

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

**The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.** Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

# UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA  
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



**MIDDLE SCHOOL CULTURE AND TEACHER EFFICACY:  
AN EXAMINATION OF RELATIONSHIPS IN TWO  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS**


by

**Kimberly J. Hartman**

**A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy**

**Greensboro  
1996**

Approved by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Stashaw", written over a horizontal line.

**Dissertation Advisor**

UMI Number: 9705291

Copyright 1996 by  
Hartman, Kimberly Jeane

All rights reserved.

---

UMI Microform 9705291  
Copyright 1996, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized  
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

---

**UMI**  
300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

HARTMAN, KIMBERLY J., Ph.D. Middle School Culture and Teacher Efficacy: An Examination of Relationships in Two Professional Development Schools. (1996)  
Directed by Dr. David B. Strahan. 129 pp.

School culture and teacher efficacy have been examined separately for several years. This study examined teachers' and student teachers' perceptions of personal and general teaching efficacy, seven dimensions of school climate, and the relationships among efficacy and culture. These constructs were examined in two Professional Development Middle Schools in a suburban setting.

Sixteen cooperating teachers and 14 student teachers completed the Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale and Cheal's (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator. Additionally, teachers, student teachers, and principals answered structured interview questions regarding dimensions of efficacy and culture. The researcher conducted observations in each classroom, as well as general observations while visiting the schools.

Results of this study indicated that teachers and student teachers had high personal and general teaching efficacies. Participants' responses suggested they individually and collectively were developmentally responsive to the needs of the middle school adolescent and were able to help students experience many successes. Results additionally indicated that school culture was important to teachers empowerment. Participants at one school indicated their principal was controlling, and that they felt a sense of isolation and a lack of camaraderie. Teachers at the other school indicated that they felt their principal was supportive, and that they felt a strong sense of camaraderie. Student teachers at both schools indicated they felt much collegiality with their cooperating teachers. This reflected the university's efforts at building collaboration between the university and Professional Development Schools to facilitate student teachers' positive experiences and development as preservice educators.

Implications from this study suggest the need for additional research to examine the relationships among culture and efficacy, particularly at the middle school level.

Examining how teachers and student teachers perceive culture and efficacy and how these perceptions affect their response to meeting students' needs is also beneficial. The results of this study indicated that teachers who had a strong sense of "how we do things around here," and who "we" are felt more positively about their abilities to affect student progress.

© 1996 by Kimberly J. Hartman

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee by the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Advisor David Strahan

Committee Members Shelby

Thomas

Barbara B. Levin

Mary W. Olson

JULY 15, 1996  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

JUNE 24, 1996  
Date of Final Oral Examination



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the many people whose support and cooperation made the completion of this dissertation possible.

First, I appreciate the teachers, student teachers, and principals who completed surveys and allowed me to observe them and to ask them many questions throughout the 95-96 school year. They are at the heart of this dissertation.

Secondly, I appreciate the members of my committee, Dr. David Strahan, chair, Dr. Dee Irwin, Dr. Barbara Levin, Dr. Mary Olson, and Dr. Gerald Ponder. They offered much feedback and assistance, and they were willing to share their time and expertise. I am especially grateful to Dr. Strahan whose guidance, support, patience, and persistence made this accomplishment possible.

Lastly, I would like to thank my daughter, Ariel, who entertained herself and was patient while I completed this dissertation.

Thanks to each of you for helping me achieve this goal.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
I. BACKGROUND .....	1
Introduction .....	1
Statement of Problem .....	3
Research Questions .....	3
Procedures .....	4
Significance of the Study .....	4
Definition of Terms .....	5
General Teaching Efficacy (GTE) .....	5
Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE) .....	5
Culture/Climate .....	5
Professional Development Schools (PDS) .....	6
On-site teacher educators (OSTE) .....	6
Student teachers (ST) .....	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	7
Conceptual Framework .....	7
Exemplary Middle Schools and Practices .....	8
School Culture .....	12
Efficacy .....	14
Summary .....	19
III. METHODOLOGY .....	21
Desired Contributions .....	21
Participants .....	22
Instruments .....	23
Procedures .....	27
Analysis .....	28
Limitations .....	28
Summary .....	29
IV. RESULTS .....	30
Overview .....	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS - continued

CHAPTER	Page
Perceptions of Middle School Efficacy and Culture . . . . .	30
Analysis of Perceptions Related to Middle School . . . . .	31
Critical Needs of Adolescents . . . . .	31
Obstacles to Meeting Students' Needs . . . . .	33
Analysis of Efficacy . . . . .	36
Personal Teaching Efficacy . . . . .	36
Pre-Post Personal and General Teaching Efficacy Comparisons . . .	37
Item Analysis with Qualitative Illustrations for	
Personal Teaching Efficacy . . . . .	37
General Teaching Efficacy . . . . .	42
Item Analysis with Qualitative Illustrations for General	
Teaching Efficacy . . . . .	43
Personal and General Teaching Efficacy Conclusion . . . . .	48
Analysis of Climate . . . . .	55
Perceptions of Climate . . . . .	56
Shared perceptions of Climate . . . . .	56
Perceptions of Climate That Differ	
Among Teachers and Student Teachers . . . . .	65
Perceptions of Climate That Differ	
Between Schools . . . . .	73
Conclusions of Perceptions of Climate . . . . .	90
Correlations of Efficacy and Climate . . . . .	94
Summary . . . . .	96
 V. DISCUSSION . . . . .	 100
Overview . . . . .	100
Conclusions . . . . .	103
Implications for Teacher Efficacy and School Culture . . . . .	105
Implications for Research . . . . .	106
 BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 109
 APPENDIX A. RESEARCH QUESTIONS . . . . .	 113
 APPENDIX B. TEACHER SELF EFFICACY SCALE . . . . .	 116
 APPENDIX C. DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE . . . . .	 119

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table	
1 Personal Teaching Efficacy Scores (PTE) . . . . .	36
2 Pre-Post Personal Teaching Efficacy Scores (PTE) . . . . .	38
3 General Teaching Efficacy Scores (GTE) . . . . .	43
4 Pre-Post General Teaching Efficacy Scores (GTE) . . . . .	44
5 Expectancy and Motivation . . . . .	57
6 Teacher Frustration . . . . .	61
7 Tangible Environment . . . . .	65
8 Administrative Support . . . . .	69
9 Pupil Control Behavior . . . . .	74
10 Teacher Social Needs . . . . .	80
11 Administrative Control . . . . .	85
12 Pearson-Product Moment Correlations . . . . .	95

## CHAPTER I BACKGROUND

### Introduction

The literature clearly indicates that middle schools must meet the diverse developmental needs of the young adolescent in order to foster both academic and personal success (Turning Points, 1989; Eichhorn, 1966; George & Shewey, 1994; An Agenda For Excellence, 1985; This We Believe, 1982). Middle level education has been identified as the "last best chance" for many youth (Turning Points, 1989). Middle school adolescents are facing some of the greatest physical, emotional, intellectual, and social changes in their lives (Schoolyear 2000, 1993; This We Believe, 1992). Accordingly, middle level teachers who feel empowered and believe in their ability to reach and teach students are vital in order to facilitate this "last best chance." Middle schools that strive to become exemplary must constantly examine ways to be developmentally responsive to the needs of young adolescents. One key to accomplishing this is through an examination of the school's culture and the identification of cultural aspects affecting teachers' efficacy. Through cultures of empowerment that sanction heightened self-efficacy, teachers believe in their ability to affect academic achievement and change, thereby increasing the likelihood of meeting the needs of young adolescents.

A series of studies have documented the importance of teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1989; Eichhorn, 1966; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; This We Believe, 1982; Turning Points, 1985). Other research indicates that heightened efficacy among teachers increases personal and professional contentment and relates positively to student academic growth when teachers believe they can affect change (Ashton, 1985; Garvin, 1987; Johnston &

Ramos de Perez, 1985; Lee, Dedrick, & Smith, 1993; Miller, 1987). The literature also suggests that teachers' efficacy affects their teaching styles, effort expended, persistence, and can positively or negatively impact students' success (Ashton, 1985; Bandura, 1977; Miller, 1987; Schunk, 1991).

In considering exemplary middle schools and teachers' efficacy, one must also examine the school culture. The issues of school culture and teachers' efficacy have been examined separately in educational literature many times. Some researchers address the culture of a school and how culture is crucial to the empowerment of teachers (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Brofenbrenner, 1976; Cheal, 1990). Culture also impacts teachers' efficacy. More empowering cultures are likely to encourage heightened efficacy, while more autocratic cultures are likely to decrease efficacy (Ashton et al., 1983; Cheal, 1990; Johnston, 1992; Strahan, 1994; Taigura & Litwin, 1986).

This study identified seven factors of the organizational climate in two Professional Development Middle Schools (PDS) and examined these factors in relation to middle level teachers' personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE). Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) developed a Likert-type instrument to assess two dimensions of efficacy: personal teaching efficacy (PTE), the belief that one can personally affect change, and general teaching efficacy (GTE), the belief that teachers in general can affect change. Cheal (1990) developed a Likert-type instrument to assess seven dimensions of climate: administrative support, administrative control, teacher frustration, pupil control behavior, expectancy and motivation, tangible environment, and teacher social needs. Research using these two instruments, structured interviews, conversations, and informal observations yielded insight about the relationships between a school's culture and teachers' efficacy.

The rationale for this proposed research was grounded in theory related to exemplary middle schools, school culture, teacher efficacy, and their relationships to each other.

#### Statement of the Problem

While researchers have addressed school culture and/or teaching efficacy, few studies have considered relationships between the culture of a school, particularly a middle school, and the teachers' efficacy. Empirical research examining this multifaceted relationship is lacking, but was examined through this study. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived culture and perceived teacher efficacy among preservice teachers and cooperating teachers in two Professional Development Middle Schools.

#### Research Questions

The following research questions guided this research:

- 1a. What is the relationship between pre and post scores of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale (1990)?
- 1b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of efficacy through structured interview questions and informal conversations?
- 2a. What are the relationships among the scores of on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) on Cheal's (1990) Middle Level School Organizational Climate Indicator?

2b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of Cheal's dimensions of climate through structured interview questions and informal conversations?

3. What are the correlations among scores of the seven organizational factors as identified on the Cheal Middle Level School Organizational Climate Indicator and personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) scores on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale?

4. From the perspectives of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST), what are the most important aspects of school culture that influence personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE)?

#### Procedures

The Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale was administered twice during the 1995-96 academic year, in the first nine weeks of school and the last nine weeks of school. Structured interviews were conducted between February and April, 1996. Cheal's (1990) Middle Level Organizational Climate Indicator was administered during the last nine weeks of the academic year. Correlational analyses were used to analyze the quantitative data. Qualitative data were analyzed through content analysis of interviews and informal observations.

#### Significance of the Study

While researchers have examined efficacy or culture, few have examined the relationship between the two. This study provides a better understanding of teacher efficacy and middle school climate variables and the interaction between them by weaving the strands together in an organized format. This is significant since heightened efficacy and climates of empowerment lead teachers toward being more developmentally responsive



to the needs of the young adolescent. Examining these issues in two Professional Development Schools allowed the researcher the opportunity to collect data from both preservice and inservice educators. Listening to and analyzing the on-site teacher educators' voices and the student teachers' voices provided insights into the multifaceted relationships among efficacy and culture. Through analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, this study provides illumination of the relationships among efficacy and climate and provides insight into the importance of teacher efficacy and perceptions of a supportive climate in meeting students' needs.

#### Definition of Terms

##### General Teaching Efficacy (GTE)

General definition: a belief in the power of teachers to reach all students regardless of extrinsic factors (race, sex, SES).

Operational definition: GTE as measured by the Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale and as analyzed from structured interviews, conversations, and informal observations.

##### Personal Teaching Efficacy (PTE)

General definition: a belief in the power of self as teacher to reach all students regardless of extrinsic factors (race, sex, SES).

Operational definition: PTE as measured by the Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale and as analyzed from structured interviews, conversations, and informal observations.

##### Culture/Climate

General definition: "The way we do things around here" (Johnston, 1992, p. 46). "How we do things around here depends on how we define who 'we' are" (Strahan, 1994, p. 2). Climate is an enduring quality of the environment that is experienced by its

members, influences their behaviors, and can be described in terms of values of the organization (Taigura & Litwin, 1986).

Operational definition: 1) Climate as measured by the seven dimensions of Cheal's (1990) Middle Level Organizational Climate Indicator: administrative support, administrative control, teacher frustration, pupil control behavior, teacher social needs, tangible environment, expectancy and motivation, and as analyzed from structured interviews, conversations, and informal observations.

#### Professional Development Schools (PDS)

Schools in a collaborative, university partnership where preservice teacher education majors are placed with inservice teachers for observations, clinical experiences, and student teaching experiences.

#### On-site Teacher Educators (OSTE)

Inservice teachers at Professional Development Schools who mentor preservice teachers during observations, clinical experiences, and student teaching experiences.

#### Student Teachers (ST)

Preservice senior or master level teachers who are placed with inservice teachers for field experiences.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This section presents a review of the relevant literature related to middle schools, school culture, and the constructs of general and personal teaching efficacy. First, a conceptual framework is presented. Secondly, research related to exemplary middle schools is shown. The third section presents research related to school culture. The last section discusses literature related to teachers' efficacy. Some researchers address climate and others address culture. For the purpose of this research, the terms climate and culture will be used interchangeably.

#### Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this research was grounded in the three research areas of exemplary middle schools, school culture, and self-efficacy. The exemplary middle school framework was based on the research of George and Shewey (1994), who assert in their research on exemplary middle schools and practices the following:

As the 21st century looms on the horizon, the middle school movement remains the largest and most comprehensive effort at organizational and curricular change in the history of American public schooling. (p. 3)

Therefore, as part of this vast middle school movement, educators must be aware of the factors contributing to exemplary middle schools if they are to create cultures valuing both teachers, students, and their work while meeting the needs of young adolescents.

The second body of research in the conceptual framework is grounded in theory related to school culture. Johnston (1992) defines culture as "the way we do things around here" (p. 46). Strahan (1994) adds to that by saying that "how we do things around here

depends on how we define who 'we' are" (p. 2). The culture of the schools in this study was defined in terms of seven organizational attributes of the climate (Cheal, 1990). These seven attributes were administrative support, administrative control, tangible environment, teacher frustration, pupil control behavior, teacher social needs, and expectancy and motivation. Both schools in the research are Professional Development Schools (PDS). They are part of a university/school partnership where university personnel and practitioners work together. Student interns and student teachers were placed in both sites for clinical experience and supervision.

The third piece of this conceptual framework was the research related to self-efficacy, specifically that of Bandura (1989). He provided the theoretical framework for much of the work done in teacher self-efficacy and asserted that a teacher's self-efficacy can influence choice of activities, effort expended, and persistence. Additionally, this research was theoretically grounded in the work of Woolfolk and Hoy (1990), who researched personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) to determine which aspects of teachers' efficacy related to PTE and GTE.

A review of the literature relevant to this study follows.

#### Exemplary Middle Schools and Practices

Middle schools are not just "in the middle" between elementary and high schools. While they are part of the K-12 system, these schools must meet the needs of the population they serve, primarily 10-14 year olds. Middle schools are unique and serve adolescents who are facing some of the greatest physical, emotional, and social changes in their lives.

Thirty years ago Eichhorn (1966) addressed the necessity for a middle school which would meet the needs of young adolescents who are chronologically 10-15 years old and who are academically in grades 6, 7, and 8. Eichhorn termed the developmental stage

"transescence," the stage of development which begins prior to the onset of puberty and extends through the early stages of adolescence (p. 3). In his socio-psychological model, Eichhorn examined the mental, physical, and cultural relationships existing among middle school students. He asserted that these are interconnected and interdependent and are distinguishable in operation from either elementary or high school age students. It was Eichhorn's position that middle school procedures were different in "substance from those of traditional school" (p. 93). Furthermore, if not properly trained in middle school, faculty members' morale and personal contribution could be damaged. This points to a link between middle schools' culture and teacher efficacy. The need to examine teachers' self-efficacy and school culture is vital to exemplary middle school practices.

According to George and Shewey (1994), a national consensus on the characteristics of exemplary middle school has been reached. Since 1988, 2,141 citations relating to middle school education have appeared in ERIC, and of those, 1,245 have included references to research in areas of middle grades education. Major national studies have also been undertaken. Agreement of several factors in exemplary middle schools is evident. The main factors include interdisciplinary teaming, advisory programs, flexible scheduling and grouping, enriched curriculum experiences, broadened opportunities for more student recognition, more active instruction and learning, articulation to schools above and below, shared decision making, and parent and community involvement (George & Shewey, 1994). Empowering teachers, who in turn empower students, leads to successful experiences for both groups as self-efficacy is heightened and a climate conducive to success is created.

NASSP's An Agenda for Excellence at the Middle Level (1985) contains research designed to determine what adolescents need to reach their potential. One of the most vivid statements in this publication says, ". . . young people . . . will enter careers, raise

families, and seek the satisfactions that life will offer in the third millennium. We cannot even begin to know what information they will need to successfully negotiate that world" (p. 1). As middle level educators, embracing and facing this challenge is an integral part of a mission to create exemplary schools. It is this concept that makes becoming an exemplary middle school so challenging.

Some of the critical elements in exemplary middle schools, according to NASSP, relating directly to this proposed research are: (a) a culture and climate that supports excellence and achievement instead of intellectual conformity and mediocrity; (b) learning and instruction where teachers are caring, optimistic, enthusiastic, and well-versed in pedagogy, with high expectations, while being easily approachable; (c) school organization that contributes to a sense of belonging, reducing anonymity and alienation; (d) principals with a clear sense of mission and the ability to handle problems that interfere with the learning process; and (e) client centeredness where the developmental needs of the students are met.

The Carnegie Report, Turning Points (1989), states that young adolescents face significant changes. For some youth, early adolescence offers opportunities for a productive and fulfilling life. For others, it is their "last best chance to avoid a diminished future" (p. 8). In relation to efficacy and culture, the Carnegie Task Force suggests that schools need to empower teachers and administrators to make decisions about the experiences of middle grades students. Similarly, among the characteristics of effective middle schools relating specifically to efficacy and culture, Johnston and Ramos de Perez (1985) suggest that teacher efficacy, positive environments, and administrative leadership are essential components. One of the most widely used and most comprehensive research projects embodying the concepts of an exemplary middle level school is the National

Middle School Association's publication, This We Believe (1982). One of the ten essential elements listed of a "true middle school" is a positive school climate.

The research of George, Stevenson, Thomason, and Beane (1989), regarding changes middle schools made as they reorganized from grades 7-9 to grades 6-8 or 5-8, was important in examining the components of exemplary middle schools. This research indicated middle school students want respect, fairness, safety, trustworthiness, sense of humor, and achievable challenges from their teachers. Teachers indicated they need and want collaboration and cooperation, varying curriculum and instruction, overlapping work and play, and a sense of making a difference. This body of research indicated traits in healthy student-teacher relationships at the middle level. Garvin (1987) indicated that teachers who believe they can make a difference do not give up on students. They believe in their potential, and even though they may not see the fruits of their labor, they know they have planted the seeds. Thus, the need for teachers to be in a culture where they feel a sense of control and feel empowered to meet the needs of their students is crucial to an exemplary middle school. This was supported by a survey of schools that reorganized into exemplary middle school programs and accomplished several positive results, including a climate that improved and faculty morale and support that became more positive (George & Shewey, 1993).

