Abstract

In current conceptualizations teacher sense of self-efficacy relates mainly to teaching tasks, in particular within the classroom context. This article offers a new conceptualization of teacher self-efficacy based on a broader work spectrum, comprising classroom and school-organizational contexts, with empirical evidence to support its validity. Participants were 555 teachers who served as respondents, filling out a self-report questionnaire. In a factor analysis of the scores, a two-factor structure emerged which consisted of teacher self-efficacy in the classroom and in the school-organizational domain. Each factor possessed professional tasks and inter-relation elements. The study suggests a new definition of teacher self-efficacy.
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1. Introduction

For over two decades teacher efficacy has been defined as the extent to which a teacher believes that she or he can influence students’ behavior and their academic achievement, especially of pupils with difficulties or those with particularly low learning motivation. The conceptualization of teacher efficacy is based on the breadth of the teacher’s role. In most studies, this involves only the classroom in which the teacher engages in education and teaching. In some conceptualizations teacher efficacy includes classroom management and student engagement aspects. Thus, the conceptualization of teacher efficacy in the literature has focused on the teacher’s perception of his or her own competence and on the ability of teaching as a professional discipline to shape students’ knowledge, values and behavior (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2001). This article’s main contribution to the conceptualization of teacher efficacy is the addition of the school context and inter-personal relations between teachers and significant others within the school context to the concept of teacher efficacy.

Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk-Hoy, and Hoy (1998) reviewed the vast body of literature on teacher efficacy, and pointed to two main sources of the formulation of this concept. One is ascribed to researchers of the American RAND company, who based themselves on Rotter’s (1966) work, the
second is attributed to Bandura (1977). A distinction was made between teaching-as-a-profession efficacy, and teacher’s personal sense of efficacy. This distinction served as a basis for Gibson and Dembo’s (1984) scale for measuring teacher sense of self-efficacy. Various instruments have been developed over the years for measuring teacher efficacy. Some are based on the RAND-Rotter conceptualization, others on Bandura. Of the former, we note the RAND Scale (Armor, Conroy-Osegnera, Cox, & King, 1976), the Teacher’s Locus of Control (Rose & Medway, 1981), and Responsibility for Student Achievement (Guskey, 1981). In the second group, we note the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Gibson & Dembo, 1984); the Efficacy Beliefs in Science Teaching Scale (Riggs & Enchos, 1990); Ashton’s Events Scale (Ashton, Olejnik, Crocker, & McAuliffe, 1982) and Bandura’s Teacher Efficacy Scale, mentioned in his 1997 book (Bandura, 1997).

Researchers have attempted to broaden the conceptual scope of teacher efficacy measurement instruments by introducing additional areas of teacher functioning and responsibility at work, or by expanding the scope of teacher efficacy beliefs conceptualization. Emmer and Hickman (1991) adapted Gibson and Dembo’s instrument to classroom management situations. Soodak and Podell (1996) widened Gibson and Dembo’s questionnaire to include students’ behavioral and emotional problems as opposed to simply learning related problems. Rich, Fischer, and Lev (1996) added a scale for measuring teacher efficacy in promoting social relations among students to Gibson and Dembo’s scale and improved this scale by rephrasing some of the items. They supplemented the scale with items drawn from other scales concerning teacher responsibility for student academic achievements, items on professional self-image and the teacher’s self-report on his or her teaching behaviors. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) proposed an integrated model of teacher self-efficacy, which included two dimensions, the first was teaching tasks and their context, the second was the teacher’s self-perception of teaching competencies. In analyzing the first dimension, the relative importance of factors that make teaching difficult or act as constraints is weighed against an assessment of the resources available that facilitate learning. In assessing the second dimension, the teacher judges personal capabilities such as skills, knowledge or personality traits balanced against personal weaknesses or liabilities in a particular teaching context. Tschannan-Moran et al.’s (1998) model focuses on the teacher’s performance in the classroom context, teaching specific subjects to students in a specific setting. It does not include efficacy beliefs pertaining to other aspects of the school context.

