $p = .346$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.29$, were found for PTE scores of participants with university-based and those with all four types of training (see Table 1).

The results obtained from analysis of personal teaching efficacy by character education training revealed the highest PTE mean scores for teachers who experienced all four types of character education training, $M = 49.43$. Similarly, teachers who received some combination of university and non-university training resulted in a mean PTE score of 48.85. Teachers with some university based training in character education (either undergraduate or graduate) had a mean PTE score of 47.78. Teachers with some combination of non-university training in character education (staff development or session at a conference) had a mean of 46.82. Teachers with the lowest mean PTE score were those with no training in character education, $M = 45.60$.

GTE by Character Education Using a One-Way ANOVA

Results obtained from analysis of general teaching efficacy by character education training using a one-way analysis of variance ($N = 2539$) indicated statistical significance of $p < .001$. As statistical significance was found, pairwise comparisons were conducted on each combination of character education training using Tukey's test of honestly significant difference. The comparison between GTE score of participants with no training in character education and GTE score of participants with university-based training resulted in statistical significance of $p = .005$ and very little practical significance of $d = 0.21$. GTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with non-university-based training (conference session or staff development workshop) resulted in statistical significance of $p = .002$ and very little practical significance, $d = 0.14$. GTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with university (undergraduate and graduate) and non-university-based training resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance, $d = 0.40$.

Similarly, GTE scores of participants with no training in character education compared to those of participants with all four types of training resulted in no statistical significance, $p = .223$, and no practical significance, $d = 0.26$. Neither statistical significance, $p = .119$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.17$, were found between GTE scores of participants with university-based training compared to those with non-university-based training. Similarly, neither statistical significance, $p = .761$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.07$, were found between GTE scores for participants with university-based training compared to participants with university and non-university-based training.

A comparison of GTE scores for participants with university-based training to participants with both university and non-university-based training resulted in no statistical significance, $p = .098$, and no practical significance, $d = 0.19$. Similarly, neither statistical significance nor practical significance were found for

Table 2. Results Obtained From Analysis of General Teaching Efficacy by Character Education Training Using a One-Way Analysis of Variance (N = 2539)

Analysis of Variance					
	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Squares*	*F*	*p*
Training	1166.10	4	291.52	12.78	< .001
Error	57821.79	2534	22.82		

Means and Standard Deviations			
Training	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*
No Training	940	41.55	4.77
University-Based Training	237	42.74	4.86
Non-University-Based Training	1063	42.33	4.74
University and Non-University-Based Training	252	43.81	4.79
All Four Types of Training	47	43.04	5.27
Total	2539	42.24	4.82

Pairwise Comparisons			
Comparison	*Difference*	*p*	*d*
No Training < University-Based Training	1.19	.005	0.21
No Training < Non-University-Based Training	0.78	.002	0.14
No Training < University and Non-University-Based	2.26	< .001	0.40
No Training < All Four Types of Training	1.50	.223	0.26
University-Based > Non-University-Based	0.41	.761	0.07
University-Based < University and Non-University-Based	1.07	.098	0.19
University-Based < All Four Types of Training	0.30	.995	0.05
Comparison	*Difference*	*p*	*d*
Non-University-Based < University and Non-University-Based	1.47	< .001	0.26
Non-University-Based < All Four Types of Training	0.71	.856	0.12
University and Non-University-Based < All Four Types	0.76	.853	0.13

GTE scores of participants with university-based and those with all four types of training, $p = .346$ and $d = 0.29$. See Table 2.

The results obtained from analysis of general teaching efficacy by character education training revealed the highest GTE mean scores for teachers who received some combination of university and non-university training resulted in

a mean GTE score of 43.81. Similarly, the mean PTE score for participants who experienced all four types of character education training was $M = 43.04$. Participants with some university-based training in character education (either undergraduate or graduate) had a mean GTE score of 42.74. Participants with some combination of non-university training in character education (staff development or session at a conference) had a mean of 42.33. Participants with the lowest GTE mean score were those with no training in character education, $M = 41.55$.