The Carnegie Report Turning Points recommended empowering teachers and administrators to make decisions concerning the experiences of middle grades students since these are the people who know them best. This empowerment can lead to teachers' heightened efficacy. Possible ways to empower teachers include giving teachers greater influence in the classroom, establishing building governance committees, and designating leaders for the teaching process. Two important factors were academically successful schools where teachers and students see themselves as part of the same group and schools

with a strong "ethos of caring" (George & Shewey, 1993, p. 13). Strahan (1991) presented a diagram of a climate for success in middle level schools. At the center were the developmental needs of young adolescents. Surrounding this core were instructional and management practices, people, places, policies, and programs. At the outer level were the essential elements to the success, processes, communication, decision-making, and teamwork. This model demonstrated the interrelationships and interconnectedness of the multifaceted middle level school. Exemplary middle schools must be developmentally responsive to meeting both students' and teachers' needs.

#### School Culture

Spradley and McCurdy (1972) described culture, from an anthropological viewpoint, as interpretations of behavior and stress, but they pointed out that not everyone shared all aspects of culture. They argued that culture was made of cultural scenes linked to recurrent social situations. They asserted that in order to understand any culture, researchers must determine categories and subcategories of items/information related to culture as it is observed. Specifically, middle school teachers and administrators will not see all aspects of the school's culture through the same lens. While agreement may exist regarding specific attributes of the culture, individual differences and viewpoints will be woven throughout the cultural description of a particular school. Through an examination of multiple viewpoints, attributes of a schools' culture can be established. Hoy, Tarter, and Bliss (1991) cautioned that climate was ambiguous and difficult to study. Thus, the need for an organizational way to study climate was provided by the researcher through the use of Cheal's (1990) Organizational Climate Indicator. In research related specifically to middle school climate, Cheal (1990) citing Taigura and Litwin (1986) indicated that:

Climate is the relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior,



and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization. (p. 27)

Deal (1990) suggested that we can understand school culture by understanding the "symbolic webbing" of that school (p. 5). This included the shared history of the school, legends and folklores, symbols and emblems, language of school songs, handbooks, and memos. Anderson (1982) described climate as "the total environmental quality within a given school building" (p. 369). Henderson (1992) looked at culture in terms of a general definition of climate with any prevailing condition which affected life or activity. Prevailing conditions affect everything that happens and may be altered. Henderson divided culture into physical, academic, social-emotional, or organizational. In a less structured sense, Johnston (1992) defined culture as "The way we do things around here" (p. 46). Strahan (1994) added to that by saying that "how we do things around here depends on how we define who 'we' are" (p. 2). School culture is multifaceted with many links, the way schools and individuals define themselves, who is perceived as having the power and who feels powerless, the perceived and real boundaries, and the patterns and repetitions that have developed over time.

Views of culture can empower or restrict educators. If one feels a sense of trust and collegiality, risk-taking is encouraged. In a culture that is more restricted, the converse is true. Effective schools are marked by a pervasive atmosphere that Michael Rutter and his colleagues (1979) label "school ethos" (p. 212). This ethos is a product of philosophical agreement about purpose that is shared by teachers and administration. Teachers' sense of efficacy is positively related to preservation of a warm, accepting classroom environment and negatively related to harsh control tactics (Ashton et al., 1983). Job satisfaction and collegiality can also be related to a teacher's sense of efficacy. Other aspects of a school climate hindering teachers' maintenance of a high self-efficacy are situations over which

they have little control, isolation, lack of recognition and support, and situations where they feel powerless. Not surprisingly, highly efficacious teachers feel less stress than do less efficacious teachers. According to Sara Lightfoot, "Good schools are places where students are seen as people worthy of respect" (1983, p. 350). In "good schools," all people feel valuable, able, and responsible.

According to Newman, Rutter, and Smith (1989), teacher efficacy was most strongly affected by the orderly behavior of students in a school, a sense that innovation and experimentation are encouraged, and a belief that administrators are helpful and understanding. Newman's contention was that the relationship between efficacy and organization was reciprocal. Climate affected a sense of efficacy, and efficacy affected perceptions of climate.

Cheal (1990) developed a survey to measure organizational climate in middle schools. She noted that researchers had explored climate in business, industry, colleges, and secondary and elementary schools; however, research in middle level school climate was lacking. In order to examine climate, middle schools had to use instruments developed for elementary or secondary schools. Cheal developed a climate indicator for middle grades that was psychometrically defensible within the environment it purported to measure. Cheal accomplished this through a review of related literature and scales developed by previous researchers. Statistical procedures indicated that Cheal's instrument was valid and reliable in measuring the constructs of organizational climate in middle schools.

### Efficacy

Many variations of the definition of efficacy exist. Coladarci (1992) referred to teacher efficacy as one's beliefs regarding personal ability to be successful as a teacher rather than observable behaviors. Morin and Welsh (1991) talked about self-efficacy as an

individual's perception of how effectively one can perform behaviors. Lacour and Wilkerson (1991) defined efficacy broadly as the power to produce an effect; however, researchers usually credit Bandura (1977) with providing the theoretical framework for studying teacher efficacy. According to Bandura (1989), self-efficacy can influence choice of activities, effort expended, and persistence. Although efficacy and outcome expectations are interrelated, Bandura believed they could be differentiated. For example, a teacher may believe she cannot successfully create a conducive learning environment, but her actual classroom practices may show that, in fact, she is doing exactly that.

Bandura (1977) stressed the importance of distinguishing between efficacy expectations and outcomes expectations. A teacher may believe that certain behaviors will produce a desired behavior (outcome expectation), but may not feel capable of performing the behavior (efficacy expectation). An outcome expectation is demonstrated by a teacher who believes instruction can overcome barriers such as poverty or low level support from home. An efficacy expectation would be the individual teacher's belief that she can personally deliver such instruction. Teachers with a low sense of efficacy due to a low outcome expectation may engage less effort in motivating challenging students because they see the effort as useless. According to Ashton (1985),

... these teachers are resistant to learning from experience with low-achieving students that contradict their basic belief about the students' ineducability (a cognitive deficit), but maintain their sense of self esteem, because they feel no responsibility for being unable to do what no one else could do (no affective deficit). (p. 143)

Low efficacy teachers are likely to feel little stress when unable to reach students, particularly low achieving students, and are likely to believe that all teachers are unable to do much to motivate students. Low efficacy teachers have a negative impact on students because their choice of behavior and effort used are at least partially related to self-efficacy,

rather than to a certain stimulus (Lacour & Wilkerson, 1991). High efficacy teachers use teaching techniques that are more challenging and difficult, such as cooperative learning, activity-based methods, innovative program implementation, risk taking, and persistence.

Bandura (1989) and Ashton (1975) further delineate efficacy into two hierarchically organized dimensions, teaching efficacy and personal efficacy. Teaching efficacy refers to outcome expectations which is the ability to produce student learning despite obstacles. Personal efficacy refers to one's personal sense of effectiveness as a teacher. Teacher efficacy can vary somewhat with the activity or task at hand. Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) similarly label these constructs general teaching efficacy (GTE) and personal teaching efficacy (PTE). General teaching efficacy is related to one's belief in what teachers as a whole can do to help students become successful. Personal teaching efficacy is related to one's view of self in successfully helping students.

Miller (1987) described teacher self-efficacy as beliefs about the effectiveness of good teaching and teachers' beliefs about their abilities to teach all students, regardless of the students' home environment, sex, race, appearance, or SES. Teachers with high efficacy demonstrate a sense of responsibility for all student learning, while teachers with low efficacy attribute lack of learning to extrinsic factors and see some students as unteachable. Miller's research with at-risk students indicated several findings regarding teachers' self-efficacy. For example, teachers with high efficacy scores believed that good teaching could make a difference with all students regardless of external obstacles. Teachers with high efficacy scores described a greater variety and number of teaching strategies. Teachers with high efficacy scores used more positive and more academically oriented language when describing low achievers or difficult learners. High efficacy teachers demonstrated a higher sense of responsibility toward the achievements of difficult learners than did low efficacy teachers. High efficacy teachers demonstrated a willingness

to persist when faced with difficult students. In contrast to low efficacy teachers, high efficacy teachers tended to describe principals and central office staff as instructionally supportive and helpful. High efficacy teachers saw themselves as being viewed more as professionals by administrators and the community than did low efficacy teachers, and high efficacy teachers spent more time in instructional planning outside school hours than did low efficacy teachers.

Schunk (1991) asserted that students acquire information about their self-efficacy in a given domain from their performances, informal observations of models, forms of social persuasion, and physiological indexes, and that vicariously acquired information has a weaker effect on self-efficacy than does performance based information. Although Schunk was referring to students, it is probable that the same holds true for teachers. For example, information gained from in-service or workshops may affect self-efficacy, but teachers' performance based information gathered from their own experiences in their classrooms is more likely to lead to more positive results.

In research related to teacher efficacy and school climate, Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) found that school level measures of academic emphasis, institutional integrity, and principal's influence correlated with either personal or general efficacy. In his study of efficacy and commitment to teaching, Coladarci (1992) found that the following variables related to efficacy: small classes, principals who were viewed favorably in instructional leadership, school advocacy, decision making, and relations with students and the staff; however, his central finding was that personal and general efficacy were the strongest two predictors of commitment to teaching. In fact, according to Coladarci:

... other things being equal, a greater commitment to teaching would be expected among teachers who believe student achievement can be influenced through skillful instruction, who have confidence in their own ability to influence student achievement, and who assume personal responsibility for the level of student achievement they witness in their classrooms. (p. 334)

Bandura's (1989) research with teachers on self-efficacy showed that perceptions of efficacy can affect a person's motivation, choice of activities, time on task and the effort expended, as well as persistence in the face of difficulty. This theory suggested that appraisal of self-efficacy was derived from several sources like past experiences, modeling, verbal persuasion, and psychological states. Past experiences and performance have been found to be the most influential forces. Thus, teachers with high efficacy would be more likely to help students develop competencies, whereas a teacher with low efficacy may avoid this. Teachers with high teaching efficacy may increase opportunities to experience success and enhance skills (Bandura, 1989). Teachers who do not believe they can perform necessary actions will not initiate relevant behaviors, or, if they do, they are unlikely to persist. Self-efficacy was related to motivation because one's effort and persistence in accomplishing a task is often related to the perceptions one holds about abilities and competence.

Brofenbrenner (1976) reported that the most influential factors on teachers' self-efficacy were the types of students in the classroom and the amount of control teachers had in determining the classroom environment. Control over one's environment may positively affect self-efficacy by determining how intrinsic goals are established and the criteria by which success is measured. Similarly, Ashton (1985) identified several factors related to teachers' sense of self-efficacy such as teacher characteristics, student characteristics, teacher-student interactive behavior, class size, role definition, activity structure, school norms, collegial relations, principal-teacher relations, decision-making structure, nature of school district, legislative and judicial mandates, conceptions of teacher and learner, and conceptions about the role of education. While these factors can impact teacher self-efficacy positively or negatively, they are not insurmountable obstacles and can be adjusted to create a more efficacious environment for teachers and students. The five major factors

negatively influencing teachers' sense of efficacy were salary dissatisfaction, status panic, lack of collegial and administrative support, uncertainty, and powerlessness (Miller, 1985).

In relation to school attributes and teacher efficacy, Chester and Beaudin (1996) examined efficacy in novice urban teachers. The results of their research indicate that three factors affect teachers' efficacy: collaboration, supervisory attention, and quality and availability of resources. Specifically, in urban schools where high levels of collaboration were evident "experienced beginning teachers, and most novices realized positive changes in their self efficacy beliefs" (p. 246). Similarly, in schools where supervisors paid much attention to teacher performance, efficacy increased in all teachers, and most novices. Interestingly, this study indicated that novice teachers with high levels of resources experienced declines in self efficacy beliefs, but those with fewer resources experienced small increases. The researchers explained that this decrease in efficacy may be that "young teachers may not have a repertoire of strategies to make appropriate choices" (p. 252). The overall conclusion of Chester and Beaudin was that schools can positively influence teachers' feelings of efficacy and empowerment when they offer opportunities for collegiality, offer opportunities for administrators and teachers to collaborate, and offer support in the use of instructional resources.

#### Summary

According to Strahan (1992), "how we view ourselves, how we see our students, what we prize most about our subject matter - these orientations are the 'core values' of teaching" (p. 240). Therefore, high efficacy teachers who value themselves and believe in their ability to affect change, will act in more developmentally responsive ways to middle level students. With this in mind, a need to examine the relationships between exemplary middle school practices, culture, and teacher efficacy exists. Since the decisions teachers make daily influence middle school students' lives, and self-efficacy influences teachers'

decision making, the need to help schools identify factors to build self-efficacy and to avoid factors harmful to positive self-efficacy is crucial. When teachers believe in themselves as educators, they treat students with respect and dignity and strive to meet students' educational needs. A school culture that supports these attributes creates a win-win situation for everyone. Middle schools can be the "last best chance" for both teachers and students (Turning Points, 1989, p. 8). The interrelatedness of exemplary middle schools, school culture, and teachers' efficacy supports the need to examine these factors in context. The desire is to create schools that meet the efficacy needs of teachers and the developmental needs of the young adolescent. Teachers are important resources in education. Empowering them to make decisions and act in developmentally responsive ways toward students should be a mission for any school trying to create a better culture for itself.



## CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

### Desired Contributions

This research identified the cultural aspects of two Professional Development Middle Schools and examined personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) of the teachers and student teachers at each school in relation to its culture. Embedded in this research was an examination of the presence of exemplary middle school practices. Through a careful examination of the relationships between PTE and GTE and the culture of two Professional Development Middle Schools, this research makes a contribution to the field by identifying factors of culture that positively influence teachers' efficacy. A school culture conducive to heightened teacher efficacy has the potential to meet the needs of its young adolescents. Additionally, this research offers a clearer understanding of how on-site teacher educators and student teachers shape their teaching efficacy in relation to the perceived culture of the school. The analysis procedures using empirical descriptors of efficacy and climate coupled with qualitative descriptors should provide a significant research framework.

Following is a list of the research questions that guided this study. (For analyses, see Appendix A)

1a. What is the relationship between pre and post scores of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools on Woolfolk and Hoy's (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale?

1b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of efficacy through structured interview questions and informal conversations?

2a. What are the relationships among the scores of on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) on Cheal's (1990) Middle Level School Organizational Climate Indicator?

2b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of Cheal's dimensions of climate through structured interview questions and informal conversations?

3. What are the correlations among scores of the seven organizational factors as identified on the Cheal Middle Level School Organizational Climate Indicator and personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) scores on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale?

4. From the perspectives of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST), what are the most important aspects of school culture that influence personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE)?

#### Participants

Fourteen student teachers and 16 on-site teacher educators participated in this investigation. Nine student teachers were senior Middle Grades Education Majors, and five were Option II, Master's Level Middle Grades Education Majors. A total of 30 individuals participated in this study. Demographics for the on-site teacher educators showed that the group consisted of 13 females and 3 males. All were white. The number of years taught ranged from 5 to 27. The average number of years taught was 17.2. The

ages of the on-site teacher educators ranged from 26 to 50 . Their average age was 42.6. For the student teachers, demographics showed that 11 were female and 3 were male; 13 were white and 1 was Asian. Their ages ranged from 20 to 33 years. The average age was 23.9. Each participant was assured confidentiality. Principals at each Middle Level Professional Development School allowed access into the schools. Results were reported without identifying information about a specific school, teacher, or student teacher.

Both middle schools are part of a collaborative effort between a local university and school system to provide a strong field based experience for preservice educators. Teachers who supervised student teachers were selected from a pool of volunteers. Selected supervising teachers were chosen based on perceptions of administrators and university team leaders that these teachers were strong mentors and positive role models who embraced the middle school philosophy. Preservice educators at each school were placed in the schools in August for internship and began student teaching in January. They were supervised by a professor who served as a team leader and a doctoral student. As part of the collaborative effort the university partnership provided mentoring, staff development, and school improvement efforts to the two middle schools.

At the time of this study, North had 901 students and 64 full time teachers. The student population was 64.2% white and 35.8% minority. South had 646 students and 51 full time teachers. The student population was 77% white and 23% minority. Administrative staff at both schools consisted of a principal and two assistant principals.

#### Instruments

Both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered to address the research questions. Triangulation, for cross-validation, was employed through the use of two administrations of the efficacy subscales, the administration of the climate indicator survey, informal observations, and interviews. Two instruments provided measures of quantitative

variables. The Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale (see Appendix B) measured general and personal teaching efficacy. Cheal's (1990) Middle School Organizational Climate Indicator (see Appendix C) measured seven dimensions of climate: administrative control, administrative support, teacher frustration, teacher social needs, tangible environment, pupil control behavior, and expectancy and motivation. These instruments were chosen because of their applicability to the proposed research. Specifically, Woolfolk and Hoy measured efficacy in relation to beliefs about control (1990), and later examined teachers' efficacy in relation to the organizational health of school (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1993). Cheal's Middle School Organizational Climate Indicator was chosen because of its specificity to middle schools and measures of dimensions of culture.

Both quantitative instruments used have been determined to be reliable and valid. Hoy and Woolfolk used 20 items found to have acceptable reliability coefficients. Factor analyses were performed to confirm the existence of the two factors: GTE and PTE. Multiple regression was used to assess the contribution of GTE and PTE and their interaction to pupil control ideology, bureaucratic orientation, and motivational style. Other psychometric procedures included analysis of eigenvalues to determine that constructs asserted to be measured, PTE and GTE, were indeed being measured. For this sample, the Cronbach's alpha was .74 for the GTE scale and .82 for the PTE scale.

The Middle School Climate Survey (Cheal, 1990) was initially developed from three other instruments: Rutgers Secondary School Climate Inventory-Final Form (Mulhern, 1984), Pupil Control Ideology Form (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy, 1967), and Miskel's (1982) Expectancy and Motivation Scale. From this combination, seven statistically valid and reliable factors were identified and defined to portray aspects of the

organizational climate of middle schools. The reduced final form contains 43 items with the following alpha reliabilities:

Expectancy and motivation, alpha=.95  
 Administrative support, alpha=.95  
 Pupil control behavior, alpha = .92  
 Tangible environment, alpha =.87  
 Administrative control, alpha =.91  
 Teacher intimacy, alpha =.93  
 Teacher frustration, alpha=.76

The third instrument administered, a demographic questionnaire, administered to the OSTE and student teachers gathered the following information:

Name	Name of school
Gender	Teaching Assignment (subject and grade)
Race	Number of years taught *
Age	Number of years as OSTE *
Licensure Area	Numbers of years at this school *

\*gathered from OSTE only

The fourth instrument, eleven structured interview questions, matched the items measured by the instruments gathering quantitative data, the Hoy and Woolfolk Teaching Efficacy Scale and Cheal's Middle School Organizational Climate Indicator. Specifically, the interview questions addressed personal and general teaching efficacy measured by Hoy and Woolfolk as well as expectancy and motivation, pupil control behavior, tangible environment, teacher social needs, teacher frustration, administrative support, and administrative control as measured by Cheal. The following questions, based on GTE, PTE, and the constructs of Cheal's instrument, were asked:

1. What are the most critical needs of young adolescents?
2. What are the biggest obstacles to meeting these needs?
3. In what ways do teachers overcome obstacles to meeting students' needs?  
 (general teaching efficacy)

4. In what ways do you overcome obstacles to meeting students' needs?  
(personal teaching efficacy)
5. In what ways do teachers at this school monitor progress and adjust the instructional program? (expectancy and motivation)
6. How do teachers at this school handle classroom management? (pupil control behavior)
7. How are instructional materials and opportunities for teachers to learn new things decided at this school? (tangible environment)
8. In what ways are teachers friends and/or socialize outside the school? (teacher social needs)
9. What effect do non-teaching duties, paperwork, and committee meetings have on the teachers at this school? (teacher frustration)
10. In what ways are faculty recognized or complimented at this school?  
(administrative support)
11. How does your principal know what teachers are teaching and how they are carrying out non-instructional duties? (administrative control)

The guiding questions regarding this proposed research was "How do we do things around here" and "who are 'we'" (Johnston, 1992; Strahan, 1994). The informal interview probed for tacit knowledge and included questions regarding "how we do things around here" to determine how participants describe the school's culture. Informal observations of lessons focused on the same issues addressed in the structured interviews to determine what was perceived by the participants versus what was observed during lesson informal observations and school visits. Five qualitative research techniques were used to gather data from the OSTE, student teachers, principals, and two UNCG faculty who served as team leaders in the middle schools being studied:

- 1) Structured interviews - taped interviews using the 11 questions related to culture and efficacy
  - 2) Informal observations - occurred with weekly visits to the schools
  - 3) Non-structured interviews and conversations - hallway chats, requests by on-site teacher educators or student teachers to meet with the researcher
  - 4) Key informants - identified as people in the school who know "how we do things around here"
  - 5) Participant reflection - participants had opportunities to examine informal observations and offer explanations and interpretations from their perspectives.
- Additionally, the researcher kept a written log of informal observations and conversations.