In recent years we find considerable discontent with the narrowness of the definition of teacher efficacy, especially with the two-factor model originating from the RAND-Rotter and the Gibson and Dembo (1984) conceptualization (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). The major grounds for this sense of discontent rest on the assumption that the teacher’s role is much more complex than represented in extant conceptualizations. In this regard, Bandura (1997) stated that teachers’ perceptions of efficacy depend on more than their ability to teach subject matter. Teacher’s effectiveness is, in part, determined also by their efficacy beliefs in maintaining classroom discipline that establishes an environment of learning, in using resources, and in supporting parental efforts to help their children learn. Multi-faceted scales for evaluating teacher efficacy may therefore enable researchers to choose subjects and domains more worthy of focus and hence produce effective teachers. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) suggested that in order to be useful and generalizable, measures of teacher efficacy need to tap teacher’s assessments of their competence across the wide range of activities and tasks they are asked to perform. Based on their model (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998) they noted that a valid measure of teacher efficacy must assess both personal competence and an analysis of the task in terms of the resources and constraints in particular teaching contexts. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy (2001) introduced a new instrument to measure teacher efficacy, comprised of three subscales: (1) efficacy for instructional strategies, (2) efficacy for classroom management, and (3) efficacy for student engagement.
A different approach to examining teacher efficacy appeared in the literature during the last decade. Cherniss (1993) has suggested that teacher efficacy should consist of three domains: Task (the level of the teacher’s skill in teaching, disciplining and motivating students); Inter-personal (the teacher’s ability to work harmoniously with others, particularly service recipients, colleagues and direct supervisors) and Organization (the teacher’s ability to influence the social and political powers of the organization). Cherniss (1993) did not elaborate on his proposed conceptualization beyond its basic definition, and suggested that this three-dimensional model of teacher self-efficacy can contribute to understanding and preventing teacher burnout. Basing himself on these three dimensions of teacher efficacy (Task, Relations, and Organization) Friedman (2000) suggested strategies for coping with teachers’ work stresses, enhancing the need to reinforce their sense of self-efficacy in these three areas. He stressed that an important, relatively undisclosed area of teacher functioning is the school context, and that the teacher’s professional world is comprised of the classroom as well as the school domain. He also noted that both should be included in assessing teacher efficacy.

Several recent studies have highlighted the organizational aspect of teachers’ work and its significance to the concept of teachers’ sense of efficacy. School variables such as school climate, principal behavior, sense of community among school staff and school decision-making procedures are of importance for the teacher’s sense of professional efficacy. For example, Bandura (1997) suggested that teacher efficacy should comprise seven categories: efficacy in influencing decision-making, efficacy in influencing the acquisition and use of school resources, teaching efficacy, efficacy in disciplinary matters, efficacy in enlisting parental assistance, efficacy in involving the community, and efficacy in generating an open school climate.

The question that now remains open is which spheres of activity should be included in the frame of the teacher’s world and used in defining teacher efficacy. To answer this question, we should note that although teachers function mainly in the classroom domain, the classroom is an integral part of the school as an organization. Teachers must be acquainted with the organization’s goals, norms, values and preferred way of doing things, through a socialization process. Successful organizational socialization produces dependable performance, innovation and cooperation, higher motivation and satisfaction, and lower turnover. Besides learning how to deal with conflicts involving students and their parents, teachers need to handle conflicts involving managers and colleagues inside and outside their work groups. People in the school, e.g., the principal, administrators, counselors, parents, colleagues, supervisors, etc., can be either aids or roadblocks to what the individual teacher wants to get done. The organizational reality is that most jobs are interdependent, therefore employees should realize that other people in the same organization may be the key to becoming effective, or efficacious. Managing these inter-dependencies is an important focus of teacher self-efficacy. A model that aims to incorporate a broad spectrum of the teacher’s professional world should also cover the realities of the school as a human organization. Such a model is presented in this work.

2. The Classroom and School Context (CSC) model of teacher self-efficacy

This article proposes a conceptual model of teacher self-efficacy, named the Classroom and School Context (CSC) model of teacher efficacy, or in short CSC model. It embraces the teacher’s two major domains of functioning, classroom and school, incorporating teaching activities, and interrelations with students, parents, colleagues, and the principal, as well as organizational functioning. The CSC model describes the general array of professional tasks performed by the teacher, and the contacts with school staff relevant to the teacher’s sense of efficacy, allowing the concept to be defined more comprehensively.