Teacher Efficacy and Character Education Training

The majority of participants, 66.80%, indicated that they had received some form of training in character education, with 31.35% of teachers receiving no training in character education. There was a significant difference in the type of character education training and both PTE and GTE scores of participants. Compared to participants with no training in character education, those with university based training; a combination of university and non-university based training; or all four types of training had statistically and practically significantly higher personal teaching efficacy. Compared to participants with no training in character education, only those with a combination of university and non-university based training had statistically and practically significantly higher general teaching efficacy. Teachers with no training in character education had the lowest mean PTE score, $M = 45.60$, and GTE score, $M = 41.55$. Therefore, it appeared that participants with some training in character education have a greater sense of personal and general teaching efficacy than those who had no training in character education.

PTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with university-based training (undergraduate and graduate) and non-university-based training resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance of $d = 0.56$. This finding offers much support for teacher training institutions to provide character education training as part of their pre-service programs.

Similarly, PTE scores of participants with no training in character education compared to those of participants with all four types of training resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance of $d = 0.65$. This finding suggests that the more exposure teachers had to training in character education, the higher the PTE composite score on the CEEBI. Neither statistical significance of $p = .119$ nor practical significance of $d = 0.17$ was found between PTE scores of participants with university-based training compared to those with non-university-based training. Similarly, neither statistical significance, $p = .214$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.19$, was found between PTE scores for participants with university-based training compared to participants with university and non-university-based training, $d = 0.19$.

A comparison of PTE scores for participants with university-based training to participants with both university and non-university-based training resulted in no statistical significance, $p = .214$, and no practical significance, $d = 0.19$.

Similarly, neither statistical significance, $p = .346$, nor practical significance, $d = 0.29$, was found for PTE scores of participants with university-based and those with all four types of character education training.

Undergraduate coursework in character education. The most telling of the results in this study was the comparison of PTE by university-based training in character education. Only 16.15% of participants had received undergraduate coursework in character education.

In this study, the ANOVA comparison between PTE score of participants with no training in character education and PTE score of participants with university-based training in character education resulted in statistical significance of $p < .001$ and practical significance of $d = 0.38$. Similarly, a *t*-test revealed the difference between teachers who had undergraduate coursework in character education as compared to teachers who had not experienced undergraduate coursework in character education was both statistically significant, $p < .001$, and practically significant, $d = 0.43$. This finding suggests that those participants who experienced character education in their undergraduate programs were more efficacious than those who had not received any undergraduate training in character education. This finding has definite implications for teacher educators in university settings. It suggests that teachers who experience character education coursework as a component of their undergraduate experience possess a greater sense of efficacy than do those who receive any other type of character education training. However, the literature reveals that very few universities offer character education in their undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

Graduate coursework in character education. Based on the results of this study, only 248 of the 2,539 participants, or 9.77% of teachers in the district studied, received graduate coursework in character education. The results for both PTE ($p < .001$) and GTE ($p = .008$) indicated statistical significance for graduate coursework in character education, but revealed little practical significance.

Session in character education at a conference. Results from conducting *t*-tests for personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy by character education workshop at a conference resulted in statistical significance PTE ($p = .001$), GTE ($p = .001$), but neither resulted in practical significance. Similarly, a one-way ANOVA resulted in PTE ($p < .001$) and GTE ($p = .002$) for non-university-based training compared to no training in character education. Significance was not found for efficacy between non-university-based training and university based training PTE ($p = .761$), GTE ($p = .119$). These results indicated that participants who received character education training from a conference do not have practically different sense of efficacy than those who did not attend character education session at a conference or had no training in character education.

Professional development workshop in character education. Of the 2,539 participants in this study, 1,240 teachers had participated in a professional development workshop in character education and 1,299 had not attended a professional development workshop in character education. The results from a *t*-test of personal teaching efficacy by participation in staff development workshop in character education revealed statistical significance ($p < .001$), but no practical significance ($d = 0.20$). Similarly, the results from a *t*-test of general teaching efficacy by participation in staff development workshop in character education resulted in statistical significance ($p < .001$), but very little practical significance ($d = 0.18$). Therefore, there was little difference in personal teaching efficacy scores of teachers who had staff development training in character education as compared to those with no staff development training.