#### Procedures

The Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale was administered to OSTE and student teachers twice during the academic year, once during the first nine weeks and once during the last nine weeks. During the last nine weeks, Cheal's Middle School Organizational Climate Indicator was administered to provide measures of seven dimensions of the organizational climate: expectancy and motivation, pupil control behavior, tangible environment, teacher social needs, teacher frustration, administrative support, and administrative control. Qualitative data will include interviews and informal observations. One structured interview with each participant was conducted between late February and mid-March and informal interviews and informal observations occurred throughout the '95-'96 school year. The purpose of the interviews and informal observations was to allow participants the opportunity to describe their perceptions of the school's culture and of their teaching efficacy in their own terms.

### Analysis

Qualitative data were analyzed through triangulation with the on-site teacher educators, student teachers and administrators, as well as the use of key informants. Data were analyzed to generate shared perceptions of culture and efficacy. Direct quotes were reported as illustrations. The quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS Statistical Programming Package.

The informal observations and interviews allowed multiple perspectives regarding the relationship between the culture and teaching efficacy of the OSTE and student teachers. By looking at patterns and themes, the researcher can discuss what is observed and how that observation came to be (Burnaford, 1993). This multi-method of qualitative and quantitative data collection increased validity and reliability of this study. More specifically triangulation will occur through specific analysis of the data (see Table 1, Appendix A).

### Limitations

The unique aspects of this study create certain limitations. Demographics of the small number of participants show that all the on-site teacher educators were white, and 80% were female. Of the student teachers, 93% were white, and 79% were female. Another limitation was due to the fact that this group consisted of a cluster sample. All on-site teacher educators were part of a collaborative teacher education program with the university and were not part of a random sample of teachers at each school. The study may not relate to other middle school teacher education programs. These limitations decreased the generalizability of the study. This study might be generalized to other teacher education programs with similar demographics or Professional Development Schools whose culture is similar to the ones described in this study.



### Summary

This research, through a careful examination of both qualitative and quantitative data, examined the interrelatedness of middle schools teachers' efficacy and school culture. This multi-method analysis allowed the researcher to gather information from Likert-type measures, structured interviews, conversations, informal observations, key informants, and the researcher's own log book. The research was grounded in theory and should provide valuable insight into the field, specifically by addressing the relationship between teachers' efficacy and seven dimensions of school climate at two Professional Development Middle Schools. The research framework included data gathering techniques that can be replicated in other settings to study middle school cultures and the personal and general teaching efficacy of teachers.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Overview

The focus of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived culture and perceived teacher efficacy among preservice teachers and cooperating teachers in two Professional Development Middle Schools. Two university professors (team leaders), a doctoral student, and two principal fellows visited the student teachers weekly, and on-site teacher educators (OSTEs) provided feedback on a daily basis. The researcher used the Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale and the Cheal (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator, to gather data, along with interviews and observations. This study examined the relationship between pre and post efficacy scores, examined the results of scores on seven dimensions of organizational climate, and examined the correlations among efficacy scores and climate scores. This study also examined cooperating teachers' and student teachers' perceptions of efficacy, climate, and their perceptions of what aspects of culture influenced personal and general teaching efficacy. This chapter presents results accordingly. The first section analyzes perceptions related to middle school. This is followed by an analysis of efficacy scores and perceptions of efficacy. The next section examines climate scores and perceptions of climate. The third section examines correlations between efficacy and climate. This chapter ends with a summary of the entire study.

#### Perceptions of Middle School Efficacy and Culture

The following data are based on structured interviews, the researcher's observations, notes, and results from the Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale

and the Cheal (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator. Information for both groups and both schools are presented together. Separations are made only for clarity or to alert the reader to differences in perceptions by school or rank. An analysis of perceptions related to middle school students' needs and obstacles to meeting these needs is presented, followed by an analysis of perceptions related to efficacy and climate.

### Analysis of Perceptions Related to Middle School

#### Critical Needs of Adolescents

When asked about the most critical needs of young adolescents, teachers' answers varied but tended to center on social-emotional needs. Teachers' comments reflected their perceptions that middle school adolescents needed emotional support, particularly to know, "Am I good, and am I doing a good job." Other needs teachers identified most frequently related to establishing relationships and a sense of belonging. Family support and love were identified as needs. As one teacher reflected on her students, she identified that the achievements of those who had family support and those who did not were completely different. Other teachers said that working through issues of home life and societal problems as a means of increasing students' learning opportunities was a need of the young adolescent. Most teachers felt that a lack of consistency and structure at home was reflected in the absence of many students having a routine, study time, parental guidance, organization, work ethics, and positive peer relationships. Teachers added that societal pressure related to peers, drugs, adolescence, and a lack of family guidance/background contributed to the critical needs of many students.

Some teachers felt students needed an adult to listen to them, to be flexible, and to be forgiving of their shortcomings. One teacher said young adolescents needed adults who cared enough to spend time with them. Teachers also perceived that middle school students needed guidance in the transition from childhood to adulthood, particularly in dealing with

developmental needs and the new challenges their bodies and minds were experiencing, such as feelings of inadequacy, aggression, and sexuality.

Student teachers observed that support was crucial for middle school students as they experienced many transitions, both academically and emotionally. The student teachers felt the students needed attention and needed to know that someone at school cared about them. Additionally, the student teachers felt students needed individual quality time with an adult, whether it was one-on-one time with a teacher or with a parent. They also felt middle school students needed to have time to socialize, to have a break during the day, and to explore different interests and activities to find their strengths and talents.

Principal Smith, at North, said the most critical needs of the young adolescent were to work on their own identity and see how they fit into the world. She felt middle school was an ideal place to reach adolescents in what she labeled an "ideal point between childhood and serious academic pursuit." She felt this was a good time for students to grasp what it meant to be a citizen of the world, and noted she saw many students floundering for role identity. She felt middle school was the best time to help students feel positive about who they were and to help them become responsible citizens in the community through service and citizenship. She said that, as a society, "we have not done a good job helping students become responsible citizens." She felt we have focused much more on trying to make all students happy, and that as a result, they are all very unhappy.

Principal Miller, at South, addressed this issue by saying that middle school students needed to have a sense of acceptance, belonging, and being a part of something. He felt that middle school students were searching for direction and guidance, while sometimes going around in circles. He felt middle school was a good time for educators to have an influence and offer guidance, as students were transitioning into young adults. He gave an example of a South program called TOPS, Teaching Our Pupils Success, that had

been successfully implemented to help at-risk students. He attributed its success to the strong bonds created between teachers and students, not its academic pursuits.

### Obstacles to Meeting Students' Needs

The researcher asked teachers and student teachers to think about the biggest obstacles they faced in meeting the needs of the young adolescent. Teachers perceived dealing with home life, outside influences, not getting parental support, and negative peer influences as obstacles that got in the way of students not being able to "tune in and focus." For example, one teacher felt that she was unaware of the home baggage and background, and that, coupled with a lack of parental support, made reaching some of her students difficult. Another teacher stated that she could see a difference in the last 15-20 years in parents stressing the importance of school. She perceived that a decrease in parental focus on school's importance harmed students. She wished we (society in general) could turn around and emphasize the importance of education.

Other perceived obstacles included a lack of time and resources to meet individual differences among students, particularly in the area of learning styles. This was a concern especially for one teacher who felt frustrated that she was unable to meet all students' preferred learning styles and modalities. One teacher felt too many educators fell into junior high modes of thinking, where content was more important than understanding the student. He felt that adolescence deserved greater recognition relating to their developmental needs. Other teachers identified local and state mandated testing as an obstacle to meeting student needs. Other obstacles teachers faced included difficulty in making parental contact, doing paperwork for the school and the county, and trying to maintain the curriculum. This related to teacher's frustration with lack of time, which they identified as a big obstacle to meeting students' needs.

Student teachers identified various obstacles to meeting student needs. One need was identified as the inability to accommodate academic differences and abilities. Student teachers felt they either did not have time or skills to deal with all the academic levels and abilities they faced daily. They indicated that many students needed individual time. One student teacher gave an example from her experience. In a class of 30, five students needed one-on-one time. Some students needs were not met, and she found it difficult not to bore some students while repeating material for slower students.

One student teacher saw the institutionalization of education as a large part of the problem and felt that it got in the way of meeting individual needs of children. He noted that some students needed to move around and have different learning opportunities, but they were often overlooked by the institutional requirements for structure, order, and accountability. Similarly, another student teacher stressed that imposed structures such as state and local requirements, prevented students from getting quality time and instruction from the teacher. Student teachers also listed lack of money for education and the End of Course testing as "system" obstacles to meeting students' needs. One student saw the biggest obstacle as school not being students' number one priority. She saw this as a kind of tug of war and felt that often it was easier not to pull. She focused on students and felt that they complained about taking notes and writing essays. She felt they wanted to "write down facts and spit them out on Friday" (Melanie). Unlike the other student teachers, this particular student teacher identified the students themselves as obstacles.

Principal Smith identified the major obstacle to meeting the needs of the young adolescent as our success as a country. She said our ,society had done a good job of allowing people to "have a say," of being "democratic" and of welcoming diversity of opinion, religion, and culture. She felt this was good, but felt that we were at a benchmark as a country in a pre-anarchy stage and that not many people agree on anything. She said

parents were diverse. She had some who wanted absolute character taught and others who did not want children to have to say "Yes" to a teacher. She felt that as educators, rather than fight that battle, we had basically required nothing of the students. She also commented that parents were letting their houses be run in a democratic fashion. She perceived that children were being allowed to make decisions about what they ate, when they went to bed, what they wore, and how they spoke to their parents. She felt if one added all these factors together, education was a tough battle. She expressed concern that many people were too tired to fight it. She felt the only way to turn things around was "to bite the bullet" and say, "In this school, this is what will happen." Principal Smith expressed a need to set standards at North.

Principal Miller felt that accountability was an obstacle preventing educators from more successfully meeting middle school students' needs. He felt that local, state, and national mandates caused schools to address only academic needs and kept schools from addressing social needs. He commented that some teachers did well in balancing academic and social needs, but he felt other teachers needed training in how to meet the many needs of young adolescents.

#### Analysis of Efficacy

After reflecting upon the needs of middle school students and obstacles to meeting these needs, teachers and student teachers reflected on how they individually and collectively meet student needs. The cooperating teachers and student teachers at two Professional Development Middle Schools also took the Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale twice during the academic year, once in September and once in April. The scale measured personal teaching efficacy, which refers to a teacher's belief in his or her own ability to positively affect students and general teaching efficacy, which refers to one's belief in the ability of teachers in general to affect students positively. The

results of each scale measuring personal teaching efficacy (PTE) are presented in Table 1 and of general teaching efficacy (GTE) are presented in Table 3. A score of 1 indicated the highest level of personal teacher efficacy and a score of 5 indicated the lowest level of personal teaching efficacy. Pre-test efficacy PTE scores ranged from 1.67 to 2.50, and post test efficacy PTE scores ranged from 2.10 to 2.83. Data indicated that teachers and student teachers perceived a high level of personal teaching efficacy, or the belief that individually, they could positively affect students. Data indicated no statistical differences between pre and post efficacy scores for school or rank. Scores presented are scaled scores. Teacher and student teacher comments follow the quantitative data analyses.

#### Personal Teaching Efficacy

Personal teaching efficacy was measured using the Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale. Results are presented in tables 1 and 2. The tables are followed by quantitative examples.

Table 1

#### Personal Teaching Efficacy Scores (PTE)

School	Rank	Pre-Test Efficacy Scores			Post-Test Efficacy Scores		
		N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Difference
North	T	6	1.67	0.52	2.17	0.75	-0.50
North	ST	6	4.00	0.63	2.83	0.75	+1.17
South	T	10	2.13	0.35	2.10	0.88	+0.03
South	ST	8	2.50	0.53	2.43	0.98	-0.07

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.



### Pre-Post Personal and General Teaching Efficacy Comparisons

Individual personal teaching efficacy scores for teachers and student teachers at each school are listed in Table 2. At North, six cooperating teachers and six student teachers participated in the study. At South, ten cooperating teachers and eight student teachers participated in the study. One student teacher at South left the program to enter the Air Force, and another South student teacher chose not to participate in this study.

Personal teaching efficacy scores for North student teachers as a group increased 1.17, from 4.00 to 2.83. These student teachers commented they had learned to modify assignments, develop a good rapport with the students, and work with the supervising teachers to find ways to meet student needs. Developing these skills appeared to make them perceive they could positively impact students.

### Item Analysis with Qualitative Illustrations for Personal Teaching Efficacy

Most teachers' and student teachers' comments indicated they perceived themselves as capable of successfully meeting students' needs. They perceived themselves as having a variety of methods to help students become successful socially, emotionally, and academically. A few exceptions to the perceived high sense of efficacy were indicated by teachers or student teachers who felt extremely frustrated or overburdened by meeting student needs. However, most teachers and student teachers indicated they were willing to devote much personal time to helping students.

Teachers or student teachers whose differences on personal teaching efficacy scores were more than two points have been analyzed. Two student teachers, Susan and Amber, had increases of 2 and 3, respectively. Susan commented that she felt good when students succeeded. She modified assignments or used alternative assessments such as oral tests to assess student progress. Amber commented that she called students at home when they were absent, sent a newsletter to parents, and worked one-on-one with students. She

Table 2

Pre-Post Personal Teaching Efficacy Scores (PTE)

Teachers				Student Teachers			
Name	Pre	Post	Difference	Name	Pre	Post	Difference
North							
Donna	1	2	-1	Susan	4	2	+2
Patty	2	2	0	Jack	3	2	+1
Robin	2	2	0	Eric	4	3	+1
Kate	2	3	-1	Melanie	5	4	+1
Barbara	1	1	0	Tim	4	5	-1
Brenda	2	3	-1	Amber	4	1	+3
Range	1-2	1-3		Range	3-5	1-5	
Mean Score	1.67	2.17		Mean Score	4.00	2.83	
South							
Bob	2	3	-1	Alison	2	3	-1
Denise	2	3	-1	Hilary	2	2	0
Joann	2	3	-1	Ann	3	4	-1
William	3	2	+1	Elizabeth	3	3	0
Glenda	2	1	+1	Cathy	2	2	0
Kelly	2	1	+1	Jill	3	2	+1
Molly	2	1	+1	Shelly	3	1	+2
Jennifer	2	2	0	Cindy	2	3	-1
Linda	2	3	-1	Range	2-3	1-4	
Joe	2	3	-1	Mean Score	2.50	2.40	
Range	2-3	1-3					
Mean Score	2.10	2.30					

directed a play with her students, which allowed her to utilize students' talents. Both student teachers developed a good rapport with students

In viewing schools as being influential versus society as being at fault, the teachers and student teachers made the following comments. Susan said schools used accountability, documentation, paired activities, group work, and outside work. Donna said schools overcame obstacles through academics and emotional support. Brenda noted that 6th grade teachers "bent over backwards" to raise test scores. Finally, regarding their views of personal empowerment, or "I can make a difference/ I cannot do it all," teachers and student teachers made several comments. Susan noted that she felt good when students succeeded, that consistency was important, and that she felt supported by other student teachers and the 6th grade teachers as a group. Donna said she stayed after school, gave emotional support and used assertive discipline. Brenda tutored individually and talked with the students.

Individual cooperating teachers' PTE perceptions were evident in the ways they described how they tried to overcome obstacles and meet student needs. Teachers said they gave up planning time and stayed after school to work one-on-one with students as ways of meeting student needs. Three teachers talked about their abilities to be emotionally attuned with their students. These teachers wanted to help students feel successful, try to understand them, make them feel needed, and make the school environment inviting, comforting, and safe. One teacher simply said, "I do my part: challenge kids." She followed this by discussing her caring for the students and modeling appropriate interactions. Her hope was that someday the students would look back and say she made a difference in their lives. She concluded her interview by saying that when things were not going well, she remembered that she was making a difference and tried not to let the frustrations get her down. Another teacher felt her key to overcoming obstacles was the

good rapport she developed with the students. She felt her students trusted her and felt comfortable in her class.

Other teachers described themselves as being flexible and trying to work cohesively with other teachers, particularly the ones on their team and grade level. The teachers who described this felt the team could work collectively as a unit to meet students' needs. One South teacher discussed requesting students to stay after school almost every Tuesday and Thursday, so she could give them additional help. She also made 50 to 60 phone calls per month to parents and students and sometimes gave oral tests to students over the phone. Another teacher stressed that she gave assignment sheets and planners to all her students so no one stood out. She also worked on peer relationships with her students. Many teachers held parental conferences and used written communication as a way to meet student needs. One teacher indicated she kept in close contact with the parents and tried not to alienate them. She tried to approach them in a manner of "what can we do together to help your child?"

One South teacher tried to meet student needs by working on students' self esteem. She believed not succeeding in school led to a lower self esteem. She also talked to parents, worked closely with HUB (Helping Understand the Basics), and tried to link the community and school together through support group meetings, as well as discussion groups with parents. She had a good rapport with students, parents, other teachers, and the administration. She noted that the assistance from a local university and college had been particularly beneficial in helping her overcome obstacles and meeting student needs because this involvement allowed more people to become involved with the students. Another teacher on this same team described herself as letting her students know she really cared. She felt she had to meet social and emotional needs before ever trying to meet the

academic needs. Another teacher said the best way to overcome obstacles was keep the students as the main priority.

Student teachers described themselves individually meeting student needs in many ways. Common descriptors included giving up planning and personal time, differentiating instruction, and being flexible. One student teacher realized she had to meet certain local and state requirements, but had learned to make learning interesting and meaningful to the students' lives. Another student teacher stressed that she tried to make herself available before and after school and to let the students know they could come talk to her at any time. She said basically she cared about the students and wanted them to feel comfortable around her without feeling too comfortable, or overstepping boundaries in class.

One student teacher said he conducted help sessions two times per week, gave untimed tests, read tests to students, and prepared different versions of tests as ways to overcome obstacles. One student teacher said that she felt good when students succeeded, so she tried "anything I can" to help students become more successful.

Another student teacher talked about the need for parental contact and involvement. She worked on encouraging parental support by sending newsletters to keep parent informed. She called home if a student was out more than one day to let the student know she cared, and she described working hard to help students complete missed work. An example she shared was about a student, Larry, who always hummed in class and rarely completed assignments. After she helped him with assignments, read assignments orally to him, and basically made him feel worthwhile as a person, she said she saw a, "360 degree turn" (sic) in his behavior and work. He no longer threw away his work. He attempted assignments and worked hard to please her. As a result, his grades and self esteem appeared to improve.

One student teacher tried to find the difficulty, and then fix the problem. She did this through discussions in team meetings, contacts with parents, and referrals to the guidance department. She also allowed socializing in class through working with partners and groups. She described her teaching as not always lecturing, but as trying to let students teach themselves and others. She offered an example of Writer's Workshop where students engaged in peer coaching and conferencing. Another student teacher said, "I try hard to find out what's going on in their lives, open up myself, get to know them, and maintain a sense of humor" (Cindy). One student teacher felt she was still trying techniques she saw cooperating teachers use that worked. She felt that she needed to stay on her toes and longed for "eyes in back of her head" (Alison).