The CSC model is based on the following three premises:

1. The teacher operates simultaneously as a leader and as an employee within two social systems in
the school: the classroom and the organization. The classroom represents the social framework in which a formalized, agreed upon set of reciprocal relations exist between the students and their teacher (Waller, 1932), with the teacher serving as the leader (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). However, the school is the place in which the teacher performs educational duties (teaching, educating). The teacher is the school’s employee and as such functions as an “organizational person” (Whyte, 1956). The teacher is thus both a leader and a follower at the same time, in the very same organization.

2. The teacher is engaged in two social systems. One social system connects the teacher to the students; the other connects the teacher to colleagues and the principal. In performing the role-related tasks and, naturally, by nurturing and forming reciprocal relations within the classroom, the teacher is associated with the students. In the fulfillment of general school tasks, related to the school as an organization, the teacher is associated with adults: colleagues, parents, and the principal.

3. The teacher must function on two levels in both social systems in the school: the task and the relation levels. In the classroom, the teacher is required to achieve role-related purposeful goals (achievements and education) and expressive goals (nurturing and establishing informal reciprocal relations with the students) (Jackson, 1968; Lortie, 1975). The teacher cannot neglect one goal and focus on the other, and should this happen, he or she will feel that not all professional tasks demanded of him or her are fulfilled (Bales, 1956; Lortie, 1975). In the school, the teacher has to be part of a group influencing the social and political forces, promoting the organizational goals.

Fig. 1 is a schematic presentation of the CSC model of teacher self-efficacy, indicating the action arenas and people associated with the teacher’s perception of efficacy. According to this model, the concept of teacher professional self-efficacy should embrace both social systems in which the teacher functions (the classroom and the organization), and should relate to the people inside these systems (students, colleagues and management). In the classroom, the teacher imparts knowledge, functions as an educator, and handles both formal and informal aspects of his or her relationships with the students. The student-related tasks are, for example, good teaching, generating change in
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the student’s life, flexibility within the classroom and nurturing social relations among the students themselves. Relationships on the classroom level are expressions of an assertive relationship with students. This is achieved by dealing effectively and confidently with real threats within the environment, e.g., discipline problems, classroom disruption, and maintaining clear student–teacher boundaries.

As an “organizational person” the teacher may possibly seek influence and active involvement in performing organization-related tasks (involvement in decision-making, membership of the “inner circles”, confidence in maneuvering around the organizational maze, ascending the school hierarchy), as well as establishing positive relations with colleagues and members of the administration, assertiveness and social integration, affording a sense of belonging and security (Derr & Laurent, 1989; Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Organ & Bateman, 1991, Schein, 1971).

Based on the proposed conceptualization, teacher efficacy should encompass two basic aspects: (a) working with students within the classroom context, and (b) being a member of the school as an organization. In both contexts the teacher has to perform professional tasks and be involved in inter-personal relations. The task aspect involves professional assignments in the classroom, tasks associated with the general school framework, and serving as an “organizational person” (Fuller, Wood, Rapaport, & Dornbusch, 1982). Concerning relations, the teacher must be able to maintain successful inter-personal relations with students, colleagues and the principal.

3. The concept of teacher self-efficacy and its components based on the CSC model: empirical evidence

3.1. Sample

Participants in this study were 555 teachers from 22 randomly selected elementary and secondary schools in Israel. Their average age was 34.9 years (SD = 8.80), and the average number of years of experience was 10.8 years (SD = 8.70).