The results from ANOVA comparison of PTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with non-university-based training (conference session or staff development workshop) resulted in statistical significance ($p < .001$) but no practical significance ($d = 0.21$). Similarly, GTE scores of participants with no training compared to those with non-university-based training (conference session or staff development workshop) resulted in statistical significance ($p = .002$) and very little practical significance ($d = 0.14$). This finding further suggests that there was little difference in personal teaching efficacy between participants who have had non-university-based training and those who had no character education training.

Perhaps the difference between university coursework and staff development is that staff development generally occurs on one day or in a brief session, whereas, university courses span the course of an entire semester and require graded assignments and projects. The length of time one spends in a university course is generally more than one spends in a staff development training session, which may account for the difference between university coursework and staff development.

Other training in character education. Only 145 teachers, or 5.71%, noted that they had received "other" type of training in character education. Analysis of PTE by participation in other character education training resulted in statistical significance ($p = .002$), but little practical significance ($d = 0.26$). Analysis of GTE by participation in other character education training resulted in neither statistical significance ($p = .326$) nor practical significance ($d = 0.08$).

Discussion

The results of this study offer opportunities to better understand how to prepare teachers at each level to become character educators. Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy was higher than all secondary school teachers. Therefore, elementary school teacher professional development might focus more on practical applications of character education such as sharing lesson plans that

incorporate character education into the curriculum. Teachers at this level may be offered the opportunity to assist in training secondary school teachers.

Middle school teachers' mean score for both PTE and GTE fell between those of elementary school teachers and high school teachers. In the district studied, middle schools operate under the team concept. These teams meet regularly to discuss the progress of students and to plan instruction that allows for integrating curriculum. Perhaps professional development for middle school teachers could involve character education planning for infusing it into the curriculum during these team meetings.

The efficacy scores for high school teachers were the lowest for all school settings. Thus, teachers in high school may require a different type of professional development opportunity. It is possible that high school teachers viewed themselves as deliverers of knowledge in a particular content area, not as character educators. The teachers spend less than an hour a day with the same group of students.

It is further suggested that districts consider making it known from the highest levels that it is important for teachers to teach for character. This recommendation is supported by the literature, as leadership for character education must "come from members of each of the school's character education committees and from the school administration, namely, the principal" (DeRoche & Williams, 1998, p. 61).

There seems to be little room for additional instruction in character education available in the teacher-training curriculum (Berkowitz, 1998). However, of all of the types of character education received by participants, undergraduate coursework in character education compared to no undergraduate coursework in character education resulted in both statistical and practical significance for personal teaching efficacy. This was not the case for general teaching efficacy. This finding suggests that teachers who have received character education training as part of their undergraduate coursework believe themselves to be more efficacious than those who did not receive coursework in character education as undergraduates. The results of this study make a very strong case for offering character education courses in undergraduate teacher education programs.

Although this study resulted in some similarities with the Milson (2002), Milson (2003), and Milson and Mehlig (2002) studies, one important difference was that teachers in this study who had experienced undergraduate coursework in character education were more efficacious than those who had no undergraduate coursework in character education. Milson (2003) found: "On both scales the scores of those who received university-based coursework did not differ significantly from those who received no training at all" (p. 99). This study, however, revealed both statistical and practical significance for PTE and GTE by university-based character education training compared to participants with no character education training. This finding is of noted importance to both this school district and universities that prepare future teachers.

One of the objectives of this study was to determine how the results might be used for planning and implementing professional development opportunities related to character education for current teachers. However, no significant difference was found between participants who had received staff development training in character education and those who had no staff development training in character education. Statistical significance was found between teachers with undergraduate coursework in character education as compared to those teachers who had no undergraduate coursework in character education. Therefore, it seems that the results of this study may have more application for teacher educators in university settings than for district personnel who are responsible for professional development.