#### General Teaching Efficacy

Like personal teaching efficacy, general teaching efficacy was measured from a subscale of the Woolfolk and Hoy Teachers Efficacy Scale. Results are presented in table 3 and table 4. The tables are followed by qualitative examples. A score of 1 indicated the highest level of general teaching efficacy and a score of 5 indicated the lowest level of general teaching efficacy. Pre-test efficacy GTE scores ranged from 1.83 to 2.60 and post-test efficacy GTE scores ranged from 1.60 to 2.43. This indicated that teachers and student teachers perceived a high level of general teaching efficacy, or the belief that overall teachers could positively affect students.

Table 3

General Teaching Efficacy Scores (GTE)

School	Rank	N	Pre-test Efficacy Scores		Post-test Efficacy Scores		
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Difference
North	T	6	2.33	0.82	2.0	0.89	+0.33
North	ST	6	1.83	0.98	1.6	0.89	+0.23
South	T	10	2.60	1.35	2.0	1.25	+0.60
South	ST	8	1.88	0.99	2.43	1.13	+0.75

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.

Item Analysis with Qualitative Illustrations for General Teaching Efficacy

Two student teachers scores reflected changes of more than one. Tim's scores increased from 3 to 1 in GTE and Jill's scores decreased from 1 to 4 in GTE. Tim commented that he had learned to work collaboratively with another student teacher and his supervising teacher. His comments indicated he found these teachers effectively meeting student needs. Jill's scores went from 1 to 4. Jill was working with a cooperating teacher she perceived as effectively meeting student needs. However, she commented that she felt

Table 4

Pre-Post General Teaching Efficacy Scores (GTE)

Teachers				Student Teachers			
Name	Pre	Post	Difference	Name	Pre	Post	Difference
North							
Donna	3	3	0	Susan	2	1	+1
Patty	3	2	+1	Jack	3	2	+1
Robin	2	1	+1	Eric	1	2	-1
Kate	3	3	0	Melanie	1	1	0
Barbara	1	1	0	Tim	3	1	+2
Brenda	2	2	0	Amber	1	2	-1
Range	1-3	1-3		Range	1-3	1-2	
Mean Score	2.33	2.00		Mean Score	1.83	1.50	
South							
Bob	3	2	+1	Alison	1	3	-2
Denise	2	1	+1	Hilary	2	2	0
Joann	3	4	-1	Ann	3	4	-1
William	3	1	+2	Elizabeth	1	1	0
Glenda	1	1	0	Cathy	3	2	+1
Kelly	4	3	+1	Jill	1	4	-3
Molly	1	1	0	Shelly	3	2	+1
Jennifer	1	1	0	Cindy	1	1	0
Linda	3	2	+1	Range	1-3	1-4	
Joe	5	4	+1	Mean Score	1.88	2.40	
Range	1-5	1-4					
Mean Score	2.60	2.00					



frustrated by teachers on their team who did not work closely with students. She had observed team members who used worksheets to keep students busy and quiet. She also commented that she felt one or two teammates were not contributing much to the team. Her frustration with these teachers is indicative in the decrease in GTE scores, reflecting her overall perception that some teachers were not positively impacting students.

Finally, regarding their views of personal empowerment, or "I can make a difference/ I cannot do it all," teachers and student teachers made several comments. Tim said that he used mass media, followed the course of study, shared ideas with others, and used assertive discipline versus behavior modification. Barbara felt that she provided emotional support and used assertive discipline. Jill asserted that she overcame obstacles through networking, and handled management through talking to students one-on-one and using cooperative grouping. Kelly felt she was successful through her own efforts and the support from teacher friends.

With few exceptions, student teachers' comments were similar to those of their on-site teacher educators. The only student teacher who showed a drop in efficacy was Jill, who worked with Kelly. Kelly often perceived that only one of her team members worked hard and cared about the students. Jill appeared to emulate some of Kelly's feelings. On one occasion, Jill commented that the other teachers did not care about the students' emotional and social well being. She also commented, like Kelly, that doing what she perceived as more than her fair share was frustrating and unfair. Both Jill and Kelly felt that the teachers in general were not affecting students' lives as positively as they could if they cared more and tried to meet students' needs.

Teachers' GTE perceptions were evident in the ways they described teachers in general overcoming obstacles to meet student needs. Teachers felt they overcame obstacles to meeting student needs in a variety of ways. They listed differentiating instruction,

grouping strategies, one-on-one instruction, after school tutoring, and individualized student plans. South teachers described schoolwide commitments such as an after school tutorial held every Tuesday and Thursday, planners to keep assignments and notes, fostering home, school, and community relations, providing financial support when necessary, and implementing a new program called HUB (Helping Understand the Basics) to help at-risk students. They asserted this made students more successful and made the learning environment more inviting, comforting, and safe.

One teacher felt that overall North teachers were very committed to overcoming obstacles and meeting student needs. She stated that sixth grade teachers shared a close bond, worked to raise test scores, worked after school, and offered tutoring sessions to their students. She did articulate that weaker teachers did not always meet student needs. One South teacher, Joe, felt that too many teachers did not try to overcome obstacles. He said so many teachers quit and did not try to meet student needs. He felt teaching was just a job to some teachers, who gave worksheets and put grades in the computer to please the principal, but did not try to reach the whole child. Although Joe's perception was less positive, overall South teachers perceived themselves as trying to meet student needs.

The student teachers felt they overcame obstacles by making individual assignments, by grading based on student ability, by meeting needs through small groups, and by allowing students to have flexibility. One student teacher talked about one-on-one time and after school tutoring as ways to meet student needs. Another felt that the obstacles were eliminated by teams of teachers who worked together collaboratively. She gave an example of being an intern on a team where teachers worked individually, not as a team, and had inconsistent expectations from students. Student behavior was troublesome and required much support from administration and teacher monitoring. She compared this with a team whose rules and expectations were consistent and student behavior was well

managed. She also noted the few referrals to the office and the less rigid teacher monitoring.

Another student teacher saw teacher pacing as important in meeting student needs. She felt teachers needed to teach at a medium pace, not above or below most students' academic needs, and she felt that teachers should follow curriculum guidelines. One student teacher saw academic needs being met, but had not seen much time directed towards meeting social and emotional needs. Another student teacher found that networking by going to other teachers and asking how they handled a situation, or going to administration and asking how to handle a situation, was helpful to her in meeting student needs. She felt it was important not to take all the responsibility on herself. One student teacher said she had learned to work with system and not openly buck the system. "I'm learning, patience and perseverance, to take the loving hand" (Alison).

Principal Smith commented that thinking about how teachers overcame obstacles was interesting to her. She felt it ran the gamut at North. She saw some teachers as extremely successful with most of their children. However, she commented she did not think she had any teachers who would not say they had two to five children with whom they did not feel they had made much progress. She noted that teachers who were being successful were in contact with their students and parents. They did not give up because there was no phone at home or no response from a parent. They tended to do more positive communication, which Principal Smith felt resulted in less negative behavior from the students. Conversely, Principal Smith felt she had a few teachers whose attitude was, "I shouldn't have to do this." They expected students to listen and do what they said. She said she agreed that would make teaching ideal, but felt that expectation was not reality based. She felt students were less compliant because they did not have expectations at home. Since teachers were aware of this, she said they either "kicked back and drew their

check," or they cared, which meant staying on top of things everyday. She positively commented that she saw her staff at an above average point but not an excellent point, and felt that one of her responsibilities was to try to help the staff do their job in an excellent manner.

Principal Miller responded to this question by saying that a large percentage of South teachers liked the students they taught, which enabled them to meet student needs effectively. He also commented that most teachers knew how to interact with the students without arguing to make them behave. He noted that many of the teachers gave much of their own time rather than just teaching math, science, social studies, or language arts. He said, "It's an attitude the atmosphere of the school allows them to have."

#### Personal and General Teaching Efficacy Conclusion

Overall, teachers and student teachers perceived themselves as having a fairly high sense of general and personal teaching efficacy. Scores on the Hoy and Woolfolk Teacher Efficacy Scale supported these perceptions. This indicated that overall the teachers and student teachers perceived they individually and collectively could meet students' needs and have a positive impact on students. A few exceptions to the positive perceptions were uncovered, but appeared to be less prevalent than the overall sense of positive personal and general teaching efficacy. Some fluctuations in efficacy perceptions exists; however, teachers and student teachers at both schools indicated fairly high levels of personal and general teaching efficacy. Generally, teachers and student teachers tended to have two frames of reference for efficacy. Teachers and student teachers tended to feel that they were meeting the needs of their students. For student teachers, this was putting theory into practice. Secondly, they saw themselves as supporting each other. Teachers and student teachers who articulated the highest sense of efficacy tended to see students as agents, to see school as an influence, and to see themselves as being able to make a difference.

Teachers and student teachers whose efficacy was slightly lower, occasionally saw students as victims, saw society as partially responsible, and saw themselves as unable to "do it all, " although they were often willing to try to do as much as they felt was possible. Although perceptions varied, the teachers who had higher efficacies were student advocates.

Related to efficacy in the sense of "who we are," teachers and student teachers at both schools saw themselves as "people who take care of our students." Specifically, at South, teachers and student teachers perceived themselves as doing "whatever it takes" to meet the needs of the young adolescent. At North, teachers and student teachers perceived themselves as "we are the ones who care." These perceptions are reflected in the following illustrations of the teachers' and student teachers' voices.

When reflecting upon student needs, one South teacher said:

Where do I start? They need help in responsibility of self acceptance. Many parents do not have time. Our students want to talk. They are not being made to take responsibility. They need lifetime problem solving skills. Behavior would be better and grades would be better. (Molly)

One North teacher who described herself as a very caring teacher echoed Molly's comment that middle school students needed to talk to a caring adult, and to have a place to share their thoughts. She said, "A lot of my children just want to talk, not about school, about life" (Brenda). One South teacher believed that the students' needs had nothing to do with curriculum and were based on having people to support them in a loving environment. She commented that, "So many kids are fractured, have seen everything in the world in the morning before school. What difference do prepositions make in their lives?" (Kelly). She continued her conversation by saying that students needed levelness and a strong base. Similarly, another teacher who believed students needed a support system said, "They need to have a cohesive group of teachers around, who are organized, and who work closely

together to see many aspects of students' lives, not just academic areas or small segments" (William, South teacher).

Some student teachers discussed tumultuous home life and lack of parenting as contributory to the students' needs. However, they did not feel this was an insurmountable problem. They articulated ways of making a difference at school. One South student teacher said that students needed fundamental caring and attention. She followed this by saying, "Sometimes I think you need to do those things before you can even teach" (Jill). Another South student teacher felt committed to building self esteem in her students:

Subject areas are not particularly important. They need structure and loving, open arms. They need to hear that we're not here to judge you. You're always welcome here. We're here to help you. We give too many grades. They feel they are a success if they pass and a bum if they fail. Eighth grade is not the end of the world. Too often they believe it is. (Alison)

Related to meeting societal and homelife needs, one teacher felt that knowing right from wrong and having values was a critical need. "In my class I teach boys and girls right from wrong, what's fair, things they don't get at home, things that cause them conflicts and get them in trouble" (Joann, South teacher). This teacher indicated that teaching for her was as much helping students learn life skills as it was teaching information they needed. One teacher attributed student needs to societal changes. She echoed the African proverb that "it takes a village to raise a child" and felt it was harder to teach today because some parents were not taking an active role in raising their children. Although she saw society at fault, she felt she could make a difference. She commented that the "whole village" may not be raising the child, but she was committed to teaching her students about "life" and how to succeed despite their home environments. One teacher felt the key to meeting middle school students' needs was to be flexible. Another teacher echoed this need for flexibility by saying:

Everybody has his or her own way. Some are very analytical and left brained. They have kids outline, fill out planners, keep notebooks, do homework, and meet all the academic needs. Kids have to know you really care. You are there to make them successful. Years ago Principal Miller, our principal, said you can chuck the curriculum and create an environment physically and emotionally safe for kids. I think that's true. I feel successful some times, and at other times not. You can get discouraged. I work hard and 13 months later, I hear of a child who has dropped out. Sometimes I think "What was I doing?" (Kelly, South teacher)

The sixth grade teachers at North individually stressed the close bond between teachers on their grade level. They felt they each individually worked to raise test scores, tutored after school, and strove to be a strong support system for the students. One sixth grade teacher said she individualized instruction, had versatile teaching strategies and methods, and was a caring, feeling, knowing person. She stressed that her eyes had to be open and scanning constantly to meet students' needs, whether they were social, emotional, physical, or academic needs. Only one teacher felt that North did not do well in the area of monitoring progress and adjusting the instructional program. In her words, "We do poorly here with so many AD (attention deficit), ADHD (attention deficit-hyperactivity disorder), and LD (learning disabled) students. Many teachers do not pay attention to this unless a parent opens their eyes to this" (Barbara). She found this to be frustrating for students and teachers.

In talking about personally meeting students' needs, a South teacher said:

I teach self responsibility and have a student directed classroom. Other children help each other get on task and let me know when something is not right. They help each other study, call each other when they are absent, get work together, tutor, share study guides, and come up with ideas for the class. I am flexible with this. Children file papers and hand them out without prompting. I get permission to walk around and observe. It is their class. I follow the IEP (individualized education plans) and add to it. You cannot tell who the LD (learning disabled) students are in my room. I expect everyone to make 100. No one is seen as less able. I learned a lot of this as a Girl Scout leader. (Molly)

Other teachers shared their perceptions of relating to their students. One teacher said

It's a struggle for those who try: I continue to tell myself I don't save them all. I try to serve middle and not forget those on wings one way or the other. I encourage those to come back in the fold. (Joe, South teacher)

Another teacher responded by saying:

Kids just listen for me. They know I care about them. When I tell you to do something, do it. I don't mess around. I'm 99.9% easy and gentle. The other is mean as a snake. I don't yell. I get really quiet when I'm mad, and I won't punish a whole class for one or two students doing something wrong. (Kelly, South teacher)

One of the techniques a teacher identified as most effective in meeting the needs of the middle school adolescent was taking a child aside and having a private chat. She began having private chats with students after careful reflection:

Several years ago it dawned on me, I wouldn't want my administrator to speak to me in the middle of a faculty meeting the way we, as teachers, often speak to children in the middle of a classroom. Hopefully, I treat my children with respect. I demand that respect. I know you have to earn it. I hope I do earn it. I try to be fair. I don't fall over and play dead. The best thing I can do is show respect for students. (Denise, South teacher)

The last teacher interviewed described himself as being a lot different from other teachers:

I don't allow physical contact or disrespect. I don't expect them to be very still and face the front. I hit them fast with information they need during the first five to ten minutes of class. Sometimes I get carried away and they laugh. Then I move to an activity. They do a lot of talking and not always about science. When I work, I talk about a lot of different things including work. They should too. If there is a problem, I try to reason with them in the hall. Seldom, maybe one or two times per year, I refer someone to the office. I do call parents some. (Bob, South teacher)

Student teachers perceived self assurance, going through an identity crisis, self-confidence, self esteem, and a balance between self esteem and boundaries as critical needs of young adolescents. One South student teacher identified the biggest obstacles she



faced as too many time demands and trying to meet many student needs that were not met at home: basic love, care, security . . .

Those who stand out get the most attention, and the quiet, well-behaved ones are like wallflowers. The students who earn grades in the B-C range do not get attention as much as the ones who earn A's and the ones who earn D's and F's. (Elizabeth)

Although she recognized obstacles and needs, she expressed concern that she could not meet all student needs successfully. She did not blame society and continued by saying that she wanted to interact more with all students, not just the ones who stood out. Another student felt that teachers should make students the top priority:

They (teachers) don't really take the time. They could do little things like keep Band-Aids, feminine protection. We've had a lot of that this year, and the girls have to go home. Something like this seems so simple to me. If they met the students' needs, it wouldn't cut out so much learning time when kids leave the class or go home. (Ann, South student teacher)

Another South student teacher identified student behavior as an obstacle to meeting needs. "It's difficult and frustrating for me when you know that they simply need attention, but they're doing it in a really negative way" (Jill). However, she commented that she was looking for ways to meet needs effectively and decrease negative behaviors. One South student teacher saw discipline problems as a result of no time for socializing. With only 20 minutes for lunch and no break during the day, students had little time to socialize with friends. She felt middle schools needed to allow students "down" time, or "time to be real people."

One student teacher talked about standing her ground without offending students:

I don't give up, but I'm not going to argue. Pick your battles. Decide which one you're going to have a coronary over, and go after that one. You truly have to focus on what's important and what's important to get through to the kids. (Cathy, South)

Another student teacher described looking at the needs of the class, planning ahead of time, and addressing special situations such as learning preferences as ways of overcoming obstacles and meeting needs. He was exasperated at not being able to meet all the individual needs. "I'm finding it's all I can handle to meet the majority of needs at this point" (Eric, North).

Some teachers saw society as partially responsible for the problems they perceived. One South teacher felt an obstacle related to parental lack of support had to do with students being allowed to watch too much television, particularly programs with sex, guns, drugs, or a combination of these. A seventh grade North teacher felt that societal issues and a decrease in family time were responsible for many of the obstacles teachers faced and prevented teachers from overcoming many obstacles. In her words, "Overall, teachers are extremely frustrated. Some are throwing up hands and quitting" (Robin). She added to this by saying:

Many young people leave teaching after one or two years. They want to teach and are enthusiastic, but don't get responses. Kids don't care. Teachers get discouraged. This bothers me. We're losing a lot of good, capable people. If they could stick with it long enough, but they are not. It's not worth to them what they're having to put out and not feeling any reward for it. Adults also need to feel appreciated.

Although this teacher did not feel that teachers could easily overcome these obstacles, she felt she tried to combat what she saw as negative societal influences. One student teacher felt similarly frustrated. She commented that she did not have time to socialize after school:

I am here from 7:30 - 5:00, everyday. Then I go home and grade papers and make lesson plans until 12:00 midnight. I thought I could have a part-time job, but there is no way. This is a busy job. (Hilary)

A South teacher described teaching as somewhat draining. She said every afternoon she worked hard, and felt things would be easier if every person did his or her share. She was a little frustrated at being on a team where she perceived that two people did most of the work and the other three did less work. This teacher commented:

I have streamlined my life. It is hard not to be on every committee. I do not bring home six to seven hours of work. In language arts and reading, there are reams to read. I am doing more peer correction. The kids do more writing that way. I truly don't have time. Teachers take personal days with deductions in pay to stay home and grade papers. There's something wrong. You are better off to do some peer correction. I stay late, and I leave with things done, at least what has to be done.  
(Kelly)

Although perceptions varied somewhat, the overall perceptions were that "we" are teachers who take care of our students. The perceived high general and personal teaching efficacies were reflected in the teachers and student teachers voices.

The similarity in cooperating teachers' and student teachers' perceptions may be due to the fact that the teachers and student teachers talked on a daily basis, and the OSTE's provided feedback on a daily basis as they observed the student teachers. The student teachers had been in these schools since August as interns, before becoming student teachers in January.

#### Analysis of Climate

Climate was measured using the Cheal (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator and through structured interview questions and the researcher's observations. The subscales of this instrument measured seven dimensions of middle school climate: expectancy and motivation, pupil control behavior, tangible environment, teachers social needs, teacher frustration, administrative support, and administrative control. Five dimensions of climate showed statistical significance at the 0.05 level: tangible environment, pupil control behavior, teacher social needs, administrative support, and administrative control. The dimensions of expectancy and motivation and teacher frustration did not indicate statistical

significance. Statistical tables for each dimension are followed by a narrative description reflecting teacher and student teacher perceptions.

Cooperating teachers perceived a more positive tangible environment than did student teachers. South teachers and student teachers and North teachers perceived more administrative support than did North student teachers. South teachers and student teachers perceived more collegiality than did North teachers and student teachers. Finally, North teachers perceived more administrative control than did any other group.