3.2. Instrumentation and procedure

A number of stages were involved in preparing the instruments for the studies in this research. Stage one involved a study whose purpose was to produce an initial definition of the concept of teacher professional efficacy, to identify the foci of teacher efficacy and to generate statements to be used in the scale for measuring levels of efficacy. The study included collecting and phrasing of statements concerning teacher professional self-efficacy, examining the extent to which teachers understood the statements, and testing of a preliminary form on a small sample of teachers. In-depth interviews and group discussions with teachers were conducted, in which participants were asked to define teachers' required capabilities (“tool box”). Interviews and open-ended questionnaires were content analyzed and items were formulated. Seventeen categories (51 items) were found for the Task domain, 16 categories (73 items) for the Inter-personal domain, and 22 categories (75 items) for the Organization domain. An open-ended questionnaire was also administered to 40 teachers. Here, respondents were asked to detail the skills and capabilities required by teachers in the following domains: professional knowledge (ability to teach “good” lessons); and inter-personal relations (with students, parents, colleagues, the principal, etc.); organization (how to function in the school as an organization, skills teachers need to influence organizational processes, how to attain support from the school as a system). Items were checked for phrasing, clarity and relevance to their respective content domains. Existing forms for measuring personal and professional self-efficacy were also reviewed (for example: Berman & McLaughlin, 1977, Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Midgley, Feldlaufer, & Eccles, 1989; Rich et al., 1996). Two hundred and sixty items were retained, and then randomly split into halves. They were included in two parallel forms and administered to 250 teachers. At this preliminary stage, several items expressing relations with parents were included in the questionnaires. Sample items are: “I am very assertive with parents”, “I am very attentive to parents' needs”, “I feel that I am not open or patient enough with
parents”, and “I cannot agree with parents criticizing my professional ability”.

The data processing checked items for skewness and kurtosis. Reliability coefficients were calculated and “good” items were selected for the next phase. It should be noted here that all items dealing with relations between teachers and parents could not be retained either due to unacceptable item-total correlation in the reliability tests, or unacceptable factor coefficients in the factor analyses.

In the next phase, two forms were compiled from the collected and processed material. The forms contained items that had successfully passed the examination referred to above. Anonymous questionnaires were administered to 1100 teachers. Some were distributed to teachers at schools where subjects were asked to complete them in their own time and return them to the school secretary. Most questionnaires were distributed to teachers attending inservice training courses. The purpose of the study and the questionnaires was explained to the teachers before they had completed and returned them to the researchers. Altogether, 570 teachers completed and returned their questionnaires (52% return rate). The purpose of these studies was to compile evidence in support (or refutation) of the CSC conceptualization, and to formulate and select “good” items for the final validation stage.

The field work for the final stage was conducted during the Winter and Spring semesters of the school year. About 720 questionnaires were mailed to the schools and distributed to teachers. The teachers completed anonymous questionnaires and returned them in sealed envelopes to the administrative secretary of the school who mailed them back to the research coordinators. The return rate for the completed forms was 76.8%.

The Instrument for this final study was a 45-scale item entitled The Teacher Professional Capability Scale which was based on the forms used in previous studies. The scale comprised four sub-scales: (a) student and class-related tasks; (b) student-related relations; (c) organization-related tasks, and (d) organization-related relations. Each sub-scale contained about 11 items. The questionnaire also contained such background information as demographic details and school assignment data. The response options for the items ranged from 1 (never) through 6 (always).

3.3. Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics, including means, variances, and item-total correlations, were computed for every item. Missing data were treated by replacing the missing item score with the item mean score. The correlation matrix of the item scores of the scale was subjected to factor analysis. Principal factoring with iterations was used to extract the factors, replacing the main diagonal element of the correlation matrix with communality estimates. The number of factors to be extracted was based on several criteria, e.g., Kaiser’s Eigenvalue rule (Nunnally, 1978) and Cattell’s (1966) scree test. A comparison of observed correlation matrix and reproduced correlation matrix was used for verification by examining the residual correlation matrix. The factor structure coefficient saliency criterion was predetermined to be 0.30. Internal consistency for the scores on the scale and its sub-scales was estimated using Cronbach’s coefficient alpha procedure.

Procedures for testing the stability of the results were used. The sample was split randomly into halves to form two sub-samples; factor analysis was applied to the correlation matrix of the scale item scores, and the results compared by calculating Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient \( r \). Internal consistency for the item scores on the scale and its sub-scales for different teacher groups (male, female; chief grades taught, teaching assignments and religious affiliation) were calculated for reliability generalization purposes.

4. Results

4.1. Preliminary examination of items

All items had a mean score close to the center of the response range for the scale. A corrected item-total correlation analysis indicated that the items having the highest corrected correlation with the total score were: “I think that my principal would
readily accept my plans or suggestions for promoting the school’s educational and social goals” (item 21; \( r = 0.60 \)); “I believe I enjoy a good rapport with the school administrators” (item 27; \( r = 0.58 \)); “I have difficulty in making demands of the school administration” (item 20; \( r = 0.57 \)); “I feel that my students willingly comply with my requests and instructions in the classroom” (item 3; \( r = 0.57 \)); and “I believe my teaching produces positive change in my students’ lives” (item 1; \( r = 0.51 \)). At this point, three items were discarded due to low item-total correlation (\( r < 0.15 \)). None of the item scores in the classroom context were reversed, while several item-scores in the school (organization) scores were reversed.