Appendix A

Characteristic	*Statistical Procedure*	*PTE Findings*	*GTE Findings*
Gender	T-test for unpaired samples	$p < .001$, $d = 0.22$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.29$
Ethnicity	One-way ANOVA	$p = .008$	$p = .004$
Teacher Certifying Institution	One-way ANOVA	$p = .596$	$p = .978$
Character Education Training vs. No Character Education Training	T-test for unpaired samples	$p < .001$, $d = 0.32$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.23$
Undergraduate Coursework in Character Education vs. No Undergraduate Coursework in Character Education	T-test for unpaired samples	$p < .001$, $d = 0.43$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.28$
Graduate Coursework in Character Education vs. No Graduate Coursework in Character Education	T-test for unpaired samples	$p < .001$, $d = 0.26$	$p = .008$, $d = 0.17$
Participation in Session in Character Education at Conference vs. No Participation in Session in Character Education at Conference vs.	T-test for unpaired samples	$p < .001$, $d = 0.30$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.17$
Staff Development Training in Character Education vs. No Staff Development Training in Character Education	T-test for unpaired samples	$p < .001$, $d = 0.20$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.18$
Character Education Training	One-way ANOVA	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
No training < university	Tukey's HSD	$p < .001$, $d = 0.38$	
No training < univ/non-univ	Tukey's HSD	$p < .001$, $d = 0.56$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.40$
No training < all four types	Tukey's HSD	$p < .001$, $d = 0.65$	
Non-univ < univ/non-univ	Tukey's HSD	$p < .001$, $d = 0.35$	
Non-univ < all four types	Tukey's HSD	$p = .015$, $d = 0.45$	
Assigned School Setting	One-way ANOVA	$p < .001$	$p < .001$

Characteristic	*Statistical Procedure*	*PTE Findings*	*GTE Findings*
Elementary > Middle	Tukey's HSD	$p < .001$, $d = 0.37$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.38$
Elementary > High	Tukey's HSD	$p < .001$, $d = 0.48$	$p < .001$, $d = 0.44$
Middle > High	Tukey's HSD	$p = .163$, $d = 0.10$	$p = .321$, $d = 0.08$
Grade Level Taught	One-way ANOVA	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Subject Taught	One-way ANOVA	$p < .001$	$p < .001$
Special Education vs. Regular Education	T-Test for unpaired samples	$p = .333$, $d = 0.07$	$p = .499$, $d = 0.05$
Teaching Experience	One-way ANOVA	$p = .003$	$p < .001$

References

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 4*, 359–373.

Berkowitz, M. W. (1998). Obstacles to teacher training in character education. *Action in Teacher Education, 20*, 1–10.

DeRoche, E. F., & Williams, M. M. (1998). *Educating hearts and minds: A comprehensive character education framework*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

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

Guskey, T. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3/4), 381–391.

Milson, A. J. (2002, October). *Teachers' sense of efficacy for the formation of students' character.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Character Education Partnership, Atlanta, GA.

Milson, A. J. (2003). Teachers' sense of efficacy for the formation of students' character. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 1*(2), 89–106.

Milson, A. J., & Mehlig, L. M. (2001, April). *The efficacy beliefs of elementary teachers regarding character education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.

Milson, A. J., & Mehlig, L. M. (2002). Elementary school teachers' sense of efficacy for character education. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(1), 47–53.

NCLB Definition of Professional Development. (2001). *Title IX, Part A, Section 9101 of No Child Left Behind Act*. http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg107.html#sec9101

About the Author

Alice T. Ledford serves full-time in the Department of Organizational Development in Fort Bend Independent School District (FBISD) in Sugar Land, Texas, and serves as an adjunct professor in the School of Education at The University of Saint Thomas in Houston, Texas. She has more than 20 years of experience in

education in both the United States and abroad. Her K–12 experience includes teaching, counseling, and administration while her higher education experience includes serving as director of residence life, chair of department of education, and dean of education. Her research interests include character education, school counseling, professional development, and educational leadership. She may be reached via e-mail at: atledford@aol.com