#### Perceptions of Climate

The following data are based on structured interviews, the researcher's observations, notes, and results from the Cheal (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator. Results are based on evidence of statistical significance and teachers and student teacher comments. Two dimensions, expectancy and motivation, failed to show statistical significance. The dimensions of tangible environment and administrative support showed statistical significance for rank (teacher or student teacher). The other three dimensions of climate pupil control behavior, teacher social needs, and administrative control, showed statistical significance for school. Tables and narrative explanations for each dimension of climate are presented in the following.

#### Shared Perceptions of Climate

Data indicated no differences in teachers and student teachers perceptions of climate regarding the dimensions of expectancy and motivation and teacher frustration at either school, North or South. The following tables present these data.

Table 5

Expectancy and Motivation

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	2.67	0.52
North	ST	6	2.67	1.63
South	T	10	2.00	0.94
South	ST	8	1.88	0.83

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student Teacher.

Teachers and student teachers perceptions reflected their belief that their hard work and dedication would result in positive student outcomes. A score of one indicated the highest level of expectancy and motivation, and a score of five indicated the lowest level of expectancy and motivation. According to Cheal, those with a high level of expectancy and motivation were concerned with the emotional and social level of development in the middle school student. Those with lower levels did not perceive that hard work and dedication would result in positive student growth or professional gratification. The scores ranged from 1.78 to 2.66 for teachers and student teachers, and indicated a fairly high level of expectancy and motivation, although these were not statistically different.

North and South teachers and student teachers perceived themselves as having various strategies to monitor progress and adjust the instructional program. They saw themselves as flexible and willing to met student needs. This was supported by the principal at North who commented that most teachers on staff used a variety of strategies to adjust and monitor progress, and used planning time to complete non-instructional duties.

The principal at South felt his teachers generally liked the students, and he encouraged his faculty to make any necessary modifications to help students. He did note that teachers were often tired by time constraints and non-instructional duties.

Teachers gave examples of how they monitored progress and adjusted the instructional program to help students. The comments tended to reflect perceptions that their hard work and dedication resulted in positive student outcomes. The examples included record keeping, grading, monitoring individual, group, and class progress, and being attuned to the students. They emphasized adjusting for heterogeneous grouping, and using cooperative grouping to try to level the playing field for all students. Other practices they used included pre-post tests, check-ups, homework, and after school tutoring. One teacher stressed the importance of not allowing students to get too far behind, and solving problems as they occurred instead of letting them pile up and become insurmountable. One teacher said he accepted the fact that he had to give grades, but said an A was not the same for all students because he had flexible expectations. For example, one child could write one paragraph and get an A and another would need to write five paragraphs to get an A. He accepted both. "My expectations are not standardized; students are not standardized" (William).

One teacher talked about following the IEPs (Individualized Education Plans) and accommodations that were set up for children with exceptionalities. She said she was perplexed when she learned some people did not follow the IEPs because she felt it made life easier for students and teachers. Another teacher talked to the Exceptional Children teachers to learn ways to make exceptional children successful. For example, she gave a copy of each social studies unit to the exceptional children's teacher before teaching it. She got their input regarding necessary modifications for identified children. To keep students from falling through the cracks, she participated in the Tuesday/Thursday after school

tutoring program which she felt resulted in a lower failure rate for students at South. Other methods teachers shared included much communication and discussions of particular students in team meetings, focusing on students with problems, making phone calls home, speaking with students in team meetings, and using principals, guidance counselors, and parents to help find ways to monitor progress and adjust the instructional program. One teacher said she "snagged kids who didn't understand and helped them figure it out" as a way of helping students (Kelly). One teacher pulled students one-on-one, tested and retested, used essays, lab reports, and rewrites to help students. He saw the key to adjusting the program and meeting various needs as meeting each individual's needs.

One student teacher described having a general unit plan and modifying it daily to meet students' needs. Another student teacher felt that teacher organization and the structure in the classroom served as a means of monitoring progress. Another described the use of paper-pencil testing, a grading scale, and allowing student leeway in assignments as a way to monitor progress and adjust the instructional program. He did express concern over not having seen much diversity in type of instructional methods used at North. Student teachers described paired activities, group work, outside work, rubrics, and modified assignments as common in their classes.

A South student teacher saw her team collaborating during team planning to find out what was going on with their students teamwide. Another student teacher found the exceptional children's teachers to be very helpful, particularly with the IEPs, modification of class assignments, and problem solving. Another student teacher looked at academics and social behavior in order to monitor progress and adjust the instructional program. She looked at behavior in cafeteria, class, media center, etc., to help her see the whole child and better monitor his or her progress. One student teacher stressed that progress was based on the individual. For some students making 100 on a test was progress. For others, 60 was

progress. She recognized that some students did not test well, so she utilized alternative ways of assessment, such as oral quizzes, projects, artwork, and group work. Overall, student teachers felt modification were made to help student become more academically successful.

Both administrators felt their teachers did a good job of monitoring progress and meeting student needs. Principal Smith commented that some teachers used a variety of strategies such as performance, planners, projects, reading, extra credit activities, and documentation from a variety of sources to monitor progress and adjust the instructional program. She saw that as the ideal. She saw other teachers who had almost no grades recorded, and the final grade became very subjective. In the middle were the teachers who used a variety of methods, but were not always in touch with the students' needs. She felt monitoring progress and adjusting the instructional program ran the gamut and felt that teachers' ability to do this successfully was correlated very closely with the overall health of the teacher. Teachers who were cognizant of the myriad of student learning needs were better able to monitor progress and adjust their instruction than were teachers who felt students should conform to their particular style of teaching.

Principal Miller felt the biggest contributor to teachers monitoring progress and adjusting the instructional program was the flexibility South teachers had. He said he had given the teachers the freedom to make any assignment modifications they needed to meet the needs of individual students. He was quite clear that all students did not have to do the same assignments. He felt that students saw modifications as the norm at South, and did not feel other students were getting special treatment. For example, some students worked five math problems while others worked 25 problems. He felt this flexibility allowed teachers to focus on students who were not achieving academically and try to find ways to overcome their academic problems. He felt that South had many programs in place, such



as HUB, after school tutorials, test-retest, team and individual planning, and administrative support to help monitor students' progress and adjust the instructional program.

Table 6

Teacher Frustration

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	2.83	1.17
North	ST	6	3.17	0.75
South	T	10	2.90	0.88
South	ST	8	3.38	1.19

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student Teacher.

Teachers and student teachers at North and South perceived a low to moderate level of frustration, indicating that non-instructional duties were manageable, but sometimes interfered with instruction. A score of one indicated the lowest level of teacher frustration, and a score of five indicated a high level of perceived teacher frustration. According to Cheal, teachers with low levels of perceptions of teacher frustration felt that auxiliary responsibilities did not distract them from teaching. Teachers whose scores were high indicated perceptions of teacher social frustration, indicating that auxiliary duties interfered with teaching. Scores ranged from 2.80 to 3.30 and indicated a low to moderate level of teacher frustration. This indicated that the teachers and student teachers perceived some frustration due to non-instructional duties because these duties were time consuming;

however, they perceived that these duties to be were a part of their job and saw them as manageable.

Teachers shared several responses to the question of how non-instructional duties and responsibilities affected them. Some teachers said these duties were time consuming, but usually necessary. One teacher commented that most teachers take them in stride, but she noted that more outside responsibilities meant less time to work with individual students. Other teachers indicated that the effect depended on how much responsibility one assumed. For example, some teachers felt that some people did all the committee work, while others did none. One teacher stated that paperwork could be made more efficient. One teacher did say that non-instructional duties and responsibilities were overwhelming. She felt that she should be able to balance all she needed to do; and added that with a large staff, if everyone pulled equal weight, a few would not have to do so much. Two teachers felt that too many demands upon teachers resulted in lower morale.

Other teachers noted that principals tried to avoid meetings when a memo would work. One teacher noted that this year she had chosen not to serve on more than one committee. She felt herself becoming burned out and needed a year with less stress. Many teachers noted that they felt stressed, particularly at the beginning of the year. They also felt that non-teaching duties, committee meetings and paperwork were a part of the job. One teacher noted that having a student teacher helped with the stress she felt. Another teacher noted that schools always talk about trying to cut down on paperwork, but committee work took after school time many days. He felt that people resented that time to some extent, especially when they needed to do several things at the same time. Overall, he perceived teachers as flexible and understanding when dealing with non-instructional duties. Another teacher did not blame anyone, but felt that people who were not in the classroom failed to see the multiple roles teachers have:

I don't know if it is anyone's fault. I do feel it should be a rule that college professors and principals ought to have to go back to the classroom for a year every so often to get a feel for what it is like. It is easy to sit in their offices and tell us what to do and not understand what we have to do. They need to get out and get in touch. If they had to walk in our shoes they would understand. They could think of ways to cut down on paperwork or eliminate some work. If our principal were in class, he'd refuse to do some of the things we have to do because he would find it's crazy. Some professors haven't even been in classrooms in years, and they tell us and interns what to do. Things have changed. (Joann)

Another teacher described the non-instructional duties by saying that at times it is a burden. She said no one was to blame, but she felt the need to have family time. She tried to balance her job and personal life, but found it difficult since there are only so many hours in a day. Another teacher felt that these duties were part of the job, but stressed that young people needed to know that it was a big part of the job before they entered the profession. He felt it affected him, even though he could often see the purpose. Other times he could not see the purpose and wondered why he had to do some of the jobs. He felt the administration had as few meetings as possible, but with the leadership team meeting once per week, he had to set priorities carefully in order to complete all he had to do. One teacher said the positive points of non-instructional duties was that teachers got involved and saw more than just the four walls of their classrooms.

Student teachers noted that non-instructional duties took a lot of preparation time. One teacher had observed that the teachers who had been teaching the longest could leave around 4:00 because he perceived they knew what they were doing. He, however, had to stay later and take work home to complete. Two student teachers commented that the amount of required non-instructional work made the idea of planning time seem useless. They gave examples of spending planning time making phone calls, running off papers, and filling out forms. Another student teacher commented that paperwork in the class was

not that much of a burden, except for what teachers put on themselves. Another student teacher described paperwork as a necessary evil.

One student felt that committees and meetings were too intrusive in teachers' lives. She also felt the amount of documentation, logs and files for the office and for teachers' record keeping was too demanding. She said it interfered with planning. She did not like having to stay until 7:00 or 8:00 P.M. to complete work. Her two planning periods were often taken by meetings and she had to stay after school to get work done. Another student teacher described teachers as frustrated. She often heard them complaining about too much to do and not enough time to do it all.

One student teacher felt the amount of stress related to non-instructional duties was directly related to whether or not teachers felt what they were asked to do was useful and purposeful. One student teacher commented that, "Teaching is so time consuming. Without limiting yourself, you would do work all weekend" (Jill). One student teacher noted that her supervising teacher forgot much of the paperwork, particularly if he saw no value in it. She said that faculty meetings were few and not a problem, and that her team worked well together to reduce paperwork.

Principal Smith commented that she kept hearing that non-instructional duties and paperwork were major issues for teachers. She was concerned since she felt that she personally tried to limit that. She noted that teachers had two hours of planning time per day, and most of them taught one subject four times per day, and only had one lesson preparation. She did say, however, that too many good people were complaining for her to say they were just lazy or whining. She acknowledged the existence of more paperwork and documentation, and said she did require lesson plans, but felt that should have always been done. She noted that parental contacts and record keeping were time consuming. She

felt that in the past these things were expected, but nobody really followed up. She expected teachers to keep up with paperwork and non-instructional duties.

When asked about the teachers and the effect of non-teaching duties, committee meetings, and paperwork, Principal Miller said "it wears them out." He felt that schools were required to have too many committees, and that teachers were being tired out by non-teaching duties. He commented that he tried to keep faculty meetings minimal, and tried to allow teachers time during planning and after school. He acknowledged that the profession required much dedication and teachers' personal time.

#### Perceptions of Climate That Differ Among Teachers and Student Teachers

Data indicated statistical significance for rank (teacher or student teacher) for tangible environment and administrative support. Results are shown followed by comments from teachers and student teachers.

Table 7

#### Tangible Environment

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	3.00	1.26
North	ST	6	2.17	1.17
South	T	10	3.00	1.05
South	ST	8	2.13	0.99

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.  $p < .05$ .  $p = 0.048$  for rank.

Teachers at both North and South indicated that they perceived they had adequate supplies and a positive physical environment. Student teachers at both schools perceived they had fewer available supplies and perceived the overall physical environment to be less positive. A score of one indicated the lowest level of perceived tangible environment, and a score of five indicated the highest level of perceived tangible environment. According to Cheal, teachers with low levels of perceptions of tangible environment felt the school was oppressive and stifling. Teachers who perceived high levels of tangible environment felt the school had adequate levels of instructional materials and a more positive school environment. A score of 3 for North and South teachers indicated a moderate level of tangible environment. ANOVA for tangible environment indicated statistical significance at the 0.05 level for rank ( $p=0.0485$ ). A score of 2.13 for South student teachers and 2.17 for North student teachers indicated a fairly low level of tangible environment.

Teachers at North and South reported they had ample supplies for instructional purposes. Principals supported this perception by indicating that materials were available for teacher use. Principal Miller indicated that providing any needed teaching materials was one of his top priorities. Overall, student teachers perceived the schools to have to have less than sufficient supplies, and a less positive environment. Some student teachers felt they could easily get materials. Others expressed difficulty in obtaining specific supplies. One student teacher commented that in the eighth grade, some students did not have books until after Thanksgiving. Another ran out of overhead transparencies, and said that she bought many supplies herself. She found social studies materials to be outdated and found the text to be lacking maps she felt were crucial to teaching social studies.

With few exceptions, teachers agreed they had ample instructional materials for classroom use. Several teachers said they requested needed supplies from the administrative office, and quickly received their requests. Items not located in the school

office were ordered from school catalogs in a timely fashion. For larger items, departmental money was available. Each teacher interviewed mentioned PTA grants they had received to purchase materials. Some teachers did comment that they always spent money out of pocket, especially for the little things they needed. Three science teachers commented that smaller items like baking soda, vinegar, cotton balls, etc., had to be purchased out of pocket, or donated by the students and parents.

One teacher at South said that because of their principal, "if you needed it you had it." South teachers felt their principal was good at raising money and augmenting the local funding for supplies. They also praised the fundraising efforts of the PTA who provided additional money for instructional materials. Other teachers felt fortunate to work at South and noted that the PTA raised over \$100,000 per year. One teacher commented that the principal had raised over \$1.5 million in 11 years. Another teacher commented that Principal Miller would leave campus, buy supplies, and bring them back to teachers. A science teacher commented that he always had what he needed. He said he had never been to Principal Miller and asked for anything and had the principal tell him he could not have it. He felt this was because the principal knew he would make use of it. He acknowledged that equipment got broken, but only because students were using it so frequently. He taught science through active participation, and ample supplies were critical, so he was appreciative of having needed supplies. Only one South teacher felt upset by what she perceived as inadequate supplies. She perceived that she spent up to \$1,000 per year buying science materials for experiments. She said the county bought new science modular books, but not the kits containing supplies. She was willing to furnish supplies, but noted that students who had teachers who would not buy supplies were at a disadvantage in learning science.

One student teacher felt that his teacher had a wealth of supplies and materials because she had been teaching for 19 years and had amassed a large collection of materials to use with students. Another student teacher commented that the seventh grade science teachers shared information and materials with each other. Another, who taught math, commented that she had many manipulatives and supplies for mathematics instruction. Others had supplies and attributed this to their supervising teachers, who opened their files and closets, and said they could use anything they needed. Student teachers did not indicate they had supplies themselves, and tended to show little ownership in this area.

Both principals felt that teachers had adequate materials and supplies. Principal Smith felt teachers at her school and in this county could do a good job with what they had. She noted that if they had more money they could do a better job. She felt the most effective people were going to find a way to be successful even if they did not have all the supplies they desired. Principal Miller acknowledged that financial planning took a great deal of time, and said he viewed the school as a family who served a larger community. He had found the community willing to raise money for the school. He felt it was his job to provide the mechanism to allow the community to give money to the school. He noted that years ago, as an assistant principal, he would sneak and get extra paper for teachers. He said he wanted teachers to be able to do their jobs. He did not want them to spend time worrying about where they would get materials. He felt worrying over supplies was a waste of time and detrimental to education.



Table 8

Administrative Support


---

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	1.67	0.82
North	ST	6	3.33	1.51
South	T	10	1.40	0.70
South	ST	8	2.13	0.64

---

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.  $p < .05$ .  $p = 0.0411$  for school and 0.00187 for rank.

Overall, North teachers and South teachers and student teachers perceived more administrative support than did North student teachers. A score of one indicated the highest level of administrative support, and a score of five indicated the lowest level of perceived administrative support. According to Cheal, teachers with low levels of perceptions of administrative support felt the administrator was not genuinely committed to overall staff morale. Teachers whose scores were high indicated perceptions of administrative support, indicating the administrator assisted the faculty in meeting instructional goals, and supported and encouraged professional efforts. A score of 1.67 for North teachers, and 1.40 for South teachers indicated a high level of administrative support. ANOVA for administrative support indicated statistical significance at the 0.05 level for school ( $p=0.0411$ ) and rank ( $p=0.0018$ ). Overall, teachers felt more administrative support than did student teachers. A score of 3.33 for North student

teachers indicated a fairly low level of administrative support. A score of 2.13 for South student teachers indicated a fairly high level of administrative support.

North teachers said they were sometimes complimented as a group in faculty meetings. They also mentioned written memos, PTA awards, and weekly school newsletters. One teacher said she had received verbal praise for her class walking quietly in line in the hall. The teachers also discussed a crystal apple that was passed from one faculty member to another in appreciation of helpfulness. One teacher mentioned that the principal had come to grade level meetings.

Some teachers commented that compliments and recognition were not given frequently at North. Another teacher commented that she did not have a general feel for being recognized. She felt saddened by this, and said, "That's education" (Patty). She did note that she was the most requested math teacher, which gave her a sense of recognition and appreciation. One teacher commented that she would like to see written compliments that could be placed in teachers' personnel files.

South teachers shared many examples of being complimented and recognized, but commented they needed more. At this point in the interview many teachers shared that their principal was retiring at the end of this academic year. Many commented that they were afraid they would be less appreciated when the change in administration occurred. One teacher spoke of much in house camaraderie, lateral compliments, and recognition by the administration. Another said that one assistant principal gave notes and verbal praise and made teachers feel special. Praise from this assistant was valued highly. Another teacher talked about receiving peer recognition on an informal basis, sharing with other teachers, being Teacher of the Year, receiving PTA recognition, and being a recipient of the PTA's weekly desserts. One teacher noted that Principal Miller shared test scores at South and praised teachers. She also noted receiving compliments from parents and students.

One teacher noted that the administration was under pressure, too. She felt that when they met with her they had been complimentary. She felt that due to the large school size, the principal had not been in her room once. She felt she got rewards from the parents' notes and her peers. Another teacher felt complimented because she had gotten to spend a week at the Holocaust Museum. The principal had thanked her by writing a letter to put in her personnel file. Another teacher commented that teachers complimented each other, particularly at the team level. He felt the faculty was complimented by the principal because the school had a lack of violence and a safe environment.

Another teacher noted that she felt good when they were told as a faculty that they were doing well. She also noted that the principal had recognized her as one of the top two staff members. This was based on recommendations from staff, parents, and students who felt she had a positive impact on their lives. She did note that she would love to hear the principal say the staff was doing a good job. She felt she was barely getting enough money to get by, so the recognition had to come from somewhere else. She noted that when the students hugged her she felt good about herself. She also needed to hear compliments from peers or administrators. Another teacher who had been identified as one of the top two staff noted that the principal and one assistant principal would walk in the halls and compliment students.