4.2. Factor analysis

A first empirical estimate of the number of factors to be extracted was obtained from the size of the factor eigenvalues: nine factors had an eigenvalue >1. However, the scree test for eigenvalues plotted against factors (Cattell, 1966) indicated a noticeable change in the direction of the lines crossing the eigenvalue plot points between the second and third factors. The residual correlation matrix indicated that a three-factor solution might serve as the upper limit of the number of factors to be extracted. An examination of the three-factor solution indicated that the third factor included only negatively phrased items that lacked any contextual or semantic coherence. The two-factor solution was finally chosen to fit the data. The two factors accounted for 31.4% of the variance in the scale item scores. At this stage, nine items were deleted due to low item-factor structure coefficients (\( r < 0.30 \)). For two reasons, one item (#19; see Table 1) was retained although its factor coefficient was 0.29: first, we thought it contained an important content domain; and second, we believed that a structure coefficient 0.29 was not really different from 0.30.

The same factor analysis procedure was then applied to the remaining 33 items, where both oblique and orthogonal rotations were used. With data value set at zero, the oblique (oblimin) rotation of the two factors had a correlation of 0.37. The comparison of the two rotated solutions indicated that in the oblique and the orthogonal rotations, the same items were correlated highly with the two factors, with very similar magnitudes. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient \( r \) was used to compare the magnitude of the factor structure coefficients. Results showed \( r = 0.99 \) and \( r = 0.97 \) for Factors I and II, respectively. For the sake of simplicity and ease of interpretation of the results, the orthogonally rotated solution was chosen to represent the data in the final solution.

The two factors in the CSC teacher self-efficacy scale have been labeled as follows (see Table 1): Factor I: The Classroom Context (sense of professional efficacy pertaining to teaching, educating and motivating students, as well as controlling inter-relations with students), and Factor II: The School Context (involvement in school activities, participation in decision-making and influencing school organizational politics).

4.3. Internal consistency and reliability generalization

Internal consistency of the CSC teacher self-efficacy scale scores was measured by Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. The coefficient alpha is the function of the extent to which items in a test have commonalities and is the lower limit of the reliability of a set of test scores (Cortina, 1993). The reliability of scale scores will naturally be influenced not only by the instrument used, but also by the sample composition and variability (Dawis, 1987). It is therefore important to report reliability coefficients for the actual data collected (Vacha-Haase, Kogan, & Thompson, 2000). Table 2 shows the alpha coefficients, means and standard deviations for the sub-groups of teachers in this study. The mean scores for the alpha coefficients for the CSC scale scores and sub-scales were: 0.89 (SD = 0.01), 0.86 (SD = 0.01), and 0.84 (SD = 0.04), respectively (see Table 2).