South student teachers listed some various forms of recognition but noted that the limited amount they saw needed to be increased. One student teacher said she had not seen as many compliments for teachers as she had seen for students. Another student teacher commented that she had not seen any open recognition. She felt that some teachers were getting recognition because they were teaching the way "higher ups" said they should be teaching. She felt that teachers who did not teach in a structured way did not get as much recognition from the administration, but did get recognition from the students because the

students saw these teachers as more fun. Another student teacher commented that everyone was treated respectfully and could voice opinions. She noted that test scores were shown in a faculty meeting, and that since the scores at South were higher than many other schools, the faculty was told they had done a good job. Some student teachers commented that they did not know how faculty were recognized or complimented. They commented they had seen the administrators infrequently, excepting one who came by to speak every morning. One noted a breakfast on a teacher workday and a steak dinner when teachers stayed late to give report cards to parents. Another commented that she had seen teachers compliment each other on a personal level. For example, her supervising teacher had covered in-school suspension for a teacher, who had written her a thank-you note.

North student teachers mentioned the crystal apple being passed at faculty meetings as a way for teachers to appreciate and recognize each other. Others mentioned the administration providing breakfast on a workday as a way to show appreciation for teachers. One student teacher had heard many rumblings from teachers who felt unappreciated. North student teachers commented that they did not see Principal Smith much and felt she did not compliment teachers often. One student teacher felt the teachers were intimidated by the administrator and heard more negative comments than positive comments.

Principal Smith said she prided herself on doing a "pretty good job" with recognizing and complimenting faculty, but noted it was never enough. She gave many examples of ways she complimented and recognized faculty. One of the things she did was pass a crystal apple at each faculty meeting, which represented a helpful act a teacher had performed. She sent every person a birthday card with a token gift. She gave the staff a gift at the winter holidays. She ordered engraved candy dishes that said, "North teachers are the heart of education." These were given to the teachers during Teacher Appreciation

Week. She had a formal breakfast on the first day of school. She said she tried to try to do as many things as possible to show her appreciation for the teachers.

Principal Miller laughed when asked how faculty was recognized and complimented. He replied, "Not enough!" He said he attempted to let them present their accomplishment to the rest of the world. He said teachers had conducted workshops, published articles, and the school had been written about several times. He allowed many visitors in order to show off the teachers' accomplishments. He had allowed many doctoral students to conduct research about various facets of the school. He felt good that outside educators were interested in South. He also commented that reports from SACS (the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) had been positive. High test scores had brought much positive attention to the school. Principal Miller acknowledged that he did not do particularly well as an administrator in recognizing and complimenting faculty. He said it had to be a "big deal" for him to do something. He said he did appreciate his teachers and felt that although some might not know it, most were aware of his appreciation of them.

#### Perceptions of Climate That Differ Between Schools

Three dimensions of climate - pupil control behavior, teacher social needs, and administrative control, showed statistical significance for the schools. Results are shown followed by comments from teachers and student teachers.

Table 9

Pupil Control Behavior


---

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	2.83	1.17
North	ST	6	2.83	0.75
South	T	10	1.80	0.79
South	ST	8	2.13	0.83

---

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.  $p < .05$ .  $p = 0.0136$  for school.

North teachers and student teachers perceived they had to exert more control in order to elicit proper student behavior and academic direction than did South teachers and student teachers. A score of one indicated the lowest level of need to control pupils, and a score of five indicated a high level of perceived pupil control behavior. According to Cheal, teachers with low levels of perceptions of pupil control behavior felt they had strong relationships with their students. Teachers who perceived the need for high levels of pupil control behavior believed students did not have the ability to demonstrate academic and behavioral growth. A score of 2.83 for North teachers and student teachers indicated a moderate level of pupil control behavior. ANOVA for pupil control behavior indicated statistical significance at the 0.05 level for school ( $p=0.0136$ ). A score of 1.80 for South teachers and a score of 2.13 for South student teachers indicated a low level of pupil control behavior.

North teachers perceived themselves as having a need to control students. Student teacher perceptions substantiated these perceptions. Teachers and student teachers described themselves as running a tight ship and having a no nonsense approach to management. Principal Smith perceived similar management techniques at North. She noted that the teachers she perceived as being effective took action immediately in dealing with behavior problems. South teachers and student teachers reported having a variety of classroom management techniques. In addition to talking about specific management strategies, they indicated a sense of acceptance of students' behaviors and taking a proactive, rather than reactive approach to management. Principal Miller indicated that voice level and talking to students were the teachers' best method of classroom management. The faculty at South perceived themselves as needing to exert little control, and being able to work collaboratively with students in the area of classroom management.

Teachers felt that although the management strategies varied from teacher to teacher, as a school North handled discipline well. The sixth grade teachers each talked about assertive discipline, modified to meet their needs, extensive record keeping (teamwide), clear expectations for students, rewards, and consistency. One teachers stressed the need for consistency by saying that she operated the same from day 1 to 180. One seventh grade teacher said that after 26 years in the classroom, she had developed effective management techniques and used her expression or a touch on the shoulder and discussed the situation with a student privately after class. She added that she did not waste class time by having confrontations with students. She was clear in her belief that students made choices and learned to take the consequences. One teacher simply felt she set the tone and students fell into line. Other teachers used more direct techniques including silent lunch, after school tutorials, phone calls to parents, in-school suspension, and referrals to the administrative

office for problems that could not be solved in the class. One teacher felt handling classroom management within her room prevented problems outside the classroom.

North student teachers talked about classroom management techniques they had seen used by their cooperating teacher or other teachers on their teams. One student felt the stricter teachers did a better job with management than teachers who had flexible standards. He had learned that he did not need to be friends with the students because they quickly took advantage of him. He thought it sounded terrible, but he believed a fear factor was important in management. He interpreted this fear as students being aware that misbehavior would result in being sent to the office, to time out, or to silent lunch. With consequences to their behaviors clearly defined, he determined that students were less likely to give him problems.

One North student teacher reflected upon his cooperating teacher's use of a combination of management techniques. He saw her as having a no nonsense approach. She did not make many threats or have to punish frequently. She was a bottom line person, and the students knew the limits. He had seen some teachers send students to time out regularly, but this teacher has used it only two or three times during the year. Other techniques student teachers described included assigning silent lunch, using demerit systems, and having the team use consistent rules which kept students behavior consistent. One student teacher described her supervisory teacher's class as a "tight ship" that was organized, concise, and consistent since September. Conversely, another student teacher described her supervisory teacher as laid back, but very clear with the students regarding acceptable and unacceptable behavior. One student teacher talked more about his management methods as opposed to those of the supervising teacher. He described himself as changing from using behavior modification to using assertive discipline. He felt



assertive discipline was more effective with middle grades students than behavior modification.

South teachers felt confident in their abilities to handle classroom management, felt that school guidelines regarding student behavior were clearly defined, and believed team support was beneficial to classroom management. One teacher described the general philosophy at South as being students are supposed to be there to learn. Teachers are expected to foster the learning process and have control in the class. She added that teachers were backed by the administration if they had a management issue which could not be solved at the classroom level.

Another teacher, who identified herself as having good classroom management, described her techniques in a different way. She had very few problems in her class. The group monitored itself. She had no problems with student movement, group work, and constructive noise. She attributed this to several factors: an Oops! book where student "mistakes" were recorded, but students were not shamed, her sense of humor, not writing names on the board, and not using or allowing sarcastic comments. She had set up her class so the students knew she meant what she said, but rules were minimal. She believed part of her success lay in the fact that she did not give students the choice of listening. Students listened and cooperated because they had ownership in the class and wanted it to work successfully.

Another teacher described a technique in which he involved the students at the beginning of class. He asserted that students who were involved in learning had fewer behavioral problems. His strategies for management included using daily planners; talking to students in the hall, not just when they had problems, but also on a less structured basis at class changes, or before and after school; keeping students after school for tutoring; making telephone calls; and eating lunch with the students. Another teacher used modified

assertive discipline, praise, behavior modification, behavioral and academic contracts, in and out of school suspension, parental conferences, referrals to the offices, and discipline forms. She also had discovered that giving seventh graders stickers with which they could earn a bonus party was an effective management technique.

One teacher noted that some teachers used busywork and worksheets, kicked students out of class, and did not involve themselves with the students. He was concerned that these teachers were encouraging behavioral problems. He described himself as one who encouraged interactions without allowing students to take over. He had an in-class suspension, which kept the student in class and did not carry a stigma, but allowed a child to have space and time to regain composure. He also described using a look or a hand gesture to alert a child to inappropriate behavior. He avoided verbal confrontations because he believed no one wins, and the student felt more antagonistic toward the teacher.

South student teachers tended to describe classroom management techniques used by their supervising teachers. One student teacher described her class as being very laid back. She saw management being handled so that when teachers respected the students the students respect the teachers. She felt this was established at the beginning of the year. One student teacher described her supervising teacher as having a plan for certain students with chronic behavioral issues. For other students, they used tone, voice, the students' last name, and hall talks. They avoided confrontations in the classroom. Another student teacher described her teacher as handling management well. "The students come in and know what to do. They do not talk back. The discipline is good, with few problems" (Elizabeth). Another described management as collaborative, with everybody helping each other. She called this "constructive chaos."

Some of the student teachers at South did address their own management techniques. When describing herself, one student teacher said she used different

techniques with different students. "I am never ugly to them. I tell it like it is. I'm straight up and honest" (Elizabeth). One student teacher described her management style as being cooperative, not straight and narrow. She talked to the student, worked one-on-one, used cooperative grouping strategies, and allowed movement in the class. One student teacher did express self doubt because she perceived herself as having more discipline problems than her OSTE.

Principal Smith noted that the teachers who were effective truly liked their jobs and liked their students. These teachers also took action immediately in dealing with behavior problems. Principal Smith explained that she was not implying these teachers were "mean." They just did not allow misbehavior to continue in their classrooms. She said she could not make those teachers who had management problems understand that complaining to and about the students was not taking action and was not effectively managing student behavior. She felt that she kept preaching, "You are the teacher. You are in charge. You do not have to get frustrated." She said that, for the most part, the really effective teachers did not have to yell and scream, because the first time something happened they took action. They called parents, referred the child, or took some form of action. She noted that successful teachers did not take action in front of other students. She felt that talking to a child who had problems in front of other students was never for the student, but was just expressing teacher frustration. Principal Smith said she worked with teachers to empower them to deal with management issues.

Principal Miller felt teachers at South handled classroom management quite effectively. He commented that some teachers knew instinctively and from experience when a disruption was likely to occur. They would cut it off with their words or voice. He commented that the best discipline method a teacher has is the use and strength of the voice and knowing when and how to project the voice. He noted that teachers knew they

would get support from the administration. He commented that he would adjust students' schedules, split groups of students, have conferences, and make contracts. He made it clear to the students that they could not sit in class and bother others. Principal Miller felt teachers at South were collaboratively managing student behavior.

Table 10

Teacher Social Needs


---

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	3.83	1.17
North	ST	6	3.17	0.98
South	T	10	2.40	1.35
South	ST	8	1.75	0.89

---

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.  $p < .05$ .  $p = 0.00024$  for school.

Overall, teachers and student teachers at South Middle perceived a high level of collegial interaction within and outside the school environment. Teachers and student teachers at North perceived less collegiality among faculty. A score of one indicated a high level of perceptions of teacher social needs, and a score of five indicated a low level of perceived teacher social needs. According to Cheal, teachers with high levels of perceptions of teacher social needs felt that the staff did not continue its relationships outside the school setting and were not close friends. Teachers whose scores were low indicated perceptions of teacher social needs being met and indicated that the staff perceived colleagues to interact inside and outside the school setting. A score of 3.83 for North

teachers indicated that teacher social needs were not met. ANOVA for teacher social needs indicated statistical significance at the 0.05 level for school ( $p=0.0024$ ). A score of 3.17 for North student teachers indicated that teacher social needs were not met. A score of 2.40 for South teachers and a score of 1.75 for South student teachers indicated that teacher social needs were being met.

With limited exceptions, teachers and student teachers at North felt a lack of true camaraderie. The principal's comments supported this perception. She expressed frustration at the lack of camaraderie at North. She noted that some teachers interacted with each other, while others demonstrated angst. A student teacher had observed that some teachers on her team were close and interacted with other teachers; however, she had noted several teachers who "rolled their eyes at other teachers," and "gossiped frequently about other teachers" (Melanie). She perceived the situation to be competitive and filled with animosity. She did note that these teachers were able to interact at times without letting these feelings show. Generally, teachers and student teachers at South perceived a fairly high level of collegiality among faculty. This was indicated by their comments describing close bonds and ties among faculty. The principal's comments supported this perception. He noted that the faculty was very collegial.

North teachers described teacher interactions and friendships based on observations and personal experiences. One teacher said she had friendships at work based on the fact that she had been teaching in the same school for several years. She said she had worked with teachers, learned to respect other teachers, and developed strong bonds with some colleagues. She felt that friendships were more difficult to form at this particular school because of what she perceived as a transient faculty. Other teachers felt that friendships were formed by having worked with teachers at a certain grade level for a long time.

Overall, North teachers felt they were not good friends, did not get along with one another well, and lacked closeness as a faculty.

One South teacher commented that he saw more friendships at this school than any other place he had worked. He did not participate outside school much because he did not live close by and he had a small child. Other teachers perceived themselves as having friends and socializing, but they were not sure other teachers felt the same. One teacher noted that she had 6 to 8 really good friends, but felt that everybody was not friends. She perceived the newer people to be more resistant to being friends, and attributed this to their having had to transfer from other schools. Overall, South teachers saw much camaraderie. One teacher said he was involved in bridge, golf, and bowling with other teachers. Another teacher described the friendships she had formed as a brotherhood and sisterhood. One teacher said she had many friends at South and had a strong support system.

The North student teachers answered based on how they perceived teacher friendships and socialization, as well as on the friendships they had developed as student teachers. Two student teachers had not seen or heard anything to lead them to believe the teachers socialized outside school. One student teacher mentioned that the seventh grade teachers had a Christmas party at one of the teacher's house. Two others indicated that they believed a few teachers were friends outside school. One student teacher perceived teachers to have good working relationships inside school, but noted he had seen no schoolwide gatherings. Two sixth grade student teachers commented that sixth grade teachers went to restaurants on teacher workdays. Two student teachers offered examples of situations they felt indicated a lack of camaraderie among teachers. One student teacher noted that many teachers addressed each other as Mr. and Mrs. even after school and on workdays when no students are around. His comment was, "That's strange" (Eric).

Although they did not perceive collegiality among teachers, North student teachers all felt they had developed friendships in school and outside school with each other. They gave examples of having cookouts, having lunch, participating in activities between their university classes, and getting together for a beer at the end of day. One student teacher commented that he and another student teacher shared ideas for teaching.

Student teachers at South described their own friendships, as well as their perceptions of teacher friendships at the school. One student teacher thought some teachers were friends. She also commented on two teachers who were a good teaching team, but who would not interact out of school. She described them as having professional likenesses and personal differences. Others commented on hearing teachers talk about going to breakfast or going to the same church. One student talked about the socializing that her team did, and described her supervising teacher as someone who had the ability to socialize and be a good friend, while maintaining professionalism. One student teacher commented that the teachers on her team were friends and had invited her to go to dinner with them.

South student teachers felt that as a group they were friendly towards one another and that many of them had developed personal friendships. One person commented that these student teachers were friends who socialized and who vented teaching frustrations to one another. Another described the student teachers as a small, close knit group. One commented that she did not go out after school, but had been invited to participate. One student teacher commented that she had formed close friendships, and that another student teacher was going to be a bridesmaid in her wedding.

Principal Smith felt staff camaraderie at North was not what it was at other schools where she had previously worked. She commented that when she examined ways to make North better, she kept coming back to the issue of camaraderie. She noted:

We have some folks who are not clinically depressed, but they are not real happy people. They do not enjoy socializing, and I am not talking about going out to a bar and drink. I am just saying being together. They do not enjoy their children, and you cannot give what they do not have. If they are not happy, all the activities I try to do make them happy probably are not going to work. Other teachers are collegial and friendly.

She did comment that she felt very close to most of the staff, even though they did not get together at people's houses at night and socialize. She said she felt friendly, as much a friend as a boss. She had found a "critical mass," but said camaraderie was an area she worried about.

Principal Miller commented that some teachers are friends and socialize, while others are not friends and do not socialize. He commented that he did not socialize with individual teachers because it would cause divisiveness among faculty. He noted that he had some conflicts with teachers, but felt most were minor, and were the result of situations not being handled that way teachers wanted. Overall, he found his faculty to be collegial.



Table 11

Administrative Control


---

<u>School</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
North	T	6	4.83	0.41
North	ST	6	2.83	1.83
South	T	10	2.00	1.05
South	ST	8	2.88	1.36

---

Note. T = Teacher; ST = Student teacher.  $p < .05$ .  $p = 0.0060$  for school and  $0.0048$  for school interacting with rank.

North teachers perceived a high level of administrative control, indicating that they felt the administrators did not trust faculty to perform professional duties without the control of the administration. North student teachers and South teachers and student teachers perceived a lower level of administrative control, indicating that they perceived a collaborative relationship between faculty and administration. A score of one indicated the lowest level of control from the administrator, and a score of five indicated a high level of perceived administrative control. According to Cheal, teachers with high levels of perceptions of administrative control felt the administrator was more authoritative and did not trust the faculty to perform professional duties without the control of the administration. Teachers whose scores were low indicated perceptions of administrative control indicating the school environment to have a collaborative effort between the teachers and administration. A score of 4.83 for North teachers indicated a high level of administrative control. ANOVA for administrative control indicated statistical significance at the 0.05

level for school ( $p=0.0060$ ) and school interacting with rank ( $p=0.0048$ ). A score of 2.83 for North student teachers indicated a moderate level of administrative control. A score of 2.00 for South teachers indicated a fairly low level of administrative control. A score of 2.88 for South student teachers indicated a moderate level of administrative control.

Teachers at North perceived a greater degree of administrative control than did North student teachers or South teachers or student teachers. South teachers perceived that their principal empowered them and trusted them to make decisions. North teachers perceived that they had less decision making power and needed to try to please their principal. North teachers' comments indicated they were unsure of the administrative requirements, and felt they had little room to make mistakes. The teachers indicated they felt a bit insecure in making decisions. They indicated they were not sure how the administrator would react to their decision making. Since this was her first year as an administrator, Principal Smith described herself as trying to get a handle on North. Principal Miller, at South, supported the teachers' perceptions by describing himself as an enabler who wanted teachers to try new ideas.

All the North teachers made comments indicating that they perceived the principal as having a "good idea of the pulse of the school." They all said that the principal knew what was happening, and appeared to be "everywhere at once." Some teachers commented that not all administrators at North had appeared to be attuned to what was happening in the school. All the teachers commented that the principal knew what teachers were teaching because of the vast amount of feedback from parents and other teachers. They also felt she observed teachers when she was in the halls, and consulted with the assistant principals to assess their observations of teachers. Two teachers noted that North teachers were required to turn in lesson plans, which they felt told the principal what they were teaching. Teachers had also seen the principal in the halls and in the cafeteria. A teacher commented

that the principal was involved at all levels, and another commented that the principal was good at keeping tabs. Many North teachers commented that this was the administrator's first year as the principal of the school. They perceived that they would know more about her style and evaluation methods after they had worked with her for a longer period of time. They generally felt she had a knowledge of the teachers and whether or not they were performing duties at an acceptable level. The teachers were apprehensive about disappointing Principal Smith. They felt she had little tolerance for their imperfections.

South teachers felt their principal had an overall sense of what they taught and whether they carried out non-instructional duties, although some said they were not sure how the principal knew. One teacher commented that the principal was very observant, knew teachers well, talked to teachers, and generally knew what was going on. She commented that he just made it his business to know what was going on in the school, and discussed issues with other administrators, who kept each other abreast on observations. She perceived that Principal Miller only visited classes where he perceived there to be problems.

Several South teachers commented that one administrator tended to be in the halls frequently and greeted them daily. One teacher commented that if teachers were not carrying out non-instructional duties like hall duty, other teachers would bring it out in leadership meetings, and the principal and assistants would stand in the halls, or send messages with team leaders regarding areas in which teachers need to improve. He also commented that the administrative staff saw teachers at dances, ball games, and other after school activities. One teacher concluded that the principal kept abreast of things by having conversations with teachers and parents, and by examining test scores and report card grades. Another teacher commented that Principal Smith simply trusted teachers to be professionals. He perceived that the principal did not come to individual classes because he

was doing his job and protecting teachers from having to deal with problems other schools had to go through. He commented that he was sure the principal did know what was happening in the school. The final comment came from a teacher who did not know how, but knew the principal definitely was aware of what happened in the school. He commented that the principal formally knew by assigned tasks and duties, from talking with teachers, and by trusting teachers.

South student teachers were not aware of how the principal knew what teachers were teaching and how they were carrying out non-instructional duties, but overall they perceived that Principal Miller knew what was going on in the school. One North student teacher felt Principal Smith would know about non-instructional duties if they made a mistake on a report turned in to the office. One student teacher did note that the principal did check lesson plans, but he commented that he did not know if this really told anything about teachers' abilities to teach. Another student teacher noted that the administration had done no observations in her class this academic year, and that she had seen the principal in the hall only once, when the principal commented on the good behavior of her class. One student teacher felt that the principal did not have much of a presence at North, only by rumor. Student teachers at both schools were not sure how administrators knew what teachers were teaching or how they carried out duties. The South student teachers perceived that Principal Miller had a general knowledge of what was going on in the school. North student teachers were not certain if Principal Smith knew what was going on all the time, but felt she had a general knowledge of the school.

Principal Smith responded that knowing what teachers were doing was a tough call. One of the ways she did it was to have all administrators evaluate teachers. She took the new teachers or teachers who were having difficulties. She said all administrators were in and out of the classrooms and up and down the halls. She commented that it was amazing

how much she could learn from unscheduled snapshot visits. She could tell if classes were organized, and if students and parents were happy. She commented that it only took a few visits to tell what was happening in the class. She also commented that parents knew the good teachers, especially if she looked at parents' overall comments. She said it made her sad when she thought that her better teachers thought she did not know what was going on. Principal Smith said one of her goals was to document "snapshot visits" in classrooms to provide a better overall profile of teachers.

Principal Smith said that three cultures were quite evident when she came to North this year: the staff culture, the student culture, and the parent culture. The staff consisted mainly of adversarial relationships. The student culture reflected apathy in about one-half the students, and the parents' culture was filled with what Principal Smith called "attacking negativity." She commented:

I have never seen anything quite like it. I think we have made progress, but we are still at the base of the mountain. It is hard. I do much to try to work with parents. I started in education in 1967. I have been talked to, and talked at, and written to and written about since I came to North like I have never been in my career. That cannot be an accident. I am working on a project to involve more black leaders in the community in our school. They can help us through their involvement. I am involving all parents as much as I can.

Principal Miller, at South, commented that he did not walk the halls, but he felt that people read him well and knew his level of expectations. He said he placed importance on what the teachers did in the classrooms. He felt he and the teachers had developed a level of trust, and the teachers knew he supported them as long as they were working to help students. Principal Miller commented that he gathered information from the times he was in the halls, from talks with teachers and parents, and noted that he had good assistants and good secretaries in the office. He said he and his teachers had expectations of each other as people who cared about students and tried to meet their needs. He stressed that he trusted

teachers and did not require them to turn in lesson plans. He felt there was no one correct style of teaching and felt imposing preferences would waste time and decrease teacher morale. He commented that he liked people at South, and they knew he liked them. He said mutuality of respect existed. He commented that he liked teachers to have power and that if he could convince them an idea was theirs, he did. He said that most events at South were by design and not accidental, and that teachers had more to do with the design than they realized. His structure was to get teachers to do as much as they could and to come up with ideas. He saw himself as an enabler, with just enough politician to allow him to be effective.

#### Conclusions of Perceptions of Climate

Cooperating teachers and student teachers in both schools tended to illustrate that context influences who "we" are and how we do things around here. Teachers and student teachers at South perceived "how we do things around here" as we help each other and our principal helps us. Teachers and student teachers at North perceived "how we do things around here" as we help our teammates, and we work in small groups. At South, the perceptions tended to reflect the culture of the whole school via individuals with a common mission. The perceived atmosphere of collegiality and support between cooperating teachers, students teachers, and administration was evident. A metaphor for South might be "the compatriot" - all working together to meet the needs of the student. Through their collegiality, students' needs are met, and teachers and student teachers support one another as they collectively strive to make South "be all it can be." Everybody is needed and is a part of the team.

North's cooperating teachers and student teachers perceived their culture to be fragmented, with individuals or teams working alone to meet student needs, without the support of the whole school. A metaphor for North might be "the lone star" - some

individuals shining and making a difference. While a few teachers perceived that they or their team made a difference and tried to meet young adolescents' needs, their "light" was dimmed by a lack of collegiality and angst over administrative control. At North "we" was seen as a personal culture, unlike South, where "we" was seen as a general culture. The following comments are used to illuminate the areas of culture student teachers and teachers identified as most crucial in their respective schools.

Teacher social needs were viewed quite differently at North and South schools. North teachers commented that limited socialization occurred outside school. One teacher discussed that tension among certain people was evident and created barriers. One teacher stated that, "Our staff is notorious for not getting along, and we do not cooperate. We butt heads" (Barbara). She continued by saying that North's staff is not one big, happy family. Another North teacher simply said, "No, teachers here are not friends" (Kate). She felt that teachers did not share friendships and did not socialize outside school. The only examples North teachers gave of socialization were a ropes course, lunch and breakfast on workdays, and a seventh grade level Christmas party. They indicated that collegial friendships were not an integral part of their lives.

Conversely, South teachers saw themselves as very collegial, with deep friendships. One teacher answered enthusiastically:

Oh, yes! We 're very much a family, not just friends, but a family. There's a lot to be said for staying in a situation for a number of years. I've been here for 16 years. When something happens, you have a support system. Friends are there in illness, death, anything. These are your family members. We go out to eat, go to Super Flea and have lunch. We do many things together. (Denise)

Another South teacher answered, "Yes, definitely, here. I am part of a bridge group. The support system is unbelievable." Another teacher said that most teachers had friends at

school, and that even if teachers were not friends, they were at least friendly to one another. One teacher used the analogy of combat to describe friendships at South:

I compare it to combat. Men that come back from service never forget the guys they were in the trenches with, under fire with. It's exactly the same situation. Sometimes we feel like we're fighting the enemy or we're trying to perform in spite of, and we stick together. Teachers, they bond. I cannot imagine a group in a bank working on some floor or department bonding like teachers because we go through everything together. We laugh, cry, fuss. It's almost like being in a battle. I think we bond like soldiers bond. (Jennifer)

Teacher and student teachers discussed administrative support and administrative control. South teachers and student teachers viewed Principal Miller as being less controlling than the teachers and student teachers viewed Principal Smith, at North. They felt comfortable stopping by to chat. One South teacher commented that sometimes she ". . . stopped by and let the administration know if she did something she was delighted with. I toot my own horn" (Jennifer). One South student teacher commented on her supervising teacher, who she perceived as part of the administration, as she reflected upon support at South. She described him as follows:

Mr. Simon is a godsend, a walking angel. He finds anything I need. He will buy it if necessary. We use video and the laser disc. Some people don't know how and don't use what's available. After being at East Middle School, it's great here at South. (Alison)

Principal Miller at South, described his support for teachers in many ways. For example, Principal Miller said he made sure teachers had supplies they needed because it was important to him. He described managing the finances of the school like managing the finances of his home:

If I know I want something or know I am going to want something, and I know there is always going to be a need for food, telephone, etc., I make arrangements to have an income to meet these needs. It is the same with a school. I make sure we have fund-raisers to generate money. I put that money in a special account for



teachers' use. If a teacher comes to me with an idea, I can find money to support that teacher.

Principal Miller recounted a story from his first years as a teacher:

When I taught I couldn't believe I only got two boxes of paper clips per year, one case of paper, and one roll of masking tape. One teacher at our school stole 75 rolls of tape. He needed it, but isn't it ridiculous to force someone to do that in this job?

Many South teachers commented that Principal Miller was retiring at the end of the academic year. Each teacher expressed a sense of loss. Many teachers expressed apprehensions over his departure. He was described as a "part of the family," and teachers were quite articulate that they would miss him. One teacher felt adamant that he was a good leader and worked hard to make South the best school it could be. She said, "If the new principal does not come and continue with the good programs we have, allow teachers to do things the way we are used to, and fit into our system, he or she will not last very long" (Glenda). She was quite clear that teachers were happy at the school and did not want to make changes they perceived as unnecessary. Another student teacher felt that the administrator was very in touch at South. She commented that he met with HUB teachers weekly, was very insightful, and somehow knew if teachers were teaching.

Sixth grade teachers and student teachers at North commented that their teams worked well together. They felt they were the only grade level who did this. Other teachers commented that they individually met young adolescents' needs, but they felt they had little school wide support. One cooperating teacher commented that she was frustrated by the lack of collegiality and support from the faculty. Some North teachers and student teachers perceived their principal as moody and controlling. One North student teacher commented that teachers' reactions depended on the mood of the administrator:

Sometimes I agree with the principal. Then there is an 180 degree turn. It is like having a faculty meeting with Sibyl. This puts them (the teachers) on edge. They do not know who is going to show up to lead the faculty meeting, so they are on edge and stressed. (Susan)

Another North student teacher shared an example of how she perceived the principal affecting morale:

For example, the principal wrote a memo stating that a faculty meeting would last until 4:45, and they would meet another day if necessary. Last time we had a late meeting a teacher got up to leave to pick up her child from daycare. Principal Smith called her back to the meeting, and commented that no one should leave before the meeting was over. I do not think that was professional. It affects the teachers. They are on pins and needles. They are not sure what they should do. It's not all negative. There are some positives. (Amber)

#### Correlations of Efficacy and Climate

Data failed to indicate statistical significance between the scores on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale and Cheal's' (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator. This may be indicative of the small cluster sample, or it may reflect lack of correlation between these two quantitative instruments.

Table 12

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations


---

	TSN	ADCON	TFRUS	TGEN	EXM	ADSUP	PCB	GTE	PTE
TSN	1.000								
ADCON	0.211	1.000							
TFRUS	-0.009	-0.291	1.000						
TGEN	0.184	-0.202	0.273	1.000					
EXM	0.334	-0.037	0.153	0.316	1.000				
ADSUP	0.239	-0.234	0.372	0.200	0.580	1.000			
PCB	0.584	0.215	0.347	0.019	0.345	0.375	1.000		
GTE	-0.168	0.070	0.031	-0.112	-0.141	-0.090	0.096	1.000	
PTE	0.064	0.015	0.046	0.066	0.187	0.297	0.083	0.126	1.000

---

TSN-Teacher Social Needs

ADCON-Administrative Control

TFRUS-Teacher Frustration

TGEN-Tangible Environment

EXM-Expectancy and Motivation

ADSUP-Administrative Support

PCB-Pupil Control Behavior

GTE-General Teaching Efficacy

PTE-Personal Teaching Efficacy

### Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between perceived culture and perceived teacher efficacy among preservice teachers and cooperating teachers in two Professional Development Middle Schools. This study identified seven factors of the organizational climate in two Professional Development Middle Schools (PDS) and examined these factors in relation to middle level teachers' and student teachers' personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE). The researcher used the Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale to measure personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy and the Cheal (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator to measure seven dimensions of the school climate. Along with these two instruments, the researcher used structured interviews, conversations, and informal observations to understand the perceived relationships between a school's culture and teachers' efficacy.

Specifically the researcher examined the relationship between pre-test efficacy and post-test efficacy scores on the Teacher Efficacy Scale, and scores on the Middle Level Climate Indicator. This, coupled with the information gained from interviews and observations, provided insight into the perceived relationships. Teachers and student teachers articulated their perceptions of efficacy and climate. This provided an understanding of "how we do things around here" and who "we" are in two Professional Development Middle Schools in a suburban southern area.

The fact that the teachers and student teachers perceived high levels of general and personal teaching efficacy was a positive finding and indicated a high level of commitment to education. In the area of efficacy, cooperating teachers and student teachers tended to look at meeting the needs of their students and generally believed other teachers could positively affect students. Teachers tended to perceive climate in terms of how they defined schoolwide efforts. South teachers and student teachers tended to perceive "we" as "we are

in this together." North teachers and student teachers tended to perceive "we" as "we are alone, as individual or small groups, in meeting student needs."

Middle schools must be developmentally responsive to the needs of young adolescents. Teachers have to learn to both identify and meet these needs. The results of this study indicated that both cooperating teachers and student teachers identified young adolescents needs, particularly academic, social, and emotional. Less emphasis was placed on meeting students' physical needs. Cooperating teachers indicated they were aware of many strategies to meet student needs. Results indicated that student teachers were in a transition period. They observed cooperating teachers and replicated their methods as they experimented with ways to meet student needs.

Results from this research indicated that cooperating teachers and student teachers felt they could individually and collectively meet student needs. Variations were accounted for by perceptions of a supportive climate. At South, cooperating teachers and student teachers perceived the whole school as working collectively in the students' best interests. At North, cooperating teachers and student teachers perceived individuals or teams working to help students, with little school wide support.

Lack of camaraderie among teachers at North appeared to be a long term issue. The new principal, Principal Smith, was aware of this and was committed to making what improvements she could. North teachers perceived less administrative support and more administrative control that did South teachers. One reason for this may be the difference in principals' personalities and management styles. Also, Principal Miller is retiring and Principal Smith is completing her first year as principal at North. Both schools have faced changes this academic year.

Additionally, results indicated that at South cooperating teachers and student teachers felt much collegiality and administrative support without administrative control.

There was an atmosphere of teamwork and camaraderie. At North, cooperating teachers and student teachers felt a lack of collegiality and a great deal of administrative control. They worked individually or in small groups. The atmosphere was less positive. Results indicated that teachers and student teachers in both schools had high personal and general teaching efficacies. The differences were in the ways teachers had to maintain their sense of teaching efficacy. In their less cohesive culture, North teachers and student teachers had to overcome more obstacles to meet student needs.

Results from this study indicated that the schools had defined cultures with some aspects shared by everyone and other aspects that differed based on individual perceptions. For example, teachers and student teachers all perceived frustration related to non-instruction duties; however, their perceptions of how they dealt with the frustrations varied greatly. For both schools clear definitions of "how we do things around here and who 'we' are" were evident. South teachers and student teachers indicated a strong sense of collegiality, with much support from a caring administrator. North teachers and student teachers indicated a lack of camaraderie and perceived a less caring, more autocratic administrator. For South, who "we" are was clear. Teachers felt a strong sense of "who they were" and were adamant that although the principal was retiring, they did not expect the culture of the school to change. They felt empowered to continue "how they do things around here," and felt the new administrator would become acclimated to the "way of life here," or simply leave the school. Another result of this study was that North teachers perceived their culture to be permeated by too much control and not enough teacher camaraderie. They also felt the need to control pupil behavior. They had a less clear sense of who "we" are.

Results from this study indicated that, with few exceptions, teachers and student teachers had a strong sense of personal and general teaching efficacy. This was indicated

by the examples they offered of adjusting their expectations and monitoring progress and meeting students' needs. Most teachers and student teachers gave examples of how they personally, and teachers in general, adjusted the instructional program and monitored progress. The belief that "kids are not standardized, so my expectations are not standardized" (William), appeared to echo throughout many teachers' comments. Much effort was expended through alternative assessment, individualized contracts, modification, after school tutoring, and social interaction with the students. Persistence in meeting student needs was evident.

Both qualitative and quantitative results indicated a high level of general and personal teaching efficacy. On all seven dimensions of school climate- expectancy and motivation, pupil control behavior, teacher social needs, tangible environment, teacher frustration, administrative support, and administrative control - South ranked higher overall, indicating that the overall culture of the school was positive. Results indicated that North ranked lower, as teachers seemed to find the culture fragmented and less positive. They felt the need to control student behavior and felt they were controlled somewhat by the principal. Results indicated North teachers' social needs were not met.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

#### Overview

As indicated previously, the focus of this investigation was to examine the relationship between perceived school culture and teacher efficacy in two Professional Development Middle Schools. The theoretical framework for this study was grounded in theory related to exemplary middle school practices, teacher efficacy, school culture, and their relationships to each other. Although the schools, teachers and student teachers were examined separately, conclusions are based on the overall findings except where significant differences were evident.

The review of the literature examined three main issues related to this study, middle schools, teacher efficacy, and school climate/culture. Each was carefully examined in this study. First, the level of developmental responsiveness to the young adolescents' needs was examined. The researcher examined ways in which teachers felt they individually and collectively met young adolescents' needs, and created a climate in which they could meet these needs. Last, the researcher examined elements of organizational culture that were either empowering or disempowering, and affected perceptions of efficacy.

In order to examine conclusions and implications for additional research, reexamining the research questions guiding this research is necessary. The following questions guided this research:

1a. What is the relationship between pre and post scores of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale (1990)?



There was no statistical difference between pre and post scores on efficacy. Overall, teachers and student teachers at both schools reported high general and personal teaching efficacies.

1b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of efficacy through structured interview questions and informal conversations?

In terms of “who we are” teachers and student teachers at both schools perceived themselves as teachers who took care of their students. They articulated this perception as they described meeting the needs of all students and believing that they could make a difference in students’ lives.

2a. What are the relationships among the scores of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) on Cheal’s (1990) Middle Level School Organizational Climate Indicator?

Of the seven dimensions of climate, two failed to show statistical significance: expectancy and motivation and teacher frustration. Teachers and student teachers at both schools indicated they could motivate students, had reasonable expectations, and were sometimes frustrated by non-instructional duties, but were able to handle these as a part of their jobs. Statistical significance was evident at the 0.05 level for the other five dimensions. Teachers perceived the tangible environment to be better than did student teachers. Teachers at North and teachers and student teachers at South perceived they had adequate support from the administrator. Teachers and student teachers at North perceived a greater need to control their student than did teachers and student teachers at South. Teachers and student teachers at South perceived their social needs were being met and they had a sense of camaraderie. Teachers at North perceived too much administrative control from the principal. They indicated she was too authoritarian.

2b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of Cheal's dimensions of climate through structured interview questions and informal conversations?

Teachers and student teachers indicated they felt frustrated by non-instructional duties, but felt they could handle this frustration as part of their job. They indicated they had appropriate levels of expectancy and motivation. At both schools teachers felt the tangible environment was appropriate; student teachers perceived a lack of instructional materials. Student teachers at North did not feel administrative support. Teachers and student teachers at South perceived friendship among colleagues and cooperative learning environment with students. The North teachers felt too much control from their administrator.

3. What are the correlations among scores of the seven organizational factors as identified on the Cheal Middle level School Organizational Climate Indicator and personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) scores on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale ?

Data failed to show statistical significance for correlations among the scores of the seven dimensions of climate and personal and general teaching efficacy.

4. From the perspectives of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST), what are the most important aspects of school culture that influence personal teaching efficacy (PTE) from general teaching efficacy (GTE)?

Teachers and student teachers at both North and South expressed an understanding of "how we do things around here." At South, the teachers and student teachers perceived that they helped each other and that their principal helped them. At North, teachers and student teachers perceived that they helped each other in small clusters. They did not perceive an overall sense of camaraderie.

## Conclusions

Results of this study extend some earlier investigations. Middle school adolescents are facing some of the greatest physical, emotional, intellectual, and social changes in their lives (Florida Schoolyear 2000, 1993; NMSA, 1992). In this study teachers and student teachers articulated that these changes made meeting the developmental needs of the middle school adolescents challenging. Teachers indicated they modified assignments, allowed flexibility in assignments, and addressed emotional and social needs as a way of meeting academic needs.