4.4. Stability of results

Stability of results was tested by using split sampling. The sample \( (n = 555) \) was split into halves by random sampling to form two sub-samples. Differences in the important characteristics
Table 1
Rotated principal component factor matrix for the Classroom and School Context (CSC) teacher self-efficacy scale items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Item content</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I believe my teaching produces a positive change in my students’ lives</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I think I know how to tie my teaching with my students’ everyday interests</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel that my students willingly comply with my requests and instructions in the classroom</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I believe that I am a highly capable teacher</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I think I know how to improvise in response to changing circumstances when I teach</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I think that my teaching has an impact on the morals and values of my students</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I know how to adjust the level of difficulty of my teaching to suit the students so that they can understand and learn</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I think I can be very creative in my work with students</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I think I have the capacity to encourage my students to express their thoughts and feelings freely in my class</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I think I am an interesting and motivating teacher</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>If a student does not remember what was learned in previous classes, I know what to do to help</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I think I know how to identify and deal with my students’ problems before they get worse</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I think I know when to involve my students in decisions concerning learning issues</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I can handle student disturbances in the classroom without raising my voice</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I think that my teaching is flexible and adaptive</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I think that in conflict situations I can act in such a manner that would not lead to a crisis</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I think I can joke with students without it affecting their respect for me</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I think I can let my students laugh or joke in the classroom without losing my grip on the class</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I can easily share my feelings with my students if I decide to do so</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Item content</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I have difficulty in making demands of the school administration*</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I think that my principal would readily accept my plans or suggestions for promoting the school’s educational and social goals</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I feel that my school administrators are not sympathetic to me or my ideas for promoting the school’s educational or social goals*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I am actively involved in important decision-making processes at school</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I do not think my school administrators are sufficiently familiar with me or my views*</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I think I can play an important role in solving serious school problems</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I believe I can contribute to molding school educational and administrative policies and characteristics</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I believe I enjoy a good rapport with the administrators at school</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>When I have problems at school, I do not know whom to turn to*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I think I could get a better position in my school if I wanted</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>When faced with too many difficulties in my relations with colleagues or administration staff I prefer to retreat or give up*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I do not know who really makes the important decisions in my school*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I think I have friendly relationships with colleagues at school</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I feel I cannot establish good relations with colleagues at my school*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Item scores were recoded.
of subjects in the two sub-samples were compared and tested. There were no statistically significant or meaningful differences. Correlation matrices of scores on the CSC scale for each sample were factor analyzed and the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient $r$ used to compare magnitude of factor structure coefficients for the two sub-samples. The correlations found for the factor structure coefficients were 0.87 and 0.62 for Factors I and II, respectively.

5. Discussion

Our study of teacher self-efficacy was prompted by the need to extend the definition of teacher self-efficacy to include a more realistic description of teacher professional functioning and teaching context. Our basic argument was that almost exclusively, most definitions and conceptualizations of teacher self-efficacy address the classroom context of the teaching function, overlooking the school as an organization and the teacher as an organizational person, even though these represent important elements of the professional function of teaching. Two theoretical frameworks have served as the platforms for our study. The first of these was Cherniss’s (1993) three-dimensional conceptualization of teacher sense of professional self-efficacy, consisting of teaching tasks (normally taking place mainly in the classroom), interpersonal relations, and organization (relating to the school as a work organization and the teacher as an organization person). The second theoretical platform for this study was Bandura’s (1997) claim that teacher efficacy beliefs need to cover some other context areas besides the traditional classroom context. He isolated such school organizational processes as decision-making, collegiality, and parental and community support, showing their bearing on the assessment of professional efficacy beliefs.

A comparison of the conceptualization suggested in this article and the one proposed by Bandura (1997) reveals various similarities and differences. The present conceptualization resembles that of Bandura in that it contains such components as efficacy in influencing
decision-making, teaching efficacy, efficacy in disciplinary matters, and efficacy in contributing to a positive climate at school. The main difference is that the conceptualization presented here clearly highlights the field of relations, which is linked to both the students and to the school as an organization.

The classroom–school conceptualization of teacher burnout presented here is different from some of the other organizational concepts applied to schools. For example, it diverges from the employee empowerment concept, since self-efficacy belief is only one component of empowerment. Furthermore, empowerment is a process where the principal acts to enhance and strengthen teacher sense of efficacy. The classroom–school conceptualization of self-efficacy focuses on the actual teachers’ point of view of his or her ability to function as a professional, including his or her relations with the principal and colleagues. Also, we find that embedded in the classroom–school conceptualization is the notion of shared decision-making, another organizational concept. The capacity to participate in decision-making is a pivotal part of a professional’s sense of organizational self-efficacy.

Organizational efficacy is also different from collective self-efficacy. Collective self-efficacy is a group process related to group performance. It too is an important part of organizational culture (Bandura, 1997). Culture is concerned not only with shared assumptions, values and norms, but also with shared beliefs regarding the collective beliefs that members of an organization have regarding their efficacy in producing and achieving particular goals (Goodard, Hoy, & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2000). The sense of organizational efficacy suggested by the classroom–school conceptualization encapsulates the person’s beliefs concerning his or her ability to function as a single member of the organization, contribute to achieving collective goals, gain organizational support to improve personal functioning, improve relations with colleagues and superiors, etc.