A series of studies documented the importance of teacher efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1989; Eichhorn, 1966; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; This We Believe, 1982; Turning Points, 1985). Other research indicated that a high personal and general teaching efficacy among teachers increased positive relationship with students, and positively affects their academic growth. This study supported that research. Overall, teachers and student teachers reported high efficacy and demonstrated their commitment to students academic and personal success.

Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) labeled the two dimensions of efficacy personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy. General teaching efficacy is related to one's beliefs about what teachers in general can do to help students become successful. Personal teaching efficacy is related to one's view of self in successfully helping students. Miller (1987) described teacher efficacy as beliefs regarding the effectiveness of good teaching and teachers' beliefs about their abilities to teach all student regardless of the students' home environment, sex, race, appearance, or SES. Bandura (1989) asserted that efficacy influenced the choice of activities, effort expended, and persistence. Chester and Beaudin (1996) indicated that teachers' efficacy is mediated by collaboration, and that teachers in

schools where they have opportunities for collegial collaboration reflect an increase in teaching efficacy.

Only a few researchers examined culture and efficacy together (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Brofenbrenner, 1976; Cheal, 1990). Other researchers suggested that culture and efficacy are related (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Cheal, 1990; Johnston, 1992; and Strahan, 1994). While the quantitative results from this study failed to indicate statistical correlation between efficacy and climate, teachers' comments indicated they were affected by a culture that empowered them less. North teachers clearly indicated administrative control caused them stress. There are indications that the strong administrative control appeared to be related to the teachers' needs to exert greater pupil behavior control. For example, teachers felt the need to keep students quiet because they had received memos critical of their actions and had been praised for controlling students in the hallways.

Another study related to efficacy (Chester & Beaudin, 1996) found that novice teachers in schools with collaborative faculties and much supervisory attention showed increases in efficacy. The overall pattern for student teachers in this study was a high sense of efficacy. Although North reported less collaboration than did South, the student teachers were collaborative with their OSTE's and usually with two or more team members. Since this research was conducted in two Professional Development Middle Schools, the student teachers were in close contact with supervisors. They had daily interactions and feedback from their OSTEs, and weekly contact and feedback from the university professors (team leaders), a doctoral student, and two Principal Fellows. Multiple opportunities were available for the student teachers to affirm that they were capable of effectively meeting student needs.

### Implications for Teacher Efficacy and School Culture

Overall, this study indicated that teachers and student teachers were interacting with students in a developmentally appropriate manner. One of the results of this study indicated that teacher efficacy was related to meeting students' developmental needs. The teachers and student teachers in this study reported high levels of personal and general teaching efficacy, and reported many ways they met student needs. Teachers and student teachers indicated that they met academic and emotional needs frequently. However, they reported meeting social needs less frequently, and almost no one mentioned middle school students' physical needs. The exceptions came from student teachers who addressed the middle school students needs to move, and not sit still for extended time periods. The other exception came from a student teacher who felt teachers could more effectively meet middle school girls' physical and emotional needs as they begin menstruation.

The results of this study indicated that the culture of a school was important to teachers' empowerment. South teachers believed in their value to students' lives. Teachers did not feel a need to exert much control over pupils. They viewed their efficacy as more collaborative with students. They felt supported by Principal Miller and felt he would help them if they wanted to try something in their classes to help students. South appeared to be like a family. Principal Miller described running the school like he ran his own home. Teachers described friendships that were familial, brotherhoods and sisterhoods. Teachers described depending on each other and knowing their "teacher" friends would be there in times of sickness, death, crises, etc. Teachers felt they had a core group of friends and an administrator who offered them support in the South culture.

In the North culture, teachers felt less support from the administration than did South teachers. These teachers felt their administrator was more autocratic and had less trust in them to make decisions. They expressed feelings of doubt of support from her if they

made mistakes. They needed to exert more control over students. Although results indicated that North teachers tried to meet student needs, they appeared to work in more isolation. They did not feel a sense of friendships and loyalty among the faculty. Many of the teachers perceived that they would "butt heads" with other teachers. Exceptions were teachers who described the 6th grade as working well together, or having a few friends at school. The language of family and support systems was missing from the North culture. However, North teachers' efficacy remained high. They worked hard to meet student needs and believed that could overcome obstacles to meeting those needs.

With collaboration, efficacy increased in novice teachers (Chester & Beaudin, 1996). The collegiality between OSTEs and student teachers is different from that between a novice teacher and a mentor or peer. The university partnership works to match personalities and styles of teachers between the student teachers and the OSTE when placements are made. An effort is made by the university to facilitate collegiality. This collegiality provides the student teachers a support system and a safe place to explore their ideas related to teaching. This combination of collegiality and support may facilitate increases in student teacher efficacy.

#### Implications for Research

Previous research has focused on teacher efficacy or school culture. Few studies have examined both, and even fewer studies have examined teacher efficacy, school culture, and middle school adolescents. This study allowed the researcher to examine efficacy, culture, and the developmental needs of young adolescents in middle schools. The researcher also examined perceptions of teachers and student teachers who worked in Professional Development Schools. At times this study became difficult because it examined many facets of schools; however, this allowed for an examination of multifaceted middle schools in relation to culture and teacher efficacy.

To study the relationships between culture and efficacy the researcher used the Hoy and Woolfolk (1990) Teacher Efficacy Scale, the Cheai (1990) Middle Level Climate Indicator, interviews, and observations. While this provided valuable insight, future research should include more direct probing into how teachers and student teachers perceive the relationship between culture and efficacy. Although Chester and Beaudin (1996) developed an instrument close to assessing efficacy and culture, the development of an instrument that specifically measures both efficacy and culture would be a helpful research tool.

This research was conducted in two Professional Development Middle Schools, with a cluster group of teachers who had been identified as quality educators. The student teachers in this study were from a preservice education program steeped in field experience and middle school philosophy. Future research on culture and efficacy in middle schools should be conducted with all teachers in a school, not just "the better ones," and may want to include student teachers from a more traditional teacher education program. This would provide comparison groups. Also, the sample size was quite small. Future research should include a larger sample size. Lack of diversity among participants was evident. Participant diversity is needed in future research.

This study provided insight into many areas of middle school, culture, and efficacy. Future research should address these areas in greater depth in order to facilitate insight into the relationships among these areas. Even though the findings in this study may not generalize to other middle schools, they provide illumination on middle school practices, teacher efficacy, and culture in two Professional Development Middle Schools. The findings may be useful in examining culture and efficacy in other middle school settings since they indicated that the relationships between culture and efficacy impact both teachers' persistence and effort and students' academic and personal successes.

Specifically, implications include the need for researcher to examine efficacy and culture in a longitudinal study. Since efficacy is a state and not a trait, many circumstances may influence educators personal and general teaching efficacies. Noteworthy, in this study is the fact that North has a new principal and South's principal is retiring. A follow up to this study to examine efficacy and culture in the next few years would provide valuable insights into the relationships between efficacy and culture. Another implication from this research is the need to closely examine the relationships between teachers and student teachers and Professional Development Schools in terms of how teachers transmit their perceptions of efficacy and culture to student teachers. Finally, additional research is needed to examine the efficacy among teachers and student teachers to determine whose validation is necessary in order for one to maintain a high sense of personal and/or general teaching efficacy.

The high efficacies and belief that "we take care of our students" is illustrated by a teacher who described overcoming obstacles and meeting student needs in a supportive climate. She described this process as:

Doing what you have to do. You have to come to this job with a feeling, not just I'm going to teach, but I'm going to overcome this (obstacles) and teach, I'm going to overcome that, and I'm going to meet the needs. You cannot just walk in at 8:00 and teach. I work with students individually, keep them after school, stay late Tuesday and Thursday, modify assignments and tests, whatever it takes (Denise).



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

An agenda for excellence at the middle level: A statement by NASSP's council on middle level education. (1985). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Ashton, P., Webb, R., & Doda, N. (1983). A study of teachers' sense of efficacy (Final Report, Executive Summary). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Ashton, P. (1985). Motivation and the teacher's sense of efficacy. Research on motivation in education: Volume 2: the classroom milieu. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. American Psychologist, 44(9), 1175-1184.

Burnaford, G. (1993). Beginning curriculum integration. Research in Middle Level Education: Middle Level Curriculum, 16(2), 43-63.

Brofenbrenner, U. (1976). The experimental ecology of education. Educational Researcher, 5, 5-15.

Cheal, J. (1990). Organizational climate in middle level schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Researchers Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).

Chester, M., & Beaudin, B. (1996). Efficacy beliefs of newly hired teachers in urban schools. American Educational Research Journal, 33(1), 233-257.

- Coladarci, T. (1992). Teacher's sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. Journal of Experimental Education, 60(4), 323-337.
- Deal, T. E. (1990). Reframing reform. Educational Leadership, 47, 6-12.
- Eichhorn, D. (1966). The Middle School. New York: The Center for Applied Research.
- Garvin, J. (1987). Beliefs that make a difference. Educational Oasis, 7(7).
- George, P., Stevenson, C., Thomason, J., & Beane, J. (1989). The Middle School and Beyond. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- George, P., & Shewey, K. (1994). New Evidence for the Middle School. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.
- Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569-582.
- Henderson, J. (1992). Reflective teaching: Becoming an inquiring educator. New York: Macmillan.
- Hoy, W., Tarter, C., & Bliss, J. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 260-279.
- Hoy, W., & Woolfolk, A. (1990). School health and teacher efficacy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.
- Johnston, J. H., & Ramos de Perez, M. (1985). Schools in the middle: A report on trends and practices. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Johnston, H. J. (1992). Youth as cultural capital: Learning how to be. In J. L. Irvin (Ed.), Transforming middle level education: Perspectives and possibilities (pp. 46-63). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Lacour, E., & Wilkerson, T. (1991). Efficacy in education: A synopsis of the literature. Unpublished manuscript.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.
- Lee, V., Dedrick, R., & Smith, J. (1991). The effect of social organization of schools on teacher efficacy and satisfaction. Sociology and Education, *64*, 190-208.
- Miller, P. (1987). The relationship between teacher efficacy and referral of students for special education services. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Virginia Tech, Blacksburg.
- Miskel, C. (1982). Structural linkages, expectancy, climate, and school effectiveness (Research Report No. 58). Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities.
- Morin, S., & Welsh, L. (1991). Teaching efficacy scale: Job analysis and theoretical factors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Northeastern Educators Research Association, New York.
- Mulhern, J. (1984). Organizational climate of secondary schools: Revision of the OCDO. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University.
- Newman, F. M., Rutter, R. A., & Smith, M. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations. Sociology of Education, *62*, 221-238.
- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. London: Open Books.
- Schoolyear 2000: Florida, background information: Middle level programs. (1993). Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University, Center for Educational Technology.
- Schunk, D. (1991). Goal setting and self-evaluation: A social cognitive perspective on self-regulation. Motivation and Achievement, *7*, 85-113.

Spradley, J., & McCurdy, D. (1972). The cultural experience: Ethnography in complex society. Chicago, IL: Science Research Associates.

Strahan, D. (1991). Creating Climates for Success in Middle-Level Schools. Greensboro, NC: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

Strahan, D. (April, 1992). A developmental analysis of preservice teachers' orientations toward themselves, their students, and their subject matter. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston).

Strahan, D. (Fall 1994). Putting middle level perspectives into practice: Creating school cultures that promote caring. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Taigura, R., & Litwin, G. (1986). Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept. Boston: President and Fellows of Harvard College.

This we believe. (1982). Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century. (1989). Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Willower, D., Eidell, T., & Hoy, W. (1967). The school and pupil control ideology. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.

Woolfolk, A. & Hoy, W. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 81-91.

Woolfolk, A., & Hoy, W. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. The Elementary School Journal, 94(4), 355-372.

APPENDIX A  
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

OSTE = on-site teacher educator  
ST = student teacher

PTE = personal teaching efficacy  
GTE = general teaching efficacy

<u>Research Questions</u>	<u>Measure</u>	<u>Source of Evidence</u>
1a. What is the relationship between pre and post scores on the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale (1990)?	Teacher Efficacy Scale	Subscale
1b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of efficacy through structured interview questions and informal conversations?	Structured Interviews Informal Observations	Content Analysis (coding, categorizing, synthesizing)
2a. What are the relationships among the scores of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) on Cheal's (1990) Middle Level Organizational Climate Indicator?	Organizational Climate Indicator	Subscale
2b. How do on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and student teachers (ST) in two middle level Professional Development Schools articulate their perceptions of Cheal's dimensions of climate through structured interview questions and informal conversations?	Structures Interviews Informal Observations	Content Analysis (coding, categorizing, synthesizing)
3. What are the correlations among the scores of the seven organizational factors as identified on the Cheal Middle Level Climate Indicator and personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE) scores on the Woolfolk and Hoy Teacher Efficacy Scale?	Organizational Climate Indicator Teacher Efficacy Scale	Correlational Analyses

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS - continued**

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 4. From the perspectives of the on-site teacher educators (OSTE) and the student teachers (ST), what are the most important aspects of school culture that influence personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE)? | <b>Structured Interviews<br/>Observations</b> | <b>Content<br/>Analysis<br/>(Coding,<br/>categorizing,<br/>synthesizing)</b> |
|--|---|--|

APPENDIX B  
TEACHER SELF EFFICACY SCALE



Name \_\_\_\_\_ **TEACHER SELF EFFICACY SCALE**  
from Hoy and Woolfolk, 1990

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exert a little extra effort . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
2. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
3. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
4. If students aren't disciplined at home, they aren't likely to accept any discipline . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
5. I have enough training to deal with almost any learning problem . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
6. When a student is having difficulty with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
7. When a student gets a better grade than he/she usually gets, it is usually because I found better ways of teaching the student . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
8. When I try, I can get through to the most difficult student . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
9. A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his/her behavior . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
10. Teachers are not a very powerful influence on students' achievement, all factors considered . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5

	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>No Opinion</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>
11. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching approaches . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
12. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
13. If parents would do more for their children, I could do more . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
14. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next class . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
15. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
16. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
17. If one of my students couldn't do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
18. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated student . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
19. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his/her home environment . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5
20. My teacher training program and/or experience has given me the necessary skills to be an effective teacher . . . . .	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C  
DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

## DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Cheal, 1991

**Dimension 1:** The faculty's force of motivation toward the school's academic orientation to student achievement. This dimension was measured through the faculty's perception of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence as rewards for their collective efforts. (Expectancy and Motivation)

**Dimension 2:** Interactions between the teachers and their students that indicate a degree of control exerted over the student population. This dimension measures the faculty's perception of the level of control needed to maintain an educationally conducive climate. (Pupil Control Behavior)

**Dimension 3:** The physical and material aspects of an organization as perceived by the faculty. (Tangible Environment)

**Dimension 4:** Teachers' close social relationships among faculty members. This dimension reflects the teachers' perceptions of personal social interactions among staff members. (Teacher Social Needs)

**Dimension 5:** The faculty's perceptions of their colleagues' attitudes toward their professional attitudes and actions of their peers. (Teacher Frustration)

**Dimension 6:** Interactions between the building principals and the instructional staff that serve to create a climate that is perceived to be a cooperative working environment by faculty. (Administrative Support)

**Dimension 7:** Principal's efforts to control the internal functioning of their school through the coordination of work. This dimension describes actions by the principals that are interpreted by the faculty as controlling and authoritarian in nature. (Administrative Control)

**Middle School Organizational Climate Survey**  
Based on the work of Jennifer Putnam Cheal

**Please circle the number that indicates your response to each item. The choices are: Strongly Agree, Agree Somewhat, No Opinion, Disagree Somewhat, and Strongly Disagree**

**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

1. Our principal(s) recognizes faculty achievement.

SA AS NO DS SD

2. Our principal(s) does NOT monitor everything teachers do.

SA AS NO DS SD

3. Our principal(s) compliments teachers.

SA AS NO DS SD

4. Our teachers believe that all students can learn.

SA AS NO DS SD

5. Our principal (s) does NOT explain his/her reasons for criticism to teachers.

SA AS NO DS SD

**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

6. Our principal(s) provide instructional leadership.

SA AS NO DS SD

7. Our teachers plan instructional activities for maximum learning at all achievement levels.

SA AS NO DS SD

8. Our students solve their problems through logical reasoning.

SA AS NO DS SD

9. Custodial services are available when needed.

SA AS NO DS SD

10. Our teachers continually monitor student progress to adjust their instructional programs.

SA AS NO DS SD

11. Our principal(s) uses constructive criticism.

SA AS NO DS SD

- Strongly Agree = SA**  
**Agree Somewhat = AS**  
**No Opinion = NO**  
**Disagree Somewhat = DS**  
**Strongly Disagree = SD**

12. Our principal(s) closely checks teacher activities.

SA AS NO DS SD

13. Our principal(s) goes out of his/her way to help teachers.

SA AS NO DS SD

14. Our students cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom.

SA AS NO DS SD

15. It is often necessary to remind our pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers.

SA AS NO DS SD

16. Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive.

SA AS NO DS SD

17. Our teachers are sensitive to the developmental needs of middle school students as they plan their lessons.

SA AS NO DS SD

**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

18. Our principal(s) talks more than listens.

SA AS NO DS SD

19. Our principal(s) encourages teacher autonomy.

SA AS NO DS SD

20. Our teachers have too many committee requirements.

SA AS NO DS SD

21. Being friendly with our students often leads them to become too familiar.

SA AS NO DS SD

22. We have adequate instructional materials for our school program.

SA AS NO DS SD

23. Our principal(s) supervises teachers closely.

SA AS NO DS SD



**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

24. Our teachers have chances to learn new things.

SA AS NO DS SD

25. Teachers in this building show a genuine caring for students.

SA AS NO DS SD

26. Our school has a well maintained/clean interior.

SA AS NO DS SD

27. High faculty initiative leads to the attainment of the desired educational objectives.

SA AS NO DS SD

28. Our teachers re-teach materials to students as needed.

SA AS NO DS SD

29. The exterior of our school is well maintained.

SA AS NO DS SD

**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

30. Our teachers motivate their students to learn.

SA AS NO DS SD

31. Our principal(s) provides instructional leadership.

SA AS NO DS SD

32. Teaching strategies in this school are based upon principles of learning.

SA AS NO DS SD

33. Our teachers socialize with each other on a regular basis.

SA AS NO DS SD

34. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.

SA AS NO DS SD

35. Our students often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad.

SA AS NO DS SD

**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

36. Our students are usually NOT capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning.

SA AS NO DS SD

37. A few students are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly.

SA AS NO DS SD

38. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant student is a good disciplinary technique.

SA AS NO DS SD

39. Our principal's organization insures maximum classroom time-on-task.

SA AS NO DS SD

40. In this school, it is important that our students acquire an interest in the subject matter.

SA AS NO DS SD

41. If our students are allowed to use the restroom without getting permission this privilege will be abused.

SA AS NO DS SD

**Strongly Agree = SA**

**Agree Somewhat = AS**

**No Opinion = NO**

**Disagree Somewhat = DS**

**Strongly Disagree = SD**

42. Teachers do not help and support each other.

SA AS NO DS SD

43. Our teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.

SA AS NO DS SD

44. Our expending high levels of energy DOES NOT lead to commensurate levels of student achievement.

SA AS NO DS SD

45. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.

SA AS NO DS SD

46. Our principal(s) does NOT look out for the personal welfare of the faculty.

SA AS NO DS SD

**Thank you for completing this survey.**

**MIDDLE SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE SURVEY**

**Thank you for taking time to complete this survey. All responses will be kept confidential and no information identifying individuals will be reported. Your name and school are needed in order to match On-Site Teacher Educators and Student Teachers.**

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**School** \_\_\_\_\_