The classroom–school conceptualization of teacher efficacy extends Tschannen-Moran et al.’s (1998) model and Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk-Hoy’s (2001) recently published scale for measuring teacher efficacy by adding the organizational context to the classroom context of teaching. Based on Tschannen-Moran et al.’s (1998) model, organizational efficacy may be the result of an analysis of the school’s functioning as an organization, and an assessment of personal competencies of functioning in the organizational setting. Consequences of these analyses will reflect in the teacher’s performance. A teacher with a strong sense of organizational self-efficacy will be a better team member, will draw more upon colleagues’ assistance, will use school resources more efficiently, and will contribute more to the sense of community among school staff and to school decision-making. A teacher with a weaker sense of organizational efficacy will tend to confine himself or herself to the classroom terrain.

The conceptualization of teacher self-efficacy formulated in the present research can integrate well with recent trends in research on the subject (Bandura, 1997; Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). The main difference between this and other conceptualizations is the addition of the organizational (the school domain) aspect of the teacher’s role to the concept of teacher self-efficacy, stressing the distinction between the teacher’s teaching-related tasks, and tasks which are associated with the school as an organization. Another difference is the augmentation of the “relations” part of the teacher’s work, in both the classroom and school levels. We can now suggest a new definition of teacher self-efficacy based on the empirical data gathered in this research:

Teacher self-efficacy is the teacher’s perception of his or her ability to (a) perform required professional tasks and to regulate relations involved in the process of teaching and educating students (classroom efficacy), and (b) perform organizational tasks, become part of the organization and its political and social processes (organizational efficacy).

According to this definition, teacher self-efficacy is a two-factor concept, embracing two interrelated efficacies: classroom efficacy and organizational efficacy. The typical behavior patterns included in the notion of this definition of teacher self-efficacy are: ability to motivate and impart
knowledge, values and morals to students; ability to manage the class, to improvise when unforeseen classroom situations arise; ability to overcome disciplinary infractions without much effort; assertiveness toward school administration; mastery of the whereabouts of the school political and social systems, resourcefulness; and involvement in the foci of influence within the organization.

The proposed definition of teacher self-efficacy provides support for the view which regards the teacher as a member of an organization in which he or she functions in two circles of activity and relationships: (a) the student and classroom circle, and (b) the colleagues and administration circle. In the first circle, the teacher functions as a leader, directing students toward cognitive and social goals. In the second circle, the teacher functions as a member of a group in which he or she acts to support the group and the organization in achieving and promoting its goals, and in determining the strategic directions of the organization (Schein, 1971). This contribution opens an important door to a deeper understanding of the complex role of the teacher and the system of conflicts and achievements that the teacher is required to deal with at work.

The CSC model of teacher efficacy draws upon a conception of the teacher as a professional who functions as a leader in the classroom as well as being a member of an organization. Our premise was that inter-relations are context-related and therefore should be assessed as part of both the classroom and organization (school) contexts. Thus we devised our scale to measure teacher professional efficacy beliefs, including classroom tasks, classroom relations, school tasks and school relations. The studies that we conducted in earlier stages showed that tasks and relations within the contexts of both the organization and classroom did not warrant separate measures. In the final study we found a good fit between the model and the data for classroom (tasks and relations), and school (tasks and relations) separation. The scale, using two separate scores, one for each subscale. A total score may perhaps serve some purposes, but in using a single score important information may be buried and disguised. We also believe that even for preservice teachers the school aspect of teacher functioning should serve as a measure of efficacy.

The classroom–school conceptualization of teacher self-efficacy leaves several questions open for future research. It would be interesting to discover the links between organizational self-efficacy of teachers and collective efficacy in school settings; are there gender differences in organizational efficacy; what may enhance the sense of organizational efficacy in a teacher; and most importantly, are there links between sense of organizational efficacy beliefs and teacher burnout, work satisfaction and staff turnover.

Findings of this study also carry some practical implications concerning teacher training. For many years, most of the training effort has been invested in ensuring that teachers are competent to teach students: to help their students learn, and to change teaching content in response to a child's ability to absorb and learn certain materials. This broader definition of teacher efficacy stresses the importance of training teachers as “organizational persons”, possessing the necessary skills to function in an organization. This includes an understanding of organizational processes, communications within the organization, group decision-making processes, and most of all, the importance of equipping teachers with skills in informal aspects of relationships among colleagues, and the capacity to deal with difficult social situations arising within the organization.
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